is quietly starting another major expansion of the Armed Forces. By the end of the year the 280,000-man force currently in South Vietnam will have increased to 375,000 by yearend and to 425,000 by next spring.

The Times itself in the same edition said supply problems in Vietnam are being overcome. But it added that lack of candor by the Johnson administration and the attempt to hide problems is unfair to the military.

CASE III

The Scripps-Howard roundup which appeared in the June 4 Washington Daily News said the Johnson administration has a hush-hush policy on prices. It said Cabinet members, economists, statisticians all have been told to soft-pedal prices and inflation which this newspaper pointed out are political dynamite.

CASE IV

According to a recent report of the Senate minority policy committee, the civil service retirement fund has $15 billion in investments. Income from this investment, plus Government contributions, keep the outgo current, but by 1970 the outflow will exceed cash receipts. On an accrual basis, there is an arrearage in the capital account of about $40 billion. Congress is obligated to vote funds to pay retirement benefits to civil employees.

CASE V

Under the title of "Politics in Poverty," the July 1 Washington Daily News described job security in a federally financed Kentucky coal area poverty program as conditioned on political kinships or economic interest to the county's Democratic courthouse machine.

CASE VI

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, according to a letter published in the Nation, berated a Washington, D.C., professor who in a broadcast pointed out that weekly figures on American deaths in Vietnam do not include casualties from disease, air accidents, and the like. In the past, when Sylvester did not approve of newsmen he threatened to go to their editors; in this case he carried his protest to the president of the university where the professor teaches.

CASE VII

The Department of Agriculture placed a rush order for 2,900 special typewriters which cost more than $500 each. Due to the rush, the Department was spending $1,500,000, or $500,000 more than the cost would have been if it had taken competitive bids.

According to the Agricultural Stabilization Service the rush was to meet a deadline of January 1, 1967, for reporting of farmers' payments. What the Department overlooked was that an amendment establishing the deadline had been defeated and was not in the law.

CASE VIII

Not long ago an article in U.S. News & World Report said antipoverty funds granted to Syracuse University were used, in part, to hire baby sitters and pay taxi fares to transfer people from heavy Democratic public housing areas to voter registration centers in the city.

CASE IX

A recent Gallup poll reported that 41 percent of the population lists crime as the greatest domestic problem in America. Some 51 percent of those polled believe that the problem had worsened in the last 5 years.

Statistics bear out this worry. In a report on June 20, 1966, the U.S. Department of Justice revealed that crime increased 6 percent in the first 3 months of 1966. The increase was led by a 14-percent rise in forcible rape, 11-percent rise in larceny, 9 percent in aggravated assault, 5 percent in auto theft, with murder, robbery, and burglary each chalking up 4-percent gains.

CASE X

An editorial in the June issue of a trade magazine, Welding Engineer, mentions a program of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity. It criticizes the program's cost of $16,000 to train four welders but especially is critical because the students only received training in one kind of welding. It points this up as an example of Government getting into some areas about which it knows little or nothing, and wonders why a welding school has to be set up in a city that already has two of the best privately operated welding schools with experienced teachers in the country.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Almighty God, so teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto Thy children.

And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it.

For the Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident.

For in the time of trouble He shall hide me in His pavilion: in the secret of His tabernacle shall He hide me; He shall set me up upon a rock.

Teach me Thy way, O Lord, and lead me in a plain path.

For I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.

Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 13, 1966, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXCEPTION OF REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY NEW ZEALAND FROM PROVISIONS OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO LOCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to except real property owned by the Government of New Zealand from the provisions of certain laws regulating the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace in freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompaning paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on that Department's activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the calendar year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the third division of the Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNTS OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON RADIATION PROTECTION AND MEASUREMENTS

A letter from the General Counsel for the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the accounts of that Council, dated December 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the letter of Albert Archibald, of Martinsburg, W. Va., expressing condolences relating to the illness of Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, Sr.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3615. A bill for the relief of Desire V. Vanderhoeven; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning November 27, 1966, and ending December 1, 1966, as "National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

LOCATION OR TRANSFER OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) to provide for use of a major factor of avoiding problems of heavy population concentrations in the location of Federal Government activities and in Federal Government purchasing and contracting, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF A COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 283) creating a Committee on Intelligence Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and submitted a report (No. 1371) thereon.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour on matters other than the announced business this morning, and with a time limitation of 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. That does not refer to any discussion that might occur on any point of order that might be made. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. Just routine morning business.

Is there morning business?

THE TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in order to permit those States now divided by two or more time zones to exercise some option in its application.

This bill would not detract in any major way from the basic principle of uniformity established by the recent Time Act. Its only purpose would be to eliminate the difficult and unfair circumstances which result from applying the act to States bisected by time zone lines.

There are 13 States which are cut into parts by time zone lines. For example, at the present time the boundary line between central time and eastern time runs almost through the center of the States of Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee; it also separates Michigan's Upper Peninsula from the rest of the State, and goes through the western tip of Florida.

Furthermore, the line between mountain and central time bisects South Dakota and Nebraska, and slices across the southwest corner of North Dakota and the western part of Kansas. The boundary line between Pacific time and mountain time separates portions of Idaho, Oregon, and Utah; even Salt Lake City and the Great Salt Lake are in different time zones. The most extreme case is that of Alaska which is in four time zones: Pacific, Yukon, Alaska, and Bering.

All of these time lines, which were established by the Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation, hearings and negotiations, have been designed to minimize the problems resulting from time differentials. The line through my own State of Indiana had to be drawn carefully to avoid splitting metropolitan areas.

The bill which I am introducing today will make it much more feasible for bisected States to operate under the new Time Act. Under present provisions of the Time Act of 1966, the decision to adopt daylight saving time or to remain on standard time must be made for entire State. This will in some cases result in great hardship and confusion, especially in those sections of a State which are part of a large metropolitan area centered in an adjoining State. Under my amendment, that decision could be made separately for each portion of a State bisected by a time line.

Let me emphasize that other States would not be affected and that bisected States would not be exempted from any other provision of the Time Act. It would require bisected States to commence and end daylight time on the same dates as all other States. It would not authorize any form of local political option for a city, a county, or any other such subdivision. To the contrary, the phrase "including all political subdivisions thereof," which makes the Time Act applicable to an entire State, would remain in the act.

The bill is not designed to exempt political or governmental subdivisions of any kind; rather, it would permit removal of the time zones as such from only one of the act's many requirements. Its scope is much narrower than those amendments which were presented to Congress during consideration of the Time Act. It will apply in only a few instances, and will not detract from national time uniformity.

The difficulties which will face Indiana and other States under the present provisions of the Time Act are not products of isolation. They will be caused by their unavoidable and significant economic and social ties to sister States. An amendment recognizing the indivisible relations between one part of a bisected State and its neighbors would allow choices which can only increase joint, interstate time coordination.

Mr. President, the diversity of our Nation often requires that we take different paths to reach common goals. A coordinated national time system is indeed a worthy goal, but to ignore the different ways in which time zones affect individual States could produce a stifling uniformity that might prevent further development of a coordinated national time system. Recognition of the specialized problems presented by that group of States divided by time zone lines is but one more recognition of the diversity of our States. It is also a recognition of the principle that true national policy comes best from coordinating the Nation's diversity, not stifling it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this bill be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3616) to amend the Uniform Time Act in order to allow an option in the adoption of advanced time in certain cases, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 is amended by inserting after "including all political subdivisions thereof" the following: "other than in the case of a State with parts thereof in different time zones which State may so exempt one or more such parts".

NATIONAL DAIRY FARMERS COOPERATIVES WEEK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation providing for a National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Milk Producers Federation.

The Nation's dairy farmers are the most efficient single group of agricultural producers in the Nation today. Much of this efficiency in production can be attributed to the giant strides made by dairy cooperatives in spreading technological know-how among farmer members.

Even more important, dairy cooperatives have done a magnificent job over the years of helping the dairy farmer to raise his income. Despite long hours of work and high capital investment, the Nation's dairy farmer gets a pitifully low return on his dollar. Without dairy cooperatives the return would be much lower.

The consumer has a particular reason for being grateful to the dairy cooperative movement. Dairy cooperatives have insured the consumer of a constant supply of "nature's perfect food" at reasonable cost. They have done this by fighting low dairy prices—prices that might cause many a dairy farmer to stop producing milk—while at the same time emphasizing greater efficiency on the dairy farm.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will express its appreciation of the job being done by the cooperative movement by passing this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 175) to designate the period beginning November 27, 1966, and ending December 1, 1966, as "National Dairy Farmers Cooperatives Week," introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT PROVIDENCE, R.I., AS THE "THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL"

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would designate the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital."

This joint resolution would be a most fitting tribute to my distinguished predecessor in this Chamber who died last month at the age of 99 after achieving a remarkable record as the oldest man ever to serve in the U.S. Congress.

Theodore Francis Green will long be remembered as a statesman and a patriot who understood the realities of international power and who knew at firsthand the perils and price of military service. It is therefore appropriate that we commemorate him by designating a veterans hospital in his name.

As a young man he raised his own company in the Spanish-American War, thus beginning his career in public affairs on a singularly patriotic note. Some years later, as a Member of the Senate, he was instrumental in establishing the Navy base at Quonset Point on the eastern shores of Narragansett Bay. He was also instrumental in establishing in Rhode Island the Veterans' Administration hospital which by the terms of this Senate joint resolution, would be designated by his name.

Mr. President, I am aware that it is the practice of the Veterans' Administration to defer to the wishes of Congress in giving such designations to hospitals, rather than to do so by administrative action. At least two VA hospitals have been so designated by specific legislative directives: the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital at Montrose, N.Y., and the Royal C. Johnson Veterans' Memorial Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. In addition, I am advised, there are the John J. Cochran Veterans Hospital in St. Louis, Mo., and the Edward Hines Veterans Memorial Hospital in Hines, Ill.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the memory and record of Theodore Francis Green clearly merits this sort of commemoration and that the Providence hospital, designated by his name, should be added to this list. I hope the Senate will join me in honoring one of its great members and give early consideration to the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a letter from Carmine V. Rivera, of Rhode Island, national vice president of the National Association of Government Employees, who first suggested the idea embodied in this joint resolution; and also a letter from W. J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 176) to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R.I., as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital," introduced by Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. PASTORE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 176

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration hospital, located at Providence, Rhode Island, shall hereafter be known and designated on the public records as the "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital", and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such hospital is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such hospital under and by the name of "Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital".

The letters, presented by Mr. PELL, are as follows:

JUNE 6, 1966.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: Thank you for the opportunity extended by your letter of May 27th, 1966, to comment on a suggestion by Mr. Carmine V. Rivera, National Vice President of the National Association of Government Employees, that the Veterans Administration Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island, be designated as the Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital.

Senator Green had a distinguished career of public service, most notably as a Senator from Rhode Island for many years. We fully appreciate the importance of paying due homage to this outstanding statesman. I must tell you, however, that the Veterans Administration has long followed a policy of naming its hospitals for the city or town in or near which they are located. That policy was adopted after considering suggestions that the hospitals be named for prominent doctors, Congressional Medal of Honor winners, and other individuals. It was realized that a fair basis of selection would be difficult, that controversy would result, and that persons or organizations whose candidates were not chosen would be disappointed.

Hospitals named by Congress, of course, are not subject to the mentioned administrative policy, and two have been named by legislative directives. They are the Royal C. Johnson Veterans Memorial Hospital and the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital, both of which were named by public laws enacted in 1945.

It has been our position in reporting on bills to name hospitals after individuals to point out our administrative policy and defer to the Congress on the propriety of legislative action.

We hope that this informaton will help you in your consideration of Mr. Rivera's suggestion.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
Administrator.

MAY 19, 1966.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PELL: The passing away of the Honorable Theodore Francis Green was indeed a great loss to all those who loved him, not only in our state of Rhode Island but throughout the country.

We in Rhode Island will always be grateful to this dedicated man for his tremendous accomplishments during his tenure of office, particularly while he represented our state as a United States Senator.

We all know that the late distinguished gentleman was instrumental in bringing to Rhode Island the Veterans Administration Hospital, as well as naval establishments and other Federal agencies. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the entire Rhode Island Congressional Delegation immediately introduce legislation designating the Veterans Administration Hospital in Providence as the Theodore Francis Green Memorial Hospital.

With warm kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

CARMINE V. RIVERA.

LOCATION OR TRANSFER OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution by the senior Senator from Ohio and myself, ask to have it printed, and lie on the desk through the close of business on the 25th

of July, and further, that a joint statement by Senator LAUSCHE and myself be placed in the RECORD as if read immediately following the printing of the concurrent resolution in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD and will lie at the desk as requested by the Senator from Iowa, and the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 101

Whereas heavy concentrations of population are causing a proliferation of social and economic problems which tend to deprive numerous citizens of an opportunity for wholesome living for themselves and their families; and

Whereas unrestrained commercial and population expansions will result in rapid increases and concentrations of municipal refuse, of agricultural solid waste, of smog-producing hydrocarbons, of nitrogen oxides, and in a rapidly increasing concentration of population; and

Whereas the location of sites for activities of the Federal Government and purchasing and contracting of the Federal Government, coupled with the mobility of our population, have caused and will continue to strongly influence regional and local concentration of population; and

Whereas the rate of population growth of certain regions of the United States has been substantially lower than the national rate of population growth; and

Whereas many such regions possess not only abundant resources for economic development but, equally important, unparalleled opportunity for wholesome living for people who wish to remain or move into them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that in the location or transfer of any Federal activity, or in the award of any Federal contract or subcontract (other than on a competitive bid basis), a major factor entering into the decision by the Federal Government shall be the promotion of a more orderly and equitable growth of the population of the various states and the areas within the several states to the end that problems of heavy concentrations of population will be avoided or minimized in order that more opportunities for wholesome living will be available to more people.

The statement, presented by Mr. MILLER and Mr. LAUSCHE is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS LAUSCHE AND MILLER

The Federal Government spends between $16 and $20 billion annually on research and development.

Billions more are poured into defense and space related activities and installations.

Yet, if one were to examine closely where these funds are being channelled, he would find that they are being concentrated in but a few states.

He would find that:

More than 34 per cent of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare research and development funds are being earmarked for universities in New York, California and Massachusetts.

More than 59 per cent of Atomic Energy Commission research and development funds are being sent to universities in California and New Mexico.

More than 69 per cent of National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development funds are going to universities in California.

More than 37 per cent of National Science Foundation grants are going to universities in California, New York and Massachusetts.

Anyone interested would further find that:

Five states—California, New York, Texas, Connecticut and Massachusetts—were awarded in fiscal year 1965 close to 50 per cent of the $23.3 billion in Department of Defense prime contracts. A closer scrutiny would reveal that two-thirds of the total prime contracts went to only 10 states.

An example of the inequities can be illustrated in the case of Texas. In fiscal year 1962, Texas was awarded military prime contracts in the amount of $1,006,000,000—four per cent of the national total. In fiscal year 1965, this had grown to $1.5 billion or 6.2 per cent of the national outlay.

One State—California—was awarded nearly 46 per cent of the $4.1 billion in National Aeronautics and Space Administration prime contracts. California, together with nine other states, accounted for close to 88 per cent of the total NASA prime contract awards.

This distribution of funds is being made without regard to the promotion of a more orderly and equitable growth of population. It has spawned such unrestrained commercial and population expansions as in the case of California where, according to estimates, within the next 30 years there will be increases in municipal refuse of from 12 to 40 million tons . . . of agricultural solid waste of from 13 to 18 million tons . . . of smog-producing hydrocarbons of from 7,345 to 9,095 tons per day . . . and of nitrogen oxides of from 2,215 to 3,975 tons per day. And at the present rate of growth, California will have a population of 1.5 billion.

These heavy concentrations of population are causing a proliferation of social and economic problems which tend to deprive numerous citizens of an opportunity for wholesome living for themselves and their families.

Another effect of the maldistribution of federal government funds is its serious impact on the distribution of scientific, professional and educational talents. Skills of many regions are being transferred to other areas.

It is estimated that the Midwest, for example, produces 40 per cent of the PhDs in science. Yet, because of the imbalance in federal fund distribution and the tendency to locate federal activities on each coast, the Midwest retains only about 25 per cent of them.

Needless to say, as the Waterloo, Iowa, Courier expressed it in an editorial last April 11, "In a day when competitive industry needs scientific research to survive, the uneven distribution of scientific brainpower must be a matter of concern."

It went on to comment that the Midwest "particularly is at a disadvantage because of the great cost of training PhDs whose talents are then transferred to other States."

When these talents are drained off from one area, expansion of businesses and industry is adversely affected.

If the trend is not reversed, we soon will have virtual "deserts" of scientific talent on the one hand and excessive concentrations of such talent on the other.

As a step in the direction of decentralization of government expenditures, we are introducing today a concurrent resolution making it the "sense of Congress" that there be a more equitable distribution of federal government contracts and activities.

The resolution sounds a warning on the "proliferation of social and economic problems" being caused by heavy concentrations of population.

And this is so because "unrestrained commercial and population expansions" do result in a proliferation of the problems we now face, such as air and water pollution.

It is also true that location of sites for activities of the federal government, coupled with the mobility of our population, strongly influences regional and local concentration of population. (Parenthetically, we might point out that employment in defense and space related industries in the State of Texas jumped from 65,300 in 1962 to 73,600 in 1964. And large increases were shown in 1965 and 1966.)

The resolution will provide our federal government agencies with a new guideline to follow in the location of federal government activities and in the placement of federal government contracts, and the result will be a reversal of the serious and dangerous trend towards undue population concentrations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 646

Mr. HART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MAILING PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 647

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I have heard of many cases which constitute real hardship amongst many of my constituents who are sending parcels to their relatives serving in Vietnam. One mother, whose monthly income is less than $300 related to me that the cost of sending parcels to her son in Vietnam can reach $25 a month. I consider this a real economic hardship.

At this time I am sending to the table an amendment to H.R. 13448 which is presently pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The bill as it presently stands makes certain changes in the mailing privileges accorded to and for members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other Federal Government personnel serving in a combat zone. My amendment would further liberalize those privileges.

We all recognize the great morale factor which the receipt of mail and packages has to those who are serving their country in distant places. Mail is the only link with home and family. Most of us here can remember the anticipation and the joy of opening packages which we received while serving in the military. Servicemen in Vietnam can receive no less pleasure at the receipt of mail and packages from their loved ones at home. Moreover, our young men in Vietnam are fighting a tough, dangerous, and exceedingly disagreeable war and are fighting this war with bravery and in the finest possible tradition of American manhood. The best we can do is to help them as much as we can. Furthermore, any burden upon the families of our servicemen which hinders rather than encourages the sending of

more packages and letters is also a burden upon the military effort of our country.

As I stated, I am greatly concerned about the cost of mailing packages to citizens serving in Vietnam. Many Rhode Islanders and I am sure all Americans, would like to increase the frequency of package mailing overseas. However, they find that due to cost, they cannot send as many packages as they desire. This obviously prevents the receipt of much desired mail from home by serving personnel.

To correct what I feel is an unnecessary and unwanted obstacle to the morale of our servicemen in Vietnam, I have drafted an amendment which provides that postage on parcels of 10 pounds or less, mailed to or from an overseas combat zone, shall be mailed at one half the postage rate which they would now require. I believe, Mr. President, that this proposed amendment to H.R. 13448 would have the effect of increasing the volume of packages to our servicemen. By accepting this amendment, the Senate would be doing a tremendous service to both our men overseas and their familes at home.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3475, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS OF VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 5 minutes in which to make a brief statement not on a CIA matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 29, 1966, units of the U.S. Air Force and Navy struck oil storage installations in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam. This action was taken in support of 270,000 U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam, and to deny necessary fuel supplies to aggressor forces. Most significantly, this action was taken to convince the Hanoi regime that its own best interests lie in abandoning war and choosing peace for Vietnam.

The decision of the Commander in Chief in consultation with his military and diplomatic advisers was no rash escalation of the tragic war in southeast Asia. It was, in my opinion, the logical consequence of events transpiring in that area in the past 6 months.

General Westmoreland has pointed out that the tide of battle is no longer running against the forces of the Republic of South Vietnam and those of her allies. With the substantial support of American troops, who have shown amazing skill, resourcefulness, and superb courage, the forces of freedom have taken the heart out of the Vietcong effort; they have effectively diminished if not, indeed, destroyed the Red hopes of victory through subversion and wanton murder. In so doing, they have completely altered the political outlook in Vietnam. The ends for which we fight can be achieved by force of arms, if not by negotiation.

In the course of recent political disturbances, it remained clear that the large bulk of the Vietnamese in the South want nothing to do with the terror tactics or the attempted domination by the so-called National Liberation Front. This point is agreed upon by Buddhists and Catholics, by merchants, farmers, laborers, and by General Ky and Thich Tri Quang.

In the past 6 months there has been a continuing U.S. effort to find a formula for peace, to which there has been no forthright response from the Communists to U.S. offers of unconditional discussions, or of any mutual reduction of hostilities. The only response has been that South Vietnam and her allies must accept the program of the National Liberation Front—in effect, surrender.

I find no logic in the argument that these recent air strikes will further delay reaching the conference table. Openhanded efforts, "the pause," public announcements of willingness to meet, repeated appeals to the United Nations, indications of an acceptance of a reconvened Geneva Conference, global diplomatic efforts—all have failed to produce a significant response because the forces of North Vietnam have counted on a military victory.

The logic is much more persuasive, it seems to me, that our continuing military exertions in the South, and, on a carefully measured basis in the North—as part of a resolute policy of standing up to aggression—will actually expedite the chances for a political settlement. This is the logic of reality as against sophistry.

The North Vietnamese now have further evidence that they must seek solutions other than their assumed future "victory." It is more timely than ever to press for an honorable settlement—after the Communists have had an opportunity to assess the changed military situation, and to see, perhaps more clearly now, America's unyielding determination to set South Vietnam free.

I also disagree with those who argue that the considered use of American military power means an increased risk of global war. Their argument rests on the abstract premise that the free world must exclude war as an instrument of foreign policy, and that military action by the other side must be countered, on our part, only by some kind of splendid moral inaction. If adequate and worldwide peacekeeping machinery were available, if, indeed, the other great powers of the world were willing to concert with us for peace, if there were no aggressor nations, then perhaps a presently available alternative of war might be found. But I see no evidence of this when France and China explode their nuclear bombs, when other nations clamor to possess this dread weapon, when neither the United Nations nor any of the great powers of Europe dare come to grips with the problems of southeast Asia.

At this moment in the history of mankind, the strength of the peoples of the world who would be free rests fundamentally on the power of the United States of America and its determination to maintain her freedom. To argue that this power must not be used in defense of freedom is to give way to the fallacy, so assiduously practiced in Communist propaganda, that military action is morally wrong except when taken in the name of world revolution. The world is not perfect yet, but there is much good that needs defending, and it will not be improved without positive action.

Earlier this year, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, defined the objective of the war as "restoring the integrity and security of Vietnam and its people; so this means no attempt to overthrow the North Vietnamese Government, no wish to be involved in China, but that whatever is required in South Vietnam would be done."

While questions may remain regarding the history and constitutional sanction of our involvement, they have little relevance to the immediate problems of the United States in Vietnam. America has fought her campaign in the wilderness. The President has found his generals. As the Secretary of Defense pointed out only this week, a long road still lies ahead toward a successful conclusion of American military efforts. But let there be no doubt about American intention to see these efforts through. From this point on, the central issue is not solely the war, but the reconstruction as well.

American men have been sent to fight and to risk their lives in Vietnam. For many months, this commitment of our forces has been the subject of a great national dialog on our purposes in Vietnam. Because we possess such enormous power, it is relatively easier to solve the military problems than the more complex political ones. It has always been so. But at this point, as the possibility of a successful conclusion of the Allied military effort may loom dimly in the distance, America must not lose sight of its real purpose: the independence and integrity of the people of South Vietnam. Gen. Maxwell Taylor said earlier this year:

> If we are to leave the country after the end of the Viet Cong insurgency, it is essential that we make progress, even under the conditions of war, in stabilizing the government, the society and the economy.

Six months ago, at the University of California at Los Angeles, I said that, in Vietnam:

> We have shown our determination to accept the consequences of belief in the brotherhood of man and of our determination that communism can be defeated by the "good news" of democracy.

In traditional Vietnamese society there has been for centuries a tradition of village democracy. In modern times there have been several examples of successful elections by secret ballot. These practices were temporarily halted by the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem, who feared that they might be exploited by the Communists. More recently, efforts to achieve representative government through local elections have been resumed.

In my view, Diem's retreat from democracy played into the hands of the Vietcong. Free elections need to be put back in the hands of the people of South Vietnam. The time is right. The Vietcong have intimidated the people by exploiting the propaganda of "victory." Vietcong cadres have won adherents on the premise that the NLF is the way of the future—an argument which they have supported with terror.

I must say that I am greatly disturbed by reports from South Vietnam that the Ky government may seek to manipulate elections in order to exclude its opposition and to perpetuate itself. I devoutly hope that such reports are untrue, and are proved to be untrue. The United States must recognize that the processes of nation building and government building require time. There is no such thing as instant democracy. The United States must be assured that the elections in South Vietnam will be honest and fair, and that the trappings of democracy will not be substituted for the substance of popular government.

The right to vote ought not to be denied to any South Vietnamese citizen who believes in the freedom and integrity of his nation and who will accept the duties and obligations of citizenship. I mean by that, all citizens, who meet these qualifications, regardless of whether theirs is a history of association with the Communist Vietcong.

Furthermore, the restrictions on candidates should be applied only against those opposed to constitutional, self-government. The right to vote, to run for public office, to participate in the process of government, compose the foundation of orderly, democratic society. They are the strongest weapons available for the defense of freedom.

I should think that the immense contribution of the U.S. Government to the cause of a free, independent South Vietnam would allow us to exact the simple requirement that these rights be broadly given.

We seek no colony anywhere in the globe. We seek a secure South Vietnam, from which American forces can depart in peace and honor, with the assurance that man's capacity to flourish in freedom will once again be vindicated against totalitarianism in any form.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, request has been made by a member of the minority to object to such unanimous-consent request. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, is there any Member who now wishes to be heard in the morning hour?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 3-minute limitation on the morning hour be concluded not later than 11:30; that when it is concluded, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be recognized to make a general statement on the resolution which he will offer, and that he be followed by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once those general statements have been concluded, it is my intention to move that the Senate go into executive session, and I want to put the Senate on notice to that effect.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a great deal of difference between an executive and a closed session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be a closed session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be a closed session as provided for under rule XXXV.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is, a closed session.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 8 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE ETHICS COMMITTEE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I speak out this morning to express my commendation of the services of our Senate colleagues who are members of the Select Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. President, this Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct composed of Senators chosen by their colleagues deserves and has the support and confidence of all U.S. Senators.

Our colleagues on this important committee did not seek membership. In fact, a majority, if not all, reluctantly accepted this added responsibility and duty out of a sense of duty and of their pride in the Senate. We have read newspaper accounts of the proceedings of this committee in connection with hearings in executive session and also the recent public hearings.

There is every reason for Senators to be proud of the manner in which the proceedings have been conducted and to be proud of the dedication and high public service being rendered by our colleagues serving on this committee.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman, is one of the Nation's outstanding lawyers. In the past he has served as district prosecuting attorney of a judicial district in Mississippi and was a distingushed judge of the circuit court of his State. His name has frequently been mentioned in connection with a possible appointment as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Senators will agree he has eminent qualifications for the highest judicial position in our Government. No one could possibly challenge his judgment or question his integrity.

The committee vice chairman, WALLACE BENNETT, of Utah, is entitled to have, and does have the confidence, respect, and admiration of his Senate colleagues. His high intelligence and integrity are beyond question.

Likewise, the four other Senators of this committee are nationally known as Senators of the highest competence and excellent character and unquestioned integrity.

This committee is now engaged in sifting evidence regarding one of our colleagues. They neither asked nor wanted to have this additional public service. Very definitely, they did not seek to sit in this semijudicial and factfinding capacity. The senior Senator from Connecticut asked that they hold these hearings. It is certain they have done and will continue to do their duty thoroughly, fearlessly, and with the utmost fairness.

I wish to manifest my confidence and admiration toward each of these Senators.

Mr. President, more than 40 years ago I served as chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Following that time for many years I was a trial lawyer in Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. I have been president of two bar associations. My purpose in speaking briefly today is to call attention to the attempted intimidation of Senate witnesses by attorneys for the senior Senator from Connecticut before the Senate Standards and Conduct Committee. I want to commend the chairman of the Ethics Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for his forthright reminder that Senate witnesses are wards of the Senate. It would appear to me that some of the acts and actions of certain of the battery of attorneys representing the respondent have been improper. We should bear in mind that the Senate committee of which Senator STENNIS is chairman and Senator BENNETT is vice chairman were asked by the senior Senator from Con-

necticut to hold these hearings and they are doing an unpleasant duty not of their own volition.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to reports of intimidation of witnesses conducted by members of one of the largest law firms in the United States—Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl. Lawyers certainly should be familiar with the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association, if not the criminal laws of the United States.

I am informed that partners of the Cahill firm even sit on the grievance committee of the bar association. In view of this fact, if it is a fact, certainly none of these attorneys should flout the canons of ethics of the bar association.

There has already been published in the Washington Star an account of the manner in which Walter J. Kenny of this firm telephoned Michael B. O'Hare, a witness, stating:

> We just want you to know we have got a complete check on Terry Golden. It would be a shame for a lovely girl like her to have her reputation hurt in any way. Maybe after you hear the type of questions we throw at Jim Boyd you will get the flavor of it.

If such news report is a correct statement of fact this was a flagrant attempt to intimidate a witness, which incidentally Mr. O'Hare reported to the FBI. This incident was followed by the indefensible act of a combative young man, who told O'Hare, poking a finger in his chest:

> I just want to tell you one thing—when this is over I'm going to follow you to your * * * grave.

It was this latter incident which brought an admonition from the chairman and a subsequent apology. However, an apology is no substitute for the law and the rules of proper procedure at judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings. Intimidation, or attempted intimidation of a witness of the sort reported is highly reprehensible, in my judgment and would be prejudicial to the administration of justice from every standpoint.

Following the chairman's admonition on June 24, there was evidence of another incident which is said to have occurred on June 25 in the Sheraton Carlton Hotel, when the same Walter Kenny, Jr., summoned a former senatorial assistant, Glenn Cooper, to the hotel and endeavored to secure information from him derogatory to other witnesses. Kenny is quoted as saying:

> These four (referring to the four former employees) are finished. Do you want to be finished too?

I would consider that a threat.

There was still another case of intimidation when a private detective employed by this law firm called upon Judith Berling, another former Senate employee in company with her father, who is a member of the reportorial staff of the U.S. Senate. The detective is said to have suggested or threatened that Miss Berling's father might lose his job with the Senate if she did not cooperate in giving the right kind of testimony.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with the statement by Mr. Sonnett before the Standards and Conduct Committee that the threat of a muscular 27-year-old man was a "trivial incident." No violation of the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association is a trivial incident.

Equally serious has been the sinister type of interrogation conducted by Mr. Sonnett. He has attempted to attack the reputations of young women witnesses by innuendo, even indulging in the improper inquiry as to whether they intended to marry certain persons. Mr. Sonnett should know this is improper and irrelevant to the issue and is a course of conduct unbecoming a gentleman or a good trial lawyer.

Further still, it is said that employers of certain witnesses have been telephoned and asked that they discharge such employees. This is the equivalent of blacklisting, which under certain circumstances is a criminal offense.

The senior Senator from Connecticut asked for this investigation. It would seem it ill becomes his attorneys, therefore, to attack the integrity of the committee's counsel or for anyone to suggest that the committee may have arranged hammering to disturb the hearing. These are charges reflecting upon the entire U.S. Senate.

I should like to commend the members of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for their painstaking and patient efforts on behalf of this body. Each member of this special Senate committee—Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman; Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, vice chairman; and Senators EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, JAMES B. PEARSON. They have conducted the hearings in the highest tradition of the U.S. Senate. They are doing their duty with fairness, thoroughness, and impartiality. Without a doubt each one is distressed that he was selected by his colleagues to serve on this important committee. Chairman STENNIS and every member has the confidence of the Senate and of the public generally. Of this I feel certain. May I add that I hope the Senator involved in this inquiry has not been prejudiced by the actions of his counsel. I should like further to request that it be ascertained whether these cases constitute contempt of the Senate and whether the FBI has investigated these charges of intimidation, especially that which Mr. O'Hare referred to the FBI on May 23.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, the RECORD will show that I was the first in the Senate to speak out in favor of having the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct hold full and thorough hearings on the controversy involving Julius Klein and Senator DODD. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] associated himself with my position and made additional remarks on that occasion. We urged that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the Senate take those steps necessary to give complete assurance to the Senator from Connecticut and to the Senate that fair, impartial, and thorough hearings would be held with respect to the problems raised in regard to the so-called Klein affair.

The senior Senator from Oregon has taken such a position in the Senate when other questions have been raised with regard to allegations of improper conduct by members of the Senate staff and Members. As the RECORD will show, I was one who spoke up in support of a special committee to be appointed to hear the allegations concerning the conduct of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

In my judgment, Senator DODD clearly is deserving of that type of hearing. He is getting that type of hearing. I am sure he appreciates that type of hearing.

In my opinion, the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] just made in the Senate are in no way a reflection on the Senator concerned. They are remarks calling attention to the conduct of certain lawyers and other representatives of the Senator from Connecticut, which conduct the Senator from Ohio believes has been improper and which, in fact, has not been fair and helpful to the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct. I share his views and associate myself with his views.

On July 7, 1966, the senior Senator from Oregon received the following letter from the chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, Mr. JOHN C. STENNIS.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the excerpts included with the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
STANDARDS AND CONDUCT,
July 7, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed please find excerpts of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966, by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut.

Your attention is called to the portions of the enclosed excerpts in which your name appears.

In the event that you desire to comment upon these excerpts, it is requested that your comments be addresssed to the Committee office, Room 222, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. Such comments will be made a part of the record of the Committee's proceedings. This by no means suggests that you make a statement.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Benjamin R. Fern, Chief Counsel, extension 6679.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Stennis,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman.

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY

Mr. SONNETT. After you made the copies, what did you do with them?

Mr. BOYD. After the copies were made, they were brought to Mr. Anderson's office.

Mr. SONNETT. And did that include the Klein file?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SONNETT. In the Klein file at the time you took it from the Senator's office, was

there a collection of documents in plastic-covered envelopes which you had before you this morning?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, sir. I will say the entire—no, not the entire Klein folder, because you have shown me many documents in the deposition that I had never seen before. But in rough, the documents in the plastic sheet this, what we have called the instructions which have been identified in other terms by the counsel for the Committee were there, yes, sir.

Mr. SONNETT. Now, I show you a plastic envelope containing a variety of documents headed "Echo of the Fulbright hearings," with a memo reading as follows:

"Not a single U. S. Senator or Congressman criticized me after the Fulbright hearings. Somehow the people in Germany did not understand that this was not an attack against me but against the Federal Republic's strong stand on the Soviets by the appeasers. But I was pleased to get the attached letters from Senators and Congressmen since the Fulbright hearings, which include messages from leading Democrats and Republicans. As a matter of fact, I have suggested that a resolution be introduced and passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I will take the advice of Senator MORSE and forget about it."

Also in the envelope, Mr. Boyd, are the following documents:

A letter from Senator ALBERT GORE to General Julius Klein dated November 14, 1963, a letter from Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER to General Julius Klein dated December 31, 1963, a copy of a letter from HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to General Julius Klein dated January 10, 1964, a letter dated February 6, 1964, from Senator HUMPHREY to General Klein, a letter from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON to Julius Klein dated November 23, 1963, a letter from Senator JACOB K. JAVITS to Mr. Julius Klein dated December 2d, 1963, a letter from Senator Kenneth B. Keating to General Julius Klein dated December 30, 1963, a letter from Senator EDWARD V. LONG to General Julius Klein dated November 15, 1963, a letter from Senator RUSSELL LONG to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963, a letter from Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON to General Julius Klein dated December 5, 1963, a copy of a letter from WAYNE MORSE to Senator SYMINGTON dated November 19, 1963, a letter from Senator WAYNE MORSE to Mr. Julius Klein dated February 20, 1964, a letter from Senator KARL E. MUNDT to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963, a letter from Senator KARL E. MUNDT to Major General Julius Klein dated February 6, 1964, a letter from Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF to Mr. Julius Klein dated January 3, 1964, a letter from Senator HUGH SCOTT to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 18, 1963, a letter from Senator JOHN SPARKMAN to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 19, 1963, another letter from Senator JOHN SPARKMAN to Mr. Julius Klein dated January 23, 1964, a letter from Senator STUART SYMINGTON to General Julius Klein dated February 18, 1964, another letter from Senator SYMINGTON to General Klein dated November 14, 1963, a letter from Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS to Mr. Julius Klein dated November 21, 1963.

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to make a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator.

Senator BENNETT. By reading merely the names of the Senators who wrote these letters, I think an erroneous, a completely erroneous impression will be left, so I would like to suggest that the text of these letters be printed in the transcription of today's record so that the public can know what these letters said, and I would also like to suggest that when Mr. Klein comes before us, he be asked to bring up all of the correspondence he has had with these Senators whose names have been mentioned a well as correspondence during this period with Senator DODD.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, I think your suggestion is certainly well taken. I will see what the counsel proposes to do with these letters.

Mr. SONNETT. I was about to ask Mr. Chairman, that the exhibit be marked as a Dodd exhibit and be made fully available either for incorporation in the record or released to the press as you wish. I must say, Senator BENNETT, I hope you do not think that by my reading the names of some of these Senators I mean to imply that they did anything improper in writing these letters.

Senator BENNETT. I don't think you are implying that they did anything improper, but since you have spent the first half of the afternoon, or since our counsel spent a good part of the time today going through the Dodd correspondence with General Klein, by inference the implication exists that these same Senators had the same kind of correspondence with General Klein, and having read the letters in that file, I think the inference is completely false, and I think in order to keep the facts straight in this hearing, that after the file has been accepted as an exhibit, the contents to which you have referred, the actual letters, should be printed in the transcript, so that the public can see the difference between these letters and the letters that the counsel for the committee has offered earlier.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Senator.

Senator MCCARTHY. Just as an additional comment there is variation among these letters, is that not true?

Mr. SONNETT. Senator MCCARTHY, these letters differ one from the other in general. There are letters here from leading members of the Senate on both sides of the House expressing their regret at any unfair treatment which General Klein had suffered by reason of the FULBRIGHT hearings. Now I have confidence——

Mr. FERN. Mr. Chairman, I don't think we ought to characterize these letters exactly in that manner. I believe the letters speak for themselves and we should read the text.

The CHAIRMAN. I will make a statement here now. As I understand it, going back to this, I understand these letters were in the so-called Klein file?

Mr. SONNETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Taken from the DODD office?

Mr. SONNETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. That makes them pertinent here. They are part of the file. You certainly have a right to go into that and select anything there that you might wish to present. But the point is certainly well made. And I assumed you were going to offer them to go in evidence?

Mr. SONNETT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be admitted in evidence now, all of them will go into the record direct like other letters, Mr. Reporter.

(DODD's exhibit No. 6 referred to follows:)

ECHO OF THE FULBRIGHT HEARINGS

Not a single U.S. Senator or Congressman criticized me after the Fulbright Hearings. Somehow the people in Germany did not understand that this was not an attack against me but against the Federal Republic's strong stand on the Soviets by the appeasers.

But I was pleased to get the attached letters from Senators and Congressmen since the Fulbright Hearings which include messages from leading Democrats and Republicans.

As a matter of fact, I suggest a resolution be introduced and passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but I will take the advice of Senator MORSE and forget about it.

But it is time that the people in Germany not only forget about but also that they double their support for me.

(A few letters of tribute for JK from U.S. Senators and Congressmen.)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 20, 1964.

Mr. JULIUS KLEIN,
United of America Building,
Chicago 1, Ill.

DEAR JULIUS: I haven't had a chance to talk to STU SYMINGTON as yet in regard to the contents of your letter of February 13 to me, your letter of February 12 to him, and your letter of February 5 to KARL MUNDT.

However, my first reaction to your suggestion is to advise you not to press for a resolution or a letter signed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee. I don't think you will be able to get very many signatures on either one of such documents, because they are bound to be interpreted as critical of FULBRIGHT.

Next, I would point out that such a resolution would run the grave danger that FULBRIGHT would strike back, because he would interpret the move as a criticism of him. I think the record that has been made is fair to you and fair to FULBRIGHT, and what you need to do is put it to effective use. The statements which SYMINGTON and I made on the record answer the criticisms that you are running into. There is certainly nothing that stops any other member of the Committee from writing a personal letter to you which you can put to effective use, also.

However, in my judgment you will do yourself much more harm than good if you seek to obtain some kind of resolution or general letter signed by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

As you know, the Foreign Relations Committee has recommended a bill on the general subject of foreign lobbies, and with that in the offing, I think it would be unwise to press your suggestion. I think it would be better for you if during the course of the debate on the foreign lobby bill, those of us on the Foreign Relations Committee who care to could reinforce the comments we have already made.

I fully realize that I am not the party of interest in this matter, but on the other hand, I think maybe you should give some consideration to the possibility that because I am not the party of interest in the matter, I may very well be more objective than your subjective interest in the matter is inclined to make you.

I am sure that STU would be glad to join us in a visit about this matter when you return to Washington.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

NOVEMBER 19, 1963.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: It will be impossible for me to attend the Foreign Relations Committee meeting tomorrow morning, November 20, at which Major General Julius Klein is scheduled to testify on S. 2136.

In view of our conversation today, I would appreciate it very much if you would ask permission in my behalf to insert this letter in the record of the hearing tomorrow morning.

First, I wish to make some comments about Klein, himself, and then I want to make a statement in regard to the arguments he has advanced in his prepared statement in opposition to S. 2136.

I have known Julius Klein for the nineteen years that I have been in the Senate. I knew him all the time I was a Republican, as well as during the period I have been a Democrat. He has been a public relations man during

that period of time, representing various clients on many matters. I have always found him to be completely non-partisan in any of the representations he has ever made to me in regard to any subject matter in which he was interested in his capacity as a public relations man.

I also have always found him to be honorable, and I have never known him to misrepresent facts about any issue or attempt to deceive me. On some matters involving his public representations, I have disagreed with his position and opposed his recommendations in carrying out my duties as a Senator. On other occasions, I have concluded that the facts have supported his position, and in those instances, I have favored his side of some given legislative issue.

I am very sorry that his work as an advisor to the West German Government which has been under investigation by our Committee apparently is receiving bad headlines in Germany as the German newspaper stories which you and I talked about today indicate. I am satisfied that in connection with any service Mr. Klein rendered the West German Government as a public relations agent in the United States, he performed that service with full disclosure to the German Government as to the representations he was making in behalf of that Government in the United States and did not knowingly or intentionally engage in any illegal action.

As he points out in his statement, the term foreign agent has a negative connotation in the minds of many newspaper readers and undoubtedly the newspaper stories concerning our Committee's investigation of the activities of foreign agents may have caused many people to assume incorrectly that services rendered the United States by American representatives of foreign governments who function in the capacity of public relations representatives necessarily carries with such work negative connotations. However, in my opinion, that is neither the fault of the Foreign Relations Committee nor of the law. It is one of those risks relative to public reaction that anyone working in this field must necessarily run.

I do not think that our Foreign Relations Committee is subject to any criticism because of the fact that representatives of foreign governments acting under the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 may have suffered some criticism or injury to their professional standing as a result of the Committee of the Senate carrying out its clear duty to try to find out what has been going on under the administration of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938. In one respect, it is somewhat similar to the risk that anyone runs as a result of a Grand Jury indictment.

There is no doubt about the fact that no matter how innocent one's conduct has been in regard to any matter, if it develops that the Grand Jury issues an indictment which later is either quashed or a petit jury acquits, there is no doubt about the fact that the person indicted has been injured. Sometimes, I refer to such situations as part of the price of being free men. Freedom comes high, but it is worth the cost.

I feel that so long as representatives of foreign governments conduct themselves honorably and properly within the law, the facts concerning their record will stand up against any investigation or inquiry into their course of conduct.

On the basis of any information I have received to date, I am sure that Mr. Klein's record in carrying out his public relations work will support the representations he has made in his appearance before the Committee.

I wish to repeat that on the basis of the friendship that has existed between us for nineteen years, it causes me to believe that he is a highly honorable man.

Now a word about Mr. Klein's prepared statement in opposition to S. 2136. I find myself in disagreement with a good many of his criticisms of the bill. It may be that before we finish the mark up of the bill, some of his criticisms and those of other witnesses should cause us to modify the bill. However, I do not think that his major criticisms are sound.

I refer particularly to the specific comments he makes on pages 5, 6, 7 and 8 of his prepared statement. As an introduction to the specifics he lists on those pages, he says, "Would legislation really control the bad ones?" In this reference, he is referring of course to agents representing foreign governments. I think most of his comments on this point constitute non sequitur arguments.

Murder laws, of course, do not stop murders, but all of us are a lot safer with the murder laws, and we have fewer murders than we would otherwise have. I know of no law that will control the bad ones, to use Mr. Klein's phrase, if any individual is determined to flaunt the law.

However, I do know that our hearings show that the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 is very much in need of amendment, and I think S. 2136 is a move in the right direction. I am perfectly willing to consider any proposal that will improve S. 2136, but I feel that Mr. Klein's prepared statement represents too much of an ignoring of the serious defects which have developed under the operation of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938.

Incidentally, I think some of those defects would never have developed if the Department of Justice had lived up to its clear responsibilities of effective administering of the law. Nevertheless, effective administering of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 will not resolve many of the defects which have been shown by the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee to exist. Therefore, I shall continue to support amendments of the Foreign Agents' Registration Act of 1938 along the lines of S. 2136.

I think that the prepared statement which Mr. Klein will give at the hearing on November 20, deserves very careful analysis by the Committee in the mark up of the bill in order to doublecheck and make certain that the final bill will not be productive of some of the shortcomings that Mr. Klein fears. But I do think that we must see to it that the agents representing foreign governments are required to operate under full public disclosure of all their activities, because in a democracy there is no substitute for full public disclosure of any activity that affects the public interest.

I am sorry that I cannot be at the hearing, but I shall appreciate very much your making this letter a part of the record.

With warm personal regards,

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

The CHAIRMAN. They are already exhibits now. They speak for themselves. Some of them ought to be read. You refer there to the Fulbright hearing. To make that clear, the Fulbright hearings were held by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate some time in 1963?

Mr. FERN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Some time during the year 1963, at which time it was claimed by Mr. Klein, as the Chair understands it, that great work had been done. That it had caused him to lose some of his business in Germany. Now, these letters came in then from the different Senators some time later, these are all after the hearings, aren't they?

Mr. SONNETT. Not all I think, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Not all?

Mr. SONNETT. But most.

The CHAIRMAN. The ones to which I refer came in after these so-called Fulbright hearings, and found their way into Senator DODD's files and were in these papers that were collected here as testified.

Mr. FERN. Mr. Chairman, all of these letters were written after the Fulbright hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. They all were written after the Fulbright hearings? All right. I think, Senator BENNETT, both members here have made a good point. I think Mr. Sonnett was going to offer them in evidence of course. They speak for themselves. I really think some of them ought to be read here that are typical of all of them, so that the erroneous impression that the Senator referred to will be avoided. Would you read——

Mr. SONNETT. I would be happy, Senator, to try and pick if I might one——

Senator COOPER. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator COOPER.

Senator COOPER. Were these letters included in the so-called packet that at least Mr. Klein wanted the Senator to take to Germany?

Mr. SONNETT. Yes, Senator, and I have a very specific point of examination for this witness with respect to this collection of letters. I am not dragging them in merely to show or try to show that there was any impropriety whatsoever in anything that any Senator did in writing these letters, any more so than I think there was any impropriety in any of Senator DODD's relations with General Klein.

Senator PEARSON. Is that counsel's line of questioning? Is that the purpose of his line?

Mr. SONNETT. No, sir, I have a very specific question about this particular plastic envelope and these particular pieces of paper for this witness.

Senator MCCARTHY. Did I understand counsel said he didn't wish to attempt to make a selection as to a typical letter?

Mr. SONNETT. I think that might be unfair just as I think the fact that Senator DODD has been singled out for such connections as he had with Klein is unfair.

The CHAIRMAN. Just pass them over here and let it be identified. Then the Chair will make a ruling on what will be done, please.

Mr. FERN. Mr. Chairman, may I propose that Mr. Sonnett and I confer and select what we think are representative examples here?

The CHAIRMAN. We want to keep the rest of the testimony moving. I have in mind referring this to a member of the committee to look at and we go on with the rest of the proof here and will come back in a few minutes. We have got to keep this matter going or we will be here a month.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that we might have the letters read tomorrow?

Senator BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, hasn't the Chairman already ruled that the letters will be in the transcript?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SONNETT. May I show this to the witness?

The CHAIRMAN. You need it for further examination?

Mr. SONNETT. Yes, I do.

Senator BENNETT. I have no use for them at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, continue your examination then.

Mr. SONNETT. Mr. Boyd, was that plastic envelope with those letters in the Klein file in Senator DODD's office which you surreptitiously removed in June, 1964?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I responded to the letter of the chairman of the committee, my response being under date of July 11, 1966:

Thank you very much for sending to me your letter of July 7. It encloses excerpts

of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966, by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut.

Your letter called to my attention two portions of the excerpts in which my name appears. Those portions consist of two letters which I wrote, one to Mr. Julius Klein under date of February 20, 1964, and the other to Senator SYMINGTON under date of November 19, 1963. My major comment in regard to them is that they speak for themselves and on the basis of the facts which I had at my command on the dates that they were written, I am pleased to stand on the record which I have made in the letters.

However, these are not the only letters that I have written to Mr. Julius Klein, or written about him, or written in regard to his activities during my years in the Senate. I shall be pleased to make available to the Committee, if it so desires, any and all correspondence that I have in my office files concerning Mr. Julius Klein. If, at any time, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate would like to have me appear before the Committee to answer any questions in connection with any of the correspondence in my office files to Mr. Klein or concerning Mr. Klein, I shall be glad to place myself at the service of the Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter in full be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

JULY 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, Room 222 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for sending to me your letter of July 7. It encloses excerpts of testimony presented at a hearing beginning June 22, 1966 by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate investigating charges of misconduct against Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut.

Your letter called to my attention two portions of the excerpts in which my name appears. Those portions consist of two letters which I wrote, one to Mr. Julius Klein under date of February 20, 1964, and the other to Senator SYMINGTON under date of November 19, 1963. My major comment in regard to them is that they speak for themselves and on the basis of the facts which I had at my command on the dates that they were written, I am pleased to stand on the record which I have made in the letters.

However, these are not the only letters that I have written to Mr. Julius Klein, or written about him, or written in regard to his activities during my years in the Senate. I shall be pleased to make available to the Committee, if it so desires, any and all correspondence that I have in my office files concerning Mr. Julius Klein. If, at any time, the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct of the United States Senate would like to have me appear before the Committee to answer any questions in connection with any of the correspondence in my office files to Mr. Klein or concerning Mr. Klein, I shall be glad to place myself at the service of the Committee.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in closing my comments on this matter, that I think that Senator YOUNG of Ohio and some other Senators who I understand have inserted material in the RECORD today have performed a service to the Senate in making it perfectly clear that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is entitled to the full support of the Senate in carrying out a thorough, no-stone-remaining-unturned investigation and hearing in respect to the issues that has been raised by these hearings. I repeat, that is the fairest thing that can be done for the Senator from Connecticut. I know of no evidence on the basis of any record made by the committee to date, that justifies any conclusion that Senator DODD has committed any illegal act.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut has not completed, as yet, his presentation of his case in chief. There is no doubt about the fact that the record that has been made to date raises questions concerning the activities of General Klein that the committee will find it necessary to evaluate when it comes to analyze the full record of the hearings. I do not know what the full record made to date shows, because I know only what has appeared in the papers. But I wish to say, I think the committee is to be highly commended for following the course of action that the Senate in fact directed it to follow. I think that the American people and the Senate are entitled to have every confidence in the committee. I am sure that the final report of the committee will be based upon the evidence that is submitted to it.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, the current investigation of one of my colleagues by the Senate Ethics Committee has already caused considerable cynical comment by some journalists which tends to reflect on the character of members of the committee.

While it is true that a majority of the Senate has, for reasons best known to itself, failed to take positive action in passing a disclosure bill which would satisfy the public's right to know about the outside income of Members of Congress and their families—an opportunity, incidentally, which I provided by an amendment offered on July 2, 1964—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 12, pages 15849–15851—it by no means follows that the present members of the Senate Ethics Committee will fail to do a conscientious job. Suggestions of a whitewash are unjustified and premature. Only a very small amount of the evidence is in, and, until it is all in, no one should make a judgment on this case. Moreover, until all of the evidence is in and the committee has made its decision, no one should prejudge the committee.

Members of the Senate Ethics Committee are serving unselfishly in a most sensitive and thankless undertaking. How would some of the cynical commentators like to serve, themselves, on a committee to probe into the ethical practices of members of the journalism profession? Instead of being destructive in their comments, they ought to be constructive—or, at least, neutral until after this matter is over.

All of this is not to be interpreted as any condonation on my part of the way the Bobby Baker investigation was handled. Nor do I condone the investigation committee's superficial proposal relating to disclosure. We need a meaningful rule relating to disclosure of all sources of income by Members of Congress and their families, including all of those in such a close position of relationship that the public, by having them covered by disclosure, will be reassured that it has all the information needed. We need a body of canons of ethics for Members of Congress carrying with it the same high standards that prevail in the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, and other professional groups. The very existence of such standards carries with it a salutary influence on those covered by them.

I hope there will be no further instances of reckless criticism of the Senate Ethics Committee and any of its members. Each of them has my confidence that they will perform their duties in a manner befitting Members of the Senate. But it will require a majority of the Members of the Senate itself to fulfill the public's right to know by appropriate legislative action—a duty which, I regret to say, was sadly neglected here on the Senate floor on July 2, 1964.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to add my commendation to that of my colleagues for the outstanding work that Senator STENNIS, the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and his fellow committee members have been doing in their current hearings. There can hardly be a more difficult and important area of congressional work than to hear and adjudicate the difficult issues that that committee now faces.

The Senate and the Nation are indeed fortunate to be favored with the extraordinary ability, perception, and wisdom which Senator STENNIS brings to these proceedings. He and his colleagues deserve the appreciation of the Senate and the Nation for the forthrightness, thoroughness, fairness, and decorum with which they have conducted these hearings.

I have the greatest confidence in the distinguished chairman and his colleagues. I know that the conclusions they reach, after all the evidence has been presented, will be fair, accurate, and responsible.

Senator STENNIS and his fellow committee members deserve the highest respect and support from all the citizens of our Nation, in this difficult undertaking.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, comment has been made earlier today by Senators with respect to the Select Committee on Ethics. Surely the responsibilities that those six men—three from my side of the aisle and three from the Presiding Officer's—have to discharge is of transcendent importance, of great and grave difficulty, and the Members of the Senate place their faith in the ability of the six to discharge their duties.

When the senior Senator from Kentucky introduced his proposal many months ago to create such a committee,

I saw fit to vote for it. Speaking as a Senator, I have great faith in the three Republicans who were chosen, and I say to my friend, the Senator from Maryland, I have great faith in the three majority members of that committee who were appointed. I am glad to spread my own faith on the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, I also rise to commend the conduct of the Ethics Committee in this most difficult and painful responsibility.

Under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi, JOHN STENNIS, the committee has made an excellent start.

Cynics in and out of the Senate contended that this would be a hear-no-evil, see-no-evil, speak-no-evil committee. Any fairminded person who has had a chance to review the transcript of the record must be impressed by the obvious sincerity of committee members—Republican as well as Democratic—in trying to get at the full truth of this complex, delicate, and difficult matter.

This U.S. Senate has a proud tradition. People throughout America look to the Senate as the leading American source of debate and discussion of the problems that face the Nation. Together with the House, this body has the massive responsibility of making the laws under which all Americans must live.

With this vast power, a high standard of ethics can and should be demanded from this body. The current hearings by the committee obviously recognize this ethical requirement.

When Senators were appointed to this committee, all of us in this body recognized what a painful and unwelcome burden such an assignment necessarily represented. In spite of this the six Senators appointed to the committee seemed at the time of their appointment to represent excellent selections.

Certainly their conduct in these difficult hearings has corroborated this view. As one Senator I formally and publicly express my thanks to these six men for a conscientious and impressive job.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the strike which has canceled 60 percent of the commercial airline flights in the Nation is beginning to have unfortunate effects, both on the parties to the dispute and on the Nation as a whole.

Today I received copies of two wires sent to the President encouraging him to use his best judgment to bring about an equitable and immediate solution to the strike. I am sure that all Members of the Senate join with me in the hope that current negotiations will successfully end this serious work stoppage. I ask unanimous consent that these two messages be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

JULY 8, 1966.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The current strike against major airlines has a serious effect on the economy of our city. Being one of the Nation's significant industrial centers, it is in the national and public interest to use your good office to bring about an early equitable settlement.

Respectfully yours,

ROY C. ECHOLS,
President,
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Indianapolis and Indiana is suffering economic loss at the inconvenience and traffic delay occasioned by the present airline strike. I urge that all resources available to the Office of the President be used to settle this dispute as equitably and expeditiously as possible.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor of Indianapolis.

BUILDING COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for 17 years the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association has been observing a special event during which period of time more than 5 million free beauty treatments have been given to women and girls in various institutions, such as homes for the aged, hospitals, penal institutions, and homes for special care.

During the observance of National Beauty Salon Week last February, thousands of people across this land, including ministers speaking from their pulpits, publicly complimented the professional cosmetologists on the institutional welfare program of their organization of more than 70,000 members. These "angels of mercy" have done a tremendous job in giving a lift to unfortunate women.

During the last 5 years the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association also has done much to build good citizenship and community leadership in its annual community leadership award program.

Outstanding judges, representing nationally known organizations, serve on the panel of judges, which makes the award. For example, the judges for the 1966 Community Leadership Award are the following:

The Honorable John M. Bailey, chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Sterling W. Brown, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Wendell A. Falsgraf, chairman, American Citizenship Committee, American Bar Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. T. F. Haynes, executive secretary, Quota, International, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Dorothy M. Ford, immediate past president, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Mrs. Hans-Arnold Fraenkel, national treasurer, League of Women Voters of the United States, Hartsdale, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth S. Knight, president, Zonta International, Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Allen H. Seed, Jr., executive vice president, Keep America Beautiful, Inc., New York, N.Y.

The Honorable BOB WILSON, Member of Congress, chairman, Republican Congressional Committee, San Diego, Calif.

Nominees are selected from various States entering the contest and the panel of judges makes the selection of the annual Charles Award for community leadership on the basis of their activity in their professional cosmetologist association, educational programs, religious programs, civic and social welfare programs, and political programs.

Those who have been honored with the Charles Award to date are:

Miss Edna Emme, St. Louis, Mo.

Miss Miriam Cordwell, New York City, N.Y.

Mr. Gaines Pressley, Marietta, Ga.

Mrs. Nelda Lewis, Kilgore, Tex.

I wish to express my congratulations, and I believe those of all Members of the U.S. Senate, to Mr. Leonard Benner, of Bellevue, Wash., national president of the National Hairdressers and Cosmetologists Association, and to members of the board of directors: Mr. Louis A. Freiberg, of New York City, executive secretary; Mr. Nathan E. Jacobs, of Omaha, Nebr., public relations counselor, and all the cosmetologists who participated in these notable programs that have helped to build better citizens and a greater America.

I offer this salute to the hairdressers and cosmetologists in connection with the calling of their 46th national convention in Houston, Tex., July 24. May they ever continue their good work in the voluntary welfare field to brighten the lives of unfortunate people.

TAX HELP TO LATIN AMERICA STRENGTHENS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee which deals with Latin American Republics, I would like to call attention to a gratifying development in our relations with the countries of this hemisphere.

When the Alliance for Progress was forged in 1961, tax reform was one of its major goals. To assist in this effort, the Agency for International Development, in cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service made teams of experts available to 15 Latin American countries.

Since then, 11 of these countries have established permanent tax training sections, 10 have inaugurated a public education and taxpayer assistance program, 10 now have return examination programs in operation.

The results have been remarkable. As noted in the July 4 issue of the International Commerce magazine, more than half of these countries have experienced increases in their tax collections over the past 2 years ranging from 25 to 45 percent.

These new revenues have helped in the fight against inflation, have supplied funds for local economic progress, and have improved the climate for all businesses in these countries—whether they are small or large, domestic or foreign. What is also significant, these developments will undoubtedly bolster confidence in the democratic process throughout Latin America.

This is an excellent example of how countries of the Americas can cooperate. I would like to commend the personnel in AID and IRS who have been making this program work, and ask unanimous consent that the descriptive article to which I have referred to be included in the RECORD.

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACTIONS: TAX TEAMS FROM THE UNITED STATES ASSISTING LATIN LANDS TO BOLSTER SYSTEMS—BETTER COLLECTIONS WILL HELP NATIONS WITH LOCAL FUNDS NEEDED TO COMPLEMENT OUTSIDE GRANTS OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

Modernization of tax laws and particularly establishment of more effective enforcement measures throughout Latin America have radically improved the economic outlook in a number of countries there. Specialists from the U.S. have assisted in this process.

The procedures have served to curb inflation and better the climate for domestic and foreign private enterprise. They have made it possible to raise the level of tax revenue and enable Latin American governments to provide the local funds needed to go along with the outside assistance provided under the Alliance for Progress program.

The vital contribution that sound administration makes to a nation's tax system was emphasized by U.S. Secretary of Treasury Henry H. Fowler in a recent talk to Latin American tax officials.

"The wisest tax laws, as we all know, mean very little unless they are administered effectively," he said. "In absence of good administration, a tax law represents very little more than a high-sounding, hollow expression of economic or political policy."

ALLIANCE SPURRED REFORMS

The improvements made by Central and South American countries in their tax system stem from the Alliance for Progress launched in 1961. The 10-year development plan for Latin America drawn up at that time set tax reform as one of its major goals.

The Agency for International Development in cooperation with the Internal Revenue Service has supplied technical assistance in the form of tax administration teams in 15 countries.

With AID providing the funds and IRS the tax experts, the U.S. teams give advice and assistance a particular nation might require to make its tax administration more efficient, productive and equitable.

While results are not achieved overnight, considerable progress has been made. The following table shows the tax revenue increase for those countries where the currency has remained stable.

Total tax revenue collections

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

	1963	1964	1965
Guatemala	91.1	102.7	118.8
Costa Rica	50.5	56.7	65.2
El Salvador	66.2	79.8	84.9
Nicaragua	19.0	26.9	32.9
Panama	55.0	59.6	70.0
Paraguay	30.0	31.9	42.2
Ecuador	132.9	158.9	[1] 191.3
Peru	351.8	[2] 432.8	[1] 507.4

[1] Estimated.
[2] Preliminary.

The 1965 increase in El Salvador is significant because it was achieved in spite of the severe 1965 earthquake which disrupted the economy.

In countries where inflation has been a factor, part of the rise in tax collections is due to improved tax administration. In Chile, for example, tax receipts rose in two years from 13.8% of gross national product to 16.5%. And it is in Chile that the first successful prosecutions for tax fraud have taken place. Audits of returns have raised additional assessments 600% in three years.

Tax help is offered only to those countries specifically requesting it. When such a call comes in—generally through the AID mission—IRS conducts a survey to identify the nature and scope of tax administration problems involved, the objectives for overcoming them, and the advisability of rendering a tax advisory team.

When a tax team enters a country, IRS experts act strictly in an advisory capacity. The responsibility and authority to make decisions remain with the host country.

VARYING SIZES

The size of a tax team varies from one man to seven or eight, depending on the goals of the program. The overall objective could be to improve every aspect of tax administration or only such phases as returns, collection, enforcement, training, public information or taxpayer education.

IRS also aids foreign tax officials in training and orientation—either on an individual or group basis. Individual programs are tailored to a special need, while group sessions involve representatives from eight to ten countries in a six to ten week course.

A new development is the IRS mobile audit training team. The goal is to provide intensive on-site training to revenue agents in such areas as accounting principles and the examination of tax returns. The teams also train local agents who in turn teach others.

EXAMPLES CITED

In addition to statistics previously listed, the following are cited as examples of tax reform in Latin America resulting from IRS-AID cooperation.

Panama increased delinquent tax collections 130% in 1965; additional assessments from enforcement rose from $1.7 million in 1964 to $2.5 million in 1965 and over $6 million of the $10.5 million tax revenue increase in 1965 was directly attributable to tax reform and improved tax administration.

In Ecuador, a widespread publicity and taxpayer assistance program upped the number of returns filed from 27,000 in 1964 to 60,000 in 1965.

In Peru, a pilot delinquent-return program produced 1,400 returns involving nearly $500,000. The six people assigned to this program will be joined by 23 more this year.

Uruguay seized the assets of three businessmen to satisfy long-overdue tax obligations. As a result of publicity given to this action, others who owe back taxes are declaring their debts and paying them.

Colombia netted over three million pesos in a delinquent tax program that cost only 138,000 pesos to administer.

PERMANENT CENTERS

Of the 15 Latin nations participating in the program, permanent training sections have been established in 11; public education and taxpayer assistance is being carried on by 10; return examination programs are in operation in 10; delinquent tax programs have been adopted by nine, and failure to file are being investigated in eight countries.

While Latin America is receiving primary attention from the U.S. tax assistance staff, aid is being offered to other countries as manpower permits. The Philippines, Korea and India are presently receiving such help.

For IRS, Harold Moss is in charge of the Foreign Tax Assistance Staff. He worked with Japanese officials in the rebuilding of that nation's tax system after World War II, and half of his 32 years with the IRS have been spent overseas.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM MUST NOT BE SHORTCHANGED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I announced my intention to fight for funds for the school milk program in addition to the $105 million provided in the agriculture appropriations bill as reported to the floor of the Senate if such an increase seems essential to the continued progress of the program.

Past history would seem to indicate that this amount simply is not enough. Although the agency administering the program within the Department of Agriculture asked for only $105 million when the fiscal 1967 budget was prepared, the Department itself requested $106 million for the program as long ago as fiscal 1965—2 years ago. In fact I asked the program's administrator, Howard Davis, back in 1964 how much would have to be appropriated if the reimbursement rate to the States was to be continued at the fiscal 1964 level. His answer? $108 million.

This, mind you, was before the Head-start programs, which use school milk, had fully gotten underway; before the current baby boom had further accelerated the numbers in our school-age population; and before the school milk program reached its current high participation level.

Yet we find now, 2 years later, that only $105 million will be made available.

I will continue to keep a close eye on this program to see if $105 million is indeed adequate. If it is not I will do my best to get additional funds in a supplemental appropriations bill.

PROPOSED BRIDGE DAM AND MARBLE CANYON DAM ON THE COLORADO RIVER IN ARIZONA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the lead editorial in the Washington Post this morning goes a long way toward putting into proper perspective the controversial proposal to build the Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams on the Colorado River in Arizona. The editorial is one of the most sensible and low-keyed discussion of this inflammable subject which I have yet seen.

As a proponent of the dams, I welcome at long last the recognition of the fact that we do not want to "ruin" forever the spectacular Grand Canyon Gorge, or to change completely the character of the river which runs through it. I want to minimize the impact on both, and I think the bill as now drawn will do this. But all should recognize, as the editorial points out, the need for fully utilizing the waters of the Colorado River in the parched Southwest area of the country.

I appreciate editorial emphasis of the fact that Lake Powell, the reservoir behind Glen Canyon Dam upstream on the Colorado, has indeed proved to be a beauty spot rather than the desecration of the river which nature lovers predicted. Americans are now coming by the thousands to see Glen Canyon and the Rainbow Bridge where before only a hardy few could float down the muddy

river on rubber rafts. The scenery is not identical with what it was in the pre-Lake Powell period, but most people say it is now enhanced and even more beautiful than it was in its original state.

I commend to my colleagues the thoughtful and reasonable discussion of the "Colorado River Issue" which appeared in the Washington Post on July 14, and ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

COLORADO RIVER ISSUE

Debate began yesterday in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one of the most important bills before Congress this year—the measure to authorize the Central Arizona Project. It is vital to the 30 million people of the seven states in the Colorado River Basin. Indeed, the entire country will be affected by the outcome because of the great national interest in the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

The Committee will have to weigh two major objectives. The Colorado Basin states are clamoring for this final step in harnessing the great river as an essential element of their continued growth. Indeed, they insist that they cannot survive without additional water. With rare unanimity, they are asking Congress to authorize a project that will divert 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year to the parched and thirsty areas around Phoenix and Tucson.

The Upper Basin states are supporting this undertaking only because the bill would also authorize five new water projects in Colorado at a cost of $361 million and a study of 13 other Upper Basin projects. In the picture is the further hope of importing water for the semi-arid Southwest, to be financed at least in part by power revenues to be derived from the proposed dams at Bridge and Marble Canyons. Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona recently held out hope that about $3 billion will be left in the basin fund "to help solve the larger water problems of the seven basin states."

The project unfortunately comes into collision with the passionate desire of many conservation groups to avoid any further obstruction of the picturesque Colorado. Ignoring or playing down the water problem, they cry out against the "ruin of the Grand Canyon." The Sierra Club and a number of Congressmen are asking Congress, not only to defeat the proposed Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams, but also greatly to extend the existing Grand Canyon National Park.

To our way of thinking, the answer must necessarily lie somewhere between the two extremes. The inescapable fact is that harnessing of the Colorado has been essential to the burgeoning of the Southwest. It could not support its present population without the impoundments of water behind immense dams (Hoover, Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and others). There is no doubt a compelling logic to completion of the system with due regard for scenic and recreational values as well as economic advantages.

We think that Congress will recognize this logic and pass some measure authorizing the Central Arizona Project. At the same time it is under obligation to this and future generations to minimize the impact upon the natural beauty of the Colorado River. Any grave encroachment upon the Grand Canyon National Park itself would be unthinkable, and even the change of the river into a lake for 13 miles at the western end of the park by the Bridge Canyon Dam ought to be avoided if possible.

While earnestly seeking an alternative, however, is is plain nonsense to speak of this proposed minor change in the park as ruining the Grand Canyon. It would not alter the awesome sight that visitors in the National Park see. The 175-mile Lake Powell behind Glen Canyon Dam has demonstrated, moreover, that stored water in the desolate Southwest can in some cases add greatly to recreational values.

We hope that Congress, in moving to utilize the full potential of the Colorado for the people, will give due weight to scenic and recreational values. Numerous suggestions for a compromise between the demands for water and the demands for preservation of natural beauty have been made. One is elimination of the proposed Marble Canyon Dam and the addition of this gorge to Grand Canyon National Park. Another is reduction of the height of Bridge Canyon Dam so as to avoid any water storage in the park and reduction of the flooding in the Grand Canyon National Monument.

There are various other proposals for enlargement of Grand Canyon National Park by the inclusion of sections of the Kaibab Game Reserve, the Kaibab National Forest and the National Monument. Congress could soften the impact of whatever it finds necessary to do to meet the water problem of the Southwest by adding to the remarkable complex of scenic and recreational preserves in the area.

THE 179TH ANNIVERSARY OF BASTILLE DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, the 14th of July, is a great national holiday in one of the oldest nations of the Western World. This date holds a hallowed place in the national heritage of France. To the people of that nation the 14th of July is symbolic of the striving for human freedom, a striving for which the French are well noted. And to Americans of French extraction, this day is also one of great pride.

This year France will celebrate the 179th anniversary of the day in 1789 when the people of Paris took control of the fortress called the Bastille. This fortress, which dominated the city, had become in the minds of the populace a symbol of tyranny and arbitrary government. It had long been used by successive regimes as a prison for political dissenters, who were spirited away from normal life and locked in the fortress, often never to be heard from again. It was also possible in those days for high officials of the land and court favorites to have someone they disliked put secretly in the Bastille, with no record available as to what had happened to the unfortunate person.

It is no wonder that the people hated this prison, this Bastille, and all for which it stood. A great and widening gulf existed between the old order, the status quo, and the new popular movement for liberty. During a demonstration, when it became apparent that the people would have to protect themselves, the governor of the Bastille refused to issue arms when he was requested to do so. It was then that the hatred of oppression, represented by this building, caused the people to storm the fortress.

The attack on this symbol of all the cruel and despotic aspects of the then traditional order in Europe, helped to open the floodgates of revolution which in time spread to almost all the nations of the continent. The struggle for liberty and justice before the law was given a great impetus by the event which the people of France so proudly commemorate today.

It was our forefathers who fired the "shot heard around the world" which in a sense began the revolution for human rights and the dignity of man. The citizens who took the Bastille were surely following in the same path. We can thus sincerely extend to the French nation our deepest congratulations and best wishes on this holiday which is so significant for not only their great nation, but for all of mankind as well.

THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of editorials appeared today supporting the statement I made in the Senate yesterday concerning the need for new legislation to protect the public interest in strikes which imperil the public health or safety.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 14, 1966]

IMPOTENCE ON STRIKES

In rejecting the flexible and generous terms recommended by a Presidential emergency board and all attempts at arbitration of the airline strike, the leadership of the International Association of Machinists is taking an unreasonable and irresponsible stand, deliberately flouting the public interest.

The powers of the Federal Government to end this dispute that has paralyzed a large part of the nation's air freight and passenger traffic are severely limited. Because the Government is powerless, the union is under no compulsion to yield to reason. It is free to cripple air transportation, causing inconvenience and frustration and increasing costs, in defiance of the President and in disregard of the public.

The machinists are acting within the law. But there is something wrong with a law that permits either labor or management thus to ignore the public interest and disrupt the nation's transportation services. Mr. Johnson pledged himself to correct this glaring weakness in his last state of the Union message. He stated then that he would "ask the Congress to consider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us to effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

But the President has never since then advanced any such proposals. In Congress, Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and JACOB K. JAVITS are moving to make up for the Administration's lapse by calling for a form of binding arbitration to strengthen the Government's hand to deal with disputes that threaten essential national services. The machinists' strike is the latest evidence of the need for stronger powers in such areas.

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, July 14, 1966]

AN EMERGING PATTERN

In its strike against nearly two thirds of the airline industry, the International Association of Machinists has further extended

a pattern that is becoming all too familiar in American labor relations.

The sequence of events goes like this: Labor and management are at their usual loggerheads in a transport or transport-related industry the Government considers to be essential. As a strike deadline is reached, or nearly reached, the Taft-Hartley or Railway Labor acts are invoked or, as in the case of New York last Winter, the Condon-Wadlin Act. If industry and labor cannot agree, the reasoning goes, impartial arbitrators should delve into the facts and come up with a solution fair to both sides.

So far so good. But what happens then? If both sides are asked to accept binding arbitration, industry generally agrees, though often with reluctance. Labor just as frequently refuses. Very well, there would be no binding arbitration. But when the fact-finding reports and recommendations are presented the same thing happens. The employers accept with reluctance and the unions refuse.

This pattern, as we noted earlier, is getting too general for comfort. There are many examples of it, but a few recent instances are worth citing. It was the case with the International Longshoremen's Association's most recent strikes along the Atlantic-Gulf waterfronts. It was the case with the strike of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association against shipping lines last year, and with the strike of the Transport Workers' Union against the New York City transit system last January. It is also the case with IAM's current strike against five major airlines.

Negotiations for a new contract between IAM and the airlines have been in progress for nearly a year. Formal mediation under auspices of the National Mediation Board began in February and ended in failure in March. The NMB then suggested binding arbitration under the Railway Labor Act, which also governs labor disputes in the airline industry.

Within two days of this offer the carriers had accepted and the unions rejected binding arbitration. A month later President Johnson created an emergency board, which reported back to him a compromise solution on June 5, one day before the strike deadline. A 30-day no-strike period was then decreed and on June 7 the President endorsed the emergency board's recommendations on the grounds that they "form the framework for a just and prompt settlement, which is in the national interest." Once again the carriers accepted and the unions rejected the whole package.

It is, of course, conceivable that at one time or another a panel of outside experts will produce recommendations not entirely fair to the unions—even one consisting (as did the panel in this case) of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Richard E. Neustadt, associate dean of Harvard's School of Public Administration, and Washington attorney David Ginsburg. It is just as conceivable that a given panel might unwittingly be unfair to management.

But what is one to make of the impression that in case after case the transport unions are victimized by the impartial arbitrators and Presidential fact-finding boards—no matter how distinguished their rosters may be or how highly endorsed the recommendations may be outside the councils of the unions themselves?

This is what one must keep in mind in assessing the very costly and disruptive recent strikes along the waterfront, against the shipping industry, against the New York City transit system and now against five major airlines. These strikes were called not because management refused to give way to union demands, but because in each case the union involved refused to accept what impartial arbitrators found to be a fair settlement.

From this one might deduce that only the unions themselves are the proper judges of what can be considered a fair settlement, or, to put it another way, no Government body and no consideration of public interest or public inconvenience should be allowed in any circumstances to come between the unions and what they may be able to wrest by exerting the maximum pressure on the employers and on the public.

Senator JAVITS was absolutely right in saying yesterday that the President does not have "a single statutory step left" to protect the public in this instance and in adding "surely it is high time we stopped pretending that existing laws are adequate." The mechanisms provided by law, in this case the Railway Labor Act, have been entirely exhausted.

But the fact that in a statutory sense the President is left without weapons is not an excuse for accepting this sorry state of affairs as necessarily permanent. Where is that new emergency strike legislation Mr. Johnson has indicated is in the works? The time to produce it and the time for Congress to get down to business on it is now.

NATIONAL LABOR FRONT

Two U.S. Senators spoke out vigorously yesterday in favor of national legislation to ward off crushing nationwide strikes, such as the current airlines walkout.

Sen. JACOB JAVITS (R–N.Y.) proposes that a special Congressional committee whip together some corrective legislation.

PUBLIC IS HELPLESS

The President, JAVITS points out, promised such a move to protect the innocent public in his January state of the Union message. "Surely it is high time we stopped pretending that existing laws are adequate," he adds.

Sen. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN (R–Mich.) on this past hot Tuesday had to struggle back to Washington from Detroit via a plane to Boston. He arrived convinced firsthand that the Railway Labor Act is woefully inadequate when it comes to handling modern airline strikes. He, like JAVITS, demands Congressional action. And what's been the big delay?

[From Newsday, July 13, 1966]

STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By Clayton Fritchey)

STUPID STRIKES

WASHINGTON.—In his state of the union message on January 20, President Johnson, in the wake of New York's crippling subway strike, said:

"I intend to ask Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading state and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

That's the last we've heard about that. Six months have gone by and, as the shutdown of the airlines painfully shows, nothing has been done. There has been no White House followup, and none appears on the horizon. In fairness to Johnson, it should be noted that he finds himself in the same dilemma that has frustrated many other White House incumbents: It's easy to talk about doing something; it is not at all easy to do it; for the plain fact is that no President has been able to find a wholly acceptable and effective remedy for strikes which imperil the public interests.

It is also a notable fact that both George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Walter Reuther, the No. 2 labor leader, joined the President in denouncing the subway strike, but they have not come forward with any new remedies either. Meany, in his usual constructive fashion, merely said he would oppose any presidential effort to obtain federal legislation covering city and state employees. Reuther, in his more responsive way, said, "Society can't tolerate stoppages which endanger the very existence of society."

Reuther is wrong. Society not only can, but does tolerate such stoppages. In the last few years there have been big strikes which shut down shipping, building, public schools, newspapers, taxis, buses, and the airlines.

In each instance everybody, including the lawmakers, agreed "there ought to be a law." But it takes time to prepare legislation, and by that time the emergency is over and the pressure is off. It is also then discovered that while strikes are damaging, they seldom prove fatal to the national interest. They just seem to at the time.

At the moment, the country is indignant about the airline shutdown, and there is renewed talk of "doing something" but in the wake of settlement, the passion for reform will, as usual, soon spend itself. The politicians are wise to this. Six months ago everyone thought this session of Congress would certainly pass new strike legislation, but there is little or nothing left of that innocent hope.

Perhaps, after all these years, it is time for us to stop kidding ourselves that there is some miraculous answer to these exasperating, and often stupid strikes, which hurt the innocent bystander—namely the public. After the Manhattan subway strike, New York State was urged to emulate the National Railway Labor Act, which provides for a national mediation board to handle disputes between rail or air carriers and labor unions. It also permits a presidential emergency board to make nonbinding recommendations if mediation fails, and provides for a 30-day cooling-off period before a strike can be called.

Arbitration demanded

Yet in the airline dispute, every step of this procedure was followed, and still there was a strike. That's what prompts recurring demands for compulsory arbitration. For years this radical but seemingly simple solution has tempted Americans. A recent Gallup poll showed the public 2–1 in favor of it, a large increase over last year. Unfortunately, it has two serious drawbacks.

First, various state experiments with compulsory arbitration have not been too encouraging, nor has experience of other countries where it has been tried nationally. Second, both labor and management shrink from such critical government intervention, and as long as they feel that way it is unlikely that Congress will go against them.

Still, even if forced arbitration is not the instant answer, Congress has an obligation to develop better strike machinery than we have now. It could do worse than consider the formula sponsored by Senator JACOB JAVITS (R–N.Y.).

If, under his proposal, a labor dispute did not yield to fact-finding or a compulsory 30-day bargaining period, federal courts, at the President's request, could appoint receivers to operate struck facilities to the extent necessary for health or safety. If the administration feels this is not a good answer, it would be helpful to know why—and also what its own promised answer is.

[From Newsday]

THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED

The airline strike is now in its sixth day, with both sides refusing to budge, and both apparently happy not to bargain. Five major lines are closed, inconveniencing about 150,000 passengers per day seeking to reach 231 U.S. cities and 23 foreign countries. Travelers who really have to go have engaged in some fantastic expedients to reach their destinations. One man flew from California to London and then back to New York

on a non-struck carrier. Others have gone to California by way of Mexico, or to Chicago by way of Montreal.

Both the economic loss and the inconvenience have been incalculable, not to mention the problem involved in moving members of the armed forces bound for Vietnam. Non-striking employes of the struck airlines are beginning to feel the pinch too. Eastern Airlines, for example, has laid off 12,000 workers who do not belong to the striking International Association of Machinists. American industry in the long run is also bound to suffer, since important shipments so often travel by air.

This is another of those "public be damned" strikes in which neither side shows any conscience. Without discussing the merits of the union's demands and management's counteroffer, both contending forces have been standing pat, and no amount of government mediation has budged them.

Congress, under the lash of this latest strike, has begun to rouse from its torpor. Senators LAUSCHE (D-Ohio) and JAVITS (R-N.Y.) are sponsoring bills that recognize the problem of strikes against the public interest but these do not go far enough.

The only answer, and Congress is ducking it, is to create an independent, non-politically appointed board representing labor, management and the consumer in equal numbers. That board must have the power to step in and to enforce settlements that are in the public interest. An outraged public must eventually make its feelings known so that crippling strikes such as the present one can be prevented through compulsory arbitration when normal bargaining fails.

Since, at this moment, Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa is preparing to demand nationwide contracts with grocery store chains and regional contracts with big dairy companies, the threat of a national trucking tieup is menacingly near. Action is needed, and this session of Congress must provide it.

CONTAINERIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Norman Scott, executive vice president of Matson Lines, presented an excellent statement to the Maritime Administration Transportation Industry Symposium in Washington, D.C. on May 26. This is a factual statement indicating the direction that technology will lead in the next 20 years as our merchant fleet continues to modernize. It is recognized that Matson Navigation Co. has played a leadership role in the development in marine transportation that has so substantially increased the efficiency of our domestic merchant marine and substantially reduced freight rates to our offshore areas such as Hawaii and Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Scott entitled "Containerization—1986" be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONTAINERIZATION—1986

That title sounds a bit Orwellian—but this brief look into one aspect of the transportation industry 20 years hence is not designed along such lines.

I will sketch a picture of our industry in the 1980's, pointing out a major problem area that must be met head-on now if we are to progress at the rate we should.

We all know the transportation industry—on the sea, on the land and in the air—has made tremendous strides in the past 20 years. And within the industry it has been a period of progress for ocean shipping after years of doldrums as far as new developments were concerned.

Those big "boxes" are still revolutionizing transportation. More and more steamship, airline and rail and truck carriers all over the world are going into containerized operations. It has reached a point where a shipping company carrying general cargo almost has to provide a container service to stay even with its competitors. For ocean transportation, containerization represents as dramatic a change as did the advent of steam 150 years ago.

So it is safe to predict that progress in the next 20 years will be even more impressive and exciting than the past 20 years with containerization developments going full ahead on many fronts at the same time—in trucking, the railroads and airlines, as well as the ocean carriers.

It takes no crystal-gazer to see what lies ahead. Many of the tools and most of the know-how exist today waiting to be assembled and put to work for a new era of transportation.

Containerization, 1986, will go hand in glove with "6th or 7th generation computers". It will be an era of faster ships, possibly nuclear-powered, much more automated than at present and probably larger. Terminals, too, will be modernized, with cranes and other cargo handling machinery moving containers swiftly and easily from shore to ship to shore controlled by computers. Shipyards will have to be highly automated.

Also in prospect are such exotic items as large hydro-foil vessels, submarine tankers, "winged-hull" or hover craft and ground-effect machines, which skim over the water on a cushion of air at 200 knots with hundreds of tons of cargo or hundreds of passengers. Perhaps there will be cargo-laden missiles. Nobody views any of these things as pipe dreams any longer, not after what has happened in space and on sea and land since World War II.

Put all this glamourous hardware into operation and it looks as though we have it made. But to complete the picture and make it all work for maximum benefit to the ultimate consumer will require the creation and application of comprehensive systems concepts to develop maximum effectiveness of total distribution.

Consider the world demand for consumer goods by 1986 in light of population growth and standard of living increases in progress today. More people need more things and will be demanding more all the time. That means more and, hopefully, better transportation geared to the jet and atomic age, rather than the era of the "Model T" and the 5-cent streetcar fare.

What will be needed is a fully coordinated physical systems concept designed to provide total distribution of the lowest over-all cost consistent with service requirements to the ultimate consumer.

Containerization has great potential, but to yield its greatest benefits, it requires an integrated system. Such a system from a shipper's point of view would comprehend production scheduling, inventory control, insurance, storage, damage prevention and customer service and marketing. The tie-in, of course, must be complete between ocean carriers and rail, truck and air carriers to provide a system with this capability.

Unless containerization 20 years from now is part of a fully-integrated system, bottlenecks, red tape and inefficiency will inhibit much of the economic progress of the nation's and, for that matter, the world's transportation systems.

Achievement will be difficult but not impossible—provided that we start now to exercise "management technology" in a statesman-like way to solve such problems as competition between modes, standardization, the sociological questions of the impact of new techniques on the labor force, regulatory rigidity, the complications of tariffs, more realistic rate making, the political implications inherent in each phase, and each regional requirement.

By pointing out some of the more critical problems we can start to solve some of them to pave the way for the shiny, new concept of "Containerization—1986"—and realize its potential.

I have identified "management technology" as the key to these problems. And by management, I mean the management of government and labor as well as industry—it is everyone's concern. The challenge will be to achieve an environment by 1986 which will permit full realization of the remarkable "hardware technology" that is already on the drawing boards and in the memory banks of the computers. The hardware development potential, or the physical systems capability, already exceeds our management ability to utilize it fully.

My thesis and, if you will, my "message", is that to an even greater extent, we face a need to match "management technology" with the "hardware technology" capability we will possess by 1986.

Among the specific areas demanding attention today to be where we should be 20 years hence are the legal, regulatory, sociological and political ramifications, each a vital part of the complete transportation picture.

Most of our present laws affecting transportation were written when physical systems capabilities were either not thought of or in the early stages of development. They were not designed to encourage or even cope with the creation of systems that can now be physically established and operated. I refer, of course, to a much broader spectrum of transportation than ocean cargo container systems. And this points up the critical nature of the legal aspects confronting the industry in the years ahead. We must have laws that are based on today's, and tomorrow's, physical systems potentials.

For example, the container system as we know it today basically uses a single mode of transportation. Inter-modal use is still in its infancy. To accelerate the growth of maximum efficiency systems, legislation is required to encourage efficient inter-modal operations by permitting single ownership of inter-modal facilities by development or acquisition. As a minimum, the law should encourage streamlining physical operations by simplifying the development and administration of single factor rates. The legislation should provide for a single, independent regulatory agency having jurisdiction over all modes of integrated transportation. And finally, some deregulation is essential if multimodal transportation is to keep pace with the international demands of our industrial society where rapid change is the order of the day.

Our regulatory processes, some of which date back to the 19th century, need a thorough overhaul. We simply can't continue to be hamstrung by them in the 1980's. As mentioned, reaction time must be reduced. Present regulatory practices are too slow and cumbersome and more critically, they are increasingly usurping management functions.

Besides carrier regulation and tariff administration, there are customs regulations, documentation procedures and operational safety administration to be considered.

These activities should be brought into step with the times to foster the development and to meet the future requirements of the most efficient physical systems that can be assembled.

It is equally vital that rates and tariffs be simplified. The volume and complexities of today's rail and truck, and even ocean, tariffs are unnecessary road-blocks to the development of inter-modal and multi-modal cargo movements. The trend toward per-container rates should be encouraged. It is an economically logical process, which will materially simplify development of inter-modal systems. In the same regard, rate-making procedures should be based on costs rather than the value of service or other bases.

Here again, the evolution of a management technology in the field of regulatory affairs is needed. It seems obvious that if changes are not made, the growth of containerization will be retarded by red tape before the 1980's. "Management technology" must be a moving force in developing new ideas and shaping the future form of regulations that will foster maximum efficiency systems.

Now let's consider the sociological implications of our transportation preview of 1986. There are, I submit, three major categories that urgently require application of new management technology.

First is the all-important field of labor-management relations. Labor and management share a mutual responsibility to develop an equitable method or program to handle personnel adjustments resulting from automation and other applications of new technologies and equipment. In transportation, management and labor should be able to evolve satisfactory solutions through collective bargaining, even though they have had their troubles down through the years. Both have been criticized for tie-ups and public inconvenience. The maritime industry, in particular, has been through some rugged times in the mid-30's and postwar period. But there are definite signs of better understanding by both labor and management of the myriad problems that lie ahead, and of the need to work together to solve them. Ideally, new systems, new hardware and new ideas will create new jobs but there are bound to be dislocations and changes as they evolve. Part of the "management technology" we need is the ability for employee and employer groups to anticipate these problems before they become critical.

Next, for our second sociological consideration, we come to "people problems" within the management process of corporations. In the context of our 20-year look ahead, one of the primary internal management challenges will be the development of people able to use computer hardware more effectively and with more imaginative applications than is commonly demonstrated today. As I mentioned previously by 1986 we will be into more sophisticated computers, which will offer infinitely greater capacity, speed and flexibility for analysis and distribution of management information. However, regardless of the equipment capability achieved by then, its usefulness will be no greater than the accuracy of the input information and the selectivity of functions which the computers are called upon to perform. People must perform these functions. And people must create the intellectual awareness of system capabilities which transcend the short view perspectives of individual persons, departments, companies or even modes of transportation. We must have people who can visualize, plan and implement operations which do not yet exist but which are capable of development.

Third in my list of sociological considerations is the relationship with the customer community. Industrial management in our country, indeed, throughout the world, is becoming increasingly aware of the economic importance, in its broadest sense, of distribution. Gone are the days when top management relegated traffic and distribution management to a secondary role, with accountability well down the organizational line. This, of course, is no guarantee that broader systems development will find ready acceptance in the business society of 1986, but it does indicate that industry will become increasingly demanding in appraising and buying its distribution services. The management technology called for here is that of developing sufficiently broad managerial perspectives to establish true systems concepts of distribution in terms of customer requirements.

Now that we have had a look at the legal, regulatory and sociological questions, we come to the political element—probably the most difficult to classify or predict, but certainly one that will always be with us. In this category falls the development of broad public policy determinations covering basic legislation and regulation. Such matters as governmental financing of advanced research and financial aid or subsidy to new applications all fall initially within the political sphere. Equally important is the antitrust treatment of multi-modal systems, how they are created and regulated. The importance of this transcends politics as usual but we obviously must recognize the reality of things as they are, not as we might dream. So an educational and selling effort is required to restate national transport policy in the political arena in terms of multi-modal objectives.

I have tried to be realistic by pointing out a problem area that is easy to overlook, and have served up one version of a general approach to solving it. But speech is no problem-solver. As always, it boils down to a need for coordinated action, not just talk, under enlightened and hardworking leadership.

With what our researchers, scientists and engineers will come up with in the next 20 years we know we will have to do our best to be ready to manage what they make possible.

It is fitting when thinking about 20 years into the future to sum up the management challenge by recalling the words of the late "Boss" Kettering, the inventive genius of General Motors, speaking to a group at the dedication of the G. M. Technical Center in Detroit. ". . . the future will be greater than the most fantastic story you can write. You will always underrate it."

Thank you.

THE RISING TOLL OF MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that we in the Commerce Committee, and the Senate in turn, have so significantly pushed forward the cause of safety on our highways as we did in the passage of S. 3005 and S. 3052 just before the recess. These bills are receiving the concerned attention of the House of Representatives, and it is my hope that the results may be the fulfillment of the goals which I envisioned when I introduced the Hartke-Mackay National Traffic Safety Agency bill a month before the administration measure was presented to us.

But there is an area of highway safety which has escaped attention during our considerations, although it is a great and rapidly growing segment of the highway safety problem. I refer to the rapid increase in popularity and numbers of what is probably the most dangerous vehicle on our roads, the two-wheeled motorbike and scooter.

Mr. President, in 1964, 1,100 people in the United States were killed in motorcycle, motor scooter, and motorbike accidents.[1] This was an increase of almost 25 percent over 1963.[2] For 1965, it is estimated that another increase of 25 percent caused the number of deaths involving motorcycles to soar to over 1,500.[3] One hundred and thirty thousand people were injured in motorcycle accidents in 1963 alone,[4] almost 1 person for every 13 motorcycles in the United States.[5] In the 4-year period 1961–64, cycle fatalities in the United States increased 83 percent.[6] Both Wisconsin and New York recorded over twice as many motorcycle accidents in 1965 as in 1964.[7]

The burgeoning popularity of motorcycling indicates that the number of motorcycle deaths and injuries will continue to rise. Motorcycle sales in the United States have mushroomed in the past 5 years. In 1961, there were only 600,000 motorcycles, motorscooters, and motorbikes in this country. As of January 1966.[8] There were over 1,300,000 and the number is expected to reach 1,500,000 by the end of the year.

Mr. President, the tragic killings and traumatic injuries resulting from motorcycle accidents are arousing concern throughout the Nation. The Committee on Trauma of the American College of Surgeons has begun to call parental, professional, and public attention to the dangers connected with these lightweight, two-wheeled vehicles.[9] The Journal of American Insurance recently noted "growing concern among insurance writers and safety officials regarding poor accident records of cyclists."[10] And the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, at its 1966 convention in Portland, Oreg., will consider recommendations for dealing with the growing motorcycle problem. But the epidemic of motorcycle mishaps continues to spread.

CAUSES OF MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS

A major factor in motorcycle accidents is the vehicle itself. The motorcycle is basically an unstable vehicle, often difficult to handle at slow speeds.[11] Performance studies by the Road Research Laboratory of England have concluded that considerable skill and practice are required to achieve maximum braking.[12] Dr. W. R. Felix, M.D., an experienced cyclist, has observed that shifting gears

[1] *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965, page 17.

[2] Public Health Service, National Vital Statistics Division, 1963 statistics.

[3] *Traffic Safety*, April 1966, page 22.

[4] National Safety Council, *Accident Facts*, 1964 edition.

[5] Ibid.

[6] *Traffic Safety*, op. cit., at page 22.

[7] The New York statistics may be found in an article of the *New York Times*, June 8, 1966. The Wisconsin statistics were found in a May 3, 1966, publication of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, "Driver License Opinion Survey."

[8] *Press Release*, National Safety Council, Statistics Division, Jan. 1, 1966.

[9] *Medical Tribune*, November 22, 1965, page 15.

[10] "Two-Wheeled Trouble," *Journal of American Insurance*, September, 1964, page 22.

[11] *Medical Tribune*, April 16, 1966, page 18.

[12] Road Research Laboratory of England, *Research on Road Safety*, (1963), page 397.

on a cycle is often complex.[13] The instability of the vehicles increases the possibility of losing control when they hit grease spots, ice, water, sand, or gravel on a street or highway. Dr. Edwin E. Carter of the St. Louis University School of Medicine warns that "people don't realize how unstable motorcycles are on a slippery pavement, or how quickly they go out of control when they hit a rock or a stretch of gravel."[14] Problems of handling are even more acute for drivers of motor scooters and motor bikes, where size and weight distribution contribute to control difficulties.

A recent article in the New England Journal of Medicine found that scooters are "uniquely dangerous because of the small wheel that fits easily into invisible road depressions, the acute turning axis of the front wheel, and the light weight."[15]

These inherent dangers in the operation and control of motorcycles clearly imply that drivers should be required to demonstrate abilities to handle cycles with skill and care before being allowed to drive on our streets and highways. A recent study of motorcycle accidents by a team of Minneapolis physicians concluded that "it would be prudent to insist that drivers of motorcycles receive special instruction and demonstrate proficiency in the use of these machines before venturing onto our highways and city streets."[16] Yet today ouly four States—Hawaii, New York, Oregon, and Maine—require motorcycle drivers to obtain a special motorcycle operator's license and to pass a special motorcycle road test.[17] Throughout the rest of the country, possession of a valid automobile driver's license gives any person the authority to drive a motorcycle.

A second major cause of serious injury in motorcycle accidents is the exposure of the driver. Motorcyclists who hit other vehicles or pedestrians, or lose control of their cycles, go flying through the air to hit hard, rough surfaces or objects. Studies by the Road Research Laboratory, and by the Minneapolis physicians reveal that because of this exposure a majority of motorcycle accidents involve injuries to the head and lower extremities.[18] Protective coverings for the head and legs could thus significantly reduce the number of serious injuries suffered in motorcycle accidents. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. William H. Stewart, noted recently that of the 1,100 people killed in motorcycle accidents in 1964, "many died only because they failed to wear safety helmets."[19] While motorcycle trade organizations and safety groups urge cyclists to wear safety helmets and leather coverings, only Georgia requires motorcycle operators and riders to wear crash helmets approved by the State.[20]

A third primary cause of rising motorcycle injuries and deaths is deficiency in motorcycle equipment. Motorcycles are often hard to see in traffic or at night. Several States thus require them to be equipped with lights, brakes, reflectors and horns.[21] But only New York and Pennsylvania provide specifically for periodic inspections of motorcycles.[22] Defective brakes, or tires, may go unobserved in almost any part of the country, until they result in serious injury, or even death.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

These causes of motorcycle accidents and injuries reveal what can be done to prevent further increases in deaths and injuries.

First, under the forthcoming Traffic Safety Act of 1966 the Federal Government should promptly establish adequate safety standards for the design and construction of motorcycles, motorscooters and motorbikes. The definition of "motor vehicle" under the bill is broad enough to include them.

Second, special licenses should be required for all those who wish to operate a motorcycle, motorscooter or motorbike. The applicant should have to pass a physical examination, a written examination, and a road test. The State and local governments could perhaps provide for special off-street testing areas in which these examinations would be given by trained motorcycle examiners. New York, Hawaii, Oregon, New Jersey and Maine have been pioneers in developing these tests to protect not only the public, but the motorcycle operator himself.

Third, safety goggles and crash helmets should be required equipment for every motorcycle operator. Motorcycle racing drivers have recognized the protective capacities of helmets and goggles for years. The British Road Research Laboratory tests demonstrated that wearing a helmet reduces by 30 to 40 percent the risk of injury to the covered part of the head. New York State Commissioner of Motor Vehicles William S. Hults has urged his State to approve legislation which would require that all motorcycle drivers and passengers wear protective helmets and goggles meeting standards set by the Commissioner.[23]

The Road Research Laboratory has developed rigorous tests to determine the most suitable types of crash helmets. Shock-absorbing properties of helmet materials and padding materials have been investigated in order to produce the safest, most protective head covering. These tests, or similar ones, could be used by State or Federal motor vehicle officials to approve crash helmets for motorcycle operators. We learned years ago that requiring seat belts for automobiles reduced significantly the possibility of serious injury in automobile accidents. It is time for us to recognize that crash helmets perform the same function for motorcyclists. A massive educational campaign should be launched to inform the public of the protective advantages of crash helmets. In England such a campaign has succeeded so well that today 80 percent of all motorcycle operators wear crash helmets despite the fact that they are not required equipment. We must destroy the myth that only hoodlums and gangs wear safety helmets. We must persuade every cyclist that a simple $10 investment in an approved helmet may save a life—his own.

Fourth, an appropriate public agency, such as the local police department, for instance, must provide highly supervised motorcycle driver education similar to that traditionally provided for automobile driver training. Motorscooters and bikes are becoming increasingly popular with teenagers. An investment in preventive education now could save hundreds of young lives for tomorrow. The Bureau of Traffic of the Louisville, Ky., Police Department recognized this need for motorcycle driver education in August of 1965, when it established public driving schools for inexperienced motorcycle, scooter and bike operators.[24] Other cities should follow this example.

Fifth, periodic inspections of motorcycles should take place in every State, not just New York and Pennsylvania. The most careful motorcycle enthusiast may be unaware of equipment deficiencies in his vehicle, and many initiates probably do not have the technical knowledge to inspect their own cycles carefully and efficiently. The Pennsylvania motorcycle inspection is a good example of the kind of examination every cycle should be required to pass. Pennsylvania inspectors check steering, alignment and suspension, tires, wheels and rims, exhaust and fuel systems, brakes, lighting and electrical systems—including horns—vehicle glazing, registration and body items, road handling. If any of this equipment is not working properly, the vehicle is rejected and cannot be driven on Pennsylvania roads. In addition, any other equipment which has been mounted on the cycle must pass the inspection.

Sixth, it would improve the situation if no passenger were allowed to ride with the driver on any motor bike or scooter not equipped with a sidecar. These vehicles, because of their small size and light weight, are difficult enough to handle without a passenger. Riders only complicate the driver's problems of control, and increase the likelihood that an accident will occur.

Finally, at all levels of State, local and Federal Government we must begin a campaign to inform the American people of the need for prompt action to prevent the senseless injuries which occur in motorcycle accidents. Dr. James C. Drye, professor of surgery at the University of

[13] *Medical Tribune*, April 16, 1966, page 19.

[14] *Medical Tribune*, December 1, 1965, page 29.

[15] New England Journal of Medicine, October 15, 1964, p. 836.

[16] *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965, page 17.

[17] The Hawaii requirement is found in Act 29, 1965, Maine at chapter 303, Public Laws of 1965; New York, Article 9, section 503 (1965); Oregon, chapter 547, Laws of 1965.

[18] The Minneapolis study is discussed in *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965. The Road Research Laboratory results are at Road Research Laboratory, op. cit. at page 462.

[19] *Medical Tribune*, December 27, 1965.

[20] Georgia laws, 68–1673 (1962).

[21] Including New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Indiana.

[22] New York Article 9, section 390. Pennsylvania Purdon's Laws 75–834.

[23] *New York Times*, June 8, 1966.

[24] *Medical Tribune*, November 20, 1965, page 17.

Louisville School of Medicine, has called the motorcycle "the most lethal weapon on our highways and streets."[35] Sensible regulation must be used to put an end to the mayhem, death, and economic waste resulting from motorcycle accidents.

THE UGLIFICATION OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the press of urgent business there is a tendency to neglect responsibility which all of us bear to future generations in preserving the beauty of our land.

Recent proof of this was the appalling disclosure, in connection with the publication this year of the report of a "Special Committee on Historic Preservation," that half of the landmarks listed by the committee had already been torn down. This report entitled "With Heritage So Rich," was compiled under the auspices of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, financed by the Ford Foundation, and prepared under the guidance of former Representative Albert Rains. It observes:

> A nation can be the victim of amnesia. It can lose the memories of what it was and thereby lose the sense of what it wants to be. It can say it is being "progressive" when it rips up the tissues which visibly bind one strand of its history to the next. What it often does is to break the perpetual partnership that makes for orderly growth in the life of a society.

This year alone we have witnessed plans to destroy such irreplaceable treasures of the Nation as part of the California Redwood Forest, the Metropolitan Opera House of New York, National Presbyterian Church in Washington, and the west front of the Capitol Building itself. Although efforts are underway to save these landmarks, they may not be successful unless the citizens of this country rally to their support.

It is apparent that the quest for beauty must be concerned with manmade as well as natural scenes. An article in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 26 by Mr. Wolf Von Eckardt describes another aspect of uglification—the urge to lay down large ribbons of concrete which have the effect of overshadowing some of the most charming and historic areas of our cities. Examples are proposed expressways through the heart of the Vieux Carre in New Orleans, Society Hill in Philadelphia, and several sections of the Capital City of Washington.

Mr. Von Eckardt summarizes this process and comments that "our children will not thank us for it." His article deserves to be widely read and I would like to request unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the finest ways a citizen can express his patriotism is to join the fight to save as much as possible of America the beautiful. During the past several years leadership has come from the White House by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and from this body by such men as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE and Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. As a result of this concern, the Senate, on July 11, passed S. 3035, which provides for a survey of national historic properties, and for matching funds to acquire and preserve them.

In my judgment it is timely for our people, groups, and Members of the Congress to take a fresh look at the battle between beauty and the blight and to take a stand against the uglification of our cities and our countryside.

Let us do more than hope that when our children and grandchildren sing "America the Beautiful" they will have something more than pictures in the schoolbooks for which they will be able to thank us.

EXHIBIT 1

CITYSCAPE FINDS HOPE—FREEWAYS RUN INTO A BLOCKADE

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The highway builders won another important battle a few days ago in New Orleans with the approval of an elevated freeway. But even so, there is cause for hope that the monstrous concrete ribbon that will recklessly slash through the city's picturesque Vieux Carre might be the last of its kind.

There is a revolt against the senseless indignity of urban freeways ruining cities and parks, and on the Federal level, at least, the highway builders are beginning to take it seriously. The revolt started in San Francisco and spread to other cities, notably Washington, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Boston, Baltimore and New York. But what troubles the Bureau of Public Roads is that the revolt is beginning to reach Capitol Hill—the most important place of all to a Federal agency.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, told the Senate recently: "It is time that Congress took a look at the highway program because it is presently being operated by barbarians, and we ought to have some civilized understanding of just what we do to spots of historic interest and great beauty by the building of eight-lane highways through the middle of our cities."

New Orleans' Vieux Carre, or French Quarter, is, of course, just such a spot of historic beauty. For years, the Louisiana State Highway Department planned an elevated expressway along the length of this charming tourist attraction, cutting it and, even more disastrously, its charming Jackson Square, from the Mississippi River.

As elsewhere, study after highway department-sponsored study "proved" the infallibility of the highway department's decision. As elsewhere, the city planners failed to do any planning and therefore could not propose any alternatives.

It was a long and bitter battle that attracted national interest because of the Vieux Carre's significance as the legacy of French culture in America.

Those concerned with our cultural heritage felt badly betrayed last winter when the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, approved the destructive expressway. He had just returned from a tour through Europe where, at the invitation of a private foundation, he and other Government officials studied means of historic preservation. But he seemed more impressed by political pressure from the Louisiana Highway Department and Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, the majority Whip, than by any lessons he learned in faraway Paris or Amsterdam.

The pressures won out when the New Orleans City Council voted five to two to go ahead with the freeway. No alternatives were considered; no reprieve for further study was granted.

Whitton however, has said that he is "still open to any consideration to enhance the area." Just what that means nobody knows, but it seems to hold some faint chance that the Vieux Carre can be saved. The Louisiana highway builders have rejected the idea of tunneling the expressway as infeasible and too expensive. As presently conceived, a 20 foot high structure filled with trucks and cars will blight Jackson Square much as the Embarcadero Freeway blights downtown San Francisco or the Whitehurst Freeway blights Georgetown's waterfront. Our children will not thank us for it.

But Whitton and the Bureau of Roads seem to realize that the battle of New Orleans may be their last victory. They agree with Senator CLARK that "we must find new and more imaginative ways to design urban highways and the necessary dollars to finance them."

A test of the Bureau's true willingness to find such ways is now imminent in Philadelphia. There, too, an elevated freeway was to cut a historic area—Society Hill and nearby Independence Hall—from the waterfront. Whitton seemed to feel that the highway builders had made all the concessions they could to beauty and sentiment when they agreed to some rerouting to save historic buildings and to depressing the freeway. The Philadelphia Planning Commission agreed.

But a committee of Philadelphia architects supported by some 80 organizations and no less than 10,000 individuals felt otherwise. The committee has drawn up a well-studied and documented plan whereby the ten-lane Delaware Expressway would be completely covered for six blocks along Society Hill. Thus city and waterfront would be united and the expressway cover would be turned into a handsome 15-acre park with room for playgrounds and other amenities.

Although he feels that urban freeways should enhance areas through which they run, Whitton is opposed to this much enhancement. He fears the expense and is worried about drivers who might feel unsafe in the tunnel and miss the view.

The committee retorts that on the basis of land acquisition cost, increased land values and tourist spending, the long-range economic advantages of the tunnel far exceed the added $25 million construction cost. As to motorists, the committee asserts that an imaginative tunnel design with improved lighting could be both safe and attractive. It points out that a view from a trench is no prettier than from a tunnel. This is an interstate and commuter freeway and not a scenic recreation facility for motorists.

The question, in short, is whether the highway builders will seriously consider and accept urban freeway design when it is offered. The American Institute of Architects is discouraged on this point. Citing the New Orleans elevated expressway as an example, AIA's president, Morris Ketchum Jr., charged that Federal policies on the design of highways within cities are producing disastrous results.

He resigned from the National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification because AIA could not be placed in "a position of tolerating, or even approving, policies of which it disapproves—policies which are also in direct opposition to those of President Lyndon B. Johnson."

Besides the official beautification committee, Whitton has informally asked eight leading city planners, architects and engineers to

---

[35] Ibid.

advise him on route location and urban freeway design. The group includes outstanding landscape architects Michael Rapuano, Lawrence Halprin and John O. Simonds and architect Kevin Roche, an associate of the late Eero Saarinen.

The group is now working on a sort of white paper which will set forth design standards and ideas for a new kind of limited access roads in a city.

The group may also recommend a National Design Review board to assist state highway departments with a more creative approach. This thinking coincides with that of the AIA, which may, at its forthcoming convention, urge creation of an advisory task force on urban freeways. It also coincides with recent proposals in Congress, notably those of Senator CLARK and Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey.

The Bureau of the Roads, meanwhile, is doing some hard new thinking of its own. A part of its $20 million annual investment in highway research is devoted to urban transportation and design problems. Among the emerging new ideas is use of air rights over freeways and the phrased redevelopment of entire city blocks in a combination of highway construction and urban renewal to provide housing for those who are displaced.

It is too early to tell, however, just how far and how soon more creative and constructive highway design will come about. Up to now, the state highway departments have largely ignored various missives from Washington urging them to be more responsive to their social and esthetic responsibilities and "to be more considerate of all human values."

Lately, however, the Federal highway builders have been using plainer language. Thomas G. McGarry, Whitton's special assistant, recently told a meeting of public works officials: "We can respond to our responsibilities out of our own initiative and our sincere concern for the public interest, or we can be dragged kicking and screaming to them by legislation."

MOLYBDENUM PRICE ROLLBACK ANOTHER L.B.J. ANTI-INFLATION VICTORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, once again the administration has demonstrated that it is fighting inflation hard and well.

This morning's newspapers announced that the Johnson administration has succeeeded in forcing the cancellation of a 5-percent increase in the price of molybdenum that had been announced 6 days ago.

Such a price increase could have been a crucial factor in shoving prices up generally, across the board. For some kinds of high quality steel the molybdenum increase could have added up to $18 per ton.

Other types of steel also would have been pushed up in price and of course with the bellwether steel price increases, the whole structure of our industrial pricing would move up. The administration stopped that cold.

The management of American Metals Climax—by far the largest molybdenum producer made that clear in the announcement that the administration had persuaded them not to raise prices after all.

And Mr. President, this price increase should have been rescinded. Economic council chairman Gardner Ackley called the proposed price increase unconscionable. Profits of American Metals Climax related to stockholders equity have been well above the average of industry in the country.

Profits of the molybdenum division of American Metal Climax are more than twice as high as American industry—and this of course is without any price increase.

Mr. President, this tough, fast, effective action of the administration will not make big industry throw their hats in the air. Of course the administration's vigor in holding down prices will be unpopular with much of industry.

But it should be mighty popular with the rest of the country—if only the consumers in the country would take notice of what the administration has done and recognize its significance.

Mr. President, the leveling off of production growth, the reduced volume of new orders, the increase in unemployment since it hit its low several months ago at 3.7 percent and since has risen to 4 percent, the enormous increase in plant capacity in the past 3 years and the huge influx into the labor force, plus the immense upgrading of the skills of that labor force, all suggest that excessive demand is unlikely to cause prices to rise from now on.

But, Mr. President, this doesn't mean that the inflation threat is over. Far from it. What happened in molybdenum—or threatened to happen before the administration stepped in could very easily happen in the rest of industry without a vigorous, alert administration willing to take action, powerful interests don't like.

And there is every possible danger that the wage price guidelines may be so generally and substantially breached—that wage increases might shove prices up.

To enforce—or to try to persuade labor to continue to live by those guidelines—is a hard, unpopular business.

But this is just what the administration is trying to do in precisely such cases as the molybdenum story that the newspapers reported today.

Prices may rise sharply this year as they did from 1957 to 1960 in the face of rising unemployment and falling demand. How can this happen? It can and without tough administration action certainly will happen because of the ability of both labor unions and big business to shove prices or wages or both up simply through superior bargaining power.

And finally, Mr. President—and I might say most important—we should recognize that this molybdenum story is just part of a long fight that started in the Kennedy administration in 1961. When President Kennedy persuaded the United Steel workers to hold down their wage demands. When big steel later broke the agreement and proposed a $6 a ton increase in steel prices, the President made his historic and winning fight to keep prices down.

Several times subsequently steel prices were held down. The auto agreements a few years later in the Johnson administration were held close to the guidelines and auto prices were kept down. Copper and aluminum companies agreed to rescind announced price increases after Johnson administration warnings and the announcement of stockpile sales.

Just this week we acted on a government pay raise—within the guidelines—as a noninflationary example to the country.

Mr. President, this fight by the Johnson administration against inflation is far too little noted. For the last 5 years—for the first time in American history, we have a national administration that is effectively fighting to keep prices down.

The good news on molybdenum today is a fine example of that struggle.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

GOVERNMENT WINS A PRICE ROLLBACK FOR MOLYBDENUM—TOP PRODUCER ANNOUNCES RESCISSION OF A 5-PERCENT RISE MADE 6 DAYS BEFORE—LABOR PACTS A FACTOR—EXPIRING UNION ACCORDS AND STRONG CORPORATE PROFITS ARE CONSIDERED BY UNITED STATES

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—The Administration succeeded today in forcing the cancellation of a 5 per cent price increase on molybdenum announced six days ago.

As the price recission was announced in New York by American Metal Climax, Inc., the largest producer of molybdenum, Government officials here disclosed their basic motive for applying pressure on the company for the rollback.

They wanted to demonstrate to unions, as much as to management, that the Administration's anti-inflationary wage-price guidelines are not a dead letter.

The announcement came after the close of trading on the New York Stock Exchange and therefore had no impact on the market.

In deciding to make the attempt to force the first outright price rollback since January, the Government had its eye on the airlines mechanics' strike and on the many major labor contracts that expire next year, officials said.

The direct inflationary impact of the molybdenum price increase was also a major factor, officials stressed. They said the price rise, announced on Friday, could add as much as $18 a ton to certain high-quality steels used in tool-making, which require the use of considerable molybdenum.

STAINLESS STEEL IMPACT

For stainless steel, in which relatively small quantities of molybdenum are used, the direct additional cost would be around 50 cents a ton, they said.

In addition, officials were motivated to make an issue of the molybdenum increase because of the unusually high profits of American Metal Climax, they said. The company's earnings amounted to 17 per cent of stockholder's equity last year, and in its molybdenum division have exceeded 30 per cent, officials said. These figures compared with an average of 13 per cent for all manufacturing corporations.

Even the Administration's consideration of the company's profits was focused in the context of future union demands for big wage increases, however, officials indicated.

They foresee large union demands over the next 12 months or so, partly because industry profits generally are high. The striking airline mechanics, for example, have repeatedly emphasized the "unprecedented prosperity" of the airlines.

Among the major labor contracts that will have to be negotiated in the next 12 months are those in the electrical equipment, trucking and rubber industries. Auto industry labor contracts expire next fall. There have been almost no major union contracts that have expired this year.

The Government's pressure on American Metal Climax to rescind the price increase began, so far as the public knew, on Saturday, when Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, issued a statement denouncing the increase.

The statement was received with considerable surprise in industry circles, because it had appeared that the Administration had abandoned all attempts to force businesses to lower prices once they had been raised.

Rollbacks were forced on the aluminum and copper industries last fall and a partial rollback on the price of structural steel in January.

Thereafter, while Administration figures publicly criticized certain price increases—on cigarettes, for example, there appeared to be no real attempts to force reversals of price increases that had already been announced.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor said flatly at a press conference in May that there would be no more "public confrontations" between the Government and business over price increases, although the Administration would continue to exert quiet pressure to prevent or moderate price increases.

Some increases were, in fact, held to less than the manufacturer originally planned, on newsprint, for example, and shoes, after conference with Administration officials.

CIA FOREIGN RELATIONS RESOLUTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a resolution aimed at replacing the present review operations of Congress over the CIA and other intelligence agencies with a formal Committee on Intelligence Operations.

Congressional oversight of the Central Intelligence Agency and other agencies of similar purpose—such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and others—would rest with a formal nine-member Commission, composed of three members each of the Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations Committees. At the present time, oversight of such operations rests with several Members appointed by the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, such oversight has rested with the Armed Services Committee since the creation of the CIA. There has been no challenge to the functions of the Armed Services Committee in this regard, and I might say that I know of no reason to suppose that the arrangement is not proving viable and effective, as, indeed, it seems to be.

It is obvious that in sensitive and secret matters of this kind, with human lives involved in some aspects of intelligence operations, there is every reason to confine critical information to as few ears as possible.

While it is perhaps true that decisions made by these agencies do have some ultimate bearing on foreign policy, it is also a fact that almost every bill which comes before Congress has ramifications beyond the scope of the particular committee to which it is referred. There is certainly a great deal of correlation in these matters.

I do not think that the present instance is significantly different. If joint jurisdiction and oversight should be accorded both the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, then there is no reason why joint jurisdiction should not be accorded committees on any of the many bills which affect more than one legislative area.

As I understand it, the members of the Armed Services Committee who oversee operations of the CIA and other similar agencies have been quite cooperative in providing information to the Foreign Relations Committee on such subjects as the intelligence estimates for various countries, without divulging aspects of their operations.

The reasoning behind the proposal is, in my opinion, rather tenuous; and the justifications for maintaining the present methods of oversight and supervision are strong. There is much to be said for keeping the apparatus of supervision small and select, and I urge that my colleagues vote accordingly. I intend to vote to support the present, quite workable methods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I report to the Senate a resolution creating a Committee on Intelligence Operations approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a vote of 14 to 5 on May 17, 1966. On June 27, I sent to all Members of the Senate a copy of this resolution and report for their information. I did so in anticipation of the subject being taken up under the circumstances as they have developed this morning.

Therefore, I report the resolution to the Senate and ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created, effective at the beginning of the Ninetieth Congress, a committee to be known as the Committee on Intelligence Operations to consist of nine Senators, of whom three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from among the members of that committee, three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services from among the members of that committee, and three shall be appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations from among the members of that committee. No more than two of the members appointed from each such standing committee shall be from the same political party. The chairman of the committee shall be elected by the members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee on Intelligence Operations to keep itself fully and currently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence. The committee's duties shall include, but not be limited to, review of intelligence and counterintelligence activities and legislative oversight of the coordination of such activities among the various agencies concerned.

SEC. 3. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 6. The committee shall take special care to safeguard information affecting the national security.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXVI, I ask unanimous consent that it now be in order to proceed to the consideration of the resolution just reported, on the investigation of the CIA, for the limited purpose of determining any procedural problems relating thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the resolution is not to "investigate" the CIA; it is to create a committee. The original McCarthy resolution was to investigate the CIA. This resolution was reported in place of that one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the change be inserted in the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is recognized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to address a few remarks to the substance of, the necessity for, and the justification for the resolution which has just been stated. It is reported in place of the original resolution proposed in January by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. President, the resolution which I bring before the Senate this morning would authorize the creation of a Select

Committee on Intelligence Operations. It would consist of a total of nine members, three each from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations. Its mandate would be "to keep itself fully and currrently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence."

Our sponsorship of this resolution proceeds from the belief that the CIA plays a major role in the foreign policy decisionmaking process and that by its activities it is capable of exerting—and has exerted—a very substantial influence on our relations with other nations. The resolution which we bring before you is an assertion of the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee to be aware of all the developments and activities of our Government as they relate to foreign affairs.

When the CIA was created, the extent and nature of its present role could not be foreseen. From a modest beginning in an entirely different context of world politics, the operations of the CIA have grown today to exceed the Department of State in both number of personnel and budget. The CIA is an efficient organization and I compliment it because in many countries its representatives stay longer and in many ways are better prepared—certainly they are better financed and, in many cases, have more influence—than our ambassadors.

The CIA has certain unique characteristics which set it apart from other institutions involved in the foreign policy process of the Government. These characteristics give the Agency unusual advantages and influence and suggest the desirability of the Foreign Relations Committee being more aware of its activities.

As is natural with any organization—particularly one staffed by intelligent and dedicated individuals—the CIA becomes a factor in the decisionmaking process as an advocate for its own recommendations. Its ability to provide the facts on which decisions are made gives it a great advantage over the Department of State in this respect. The Agency is not under the same compulsion to subject its data or analyses to the bureaucratic clearance procedures which affect and often retard the efficiency and imagination of the Department of State. Insofar as the collection of basic intelligence data is concerned, this immunity is proper. The desirability of scrutiny becomes more obvious in the case of conclusions which the Agency draws from its own data—conclusions which may be virtually unchallengeable given the Agency's freedom in its choice and presentation of supporting evidence.

There are certain other advantages, seldom mentioned, which the CIA enjoys. It is not required to expend any significant portion of its energy in dealings with either the public at large or the Congress. It is not expected, for example, to play host and guide to visiting Members of Congress, and we do not refer to it a regular flow of constituent mail and problems. Furthermore, its officers are relatively free from the social and ceremonial requirements which so greatly distract their State Department counterparts.

These aspects of the CIA's nature and functions were well stated in the recent series of very thorough articles on the CIA appearing in the New York Times. One passage reads:

> It is the CIA, unlike the Defense Department with its service rivalries, budget concerns and political involvements, and unlike the State Department with its international diplomatic responsibilities and its vulnerability to criticism, that is freest of all agencies to advocate its projects and press home its views; the CIA can promise action, if not success.
>
> And both the Agency and those who must pass upon its plans are shielded by security from the outside oversight and review under which virtually all other officials operate, at home and abroad.[1]

And in another of the articles, the Times pointed out:

> Nevertheless, the CIA enjoys an inherent advantage in any conflict with the State or Defense Departments because of its undeniable expertise—especially in economics and science—and because it is free from such political entanglements as trying to build up a missile budget (as in the case of the Air Force) or of having to justify the recognition of a foreign leader (as in the case of State).[2]

In urging the creation of a select committee or a Committee on Intelligence Operations, I am not suggesting that the Congress can or should assume control of the CIA or the other intelligence gathering activities of our Government. This is clearly a function of executive responsibility directly related to the conduct of our foreign relations and the maintenance of national security.

It has been asserted that the CIA functions under the National Security Council and initiates no activity which has not been ordered by the NSC. This seeks to imply close, continuous supervision by an organized mechanism. In this connection, I noted with great interest a recent report that the National Security Council met on May 9 of this year, for the first time since July 1965. Furthermore, the formal NSC machinery in existence in earlier years has atrophied to the point of nonexistence.

It seems to me, therefore, that if there is a chance that the executive branch may not adequately assure the proper relation of the CIA to overall national interests—particularly those in the field of foreign policy—it is imperative that the Senate know enough about the CIA's activities to be able to offer its own suggestions in this respect. As my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], has said, this is "not a question of passing judgment on any activities, but of proper procedures of the Government of the United States * * * it is a concern for the proper function of government, for the maintenance of proper relationships, and it is a desire to provide procedures by which the Senate, in this case through the Committee on Foreign Relations, can exercise its basic constitutional responsibility."—Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Congressional Record, May 16, 1966, page 10627.

The general public and congressional concern and uncertainty over the nature of the CIA's role in foreign affairs have found expression over the years in some 200 different resolutions which have come before the Senate on this subject. Of these, the proposal before us today is probably the most moderate. I believe that its adoption would contribute to the quieting of criticism, the allaying of public fears, and the restoring of confidence in the Agency.

The Senate has in the past created new mechanisms to meet new responsibilities. This precedent is at least as compelling in the situation before us today as that which vests legislative oversight in the committee which reports creating legislation. In instances where there are legitimate questions of jurisdiction and clearly intertwined responsibilities, I believe the Senate is far better served by the creation of a specially tailored select committee. As my respected colleague from Georgia has already acknowledged:

> The Central Intelligence Agency occupies a very peculiar position in our scheme of things.[3]

I believe that it is time for the Senate to take formal action which recognizes the true and evolved nature of this "peculiar institution."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. While I recognize the limitations of institutional forms of control, I believe that the creation of the select committee called for in this resolution will strengthen our position in dealing with executive branch officials who must ultimately exercise the control which is so essential if we are to be assured that our most honorable national principles and aspirations are not sacrificed to the immediate requirements of intelligence operations.

Another advantage which would result from the creation of a Select Committee on Intelligence Operations would be a more efficient coordination of the various intelligence activities of the Government. This aspect of the resolution has not received the attention which I believe it deserves. The overlapping and confusion of activities among the CIA, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the State Department, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency are a matter of common knowledge to those in the intelligence field. Last year's lamentable Camelot affair, resulting from an ill-advised project of the Department of Defense, was an excellent example of this situation.

The size of our overall intelligence effort is difficult to establish. However, an idea of its extent can be gained from the New York Times' estimate that its annual cost exceeds $3 billion a year. According to the same source, this amount is more than six times that

[1] The New York Times, Monday, Apr. 25, 1966.

[2] The New York Times, Thursday, Apr. 28, 1966.

[3] Senator Richard B. Russell, Congressional Record, May 16, 1966, p. 10618.

specifically allotted to the CIA. The Times estimated that the National Security Agency alone spends about $1 billion of this total figure.

There is little doubt in my mind that a careful study of the entire intelligence community would result in a more efficient distribution of functions and, in turn, a reduction in its size and expense.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that the failure of the Senate to take this small step in formal recognition of its duty to exercise a more comprehensive oversight of U.S. intelligence activities will evidence an abdication of our clear duty in an area where the activities of the executive branch can spell the difference between national honor and national discredit or, conceivably, between war and peace.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I believe that with the responsibility, for good or bad that this committee has, it is entitled to access to the kind of information which would be available from the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, at this moment I shall not digress to discuss the merits of the proposal as was done by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because I wish to raise a procedural question, based, Mr. President, on rule XXV, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

This has been a most extraordinary procedure since its very inception. For example, Mr. President, this resolution has not been introduced. It did not follow the ordinary course of a Senator's sending it to the desk for appropriate reference; if that had been done, the resolution would not have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It would have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. But we have it here before us now, under this very unusual legal, though extraordinary, procedure of having a committee meet and write within itself a self-serving resolution that affects other committees of the Senate, without the rules of the Senate governing reference of legislation having been applied.

I raise a point of order, Mr. President, that before this resolution goes to the calendar, it must be referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Under paragraph (p) (1) (A) of section 1 of rule XXV matters pertaining to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I missed the citation of the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Paragraph (p) (1) (A) of section 1 of rule XXV prescribing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The provision then continues:

> except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

Mr. President, this resolution, as originally introduced, provided, as the Senator has stated, for an investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and for the appropriation of $150,000 for the purpose of providing a staff and the facilities for conducting that investigation. Of course, such provisions immediately placed it within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules. So that part of the resolution was rewritten. It was redrafted as a Senate resolution creating a committee.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has referred to the fact that this is a select committee. It is only called a select committee in his statement to the Senate. It does not anywhere else appear so in the proceedings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is not a select committee. Despite the fact that the Senator has called it that, it is a standing committee of the Senate that would be created. The resolution reads: "is hereby created a committee to be known as the Committee on Intelligence Operations." This is not a select committee in the ordinary sense of the word. It is a standing committee of the Senate of the United States that is proposed to be created, without reference to the Committee on Rules—which usually handles the creation of standing committees—or to the Committee on Armed Services—whose jurisdiction it invades in a number of instances.

I wish to point out further, Mr. President, that this is proposed to be done without hearing a single witness by the committee, in this self-serving, self-seeking resolution. It is presented here in this novel fashion to change the procedures of the Senate as they have existed since its creation, without a single witness appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, so far as I am advised, to support the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency on two occasions before the committee. His testimony, which was restricted to the very superficial aspects of their activity, was the most persuasive witness with respect to the necessity of this resolution. I do not know of any further witness. In effect, this resolution is the outgrowth of the failure of the committee to receive what it believed to be significant intelligence from the Director of the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I intend to discuss that. But when the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, wrote a letter to the members of that committee, pointing out that the Foreign Relations Committee was proposing to create a Subcommittee on Appropriations to deal with the appropriations for the Central Intelligence Agency and all of the other agencies that are listed in the resolution, the Committee on Foreign Relations, to avoid that criticism, changed the resolution again, and struck out the asserted authority to deal with the appropriations and budgetary affairs of all these various investigative and intelligence agencies.

I use that illustration to show the unusual length to which the committee went in seeking to avoid the normal procedures of the Senate, in reporting the resolution without its having been introduced and without having been introduced at any hearings except that the distinguished chairman of the committee may have been dissatisfied with the refusal of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to divulge his methods and sources of obtaining information when he appeared before the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to impose on the Senator's time, but he has said that the Central Intelligence Agency occupies a very peculiar position. I do not think it is fair to say that the Foreign Relations Committee is trying to be self-seeking, self-serving, or trying to monopolize anything when it seeks participation. It is not trying to take this over.

All the resolution provides is that the Foreign Relations Committee be allowed to be a part. It does not seem to me to be a very extreme move. We are not trying to oust anybody from jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Why does not the Senator from Arkansas introduce a resolution from the floor for appropriate reference? Why does he bring it in from the committee in this form?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said it is a very peculiar situation.

In consultation with the Parliamentarian about the point of order the Senator is about to make, the Parliamentarian said the Senate has no precedent for this kind of situation.

Actually, there is no precedent in the history of the Senate that I know of, for dealing with a body like the Central Intelligence Agency. This is a most peculiar agency, as the Senator said.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I decline to yield further.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well; but the Senator himself has said that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not deny it at all. It is a peculiar agency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The formal supervision which we are seeking has never been acted on. The Senate has never taken any specific action with regard to one of the largest agencies, one of the most expensive agencies in the entire Government. It is all done very informally. I think that is very unusual.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I challenge the Senator from Arkansas to bring forth a single other precedent since the Senate was first created in 1789 where a committee brought forward a resolution to create a new committee of which it would be a part that was not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration or to another appropriate committee.

If this is not a case which is self-serving, I do not know what self-serving means.

This proposal is presented in an unusual and unprecedented fashion. I realize we are living in a new day; but I know of no other instance in which a committee has been created on which the members were selected by the chairman of a standing committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that the committee is reporting a resolution of which it does not have jurisdiction?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is true. They avoided jurisdiction by reporting it out and not introducing it for reference to the appropriate committee.

The proposal departs from the general practice of having the chair appoint the membership of a committee or having it done by a caucus of the two parties and ratified by the Senate. I have never heard of another instance like this and I do not believe that the Senator from Arkansas has.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the Senator does now with the committee that functions in connection with the CIA, and this committee is following his precedent.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services designates members without the authority of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations designates members—also without authority from the Senate. That is the way they presently operate. This is a peculiar situation of which there is no precedent.

The committee is asking the Senate, in its wisdom, to make up its mind whether it wants a committee such as this to be formal or not. That is all that it is asking. It is not asking to oust anybody.

This procedure is the procedure that is now being followed. The present informal committee, with no formal recognition, is selected by the respective chairmen.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am utterly surprised that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has graced this Senate for so many years, does not know the difference between a subcommittee and a committee. The Senator is talking about the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services that now has responsibility for the Central Intelligence Agency, but he is proposing to create a standing committee, not a subcommittee, and he proposes to do it by having the selections made by the members of three other standing committees of the Senate.

I know of no instance where that has been done. Of course, a subcommittee can be extinguished at the end of a session of the Senate—it is extinguished—unless it is renewed by the full committee. This resolution proposes what would be a permanent committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Georgia saying that if the resolution now before us and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations in its present form had been sponsored from the floor, the resolution would have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It would have been referred either to the Committee on Rules and Administration or to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have a parliamentary ruling?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am confident it would have gone to one of those two committees. In my judgment, it would have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PASTORE. May we ask for an official ruling?

At the same time, in connection with that, may I ask if the resolution which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] introduced was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That was because he asked to have the Committee on Foreign Relations conduct the investigation. He spelled that out in the resolution. He was not letting anyone else in on that.

Mr. President, there are some other unusual features about this.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As to selection, I would be disposed to accept an amendment to have the members selected in the same way as any other committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not taking an unusual privilege. It should be the same as any other committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not essential to the resolution at all. If the Senator wishes to have members selected in the other fashion, it is perfectly all right with me, and I am sure that it is with the other members of the committee.

The simple proposition is whether or not the Senate, in its wisdom, wishes to take action on a matter of this kind or continue this vague situation.

There have been 200 resolutions showing discontent about it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That would be revision 10 or 12 in the effort to get this resolution approved in some form. It has been rewritten, rewritten, and rewritten to avoid the jurisdiction of the appropriate committee, or committees, which should handle it.

Let me point out another novel thing. On every other standing committee of the Senate, the chairman is selected by the Senate. What does this resolution provide? It provides that the chairman be elected by members of the standing committee.

It deviates from the practice that has obtained since the inception of the Senate. The Senate has elected the chairmen of committees. Here it is proposed that this is a special case, that owing to the peculiar nature of this agency, we should let the new committee take away jurisdiction from the Senate itself to elect the chairman.. That is a most unusual provision. It is one that the Committee on Rules should examine after the Committee on Armed Services has examined into the functions of the subcommittee.

Now, Mr. President, as I say, this resolution has been rewritten and rewritten and rewritten time and again in an effort to avoid the ordinary parliamentary processes of this body. Under rule XXV, there is no doubt in my mind that this resolution should be considered by the Armed Services Committee. I do not know what the Parliamentarian would say, but I do know what the rules provide.

I am therefore glad to submit this parliamentary inquiry. If this resolution were introduced for appropriate reference, to what committee would this resolution be referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to ask the Senator from Georgia, is he referring now to the resolution as it was reported——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT (continuing). By the clerk from the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a cursory examination of this resolution, there is a feeling on the part of the Chair that in light of the——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I ask the Chair if he would examine into the resolution as to the agencies covered, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the others which are involved, and the jurisdiction that is now fixed, before he makes a ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is posing a hypothetical case. I want to make that clear at this point, because the resolution before the Senate comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator poses the question, if this resolution had been introduced from the floor of the Senate, and asked for appropriate referral, where would it have gone to? On a cursory examination, it appears to deal with matters of national security, which is the subject matter covered by the Committee on Armed Services and that is the committee to which the resolution would be referred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I would not wish to yield right now, although I am glad to——

The VICE PRESIDENT. This ruling does not relate to the proposition that is presently before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I understand that. I am not complaining. I am not saying this is an illegal procedure. I say it is an extraordinary procedure that is resorted to only for special purposes by committees when they write bills within the committee and do not introduce them from the floor. That is the objection I am making. I say, for that reason, that a point of order should be sustained by the Chair, and this resolution should not go to the calendar but should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, so that we would at least have an opportunity to have some kind of hearing from the agencies affected as to what effect they think this resolution might have upon them and their operations.

Mr. President, I want to clear up a misconception which has arisen here, particularly in the distinguished newspaper published in New York, which the Senator quoted with authority about a

dozen times in the course of his remarks, as to what legislative oversight means.

That particular paper seems to have the idea that legislative oversight means that a legislative committee which is oversighting has some control over the administration of that agency.

That is not true. Nothing could be further from the facts. All that we can do by oversighting is to keep ourselves informed as to what an agency is doing, with the exception of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to make that exception. They have the power of the purse. If they feel disposed, they can reduce the appropriation. But the other standing committees, when they are exercising legislative oversight, cannot control the operations of the agency.

I would say, Mr. President, that the most illuminating example of that of which I have any knowledge is the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations has legislative oversight over the Department of State.

Anyone who has read the newspapers for the last 8 months knows just how far the Foreign Relations Committee has missed in controlling or directing the activities of the Department of State. That shows just how much this legislative oversight function gives a committee control over an agency. All that it does is to enable committees to keep themselves informed about what an agency is doing and undertake to measure up to our legislative responsibilities in that light.

The State Department itself has an intelligence operation apart from the CIA. Each of the military departments has intelligence activities. The CIA is somewhat of a coordinating institution for other intelligence gatherers.

Mr. President, I want to say also that the Foreign Relations Committee has available to it practically all the information which is available to the Subcommittee on the CIA of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, with one or two minor exceptions.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee can get any intelligence estimate that has been arrived at in this Government on a particular situation in any country that bears upon our international relations.

One of the incidents that gave rise to this matter was when the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency declined to testify as to his sources of information and his methods of acquiring information. That matter is so sensitive, Mr. President, that only in the most extraordinary circumstances has the Armed Services Subcommittee, as careful as it has been, gone into the sources of information and the methods which the CIA has used in gathering information.

Why, Mr. President, if there were evidence of the slightest disclosure of the sources of information to the CIA from any source, if the report got out tomorrow—and I use this purely as a hypothetical illustration—that the Secretary of the Soviet Legation in Tasmania was revealing information to the CIA, our intelligence sources throughout the world would dry up. It would frighten them all to death. We could not get one iota of information. The act creating the CIA particularly charged that the Director of that Agency protect and maintain the highest classification of secrecy on the methods and sources of his information. That is properly so. If he does not do this, the CIA is not worth a plugged nickel so far as getting any clandestine information is concerned, because the slightest indication that a source of information is likely to be revealed would discourage the flow of information immediately and instantly.

Mr. President, at times an effort is made by committees to exercise an influence over executive agencies by the process of publicity. They publicize certain things. They leak information to the press in an effort to build up public sentiment, to control the editorial policy of great newspapers, thereby to influence national policy. I am not going to debate the merits of such tactics in ordinary circumstances, but I am going to say that they do not work where the CIA is concerned. The first time such methods were tried, we will have destroyed the usefulness of the CIA and we might as well abolish it.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can call the Director of the CIA before his committee any time he wishes and he can get from him any information available to the Committee on Armed Services except as to sources and methods, and as to budgetary matters and how much money is spent for certain things.

Let me emphasize that when I refer to all these cloak and dagger operations, that they constitute a very small part of the total operations. They are vital. We must have them. Much of the rest might be of little value without those operations. However, the relative cost of the secret operations is not large.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Senator. When he says that the Foreign Relations Committee can get whatever information it seeks on intelligence matters from the CIA except information with respect to sources and methods used in connection with the collection of that information and the expenditure of money, is the Armed Services Commitee able to get that information?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We can get information as to sources and methods, but I want to be very frank with the Senator. I do not want the information except in the very rarest of cases. And the other members of the committee do not want that information except in unusual circumstances.

I want to say further that I do not think it is wise for the legislative branch of the Government to know all the sources from which the CIA gets its information. We should be interested in the validity of it and the importance to be attached to it. All of that is weighed in what they call the intelligence community, which consists of representatives of several agencies and departments of the executive branch.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for one additional question to seek information?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the argument of the Senator from Georgia that if this select committee——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. It is not a select committee. It is a standing committee.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the argument of the Senator from Georgia that if the Subcommittee of the Armed Services, in connection with receiving the CIA report, had added to it three members of the Foreign Relations Committee, which would be bound by the procedures of the committee in regard to the CIA, that that would increase the danger that information as to the sources and the methods of collection and financing would be made public?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Without the least intention of giving offense to the Senator or to his committee, I want to say that every time we add one person from any committee to the subcommittee, we increase the chances that there will be some leak.

Mr. MORSE. But there would be no danger if it were limited to Members of the U.S. Senate who are members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No. There is also a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and by a strange coincidence of parliamentary life, the membership of the two committees happen to contain some duplications. The members of the Appropriations Committee, of course, have the last word because they can cut off the means of existence of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other agency.

Mr. MORSE. Does it not follow that the Senator is arguing, when he makes the statement in regard to the protection of the source and the method of collecting and financing of the material of the CIA, that there is no question about its protection if the committee is limited to its present members in the availability to such material, but that if three members of the Foreign Relations Committee are added who will be bound by the same rules as those by which the Armed Services Committee is bound, we would then run into some danger of disclosing matters of secrecy?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I have been here for some time. I want to say that there is a great deal of difference in the application that some Senators give to their responsibilities for maintaining matters that they get in executive session and the application that some other Senators give to such responsibilities.

Sometimes I have seen classified matters, given in executive session, printed in the newspapers before the committee adjourned.

Any Senator who has been here for any time knows that there is a difference between the approach of some Senators to matters of classification and the approach of other Senators to such matters.

I say that without any invidious comparison. It is true on the Armed Services Committee. It is true on every other committee, and it is true in the Senate as a whole.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield first to the Senator from North Carolina. I will have to stop yielding. I want to complete this argument.

Mr. ERVIN. My question is very simple. This does not reflect on any member of any committee. However, is it not a self-evident fact that every time an additional person is given secret information there is danger of it being disclosed? The more people who know a secret, the more apt it is to be disclosed, no matter who those people are?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. As I say, if we increase the membership of the committee by one, we increase the danger of material being disclosed. I do not care who it is. It is a fact of life.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member on both committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. If we were to add Foreign Relations Committee members to the subcommittee of the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services, why should we not add members of the Committee on Government Operations and members of other committees?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I think there is some merit in the statement of the Senator. However, I will not debate all the merits of it today.

I am taking the position that the Senate should not agree to this unusual parliamentary procedure under which a committee sits in its own committee room and writes a resolution concerning somethink that belongs in the jurisdiction of some other committee. They then report it here and seek to deny jurisdiction to the other committee as a result of their procedure.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like it to be quiet so that we can all hear this colloquy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I am doing my best to bring the matter to a conclusion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I did not interrupt him in the course of his remarks, but it is all right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The remark of the Senator from Massachusetts seems to leave the impression that we should prevent action on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee because it has no concern with the subject matter.

I tried to make it clear that the Committee on Foreign Relations is charged by the Senate and by the rules with responsibility on foreign relations and is in a very peculiar relationship to this activity.

The activity that we are interested in is the foreign relations activity. Our interest has nothing to do with the domestic activities. If the CIA should seek to intervene in a domestic matter, we would not be interested. We have never asked for that information. If they were participating in an election on domestic matters, that would be something beyond our interest.

It is well known that this country is in great difficulty and is involved in a most dreadful and tragic war in which activity this country is the least unified of any country that I know of. It involves a grave responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

We think we ought to know what part the CIA plays in situations such as we are involved in in Vietnam, and such as we have been involved in in Guatemala, in Iran, and in other parts of the world. When they refute reports by reputable organizations and reports written by well-established journalists, we cannot have the information that would prove or disprove the refutation. But, when he insinuates that the Foreign Relations Committee has no more interest in this than does any other committee, he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not think he said any other committee; he said the Government Operations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have a more direct responsibility for foreign relations than does the Armed Services Committee, to be frank about it. I do not know why the Senator monopolizes the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not trying to muscle in on the Senator's committee. I am trying to keep the Senator from muscling in on my committee. That is what I am doing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing in the legislation that gives the Armed Services Committee exclusive jurisdiction on this subject. This is a power that his committee has assumed simply because the National Security Act came out of that committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I do not yield further, and I do not accept that statement. There is nothing here that would justify the statement that the Central Intelligenc Agency will not give the Foreign Relations Committee any information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. "Significant," I said.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not believe that is correct. It would be far from the purposes of the Central Intelligence Agency. In my opinion, the President of the United States was correct in not authorizing the CIA to give details on the methods and sources of obtaining information.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this resolution emphasize that the CIA affects foreign policy. But it seems to me that affecting the subject is insufficient, under our practice, to confer legislative jurisdiction. If every committee that had some small degree of interest in a subject insisted upon the creation of special committees like this to deal with it we would have such a proliferation of committees around here that the Members of the Senate could not possibly name them all. They could not bear their names in mind. If we are going to create a special committee every time there is apparently any overlapping or conflict of jurisdiction, we would have such proliferation that it would destroy the present and existing committee system of the Senate of the United States.

I submit to the Senate, Mr. President, that this point of order is valid, and that the Committee on Armed Services, to which this resolution would ordinarily be referred if normal procedures were followed, should have an apportunity to consider this resolution before it goes to the Senate calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Georgia please restate his point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. My point of order is that under rule XXV, the provision of which I have read, the subsection of the rule dealing with the Committee on Rules and Administration, this resolution relates to a substantive matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, and therefore should be first referred to such committee, before it goes to the calendar. That is the point of order I made.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to ask a question.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Does not the President of the United States have sole jurisdiction over the operations of the CIA and as to what information it can disclose?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. He has complete control of it, through the National Security Council.

The Senator from Arkansas referred to the fact that there had been only one full meeting of the National Security Council for many months, but there are constant meetings of subcommittees of the National Security Council.

I do not believe the President has failed so signally in his duty that he has bypassed and neglected and disowned as important an agency of the Government as the National Security Council.

CLOSED SESSION

ORDER TO PUBLISH

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: I now ask unanimous consent that there be a sanitized version of these proceedings prepared, that it be under the authority of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee; that they will take out anything which might be detrimental and that the record be made public, and that any Senator who participated shall have the right to correct his own remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE). Is there objection?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into closed session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make a statement.

The motion having been made and seconded that the Senate go into closed session, the Chair, pursuant to Rule XXXV, now directs the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries, close the doors of this Chamber, and that all officials of the Senate not cleared for secrecy be excluded.

(At 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m. the doors of the Chamber were closed.)

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in addition to the demand or the request or the suggestion of the Presiding Officer that the Senate Chamber and the galleries be cleared of all persons except the Senators, I move that the following staff members be allowed to remain:

The Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Frazier;

The Parliamentarian, Mr. Riddick;

The Legislative Clerk, Mr. Mansur;

The Journal Clerk, Mr. Somers;

The Official Reporters, Messrs. Drescher, Attig, Cinciotta, and Perry;

The Secretary to the Majority and Minority, Messrs. Valeo and Trice;

The Assistant Secretaries to the Majority and the Minority, Messrs. Graves and Brownrigg;

The General Counsel to Majority Policy Committee, Mr. Ferris;

The Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Dunphy;

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Wannall;

The Administrative Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Lacovara;

The Staff Director of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Marcy;

The Chief of Staff of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Darden.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, was the name of Mr. Woodruff, of the Committee on Appropriations, called?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. He has just taken the oath. Does the majority leader wish to have Mr. Woodruff remain?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would include also the name of Mr. Woodruff, who, I understand, has been sworn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Mr. Woodruff will remain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Official Reporters be authorized to take proceedings of the closed session in shorthand but that the notes not be transcribed; and that, when the session is concluded, they be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Senate and kept secret by him along with other minutes and matters of such nature already in his custody.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does this proposal include a vote which may be taken on this matter? If so, I think that should be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Going back to the only previous closed session of which I have knowledge, a vote was taken at that time, and I believe the result was announced.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I ask that the distinguished majority leader withhold that for the time being. I do not know that I shall have any objection. I really did not see any necessity for going into a closed session. But I do not oppose the leadership, because I am sure their combined wisdom is greater than mine. Certainly any vote that has been taken in a closed session that I have ever attended has been made a matter of public record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it should be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senators indulge the Chair for a moment? The precedent in the rules is that any action taken now in the closed session is closed, and that means that it is in secret. It can be divulged only by specific affirmative action by the Members of the Senate or by a majority of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any vote that is taken be made public.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may make one more request, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the hour of 1 o'clock arrives, if the matter now before the Senate has not been concluded—and I feel certain that it will not be—the time be ignored and we continue on the present subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Has the Senator from Montana now placed before the Senate his requests on all the matters to be presented?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My question goes to this action: I merely wonder how anyone hereafter who wants to announce his vote or wants to say anything about his vote in public can do so if the action we take here is secret with the exception of the vote. How are we going to do that if the vote is to be announced?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, the votes have been announced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that the unanimous-consent agreement is a part of the secrecy of the meeting. How do we get around that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The subject, of course, and the vote would both be made public; and before we went into closed session, everyone was aware of the question that was raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection to making the result of the vote public.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual procedure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am disappointed we are now going into a closed session. There has been some criticism of the Senate being a club, that the Members do not like to have facts discussed released when it is not to their convenience. I would therefore ask this question, and premise it by the statement that there has been, in my opinion, many assertions which are unfounded, with respect to the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency. I say that after having made extensive trips to the Far East, Middle East and Europe, and during those trips doing my best to find out whether this basic question was true or not: Does the CIA make policy?

As a result of these trips I am convinced that the CIA does not make policy. That conviction does not come from reading newspapers. It comes from asking our State, CIA, and other representatives all over the world what are the facts?

Now what I should like to know is based on this development, the first in my experience as a Senator, closing the doors. What are my obligations as a Senator with respect to what I can or cannot say after this meeting is over?

The reason I ask that is because those who have been attacking the CIA over a period of months and years have had a field day in that the CIA cannot reply to the accusations made against it. A good place for those accusations to be replied to is on the floor here of the United States Senate. But now that opportunity is denied by the secret aspect of this session, which I consider unfortunate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Missouri was a Member of the Senate at the time of a previous closed meeting of this body, and he will recall that when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] asked that the doors be closed to consider the question of the Nike-Zeus, that was done. That was about 3 years ago.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I stand corrected. Perhaps I was not here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If this is a closed session, then I think the information which is given out under these circumstances should remain secret. There is nothing whatever to stop any Senator, at any time, outside the closed session from saying what his feelings are about the CIA and making statements with reference thereto. But the purpose of a closed session is to speak with the greatest freedom possible; and one of the reasons why the distinguished minority leader and I were interested that a closed session be held was for the purpose of protecting the CIA and other intelligence agencies.

I think we are doing this really to protect the CIA and to bring about as much freedom of expression as possible

within this body. If we cannot trust one another, I do not know whom we can trust.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I regret this action was taken, but have no criticism.

Again I ask: What are my obligations as a Senator from Missouri with respect to what I can or cannot say as to what transpires here in this secret session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should say that the obligation of a Senator is up to each individual Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I should like to know what the parliamentary procedure is based on, with respect to what we have been asked to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to make an observation in regard to the question posed. I understand that the Senator from Missouri posed a question to the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Chair is correct.

The Chair indicated earlier that under rule XXXV, the proceedings, under that rule, in closed session are secret. That means they are secret for all Senators.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If Senators wish at a later date to make any comment as to their views on the subject matter, from their point of view, that is their privilege. But they are under an obligation not to divulge the proceedings of this session, who speaks, what was said, and all the argument pertaining thereto.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is exactly what I meant when I said that each Senator has his own obligation and will face up to it, and observe the secrecy of this session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, then, it is the position of the Chair that anything said about this meeting after the meeting is over is against the rules of the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the position of the Chair that it is in violation of rule XXXV, which makes a closed session a secret meeting to reveal any substantive arguments or proceedings of this meeting, including those who speak or those who make motions. The word "secret" is understood by Senators, unless on motion the Senate relieves itself of that injunction.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one further question. If the rule is not acceded to as it is now interpreted by the Chair, what is the penalty to the person or persons if there is an infraction?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is the judge of its own membership.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not hear the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is the judge of its own conduct and its own Members and membership.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Chair.

[Omission.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Paragraph 4 of rule XXXVI provides:

> Any Senator or officers of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is reading from rule XXXVI, which deals with executive sessions. A closed session is not necessarily an executive session. This session is a legislative session, and the doors are closed.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. JACKSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think that the ruling of the Chair is absolutely unanswerable. I think it is perfectly obvious to all of us that we may very well in this executive session involve ourselves in a discussion of policy matters. That makes it clear that the majority leader and the minority leader were perfectly correct in suggesting an executive session. I think it is perfectly clear that we are as much in executive session here as we are, I may say to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arkansas, in the two committees that handle substantive matters in regard to secrecy problems of this Government.

The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations meet in executive session. I think that so far as secrecy is concerned, we are under the same obligation in this closed session of the Senate as we are in executive sessions of the committees.

It has been pointed out that our protection is that if there is any part of the closed session that we want to make public, that can be done by motion. But I think we ought to face up to the fact that we are dealing, in the very nature of things, with a matter that is pregnant with secrecy.

I join in supporting the majority leader and the minority leader in calling the executive session. So far as the public is concerned, we are protected by the request of the majority leader that if we get to the matter of rollcall votes in this closed session, undoubtedly a rollcall vote ought to be made public. But that too ought to be reserved for final judgment until we see what the situation is in regard to the subject matter of the rollcall vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be my hope, and I would hope the Senate would concur, that if there would be a rollcall vote, it would be in open session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May we take action on the request of the Senator from Montana; namely that the proceedings be taken in shorthand and that they be kept in secret in the files of the Secretary of the Senate, and not transcribed?

Is that the full request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That leaves open the question as to whether a later motion can cause the proceedings to be transcribed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], it was made possible, with the concurrence of the Senate, for the chairmen of the two committees most immediately concerned to make statements in open session before we went into closed session.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I would hope that if we are in closed session, we would discuss only matters that should be closed. But, after all, a man must have a reason for casting a vote; and the explanation given by the Senator from Missouri a short while ago, when he said he made investigations, worldwide, as to whether the CIA was influencing our foreign policy decisions, would be very important as to whether I voted yes or no. I think that that statement ought to be made in public. The idea that we are going to discuss every matter, whether of a secret nature or not, in a closed session, and then announce our votes without explanation, is, I think, all wrong, because I would be liable under the rule if I gave the reasons for my vote predicated on what some other Senator said in closed session.

If we are in secret session, only secret matters should be discussed. After that, we ought to go into public session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator from Rhode Island is making my point. For days, weeks, and months this Agency has been attacked. It has been attacked directly; it has been attacked indirectly; and especially by a certain group of newspapers. Many of the accusations made against it, I have taken the time and trouble to get answers to. I think the point made by the Senator from Rhode Island is very well taken. Everybody in the United States knows about the attacks; very few people know about the defense.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when he rose, said he wanted to talk on a point of order, and only on a point of order, with respect to two questions that were asked; and he was led into other fields. But the way this situation is operating—and I say this with great respect for the majority leader and the minority leader—where is the defense of the people of the United States, if all the accusations and the answers to the accusations are made in secret?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think there is a state of confusion among us. Rule XXXV is entitled "Session with Closed Doors." I understand that that may be a legislative or any other kind of session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The President of the Senate announced a short while ago that the Senate is the judge of its own Members. It will be noted that rule XXXVI—and I think this might become important later—contains five sections. That rule is entitled "Executive Sessions." It was under that rule that paragraph 4 was read by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Now I should like to propound this inquiry, to be certain that we know what we are doing:

Is paragraph 4 applicable to the present situation, in which the Senate is in legislative session, behind closed doors, under rule XXXV?

The VICE PRESIDENT. After consultation with the Parliamentarian, and after an examination of the precedents available to the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian, since the subject matter that is referred to is secret, and the word "secret" or "secrecy" is involved in both rule XXXV and rule XXXVI, paragraph 4 of rule XXXVI would apply to the closed session provided for in rule XXXV.

Mr. ALLOTT. And any violation or disclosure that was made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I would appreciate a comment from the Chair amplifying an earlier comment from the Chair. This relates to the colloquy between the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Missouri.

My interpretation of the admonition from the Chair would be this: that if we have a rollcall vote subsequent to the closed session, and someone asks me, "Why did you vote the way you did?" I could give him the reason why I voted. That reason might have been discussed here. But I would be giving the reason why I voted, regardless of what was said here.

Now if the person should ask, "Was that reason discussed during the debate?" I would have to say, "No comment."

I should like to ask the Chair if that would be a correct interpretation; if that would be a way to reconcile the problem discussed by the two Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the Chair's interpretation; and as the Chair has indicated and as Senators have indicated, a number of speeches will be made as to their views on the CIA, and those views undoubtedly will be reflected in the Senator's vote.

Mr. PASTORE. If I voted "yea," on the question because of what STUART SYMINGTON said, and I were asked outside, "Why did you vote 'yea,'?" and I replied, "Because of what STUART SYMINGTON said," I would be in violation of the rule. But that would be the reason why I voted as I did, and that is why I said that it is wrong.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's interpretation is correct, whatever his views may be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think this is the time to clear up, to avoid any misunderstanding that may develop after the closed session. I completely agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Rhode Island, but I want to point out that after the closed session is ended, the two Senators and all the rest of us can say whatever we want to say on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere in the country on the subject matter of the CIA, so long as we do not disclose any matter of secrecy vis-a-vis the CIA that was brought out in the closed session.

We certainly, by going into closed session, have not estopped ourselves from discussing the pros and cons of the CIA in public, even though some of those pros and cons were discussed in closed session.

We would be in violation of the rules if we attributed to any Senator who spoke in the closed session any statement he made in the closed session. We certainly are not estopped so long as we do not involve ourselves in a discussion of any secrecy matter.

It seems to me that any other interpretation is stretching beyond reason the rule on closed sessions and the rule on executive sessions.

We all recall that we have been in executive sessions of committees, and sometimes joint sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services, where the transcript has been edited afterwards, and part of the transcript has been made public. That is a bridge we still have to cross. We may wish, after the record is made here this afternoon, to agree to a motion to edit the record made, so that only the secrecy matters are not made public, and the rest of the discussion is made public. But I thought that our only reasons for going into the closed session—and I support our doing so, and I think the majority and the minority leaders were correct in moving to do it—is to protect matters of secrecy that involve the security of this country, that ought to be protected; and we ought to be bound to secrecy on such matters.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree completely with the Senator's interpretation of the rule. I would suggest, however, that one other matter should be added. Obviously, if there is a matter of national security discussed which, if made public, would be a breach under the law of national security, even though it was in this overall secret session in connection with discussion of other matters that are not of a national security nature, that, of course, could not be brought out.

Mr. MORSE. If I have not made that clear, that is what I am trying to say.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What worries me, may I say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, is this for example. There have been all kinds of criticisms against the CIA prior to the proposal about this committee. When the Defense Department is attacked, they all, including its head, are able to defend themselves immediately. [Deletion.]

As one who has had some experience in this field, and also with the military, I would hope that our intelligence does not go back to in effect, only the military. The military gets hundreds of millions of dollars more for its intelligence operations than the Central Intelligence Agency receives for its operations. That is something that should be known, because I do not think any Member of the Senate would want to see intelligence exclusively in the military.

Now there have been statements that information is given to the Armed Services Committee which is not given to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee brought out the fact that no information is denied to the Foreign Relations Committee except information with respect to methods and sources.

Based on experience, when we get into methods and sources, if a man is caught, immediately hundreds of friends of the United States are in possible trouble all over the world; and every man carries with him the danger of that problem when he talks about methods and sources.

By coincidence, I am the only Member of the Senate of either party who is a member of both these committees, and in recent years have received more information about the Central Intelligence Agency in the Foreign Relations Committee than in the Armed Services Committee.

[Omission.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator surely does not know much about the CIA if that is the extent of his information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I know as much as the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know very little. That is the point I am making.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What worries me is that when the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency came before the Foreign Relations Committee, he came prepared to give exactly the same briefing that is given to the Armed Services Committee. But after long interrogation, he had not arrived at the matters he thought he would like to present to the Foreign Relations Committee. The idea of the able Senator from Oregon strikes me as being fair. He asked a question. The suggestion that information given the Armed Services Committee is not given to the Foreign Relations Committee is not right. There has never been a question asked, since the days of Mr. Dulles, in the Armed Services Committee with respect to methods and sources. One of the wisest decisions made in this field was made by the late President Kennedy, when he said from here on the Ambassador in every country is the boss; and anybody who does not go along or get along with him is out, off the team. As a result, to my knowledge there has not been since that directive a single

justification for saying the Central Intelligence Agency has set policy.

Now if these matters are not brought up in open hearing, following the thoughts of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, how are the people going to know about them? After this secret hearing are we going to be accused of perpetuating some form of secrecy? If that happens it would be an unfortunate development, because we should decide the issues along with the people and based on the record and the facts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am going to limit myself to procedural matters. I do not think there is anything under the procedure that we have adopted that would stop the Senator from Missouri from saying anything he wants to say about the CIA from a public platform or from an open session of the Senate later.

The only limitation we have imposed on ourselves is in the discussion of any matter of secrecy involved in this hearing.

I intend, after this session, not to be restricted in any way in my further discussions, as I have in the past, about what I consider to be the inexcusable intervention of the CIA in various places. [Omission.] We are not stopped, and it will not stop me—this is my understanding, unless the Chair corrects me—from a public discussion of the CIA, save and except as to any matter of secrecy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels he must respond to the Senator from Oregon. It is the judgment of the Chair, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, that the entire proceedings of the closed session is a secret proceeding. It is, of course, right, that any Senator at any time may make any comment he would like about the subject matter of the CIA, its operations, and so forth.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But it is not proper, under the closed session rule, for any Senator to make any comment about the subject matter discussed here or which Senator said what, or what proceeding took place, a proceeding in the closed session or under the injunction of secrecy, unless there is specific affirmative action to remove that injunction in reference to that or any other item.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask respectfully for a clarification of what the Presiding Officer meant——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Presiding Officer has used the language "subject matter." I think it should be made perfectly clear that that does not mean a Senator, after this closed session, cannot discuss the subject matter of the CIA; but that the Presiding Officer means we cannot discuss or quote what was said in this body by any Member of this body on that particular matter. He himself is perfectly free to say whatever he thinks, representing the people of his sovereign State, he should say about the CIA or any other subject matter, so long as he does not disclose any secret information of what took place in this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I would like to yield the floor. I think the Senator from Arkansas has a right to reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon's interpretation is correct, as he sees it. In other words, the Senator does not in any way lose the right, at a later date, to discuss whatever he wishes about the CIA. However, he does lose the right, under rule XXXV, which applies to a discussion of the proceedings of this session, and to comment upon statements made by another Senator in this session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think this particular discussion has gotten off the track. This resolution does not attack the CIA. I am not attacking the CIA. I am simply proposing a simple change in the present method of appointment and any oversight and proposing to place three men on the committee.

The Senator from Missouri has led us off into a highway which I think is not really involved.

I do not think we are attacking the CIA. I have no intention of attacking the CIA. [Deletion.] However, the Director of the CIA told us that under the regulations, he could not tell certain significant foreign policy information to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think that the Committee on Foreign Relations is entitled to know whether these allegations we have read in the press are true. This is no attack on the CIA at all, and I do not think it ought to be presented that we are out to get the CIA. All we are seeking is to try to understand what it is doing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has been waiting. He is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have, after some brief reference to procedure, I want to reason with my colleagues on the substance of the issue, not as a critic, but as a champion of the CIA. I should like to say about the procedure, that I have sat under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] many a day in executive session in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, dealing with stockpile, design, and technology of topmost secrecy. He lives with the secrets of nuclear weapons of the topmost secrecy. With reference to the rules of executive session, this is a closed session, and we are more or less meeting in the nature of the Committee of the Whole of the Senate to discuss matters critical and secret in nature. I have not heard one statement made, however, that was secret.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is on intelligence.

Mr. GORE. Even that has not been said. Please understand I am not critical. I think it is a contribution to the debate. We have many things said in executive session in our committees on which we base our judgment which are not revealed to the public.

Mr. PASTORE. I find no fault with what the Senator has said. I was not finding fault with the closed session. I only say that if we are going to refer to our votes here, let us have a reason why we voted a certain way. I only suggest that we sanitize this record as we have records in executive sessions, so that those matters which are secret are kept secret, and those matters which are public be made public, so that we can justify what action we take in a closed session.

Mr. GORE. Here again I shall draw a comparison with executive sessions. Sometimes we sanitize the released record. Sometimes it is within the judgment of this body. But I am going to say things that I will feel free to say here, but that I would not feel free to say if the press representatives were in the galleries. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would not have felt free to use the figure except in closed session. They have contributed to reasoning together on a matter that is vital to the Senate and the policymaking functions of the country in which the legislative branch ought to have a part. We are dealing here with an issue that goes to the full equal status of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, I have discussed the possibility of sanitizing the record with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and with the ranking members of the committee. I have not been able to see the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I am sure he would not object. I think we can trust these four men, outstanding Members of the Senate, to consider the possibility of sanitizing the record so that all suspect matters are taken out of the record.

I have discussed this matter with the minority leader also, and it has his approval.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I assume the Senator would include the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; we would be glad to have them. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and we would be delighted to have him included.

[Omission.]

Mr. SYMINGTON. The five stories that were written about the Central Intelligence Agency in the New York Times, which the CIA tells us did grave damage to the security of the United States, referred to these amounts. As against what the military receives for intelligence the CIA receives a relatively small amount. [Deletion.]

What I would suggest—is that this entire discussion held today be sent either to the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency, or both, and be sanitized, that information considered against the best interests of the United States be taken out of the record, and it then be published like any executive hearing of a Senate committee.

With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that this record be sanitized and released after the proceedings are over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand the majority leader said the leaders.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Sanitized also by the Members of the Senate who participated, it could then be sent to the appropriate agencies, who could look it over. Then it could be published.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator made a unanimous-consent request. I was reserving the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is not comparable. There is no reason to send the transcript to the CIA and others. I had just understood the majority leader to say it had been cleared with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Cleared what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The sanitization of the record. I see no reason to send it down to any executive agency. If it is going to be done at all, I approve the majority leader's request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator had made a request.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I hope the Senator will not press his request in the course of my time on the pending question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement concerning something the Senator from Arkansas has said?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator has referred to the articles in the New York Times. In my opinion, there were some breaches of security there.

There were also some grievous errors. [Omission.]

The New York Times articles were completely in error in this instance, as well as in other respects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator indulge the Chair for a moment in order to get the question before the Senate for the Senate's consideration?

May the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia, does the Senator from Georgia contend that the resolution now before the Senate is invalidly before the Senate because it should have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No; I do not challenge the right of the Committee on Foreign Relations to report the resolution. I said the procedure was unusual, but the committee had the right to follow it. I have only seen it happen a few times in the almost 34 years I have been here. I say, however, before it goes to the calendar, under rule XXV it should be referred by the Chair to the Committee on Armed Services. That is the point of order I have made against the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, the Senator contests the procedure that is being followed?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct. This resolution came forth from the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was generated there and was brought here. It was not introduced. This is the first opportunity we have had to request that, under our unquestioned jurisdiction in this field, we have an opportunity at least to have a hearing on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I think, in order to expedite the appropriate consideration of this point of order, the Chair should make his ruling, so the Senate will be at liberty to appeal from the ruling of the Chair or debate it, as it sees fit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I understand that on page 39 of the Senate Manual—this is the section the Senator from Georgia first read—that he is basing his point on section (p)(1)(A)?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is correct, the second part.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to clarify what that means, because I am somewhat confused, it deals, as I understand, with the Committee on Rules and Administration, and it says:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other Standing Committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

This resolution does not require any payment of money, or create a charge, and I am quite unable to understand how it is applicable to this resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, there is no question of what it does. For example, it gives the subpena power, and it is implicit in the subpena power that a man cannot be subpenaed under such power and not be paid his expenses and his per diem as a witness. The resolution involves expenditures of funds, and we cannot escape it.

In the first instance, I did not insist that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do ask that the Armed Services Committee, before it be deprived of its jurisdiction, have the right to consider this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that it would be helpful to have a ruling from the Chair, and then the Senators may proceed to debate it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly yield to the Chair in that regard, but I should like to be heard momentarily on this point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will entertain the views of the Senator.

Mr. GORE. This is by no means the first time that a resolution or a bill has been altered by a committee to which it has been duly referred, and which has considered it. During my service in the House and the Senate, I have known of many instances in which the nature and the content of a resolution have been changed. This is the procedure here. I see nothing particularly unusual about it. There is certainly nothing disreputable about it. The resolution is before the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia earlier asked the Chair to indulge in what appeared to me to be a most unusual undertaking—to render a hypothetical ruling. I am not critical; I am merely saying that that, to me, is unusual. The Chair was asked to rule to what committee it would have been referred if it had been introduced in its present form. That is all right; I have no criticism of that. But it was not introduced in its present form; it was introduced and duly referred to the committee, and the committee reported it back, and it is before the Senate, and is on the Calendar of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator is not stating the facts correctly. This is not any substitute for the original resolution. It bears no number whatsoever. The Senator said it was equivalent to the original resolution which was introduced from the floor; but that was not reported out by the committee, because it would of necessity have had to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration when it was reported, because it authorized expenditures for an investigation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the ruling of the Chair. The Senator from Georgia said earlier that this resolution has been handled in a legal manner. I assume by that he means under the rules of the Senate. No Member of the Senate has had more to do with either the writing of the rules of this body or the interpretation of them than has the senior Senator from Georgia.

We did change the resolution and introduced it in a somewhat different manner, in part because we wanted to get it before the Senate on the substance of the resolution. We also changed it because of some objections which were made to the original proposals. The decision to take out any reference to money, for example, was made largely because it was charged that we were going to set up a staff, have an investigation, to subpena people, and do many other things no one had in mind.

It is difficult to drain of us a resolution to create a standing committee to conform to what is a confused, merged, double subcommittee, consisting of members of the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Armed Services.

I think the Senator from Georgia will admit that the proceedings of that joint subcommittee are somewhat irregular. I

do not think there is any clear precedent for it. Some of his own remarks were to the effect that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee informally agreed to let the chairman of the Armed Services Committee preside. There is nothing in the rules that mentions how to proceed in this kind of joint committee, which is not a subcommittee. The committee does not deal with substantive matters, it does not recommend money for the CIA, it just asks the CIA to sit down and talk.

So what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the members of the committee decided, by a vote of 14 to 5, was to try to set up a procedure something like those informal arrangements. In effect, we said, "As long as you are so informal, why not let us come in and sit with you?"

They said, "We cannot do that, because of the acts of 1947 and 1949."

They interpret those acts as though they were the Atomic Energy Act. The acts of 1947 and 1949 say nothing about reporting secretly to anybody.

But they said, "No; we can't do that." Even the Director of the CIA came up. We said, "Let us have a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and you come up and answer questions which, if they were asked in this other informal joint, merged subcommittee, you could answer them here."

His defense was that the acts of 1947 and 1949 did not allow him to do that. That is an utterly ridiculous interpretation of the act.

Senator RUSSELL said that if the President decides what can be told to his subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee on this matter, it can be told. But Admiral Raborn said, "No; it is the acts of 1947 and 1949 that determine whether I can talk to the Foreign Relations Committee or not."

Everybody knows that is not the case.

We are dealing here with a strange agency, so we use unusual practices. The Senator from Georgia was using unusual practices in setting up this kind of joint subcommittee. All we are trying to do in this procedure here, is to assure that the Foreign Relations Committee can have the kind of information it needs in order to make recommendations to the Senate, so that it may pass judgment on the foreign policy of the United States. That is what is before the Senate, nothing else.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would point out to the Senator that as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, we sit together jointly on matters of procurement, and on matters of authorization of weapons, for the simple reason that it saves time. In this instance, on the CIA, these are both formal subcommittees. We sit together to save time. That is all there is to it. They are not informal; they are formal subcommittees sitting together to save time.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are willing to set up a formal subcommittee, and offer to have that sit with your two formal subcommittees. But as far as we were able to learn from what Admiral Raborn said, as to our formal subcommittee on the CIA, he would not answer questions asked by one of us, which he would answer if asked by one of you.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator's point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GORE. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry. However, before yielding, let me say to my colleagues that I have a few serious views I wish to express. I do not wish to prolong this hassle about the point of order and the parliamentary procedure, so I will yield the floor, and seek recognition when the Chair has made his ruling.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wanted to raise a parliamentary inquiry rather than a point of order. I speak, as the Chair knows, I am sure, most respectfully.

As I understand the parliamentary situation, what is really pending is the point of order of the Senator from Georgia. The Chair seems to be anxious to rule on that point of order.

After the ruling, there is a probability that there may be an appeal. It is customary practice of the Senate, before the Chair rules on a point of order, that those who have views on the point of order can be heard before the Chair's ruling. There are many reasons for that. One of them is that after the—if the arguments that are submitted subsequently indicate that he is wrong. In all due respect, I am not anxious for the Chair to rule at the present time until there is a discussion of the pending business by those who want to discuss it. There are other views than those of the Senator from Georgia as to whether or not his point of order is well taken. I think that the Chair is entitled to have those views before he rules. He has not had those views. The opportunity has not been given for the presentation of the views, and therefore I am urging that the Chair withhold his ruling until other Senators have an opportunity to present their points of view on the point of order of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refers to rule XX, clause 1, section 8:

> A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate.

The Chair, under that precedent, may indulge whatever debate he feels may be necessary before making a ruling.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I did not raise the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels it would be helpful for the procedure of this body, to get the point of order clearly before us, to have the Chair make his ruling, and then whatever debate may be desired will, of course, be permissible.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair can follow that procedure. I only wish to say, the precedents are as long as my arm that when points of order have been raised, Presiding Officers have always been willing to hear, for reasonable lengths of time, those who have a different point of view on the point of order, for the purpose of presenting to the Chair their views on the point of order. They might be right, you know, and that is why we have followed that practice.

The Chair can rule now if he wishes to rule, but I think it most unfortunate if he does, because I think those who do not share the position of the Senator from Georgia on the point of order ought to be heard before the Chair rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to be very indulgent, and he believes he is. But the Chair believes it will expedite the proceedings to have the Chair make his ruling.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Chair would permit, I would like to make my point of order clear.

I have not made any point of order that this matter should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I stated that, in my opinion, by its very nature, it would create a charge on the Senate and, therefore, was within the jurisdiction of that committee; but I did not make that point of order.

I made the point of order that this should be referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as a result of the legislative jurisdiction that is spelled out in rule XXV, for the Committee on Armed Services. The rule provides:

> to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects: (1) common defense generally. (2) The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

That involves all of your national security agencies and other agencies set forth in this resolution. The rule goes on to set forth the remainder of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. My contention is buttressed by the fact that, in rule XXV, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, to show the clear intent of the rules to protect the jurisdiction of the committees, it is provided that any resolution relating to a substantive matter shall first be referred to the committee having jurisdiction over the substantive matter.

I am making the point of order that you cannot bypass the jurisdiction of a duly established committee by any such procedure as this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule, and will not, of course, foreclose debate, because appeal from the ruling is always possible.

The situation before the Senate is a resolution reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, not a resolution that has been introduced for appropriate reference. The situation for appropriate reference is different from that of a resolution reported from a committee.

Under rule XXV, the standing committees of the Senate are created and the

subject matter within the jurisdiction of each committee is enumerated, but there are no stipulations limiting what the committee might report in an original bill or resolution, in a substitute for a bill or resolution, or what the committee may include in an amended-reported version of a bill or resolution, even if such reported bills should include subject matter the predominance of which would likely belong to another committee.

There is no rule or established precedent of the Senate to sustain a point of order to commit such a reported bill to another committee which properly has jurisdiction thereof; there is only an enumeration of the subject matter belonging to each committee.

Obviously, a point of order can be made that such a bill or resolution, in this instance, under rule XXV, should have been referred to another committee which had jurisdiction of the predominance of the subject matter, when such a measure is pending before the Senate; but, in the absence of an exact Senate precedent thereon, the Chair feels compelled to submit this question to the Senate, as authorized in rule XX, for its decision, so that the Senate may have a guideline in the future, should such a question be raised again.

The Chair makes note of the fact that had this resolution been introduced de novo by a Senator today for appropriate reference, that because the CIA had been created under the National Security Act, which was reported from the Armed Services Committee, and that was in Public Law 80-253, in 1947—that, on cursory examination of this resolution, it would have been referred to the Armed Services Committee.

But the situation is entirely different. This resolution originated in the Foreign Relations Committee, and it was reported to the Senate, and by unanimous consent is before the Senate; and there is no precedent, under rule XXV or any other rule, which gives the Chair any guidelines or any direction for referring this particular resolution to another committee, even though the predominance of the substance of the resolution rightly belongs in the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Chair's ruling—and I question the Chair most respectfully—is carried out to the extreme point, that would mean that any committee of the Senate could report a resolution on any subject that might concern another committee and get it to the Senate Calendar without reference to the proper committee. It would seem to me that that would violate the whole question of procedure within committees and for committee consideration if that rule—and I say it most respectfully—is carried out to the extreme situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair fully understands the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts. There is no precedent in this matter. We have examined it very carefully with the able assistance of the Parliamentarian of the Senate. There is always the possibility of averting the situation to which the Senator refers to by raising the point of order, which is exactly what was done today.

What the Chair seeks from the Senate now, in light of this situation, is to have the Senate express itself and to make its own precedent or its own rule, if it so desires.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the substance of what the Vice President has said at this time is that this question is not only a question referring to this resolution, but really the whole precedent of reporting a resolution by any committee which has no jurisdiction, we assume, over the subject, and having it get onto the calendar without proper consideration by the committee with jurisdiction. So it is a very broad ruling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the view of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. Does the senior Senator from Tennessee correctly understand that the Chair has ruled that a point of order does not stand and is not amenable under the precedence of the Senate, and would desire the Senate to express itself? If that be true, the Senate can do so either by an appeal from the ruling of the Chair or by an affirmative motion to proceed with the consideration of the question before the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator permit the Chair to consult with the Parliamentarian?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say to the Senator from Tennessee that the ruling of the Presiding Officer is to submit this question to the Senate.

The Chair does not rule that the point of order is out of order. The Chair rules that because there is no precedent to guide the Chair on this point of order, and because it is a matter that relates fundamentally to the jurisdictional integrity of the committees of the Senate, that the Chair refers to the Senate the decision as to whether or not the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia is well taken; namely, that the Foreign Relations Committee has encroached upon the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, and, therefore, that the resolution before us should be referred, because of the predominance of its subject matter, to the Armed Services Committee, before it is placed on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, under those circumstances, I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution before us.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that is out of order under the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are operating.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The observation of the Senator from Georgia is well taken.

Mr. MILLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand that the ruling of the Chair includes a determination by the Chair that the subject matter is preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, or is that particular point also left open for the determination of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is that the Senator from Georgia maintains that under rule XXV, this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services before the Senate considers the resolution for definitive action.

The Chair says that because there is no precedent on this exact point that the Senate must express its will on the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I inquire further? I think this may be important, because the question of whether or not the ruling of the Chair includes a determination that the Senator's point may be perfectly valid. There may be a preponderance of interest on the part of his committee, that would be one thing; but it could be another thing if the Chair is ruling that this is completely beside the point. It may be and it may not be preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. Or it may be just the mere fact of the point of order being made that it is going to be referred to the Senate. We can vote on two things here, that is, our vote could be guided by two points; one, by the mere point of order itself, and another by consideration of whether in fact that point is factually sound, in that this is preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

I might, for example, decide that this is not preponderantly with the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, therefore I will not uphold the point. On the other hand—I hope I am getting across to the Chair my point—I think it would be helpful to the Senate to know whether or not we are voting on both these concepts, one, the point of order itself, or two, the determination of whether or not, for the sake of discussion, the Senator from Georgia is correct in his position that this is within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JACKSON. This is a simple matter. Is it not the question that if we vote "yea," it sustains the point of order, if we vote "nay," it is in opposition to the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. The point of order is debatable, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is before the Senate, and the Chair has ruled that the point of order is debatable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has a point of order been made against the motion of the Senator from Tennessee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

The point of order is that the resolution appropriately belongs, under rule XXV, before the Armed Services Committee, it can be placed on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is debatable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I inquire about obtaining a vote on the merits of the resolution. Could that be done?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not until the point of order has been disposed of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Suppose a motion should be made to table the resolution, and that motion carried. Would it then be in order to vote on the merits of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would respond to the Senator from Arkansas by saying that under the unanimous-consent agreement, if a motion to table the point of order were successful, or carried, it would not be possible to complete action on the resolution today, because only procedural matters were included in the unanimous-consent agreement.

However, at a later time, or tomorrow, if the point of order fails, the resolution could be brought before the Senate for consideration, and would be subject to action by the Senate on the substance of the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In other words, the resolution would be placed on the calendar once again, and be subject to being called up on motion, for conclusive action by the Senate.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senate today establishes a precedent and requires that this resolution be sent to the Armed Services Committee, may I inquire whether or not the Armed Services Committee will hold hearings on the resolution? Hearings should be held.

Mr. McCARTHY. Since 1948, there have been 13 Senate resolutions dealing with the investigation of intelligence activities. Four were referred to the Armed Services Committee, and none were reported. Six were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and none were reported. Three were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and one was reported, I think in 1956. I think all of us know what the substance of this resolution is, and that nothing would be gained by referring it to the Armed Services Committee. If the Senate wishes to reject this on the procedural question, I suppose there is nothing to prevent them from doing it. But I hope, in view of the fact that this matter has been before the Senate on and off since 1946, and in 1956—when the present majority leader made a great fight to establish a joint committee of the House and Senate, which would supervise intelligence activities, there has been enough preparation, it seems to me, for us to act on the substance of the matter.

If hearings before the Armed Services Committee would add anything to this factual record, or if that committee had shown any interest in doing something to expand the jurisdiction of the Central Intelligence Agency, I would say let it go to the committee.

But I think under the circumstances we ought to face up to the subject which is before the committee.

If we do act on this procedural basis, it would be easy for the Foreign Relations Committee to report a resolution to set up a kind of standing committee which leaves out the Armed Services Committee and concentrates only on foreign policy aspects of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Senate might approve such a resolution, with the proviso that the President ought to instruct the Central Intelligence Agency to come up and answer questions put to it by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

But since joint jurisdiction is involved, we proposed the resolution in the form we did. I think the issue is before the Senate. Are we to evade our responsibility and slide off with this kind of very limited, specialized interpretation of the rules?

I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I know that although this may be considered a procedural question, we will be voting on a more fundamental question—on the merits of the resolution.

It will not be considered a mere procedural question. Representatives of the Foreign Relations Committee are asking to be included by the establishment of the new committee. We should decide the issue on the merits.

May I ask if the Foreign Relations Committee has, in hearings, made such an examination of the operations of the CIA as it is possible for it to conduct, and can it give to Members who are not on the Foreign Relations Committee or the Armed Services Committee, any substantial information which would support the establishment of the committee? Or is it only a matter of speculation about the activities of the CIA?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is asking me, we have had hearings twice this year, we have had Admiral Raborn before the committee; we have had them in the past. But this year in particular, because of the various articles, the articles I have referred to, raising questions about CIA activity, the book, which was a bestseller, called "The Invisible Government," all these things have developed recently and because of certain well-publicized activities the question arises again. The Senator knows about publicity in the case of the Michigan State University, that has been in the newspapers, and also press reports of the case of the Estonian refugees. All these have raised questions about the activities of the CIA.

So we had hearings and asked the CIA about certain of its activities. The Director was willing to give us certain reports about armed strength of certain nations and various things, most of which I had heard in other briefings on other occasions. None of this was particularly new or especially relevant to the aspects of foreign relations in which I am interested and in which most of my committee are interested.

Under the rules of the Senate, for example, the Committee on Foreign Relations is given jurisdiction, under section 8, on page 33 of the Senate Manual, "Intervention Abroad and Declarations of War." [Omission.]

When asking questions in this field, we were told—and I have the executive record—"We cannot answer such questions."

As the Senator says, with respect to methods and sources, methods particularly, of course, are a most important aspect. [Omission.] I think many of the CIA activities tend to discredit the integrity of our country, and these activities raise a number of questions with respect to the influence on our foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Is it an implicit conclusion, the resolution that the present subcommittee is not performing its duties?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think that is implicit in it at all.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, under the resolution, is essentially military. That committee is interested in Vietnam, in bombing, in the conduct of the war itself, as evidenced by many public statements. The members of the Armed Services Committee are inclined to feel that their particular mission is to carry on the war and to win it; whereas I think the orientation of the Committee on Foreign Relations is that it is more interested in finding a way to negotiate peace. There is a slight difference in their interests and approach.

We are not trying to oust the Committee on Armed Services or any other committee from their legitimate interest. I would not for a moment say that they have no interest in this business. We are only asking them to allow us to participate because we believe this subject involves a very important aspect of our foreign relations—much more important today than when the CIA was created. It was created in a period when the Cold War was just getting underway. It was a small operation at that time. Now it has become worldwide.

As I have already mentioned, certain aspects of this operation have been widely publicized and are not secret at all.

They brag about their success. That involves some serious question of policy. I personally question and have grave reservations whether it was wise for the CIA to intervene in certain countries. I think we are riding for much trouble.

I know I read in the newspapers today very optimistic statements in articles, reportedly emanating from the CIA. These are matters of very serious national interest to this country.

I think the Committee on Foreign Relations is not only entitled to know, but I think it has the duty to know, about these activities.

But if we ask the CIA if they use means such as these to intervene in a country, in the interest of those countries, they say, "It is not possible for us to answer such questions."

Mr. COOPER. Is it a matter of record, if it is not confidential, that this has been done, or is it speculation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am always under the inhibition to say that I cannot say that the CIA told me, but I have innumerable cases and have before my committee.

I did sit personally in a hearing with the President and Mr. Dulles, and about 15 others, and heard him make the case for intervention in the Bay of Pigs. This is public information. I heard this with my own ears, with Allen Dulles promoting it. I was there for 2 hours. This has been publicized. What has been written about it, by and large, absolutely accurate.

Mr. COOPER. I read the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Bay of Pigs, and I must say that when I finished, I had not learned much of what had occurred.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was talking about a meeting in the State Department with President Kennedy. This was before the Bay of Pigs. Allen Dulles was making a case for it and was urging the President at that time to make a final decision. This matter had been underway for a year. He wanted a final decision that would be a green light to proceed. I was there. I heard it, if we want to go into detail. That is the record.

Mr. COOPER. If we ever get to the point of voting on the merits of the resolution, and we should, how would we vote with knowledge—unless in a session like this—actual information based upon fact is provided us?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not seem to be necessary that we produce proof of them in each of these two instances, although I think we could in each instance. The general proposition seems to be that the CIA operates very deeply and broadly in the field of foreign relations.

[Omission.]

Mr. COOPER. I have personal knowledge on that point because of my experience in India.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was a long time ago.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; about 10 years ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How does the Senator know?

Mr. COOPER. Because I was given information by the State Department.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How did the State Department know—it is widely rumored—that many people are agents in the CIA? They do not know.

Mr. COOPER. That is possible, but I think it is a little farfetched. [Deletion.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to downgrade them. Many of them have been there longer and have had more experience than the Ambassador, in some cases dominating the whole team. In many cases, they are better trained and better paid.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I must insist, even though this record is being made in executive session, that the CIA officer is not paid as much as an Ambassador. There is not a single chancery in the world where the Ambassador does not receive higher pay than the CIA representative. The Senator has repeatedly stated that a CIA agent is paid more than an Ambassador. My information is that this is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has the great advantage that anything one says about the CIA cannot be challenged. The New York Times said——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. That is the Senator's Bible. But it is not the Bible always. I do not challenge the Senator's statement. I did not hear all the statement about it, but the Senator did not offer any proof that the CIA was supporting him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One can never offer proof.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. If they are, it is at the direction of the President, and the criticism ought to be launched at the President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not offer criticism. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], asked a question about the interest that we have. I was not talking in this case about the President. [Deletion.] This was years ago. It was widely reported not only in the New York Times. It was widely reported that this was an interest of the CIA. This is a matter of foreign relations. It is certainly more of prime interest to the Foreign Relations Committee than it is to the Armed Services Committee.

The Senator from Georgia has stated that he has no interest in knowing about many of these things.

That is not so with the Committee on Foreign Relations, because we have a different interest. We are not interested only in prosecuting a war or building a big Military Establishment, which is a legitimate interest of the Senator's committee. We are not trying to infringe on that at all. We are interested in foreign relations, and that comes under section 8 "Interventions Abroad" of the jurisdiction of the committee. There is express and exclusive jurisdiction over the matter of intervention, under section 8, in the Committee on Foreign Relations. This is much more explicit than the Senator's committee with respect to jurisdiction over the CIA. There is nothing in the rules that specifically mentions the CIA.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. What about the other agencies? What about the Department of Defense Intelligence Agencies, which are much larger than the CIA? They are covered by the resolution. The Senator continues to refer to the Committee on Armed Services as if we were a warlike group. We are not acting as a group of people who are trying to get this country engaged in a war. I do not believe the Committee on Armed Services is interested in getting the country engaged in a war. The Armed Services Committee is interested to see that the country is prepared to fight a war wherever it is. I have no apologies to make for that. That is where my interest it.

I am frightened by people who want to disarm this country. They scare me to death. There are many of them in high positions. I, for my part, want to maintain the security of the United States at all costs. If that means that I am a hawk, I am a hawk. I was not in favor of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say that the Senator was.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I was not in favor of getting there; but we are there, and I am in favor of winning the war there, and bringing our people home.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This has nothing to do with the resolution. That is a diversion; it is a red herring.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator attached a string to the red herring when he said we were interested in war. The Senator is the one who is drawing the red herring. We are not interested in war; we are interested in peace as much as anybody else.

I want to strengthen our national defense system as a backing for peace.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nobody is questioning that. I do not think we are worried about disarmament. I think the present budget is $60 billion for armament. The only agency that got more money out of Congress than the Executive has even asked for. I did not say the Senator is a warmonger, but that the main interest of the Senator's committee is to supply the armed services with weapons to prosecute the war and win it. Is that not so?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Our main interest is to have a Military Establishment to preserve the lives of American men all over the world. The Senator makes me think I might have more votes than I thought I had. I am encouraged.

I hope that the Senator does not have many on his side who are going on the theory that our committee has warmongers, and that it is necessary to put members of his committee on a committee to hold us down and to keep away from the Third World War.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has to go off on the war issue, then we are stronger than I thought we were. I really thought the Senator had his point won.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I have great faith in the commonsense of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to put two questions to the Senator: One that puzzles me, and one for the information of the Senate.

First, all these agencies are under the jurisdiction of the President, are they not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That goes for foreign policy and for our intelligence. The question, therefore, which I ask the Senator is: Are we not, by introducing any oversight whatever in this matter, over and above what we have, challenging the President? We are getting another avenue of review of what he is doing about intelligence, in this case, of the Nation. In other cases, we look into other matters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The short answer is that this procedure has been in effect ever since the creation of the CIA. The merged subcommittee has been operating. There is nothing new about it. The simple, narrow question is, should three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations share the opportunity to know about the CIA. That is all there is to it. We are not challenging anybody. There is nothing that seems to me to be unusual. It arises out of the legitimate jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, one might say, and the interest of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JAVITS. One other question of elucidation for Senators who are members of neither of these committees. Will the Senator tell us how he understands how any of the rest of us can get any information about the CIA now, and whether that opportunity will be enhanced by the passage of the resolution which the Committee on Foreign Relations has brought before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, it would depend on the nature of the Committee. This present committee is under the inhibition not to reveal classified information. There is certain information they can tell us that is not classified. It is similar to what happens on other committees, such as the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which have hearings. If one is not a member of the committee, there are certain things that they will not tell you, and certain things that they will. I think we cannot be so categorical that it will be complete.

I think that the judgment of the Foreign Relations Committee will be greatly improved if they have some knowledge of the activities of the CIA. I think they might even exercise some influence on the CIA if the CIA does some of the things it is reported to do. I cannot say for sure that they do them. I do not know whether they use [Deletion] at least it has been stated—that they use Michigan State University. I suppose it could be reasoned from that that they use others. My knowledge is very limited in responding on the merits, but this being in a field that is very important to foreign relations—and assuming that the Committee on Foreign Relations has the same competence as do the other committees—it ought to be of great advantage to them to know what is going on, and possibly it might produce some good ideas as to how the operations of the CIA could be improved.

Mr. JAVITS. If three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are assigned to this committee, will they consider it their obligation to brief the other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, or will they have to keep a wall between those three and the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should think there would be a reasonable exchange, particularly with reference to questions that have to do with policy. If the Senator wants to take a hypothetical question, I think it would be very important that they know.

We have had some cases [Deletion] in which, without getting into the merits, allegations about the degree of communism were involved. This is a matter of great importance in arriving at sound judgment. [Deletion.]

If we perform any function of value, it is advice and consent under the Constitution. How can we give any advice that is worth anything if we are not informed as to what is going on, and if we do not have information on which to base a judgment? Our advice would be very superficial if we did not have some information from the best available sources.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would like to be indulged.

[Omission.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the question asked by the Senator from New York, as one member who has sat on that subcommittee, now, for a number of years, I may say that when any Member of the Senate asks me a question regarding the CIA, I try in private conversation to give him an answer to the best of my ability. Occasionally something may come up, and I say, "I can't tell you at length about it"; but I try to give him an answer. That came up with Senator Dworshak, of Idaho, a number of years ago. I had a number of conversations with him. He was not a member of the subcommittee, but he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I tried to handle it satisfactorily with him in that way. I hope it satisfied him.

Mr. JAVITS. Can we assume, Senafor RUSSELL, that that is generally so?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. There were some subjects that I felt that I could not disclose. For example, we were told about the construction of the first U-2. I would not have been in conversation with any Member of the Senate on that subject. I know I would not have revealed it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Tnat is correct. That is a commonsense rule.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. But as a rule, I have been very free to disclose to Members of the Senate any information I had available as a member of the subcommittee. There were three or four instances such as that that I would not have disclosed, and would not in the future. They were so vital and could have had such a catastrophic effect if they did get out. I was using that as an illustration of one of the few that I would not have discussed.

But generally speaking, as to matters that pertain to information, and how reliable it is, dealing with questions about other countries, I feel free to discuss them with Members of the Senate. I have great confidence in the Senate. Some Senators have different ideas of the value of information; but generally speaking, I should say that 95 percent, 97 percent, or 98 percent of the information, I would feel free to give to the Senator from New York or any other Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much for this elucidation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Some few days ago, someone spoke of a fairly extensive research and intelligence office in the Department of State. I checked with the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee and asked if we had had any hearings or had called any witness concerning the Research and Intelligence Office in State, where operations are more akin to foreign policy than CIA operation, which are relatively closer to questions of national defense.

I ask in all sincerity: Would it not be well, before we continue worrying so much about the lack of information the Foreign Relations Committee is obtaining from the Central Intelligence Agency, we give consideration to the importance of the intelligence operations in the State Department. That surely comes within the operations of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have had a number of conversations in my office and Mr. Tom Hughes, of that agency; and if at any time the Members of the committee wished to see him, they could have met him. But it is no news to the Senator that this is a modest operation compared with the CIA. They are under all the inhibitions that the State Department functions under.

I have never had any meetings that embraced defense intelligence operations. The CIA, I submit, is not essentially, solely, or even predominantely engaged in military intelligence. It has a great deal to do with civilian affairs. In fact, it has more to do with civilian subjects than military, because military operations are so large, unless there is a high degree of duplication.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations for some years, I did not realize until recently that the Department of State also had a Research and Intelligence Division, regardless of its size.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very small operation compared with this and involves a very small amount of money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would hope that if we looked more into the Central Intelligence Agency, we would take a look at the intelligence operations of the Department of State, because State is closer to foreign policy than the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not think they have nearly the influence anywhere that the CIA has.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement and to raise a point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think I have the floor, but yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to raise a point, but not on the merits of the resolution. As the Senator from Mississippi understands the position of the Chair—not the ruling of the Chair, because the Chair did not make a ruling—the Chair has submitted to the Senate what is, in effect, the question whether the Senate should write a new rule. I invite attention to rule XXV, which covers 15 pages of the Senate Manual. Rule XXV carefully sets forth the names of all the committees and what their jurisdiction shall be, and expressly providing that bills introduced shall be referred to those committees, and that when the committees have considered the measures, they shall report them to the Senate..

Now it is proposed to say that a bill or resolution introduced by some committee does not have to go this route; that all these 15 pages of the rule are not controlling, are not guidelines, unless the Senate so finds that they are. That is why this is such an important ruling.

Unless we vote to sustain the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], we shall be setting a precedent whereby, I respectfully submit, the Committee on Public Works may write a bill on agriculture, report it to the Senate as such, and thereby abrogate a rule which covers 15 pages of the Senate Manual.

Do we want to set a precedent like that, merely to get at this problem? I do not think we do. If we are to launch out on a plan of such a kind as that, how shall we meet situations like this? Should not the question itself of how the rule shall be applied, be referred to a committee that is expert in the particular field for study and consideration, and then be reported to the Senate?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I finish my thought? We are confronted with one of the most far-reaching, serious matters, as I see it, that could possibly come up under the rules. It is clear to me that we will be violating the spirit of rule XXV if we voted for the resolution even though it was reported by a committee. Ninety-five Senators may introduce a bill jointly and pledge to support it; but under the rules, it would have to be referred to a committee for a study of the particular subject matter.

We shall be creating a precedent in haste in our vote, unless we vote to sustain the Senator from Georgia. If we do not vote to sustain his point of order, any committee could come in on a divided vote, and regardless of the subject matter, the Senate could start it far on its way toward passage, regardless of the nature of the committee or whether the proposal was submitted to the committee which was essentially charged with responsibility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I tried to make the same point with the Vice President. Is it not true that if the Senate sustains the point of order raised by the Senator from Georgia, we should try to write a new rule or should amend the rules so that they would cover this subject and not leave it open?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. If we are going to follow the general purpose and intent of the standing rules, that is one thing. I say that if we want to change the rule, it should be done only after study.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada, for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if we do not sustain the point of order, it will raise the question that any legislation could be brought up in committee without any hearing and reported to the Senate such as is involved in the resolution now pending. This would present a most serious question as to the handling of any legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. That is one of the main purposes for which rule XXV was written in its delineation.

Now I yield to the Senator from Nevada. I did not realize that he wished to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I make this parliamentary inquiry. If the point of order is not sustained, would the action of the Senate constitute a precedent for the proposition that any committee of the Senate could report and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters not within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is essentially correct in that statement and question. In other words, a committee could—I doubt whether it would—report a resolution that is not within the substantive area of that committee.

Mr. CANNON. Would such action here today constitute a precedent of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the point of order is not sustained, the precedent would be established that a committee could originate a resolution on its own, and send it to the calendar, even though the substance of the resolution fell within the jurisdiction of another committee.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a very fine question that presents the point of the whole subject.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this is an interesting point to the Senator from Louisiana. For some years, I have been trying to get a select committee to study what was happening to the $15 billion we were spending for research which was relevant to the question of patents on Government research, but I could not get to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which would have primary jurisdiction, or to the appropriate subcommittee, to conduct hearings to look into it.

But now I find that the Parliamentarian failed to advise me that all I had to do was to get my own Committee on Finance to report a resolution from the subcommittee. I never knew that that could be done, even though we had no jurisdiction. But I am frank to say that it is interesting to know, if that is the case, that every committee would be able to report bills on any subject under the jurisdiction of their committees. The Committee on Finance could report bills relating to public works or agriculture. Any other committee could do the same thing.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me and permit me to make an observation, without his losing the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I was intrigued by the argument of my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that it is advisable to pass this resolution so that he might be in a position to give advice when he is asked to advise or consent to something.

I do not want to disillusion the good Senator from Arkansas by saying that even if the resolution were passed, he might find himself in the same unhappy position in which I found myself on one occasion when I was practicing law.

An old woman came into my office. She laid a problem before me. I did as the Senator from Arkansas wishes to do. I got fully advised. I took down my lawbooks and read the cases dealing with the subject of her problem. I studied that problem; I looked into the statutes. I was fully in a position, as the Senator from Arkansas desires to be, to give her my advice. I gave her my advice.

She got up and started out of my office.

I said, "Wait a minute. You owe me five dollars."

She said, "What for?" I said, "For my advice."

She said, "I ain't gwine to take it."

The Senator from Arkansas may get the resolution passed and is in a position to give advice, but he may have the same unhappy misfortune that I once had, and not have his advice taken.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Nevada, for his inquiry, and I thank the Vice President for his very frank, candid, and correct response which has pointed up this question exactly as it should be.

I hope that if we are to establish a rule to cover situations such as this, it will be done after study, deliberation, and care, rather than as a procedural matter on this pending matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As a countermatter for consideration, counter to that suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I suggest that many questions involved in legislation have overlapping jurisdiction.

If this point of order is strictly and literally interpreted, there would be, if sustained, many instances in which resolutions or bills are reported by committees that infringe upon or deal with subject matter that has dual or multiple jurisdiction, and will be subject to such a point of order.

We are dealing with a serious matter of procedure, dealing with an issue that is before the Senate, reported by a committee, and on the calendar. There are many instances in which the Senate acts on a question reported by a committee, and which deals with a subject matter that could be dealt with, and indeed in other parts is dealt with properly, under the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make brief remarks in regard to what the Senator from Tennessee has said concerning the parliamentary question raised by the Senator from Nevada. But I shall yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall respond to the Senator from Tennessee by saying that no committee has been more diligent in exercising jurisdiction than the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not blame them for that. They should.

The other day a resolution was reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dealing with a declaration against nuclear warfare. No one was opposed to it, but the Senator's Joint Committee on Atomic Energy insisted that it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations because the resolution dealt with international relations.

I can recall a number of other occasions when a measure might perhaps have been within the jurisdiction of one committee or two committees, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations after they had been reported.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A few days ago, the Senator from Tennessee did a magnificent job of upholding the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, when a bill was passed which would have had a revenue impact. After the bill had been reported by the Judiciary Committee, the bill was referred to the Finance Committee and the bill stayed there for a year before we finally reported it back. The Judiciary Committee did not like our version and they took it back to their bosom. They reported it again their way. But there was no objection to the appropriate committee which had a prior claim to it looking at the bill and having the bill in committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do not think that what the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana have said in any way invalidates the point I made; they buttress it. Indeed, they point out instances of overlapping jurisdiction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to a matter which I think at least ought to be made a matter of record. in relation to what the Senator from Mississippi said in regard to the inquiry made by the Senator from Nevada, as to whether some committee, such as the Public Works Committee, could not bring to the Senate a resolution dealing with agriculture.

There is a question of fact here that I think we are overlooking in the debate, and that is the claim of the Foreign Relations Committee that the CIA involves itself in foreign policy as well as in armed services matters and other matters involving the field of intelligence. It is the position of most of us on the Foreign Relations Committee that that is true, that the CIA does involve itself in foreign policy.

Mr. President, it was not the desire of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, or Mr. McCarthy or anyone else on the Foreign Relations Committee, that this matter initially be handled by this procedure. Quite to the contrary, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee sought to work out an understanding with the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee for an agreement whereby three members of the Foreign Relations Committee would be added to the subcommittee that is given jurisdiction over conferring with the CIA.

I do not know of anyone on the Foreign Relations Committee who has ever taken the position that the full Foreign Relations Committee should have that information. I do not know of anyone on the Foreign Relations Committee who did not recognize that whoever was selected from the Foreign Relations Committee, the three people selected would be present just as the Senator from Georgia and every other member of the present seven-man subcommittee is present, but to protect secrecy, as the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts have stated, they have made a policy of saying what could be said in their conferences with other Senators, within the limits of their own responsibilities not to disclose this secrecy to the Senators.

I do not know how we can object to that. But every attempt was made, Mr. President, to try to work out an agreement whereby three members of the Foreign Relations Committee could be added to this subcommittee, because of the belief of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I happen to think it is an undeniable fact—that the CIA involves itself in questions of foreign policy. And, speaking respectfully, the door in effect was closed to us. The only procedure made available was that the issue be submitted to the Armed Services Committee.

We took judicial notice that we knew what the decision of the Armed Services Committee would be, that they were not going to be for it. And after all, we feel that the Foreign Relations Committee has a jurisdictional interest, and that the Senate, through the Foreign Relations Committee, has an interest in the Foreign Relations Committee having made available to it the information on foreign policy that it needs to serve the Senate as an agent of the Senate.

Mr. President, if we sustain the point of order of the Senator from Georgia, we are saying to the Foreign Relations Committee that this issue will have to be submitted to a committee that really would be set up as prosecutor and jury and judge, because at least in the first decision, which would be at the lower court level, to continue my analogy, the Supreme Court would be the court of final appeal. The Senate should be our court of final appeal after the appropriate committee finishes with its report.

I do not have to tell my fellow Senators that it is pretty difficult to overrule on the floor of the Senate the judgment of the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee. I happen to think they are the two most powerful committees in the Senate as far as having all the presumptions with them, as far as being sustained by the Senate.

Therefore I wish to say—and I commend my chairman—that Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator McCARTHY, I think, were offered no other procedural course if they were going to carry out their responsibilities in their positions on the Foreign Relations Committee, than to follow the course of action that we have followed.

It falls within the prerogative of the Senate, in a situation such as this, where we have a conflict over jurisdiction, to really function, in effect, as a Committee of the Whole, which the Senate is doing now.

To argue again by analogy, if the Senate can discharge a committee, if it can take an item away from a committee and bring it to the floor of the Senate it can act now. In fact, Mr. President, there have been times in the experience of those of us who have served any period of time in the Senate at which we have taken matters directly up on the floor of the Senate, without their ever going to a committee.

So the Foreign Relations Committee really was put in a position, Mr. President, where this was the only feasible procedure available to it, to try to get the Senate, acting "as a committee of the whole" to pass judgment as to whether or not the committee ought to have some voice, by way of three representatives, by way of information about the operations of the CIA in the field of foreign policy.

I think it is regrettable that we were not able to work that out. I criticize no one for the fact that we did not work it out, because each person involved was

sincere and perfectly honest, to himself, in the judgment that he followed.

But it is not a good situation, Mr. President; because after all, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee ought to act as two fingers in the same mitten—not in the same glove, but in the same mitten. We should be working hand to hand. Mr. President, there should never have been raised, in my judgment, this question of whether or not we are going to deny to three members of the Foreign Relations Committee an opportunity to be better able to serve the Senate as agents of the Senate in the field of foreign policy, by giving them the same access to information that three members of the Armed Services and three members of the Appropriations Committee have. I think that is the question of fact that is involved. And, of course, you can color it or discolor it all you want to; the parliamentary inquiries about a hypothetical case as to what would happen if some committee did something, that is not the issue before us. What is before us, when all is said and done, is whether it is in the best interest of the Senate, whether it is in the best interest of the country, to have three members of the Foreign Relations Committee joined with three members of the Armed Services Committee and three members of the Appropriations Committee in having access to the information of the CIA and to be represented by three members as each of the other two committees are?

If you want to put your Foreign Relations Committee in the position where it cannot give the Senate all the service that it should be able to give, as its agent in the field of foreign policy, then sustain the point of order of the Senator from Georgia. I say to the Senator from Kentucky, because of a remark that he made in regard to the issue involved—it is the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee to keep the Senate advised on foreign policy. If you slam this door in the face of the Foreign Relations Committee, you are denying it entrance into one aspect of American foreign policy that it should be allowed to enter, just as much as the Armed Services Committee is entering into that aspect of foreign policy as well as military policy, and that three members of the Appropriations Committee have access to.

So I close, Mr. President, by saying the real issue here today is whether or not the Senate wishes to support its Foreign Relations Committee in giving it equal treatment, along with the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, in accessibility to information now denied it, in connection with the CIA.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Section 2 of this proposed new standing committee reads:

It shall be the duty of the Committee on Intelligence Operations to keep itself fully and currently informed of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, and other agencies of the government in so far as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence.

Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has an extensive intelligence and counterintelligence operation. Am I correct in stating that if this standing committee was formed in accordance with section 2 of the resolution, the counterintelligence and intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would be taken away from the Senate Judiciary Committee and put under this joint committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That could be the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I say respectfully that I did not ask for my interpretation. I asked the Chair's interpretation, based on what the resolution says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not the prerogative of the Chair to give an interpretation of legislation or of a resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask that the Parliamentarian give a decision?

Let me state it again. "This agency would control other agencies of the Government insofar as the activities of such agencies relate to foreign intelligence or counterintelligence."

I would like a ruling from the Parliamentarian as to whether that means the extensive operations in this field of the Federal Bureau of Investigation would thereupon leave the Judiciary Committee and go to this new joint committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The ruling the Senator seeks is not within the prerogatives of the Chair or the Parliamentarian.

(Several Senators addressed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if I may make one more statement—

Originally, this resolution had the words in it "the Federal Bureau of Investigation." Later those words were taken out. But it seems to me we should have a determination on this.

I have been told by people in the Department of Justice that taking these words out would not take the prerogatives of this new committee out over the intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must say to the Senator from Missouri that whatever the Chair's personal views may be, that it is not the prerogative of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to interpret a resolution or a bill presented by a committee or a Member of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Chair. A Member of this body who knows the rules as well as anybody said it would be appropriate for me to make this parliamentary inquiry. He felt it was in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may make the inquiry, but may I suggest that the Senator refer to the processor of the resolution; the Chair has no power to interpret legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia is sustained, the effect of it will be to refer a resolution which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to the Armed Services Committee. That is what the effect of it will be, and I ask the Chair, is that not correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the point of order is sustained, the effect of the action of the Senate will be to refer this resolution to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Exactly. Now, Mr. President, this relates to the colloquy that I had with the Senator from Tennessee. A committee that did not have jurisdiction of a resolution reported the resolution; the committee that does have jurisdiction of it makes the point of order that this is in their jurisdiction, and they want it referred to them.

I have never seen it happen in this entire Congress that a committee which had jurisdiction of a bill was denied the bill.

Many times, the Finance Committee, has requested reference to our committee of some measure that had only an incidental revenue impact.

Recently the Committee on the Judiciary thought that a bankruptcy matter was their jurisdiction. The Finance Committee did not agree with that entirely because it had a revenue impact. We took one position; they took another. So we voted on it here in the Senate. But both committees were afforded an opportunity to act on it. And the committee, as it turned out, that had the greatest jurisdictional interest, prevailed on that occasion.

It would seem appropriate that if the Committee on Finance wishes to report out a bill that has only incidental revenue involvement, but that regulates interstate and foreign commerce, the bill should be referred to the Commerce Committee, if there is anybody on the Commerce Committee that would like to have a look at that bill.

I have in my office a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the request that when the Finance Committee was through looking at a matter that involves taxation and also involves foreign operations, we should make it available to them.

I have told the chairman that I do not know that we will report the bill at all, but in the event we did, I would be glad to discuss the matter, and we would work it out.

That is how these matters usually happen. I have never known of an occasion where the committee that had jurisdiction was denied the right to even see a bill, except on one occasion with regard to a civil rights matter, where the Senate thought it just had to keep it on the calendar, because the Judiciary Committee was certain not to report it. But when a bill is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Commit-

tee, and is reported here, and a point of order is made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the matter should be put in the Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over it, and see what they will do with it.

If the committee does not wish to report the measure, we can come in with a discharge petition, if we cannot get it out of the committee, or wait until some other measure comes along, and offer it on that. There are all kinds of ways to bring a matter to a vote. But I would certainly hope that the Senate will not repeal rule XXV. That is what it means.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the able Senator has pointed out some more instances of overlapping jurisdiction. I could suggest to him that a matter affecting the investment tax credit for U.S. taxpayers investing abroad is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is where it belongs. It came in here as a treaty, and it belongs in that committee.

Mr. GORE. Well, Mr. President, that raises an interesting point. Its purpose and its principal effect is on the internal revenue of the United States, which is a subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee. I know of nothing in the Constitution that requires that treaties go before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator to look at rule XXV, and he will see it right there.

Mr. GORE. But that is a rule of the Senate, not in the Constitution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I said.

Mr. GORE. Well, I could cite some other things. Is Food for Peace a foreign policy measure, or a domestic agricultural measure? I could name dozens of instances of subject matter——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I simply wish to protect my rights. Yes, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not wish to trespass on the Senator's rights.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. GORE. I am pleading with the Senate not to adopt, precedentially, a hard-and-fast rule which would plague us. The Senator has cited instances of comity between committees.

That is the only way that the Senate of the United States and its committee structure can operate. I would that it had prevailed in this instance.

The CIA gathers information, interprets information, reaching conclusions upon which decisions of our Government are based. If that is not a vital part in the decisionmaking process of foreign policy, I would not know how to describe it.

The Foreign Relations Committee sought, in conformity with the practice of comity, to reach some understanding, some modus operandi, of its senior members having access to this vital information. That was denied the committee. So the committee has come into the Senate, its parent, asking for the right to have access to information on which to base its conclusions, which it can use in rendering its responsibilities to the Senate.

Many of these questions are of overlapping jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will be brief.

Mr. GORE. I will. I have sought the opportunity to make some brief remarks all afternoon. If the Senator will bear with me momentarily, I will close.

[Omission.]

But was that within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee. I say to the Senate, it was a dual jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Just one second. I do not know which committee should have priority. I do not think we need to assign priority. If we abide by the rule of comity, then we will make both committees, along with the Appropriations Committee, fingers in the mitten in this operation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I make is that the Foreign Relations Committee has had this resolution. They reported it. They did not have jurisdiction of it, but they had it. They reported it. That is why it is here. If we are going to deny the committee that had primary jurisdiction of this resolution an opportunity to have that resolution in committee and do what the committee wants to do with that resolution, it will be the only time that this Congress has denied a committee having jurisdiction that right to look at the resolution.

If this point of order is sustained, that will not be the end of the matter. The Senator from Georgia has some ideas about how the matter might be worked out amicably between those involved. But we are going to have to decide whether to respect the jurisdiction and faithful record of the Senator from Georgia, who, in my opinion, has done a magnificent job in my 17 years here—he has never leaked a national secret, as well as that of the Armed Services Committee.

I call attention to a story in the New York Times of June 20, 1952. The Senator who leaked the information is not here any longer. The Senator was sincere, but, inadvertently he leaked some of our vital secrets.

[Omission.]

Then here is a story that appeared in Drew Pearson's column about something that happened at the White House the other day. The story is substantially correct. It occurred between two Senators. I was one of them. I don't think I am the leak. That was a completely secret meeting. It was fully agreed that this matter should be the kind of thing that should all be secret. What leaked, actually, was not a security secret. At the same time, it was agreed that everything that was said would be secret.

Then here is a story of a fellow Senator who came to me and in a personal conversation asked me why I could not help him. I told him why I could not.

I said, "This is confidential. It would be embarrassing to a fellow Senator, but here is the situation."

We read it in Drew Pearson's column. The other fellow said that he didn't leak it. I know that I didn't leak it. Somebody did. But there it is, Mr. President. Senators are not always good security risks.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So if we are going to talk about how we can protect national secrets and help the Committee on Foreign Relations to do the job it wants to do, I certainly think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his fine committee, who have never leaked a secret in 17 years, should be in a position to study this matter, before we act on it.

[Omission.]

It seems to me that anybody who is involved on a committee of this sort should be picked by those who are best at keeping secrets after they have had several years to observe him as one of those who keeps secrets best.

Certainly the Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction. They ought to be permitted to have the measure. If we do not sustain the point of order, this will be the first time we have permitted one committee to usurp the jurisdiction of another committee, and when the point was made, the request was made here on the floor to deny the committee with primary jurisdiction the right to look at that bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] asked the Chair for a ruling on this question. In a parliamentary inquiry, he said: "If the point of order is not sustained, will the action of the Senate constitute a precedent for a proposition that any committee of the Senate could report and call up for actions bills and resolutions on substantive matters not within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?"

The answer to that question was: "Yes."

I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry that I think ties in with what the Senator from Louisiana has just been talking about. Look at it the other way. Suppose the point of order is sustained. Since this is a precedent we are establishing here, would the action in sustaining the point of order constitute a precedent for the proposition that no committee of the Senate can report and call up for action by the Senate a resolution or a bill involving substantive matters, partly but not preponderantly within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. First of all, the Chair would say that while a precedent is established—or at least the beginning of one—a committee would not be prohibited from reporting to the Senate a resolution or a bill. A point of order could be raised, if such committee did report a resolution or a bill where the predominance of the subject matter was

not within the jurisdiction of that committee.

The Chair wishes to make it clear that there is, of course, a relevancy of the subject matter of this resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. But the history of the Central Intelligence Agency as one of the intelligence groups referred to in the resolution is one of having been reported from the House Committee on Armed Services, from the Senate Committee on Armed Services, under the terms of the National Security Act.

So the Chair earlier responded that under cursory examination of the resolution, had it been introduced on the floor of the Senate for the purpose of referral, on the advice of the Parliamentarian the Chair would most likely have referred it to the Committee on Armed Services. This is not to say that there is not a difference of opinion over where that referral should go. But the precedents would have indicated Committee on Armed Services.

To answer, now, the Senator's inquiry——

Mr. MILLER. May I repeat it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. If the point of order is sustained, would the action constitute a precedent for the proposition that no committee of the Senate could report or call up for action by the Senate substantive matters partly but not preponderantly within the legislative jurisdiction of the reporting committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's question leads the Chair to make this observation: The sustaining of the point of order would be a precedent, but it would not necessarily be a prohibition upon a committee in this case. If a point of order were made, the precedent that has been established could be used in the future to sustain the point of order, and this concerns measures predominantly within the jurisdiction of another committee. Likewise, a decision of the Chair is always subject to an appeal.

Mr. MILLER. That ruling is precisely what I want, Mr. President, because the Chair had previously given the Senator from Nevada a ruling on a precedent, that if the point of order were not sustained, the action of the Senate would constitute a precedent for the proposition that any committee of the Senate could report out and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters not within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee.

That is clear to me, but I think the request I have made of the Chair is more responsive, at least, to what I intend to do when I vote on this proposition. I understand the Chair to make clear that this does not prohibit it, but that if the point of order is sustained, there would be a precedent for the position that no committee of the Senate can report out and call up for action by the Senate resolutions or bills involving substantive matters only partly but not predominantly within the jurisdiction of the reporting committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The word is "predominance" of the subject matter, not just "involving."

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make it crystal clear that a precedent is not a rule; a precedent establishes a guideline for the Senate and for the Presiding Officer when he makes rulings upon a point of order.

Mr. MILLER. I so understand the Chair. But I also wish to make clear that I understand the Chair to say this would be a precedent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on the question that is before us.

The issue, as I understand it, on which the Senate must vote, is whether this resolution offered by the Foreign Relations Committee should be referred to the Armed Services Committee, or whether, if the point of order is not sustained—or if the appeal is not sustained—then it will go on the calendar tomorrow.

In other words, it is a very simple issue, as to whether the resolution should go to the Armed Services Committee or on the calendar tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the question of procedure, I should like to speak briefly. Ordinarily, if this was introduced by an individual Member of the Senate, it would go to the Armed Services Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee has brought out this resolution, and is asking the Senate to consider it without having it referred to what we believe is the proper committee, the Armed Services Committee.

The fact that I wish to bring out is that the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Armed Services Subcommittee sit together on the subject of the CIA in order to simplify the hearings, get the information that they need, not only for the jurisdiction and the work of the CIA, and to find out what it is doing, but also for the amount of money that it needs.

On the merits of the situation——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The interest of the committee stems from its established jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. In order to fulfill our responsibility to the Senate we must consider the amounts requested for the Central Intelligence Agency the existing procedure has proven to be a good one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. That is why the Appropriations Committee has joined with the Armed Services Committee for these hearings, and to save time and to carry out our objectives of following the work of the CIA to the best of our ability.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator knows, I had an exchange of correspondence and conversations with Senator RUSSELL of Georgia on this matter, and this goes back to March.

I started to put this in the RECORD when the Senator from Oregon, a moment ago, was talking about this matter. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and his reply, relating to the subject.

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

MARCH 16, 1966.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: As you probably know, there have recently been a number of new proposals in the Senate to create a special watchdog committee on the CIA, to study the effects of CIA's activities on foreign relations, or otherwise to involve the Congress to a greater degree in legislative oversight of intelligence activities.

Several members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have become particularly interested in relationships between the CIA and the Department of State and in procedures for coordinating the work of the CIA with foreign policy. In this connection, it has been suggested that a select committee of the Senate be created, with membership drawn from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations, to provide legislative oversight of the whole intelligence community. A draft of a resolution to accomplish this is being privately circulated. I do not know whether it will be introduced.

It occurs to me, however, that selected members of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees now meet together from time to time for substantially this same purpose. I wonder what you would think of informally adding members of the Foreign Relations Committee to that group. This would, I think, do a good deal to allay the concern which several Senators feel, without the disadvantage of attracting as much notice as a formal resolution of the Senate. In addition, I should, in candor, express my own view that the Foreign Relations Committee has a valid interest in intelligence activities—just as has the Department of State in the Executive Branch.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Handwritten note by JWF: I would like to discuss this with you within the next few days at your convenience. I have in mind three members.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 30, 1966.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: As you know from the several conversations we have had on the subject matter of your letter suggesting a new committee or a revision of the present Committee for Oversight of the CIA, I have delayed answering your letter until I had an opportunity to talk to all of the Senators on the present oversight subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services.

After discussing it individually with several members of the committee, I called a meeting, and the matter was thoroughly covered at length and in detail. The unanimous conclusion was that it would be unwise to increase the size of the groups that meet jointly for convenience. Without any reflection whatever on the Committee on Foreign Relations, for which we all have the greatest respect, the responsibility for legislative oversight under the Legislative Reorganization

Act of 1946 is clearly that of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which originated the legislation creating the CIA as well as the National Security Council, and all legislation coordinating the work of each unit of the intelligence community.

As you know, the Subcommittees are composed of the ranking members in seniority on the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations. Inasmuch as there was considerable duplication (for illustration, Senators Saltonstall, Smith, Stennis and I all are on both Committees), purely for the purposes of convenience the two Subcommittees have met jointly and Senator Hayden requested me to act as Chairman.

We are, of course, not able to pass judgment on the effectiveness of our oversight, but I think I can state with assurance that throughout the course of a year no agency of the Government spends as much time before its oversight and appropriations committees as does the CIA. The work of the CIA is, of course, related to international and foreign relations, but no more so than the work of the Armed Services Committee. The size and nature of our military establishment, of course, is largely determined by the status of our international relations. Indeed, there is a great deal of connection on down the line between the various committees and the subject of their oversight, but under the rules and practices of the Senate, the Senate Committee on Armed Services undoubtedly has jurisdiction in this case on matters other than budgetary.

With assurances of personal esteem and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The question, though, that I was leading up to—I make the point that this does not come as any surprise to the members of the Armed Services Committee; this has been under discussion since March—what does the Senate think about this being sent to the Armed Services Committee, with instructions to report back in 2 weeks?

I have no objection to their looking at it. They know all about it. We have discussed it ad infinitum. It seems to me the subject should be considered on the merits; if the Senate does not wish to have the Foreign Relations Committee look at the matter, then it ought to vote not to. If it thinks we have a legitimate interest, we ought to vote for it. If this question of procedure is important, that the Armed Services Committee look at it, I have no objection at all to an agreement that it go over to the committee for 2 weeks, is no problem at all.

The same thing is true about these details as to how you appoint a chairman. We were trying to make it in accord with what we believed to be the wishes of the Senator from Georgia. If he wishes to change those provisions, we will be more than willing to consider his amendments, also. It was in an effort to try to make this resolution as consistent with present practices as possible, in the same way that I informally asked the chairman of the subcommittee if he would be willing for us informally to be members of that subcommittee. That was the simple way. I originally tried to solve this matter.

But it did not work out. The idea that the Armed Services Committee ought to look at it does not offend me in the least. I am very agreeable that they look for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a very short statement that I wish to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator think about that proposal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am just one member of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would be happy to talk it over with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield momentarily here?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, a few moments ago, referred to the bills on bankruptcy, which involved dual and overlapping jurisdiction. The matter was referred to the Judiciary Committee. That committee made its recommendation, and it was then referred to the Finance Committee, with the understanding—I think with the instructions—that the committee report the bill back with its recommendations within, I believe, 2 or 3 weeks, or some such time.

That is a procedure that is frequently resorted to with overlapping jurisdictions. I think it is quite generous that the chairman of the committee has made this suggestion, and I hope the Senate will accept it, including the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Now, Mr. President, I shall briefly discuss the merits and the work of our committee on the CIA. I believe everyone here understands the issue today, which, I repeat, is a very simple one, as to whether this matter should go to the Armed Services Committee or whether it should go on the calendar tomorrow. That is the only issue before us.

On the merits of the work of the CIA Subcommittee of the Armed Services and the Appropriations Committee, let me say first that the chairman of our Armed Services Committee, who has assumed the chairmanship of the joint hearings at the request of the Senator from Arizona, has called meetings constantly, and especially when there is any subject that we believed was of importance that we should discuss at the time. He has been a hard working, able chairman, who has been a Member of the Senate for a great many years, and who has taken a tremendous interest in this subject of the CIA and the armed services generally; and I think he has a greater memory and understanding of the precedents of the Senate than any other Senator that I know.

As a member of that committee, I have never been refused an answer to any question that I have asked. I have always received all the answers to all the questions, from whomever may be the Director of the CIA. I believe that we get the information that we think is helpful, and that we should know, in connection with legislation.

One point that I do not think has been made especially complete or clear this afternoon is that the CIA is essentially under the National Security Council. The National Security Council is headed by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, and has as members the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the CIA Director, and a number of other important Cabinet officials.

The CIA is essentially different from an ordinary department like the Department of State or the Department of Defense, where Congress has a very important relationship, because of the personnel involved, because of the duties involved, and because of the legislative questions involved.

The CIA is under the jurisdiction of the National Security Council, and I would like to make it essentially, as it is in my mind essentially, a part of the executive establishment, the White House establishment.

The President calls upon the CIA for information, factfinding information that he needs, just as he asks his secretary, or just as he asks men like Mr. Rostow and other people in his office for facts on situations in which he, and he alone, at the end, has to make a decision.

In that way, the CIA is different from the ordinary departments. As such, it comes under a different category, if you will, in our legislative work here. Essentially it is a factfinding body. With all the questions that arise about the making of foreign policy, it only makes foreign policy when it finds facts for the Chief Executive, on which to act; and if it carries out any policy in any part of the world, as brought out this afternoon, it is doing so essentially under the orders of or with the approval of the President of the United States and the National Security Council.

So I say that I believe the CIA, so far as the legislative processes are concerned, is adequately handled in the manner that it has been handled. Perhaps I am prejudiced, because I have been on that committee now for a good many years; but essentially we could work problems out. And as I said before to the Senator from New York, I have never refused to tell any Member of the Senate an answer to a question regarding the CIA and its activities, to the best of my knowledge and to the best of my ability.

Naturally there are one or two aspects of the subject that perhaps we could not answer in detail. But the fundamental policies involved we could.

I wish to make one more statement. Assume we establish this committee that is requested by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as a formal committee. What is its jurisdiction? I am a member of the Small Business Committee. We cannot pass legislation to the Senate. We have to send any legislation that we want to the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Commerce.

If this committee is established as a formal committee, what will be its jurisdiction? Will it pass on appropriations, and say to the Appropriations Committee, "This is it; you appropriate this sum of money"?

If it is going to act on defense matters, is it going to say to the Armed Services

Committee, "This is it"? Or is it going to leave the matter to the Armed Services Committee for final action?

It seems to me that if we adopt this committee as a formal committee, we shall create a new situation, in which it will be very difficult to resolve the jurisdictions of the committee.

So, Mr. President, while there are other matters that we can discuss, I believe this situation is well known to the Members of the Senate today. I have a number of references here where I would argue very strenuously with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas on his prepared statement, but I will not take the time of the Senate to do it now.

I hope that the point of order made by the Senator from Georgia will be answered affirmatively by a majority of the Senate this afternoon. I believe it is in the interest of orderly procedure, and I believe it is in the best interests of administering the CIA.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I would like to touch on two points. A great deal has been made about the danger of having more people informed about the Central Intelligence Agency.

Under the resolution, there would be nine Members of the Senate on the committee, more or less privy to the Agency's reports.

Under existing practice, there is really no limit on the number of members that may be included, except the total number of the members who may be put on the committee of the Armed Services and of the Appropriations Committees. There is some overlapping between the two committees. The chairman of the Armed Service Committee could put his whole committee on the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, we have not made any changes recently. When Senator Byrd retired from the committee, we put another man on. There are five on the Armed Services Subcommittee; the Senator from Maine has not been mentioned earlier. She is a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know she is. All I said, the Senator could put his whole committee on that subcommittee, there is nothing to prevent him from doing it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No, but I have no intention of doing it.

Mr. McCARTHY. And the chairman of the Appropriations Committee could put every member of that committee on the subcommittee.

So in effect the resolution we offer sets a limit on the number of persons who might be informed with reference to Central Intelligence activities.

In the House, there are 11 members on the Committee on Armed Services, who are on the CIA subcommittee, headed by Chairman RIVERS. Eleven members of the House Appropriations Committee evidently can be trusted. They may have two different kinds of intelligence committees. They have not told me about the inside one; they tell me about the public one. I do not know whether it is 11 or 4. This is the kind of information we should have. The record question is this, Is the CIA is a policymaking agency?

I am not going to argue this. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has given his opinion. I should like to quote a former President of the United States, Harry Truman, who said in a column in the Washington Post of December 22, 1963:

"For some time I have been disturbed by the way the CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and, at times, a policymaking arm of the government. This has led to trouble, and may have compounded our difficulties in several explosive areas."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator identify who said that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Harry Truman, President of the United States, said it after he had served as President.

To move this along, the Senator from Georgia has made a point of order. If he is prepared to withdraw the point of order temporarily, I am prepared to move that the resolution be referred to the Armed Services Committee, with the understanding that it be reported favorably or unfavorably, with amendment or without amendment, in 21 days. Would the Senator from Georgia be prepared to withdraw his point or order?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. No. This matter is of such great importance and has been discussed at such great length that it should be decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is all right with me. I have heard the argument made that the Armed Services Committee should have a look at the resolution. But if the Senator is prepared to withdraw his point of order temporarily, I will move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Armed Services with the understanding that it be reported either adversely or favorably, with or without amendment, within 21 days.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, why does not the Senator make his proposal without a time limit? After all, if the point of order is withdrawn, the resolution originated in the committee itself. If the Armed Services Committee does nothing now, the resolution can be brought forth.

I do not think we ought to drag anybody around. We should not put on a time limitation. We are reasonable people, respectable people, and responsible people. We are interested in the security of our country. If the proposal is made to refer the resolution to the Armed Services Committee without any restriction or equivocation, we can then sit back as reasonable people and know that justice will be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. We tried to take it up with them.

Mr. PASTORE. But today the way has been cleared. We have never had such a discussion with respect to the CIA before.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from Georgia does not withdraw his point of order, the situation will be what the Senator from Rhode Island says it will be. The facts can be presented. This is one occasion where I would suggest a limitation of time. But I think what is involved here is known to the Senate, and whatever changes the Armed Services Committee might wish to make in the resolution could be made by tomorrow night, if they wanted to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on the merits. It is an issue important enough to have a vote on the merits. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that we should not put a time limit on the committee; but would the Senator amend his motion to provide that the resolution should be reported to the Senate during this session of Congress?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether that would be any more acceptable. I would be glad to have it back within this session.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, this issue as to the matter of time has not been discussed. The question has revolved around jurisdiction and proper handling by standing committees of the Senate. I think that question should be settled. I have had no personal objections from my standpoint, as an individual, about the Foreign Relations Committee being invited in to sit on this committee.

I so informed the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] when he first discussed the matter with me. But now here we have had raised this question and have labored it for more than 4 hours as to whether a committee ought to have the right to report to the Senate, to be placed on the calendar, a bill or a resolution that unquestionably invades the jurisdiction of another committee. I think that question ought to be decided. If it is decided against the contention I have made, the matter might well go to the calendar. If it is decided in favor of the contention I have made, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and I shall give it the same consideration in that committee as I give other matters. I endeavor to see that all matters are considered. We have not always acted favorably on all pending measures, but we have tried to consider them all. Sometimes business reaches us very late in the session.

But I do not propose at this stage of the proceedings to let this suggestion be used as a way to hold a gun at the head of the Armed Services Committee and to say, "You have to report it within this period." I do not care what the period is.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not conceive it in terms of holding a gun at the head of anybody.

Mr. GORE. I had a situation recently in which exactly such a procedure was followed. I cited an example with reference to the question of bankruptcy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask whether the Senator from Georgia means by what he has said to make this a vote, in effect, on the defeat of the resolution. It sounded as though that were his intention. I think we should know it, if it is.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mean what?

Mr. CASE. Whether the vote for his motion means a vote to defeat the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. CASE. The Senator did not state it, but is that his intention?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not know how the Senator drew any such inference from anything I said. He must have been imagining things.

I said the question had been raised and discussed here at great length as to the fundamental jurisdiction of committees and that that question ought to be decided by the vote on this point of order.

Mr. CASE. Does not the Senator mean by that that if the point of order is sustained, the resolution is defeated for this session?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I did not make that statement.

Mr. CASE. The Senator did not say it. Does he mean it?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I do not promise that I will bring this resolution out; but I am not going to consider this as a deathblow to the resolution.

Mr. CASE. When the Senator said we have been debating this for 4 hours and that we ought to decide it, what did he mean?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I was talking about the procedural question whether the committee had a right to report the resolution without any bill having been introduced, on its own volition, and to have it considered that invades the jurisdiction of another committee without its having been referred to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will permit me, with all respect——

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I am not going to make a promise that I will report this bill in a week or 10 days or any other length of time.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from New Jersey is only trying to ascertain the meaning of the action the Senate is about to be asked to take. The Senator from New Jersey cannot escape the inference that if he should vote to sustain the point of order, he will be voting to kill the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator already voted to report the resolution three times.

Mr. CASE. What the Senator from Georgia has said confirms the Senator from New Jersey in his understanding of the matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point has been made that we have reported by dates certain. Without exception, in this Congress, every time we have done that, to the best of my knowledge, it has been a case where a committee had secondary jurisdiction, did not have primary jurisdiction, and wanted to look at a bill that came from another committee.

But all these thousands of bills that have been introduced did not go to our standing committees with instructions to report by a date certain. They were referred to the proper committees—period.

It is only where a committee has an interest in passing a bill that it reports a bill, and some other committee wants to look at the bill, that the committee having primary jurisdiction would say, "Fine. We will let you have the bill. But please report back by a certain date"; and that has worked out amicably.

What we are talking about here would be a reflection on the Armed Services Committee, to insist that if we pass a resolution over which we have complete jurisdiction, that that resolution should not be referred to the committee to do what they want to do with it.

That would not be the end of it, so far as I am concerned, and I do not think it would be as far as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are concerned. That we understand. If this committee does have jurisdiction, it ought to be permitted to have the resolution over which it has jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARTHY. My feeling is that the Armed Services Committee has had ample opportunity to look at the substance of the resolution. It could have asked earlier to study it. It took no action. A number of bills of this kind have been referred to that committee over the last 20 years. Consequently, I am prepared to have the Senate vote on the substance of this matter today. The Senate regularly does not insist on applying the rules of the Senate. If we did, we would be immobilized. Any kind of amendment could be offered. It seems to me all of a sudden the Senator from Louisiana becomes a purist over the rules of the Senate. It should be remembered that we offered the great civil rights bill on the Stella school bill. That was the most comprehensive legislation ever introduced.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Stella school bill, as I recall, had been reported by the appropriate committee. It came out of the Judiciary Committee.

If the Senator wants to change the rules of the Senate, I certainly think——

Mr. McCARTHY. We are not changing the rules.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should think that if the Senator wanted to change the rules, and if he wanted to establish a new standing committee, it would be necessary to amend the rules of the Senate, not the general statutes of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not what the Vice President said, acting under the one constitutional responsibility he has as Presiding Officer of the Senate. He said there was no rule or precedent. He said this would establish a precedent. This is properly before the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana said it was not legally before us.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I said I know of no law that has been violated by this, but that it is an unusual procedure. I stand on that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota consider the possibility of amending his motion; or, if it has not yet been proposed, if he will propose that the pending matter be referred to the Committee on Armed Services with no time limitation? I make that proposal on this basis. I have a great deal of confidence in the integrity of the committees of the Senate. If a bill is referred to the appropriate committee, I would assume, without question, that that committee would hold hearings and would either report the bill favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator proposing that we do this without a vote, that this be by agreement, and that we bypass a vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator wishes a vote, that would be fine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has been under consideration for 3 or 4 months. The Senate should vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say a rollcall vote on the proposal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That, is the effect of the motion now made, would be that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand the motion now made has a time limitation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we vote on the point of order, and that point of order is sustained, the resolution will go to the committee for an unlimited time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So it has the same effect. I would rather have it that way.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. We could proceed that way.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in the form of a plea.

We have debated this matter for a long time this afternoon. I think we recognize the differences in the points of view that have developed between the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

I think the record is clear that the two chairmen were not able to reach an understanding as to how this matter should be resolved. That left the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in a position where he felt that, carrying out his duties as chairman of the committee, he should offer this resolution. A large number of us agreed with him.

I know that at this point in the debate, when there is a tendency on the part of Senators to reach fixed attitudes, there may not be a disposition to agree to what I think is a very reasonable solution of the problem.

I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] knows the high regard in which I hold him, and that his word will always be his bond so far as I am concerned.

However, a practical situation has developed which we must face up to. The reason why there has been this hesitancy on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee to this matter is that we felt, rightly or wrongly—but we felt that way, and I think we still do—that unless we can have some gentlemen's understanding that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the merits of this matter. The merits go to the question of

fact as to whether or not, because the CIA involves itself to some degree in foreign policy, members of the Foreign Relations Committee should sit in with the committee now composed of members of the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee.

I think it is perfectly all right to send the resolution to the Armed Services Committee, but that will not remove certain feelings and attitudes about it.

Therefore, all I wish to say is that if the Senator from Georgia will simply say to the Senate that the matter will be heard before the Armed Services Committee, without any time limitation being put on it—and I agree that we should not put a time limitation on it—and that the committee will bring back a report before this session closes, for it or against it, or without recommendation—we have followed all those three procedures by committees in the past—I remember the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] brought back a report from the Commerce Committee in the last couple of years with no recommendation—or if the Armed Services Committee comes back with a report against the resolution, we would have the benefit of their judgment and why they are against it in their report. The same would be true if they were for it.

However, I do not think the Senate would be dealing fairly with the Foreign Relations Committee if we were to refer this resolution to the Armed Services Committee today with no gentlemen's understanding that we will have a chance to vote on its merits before we adjourn.

Perhaps there is no justification for the feeling, but the feeling exists, because attitudes have been expressed in opposition to any members of the Foreign Relations Committee sitting on this committee.

I think if we are not willing to have an understanding that we shall be assured of a vote on the merits, what we will be doing, in effect, without justification, is discriminating against the Foreign Relations Committee, without an opportunity to vote on the merits.

I think that the Foreign Relations Committee, on the merits, is entitled to have three members on that committee. But we are not arguing the merits of that issue now. We are arguing only the question as to whether we ought to have an opportunity to vote on the merits before we adjourn.

All that would be necessary, insofar as I am concerned, would be for the Senator from Georgia to say that the Armed Services Committee, in due course of time, but before this session closes, will vote to send the resolution back, with its recommendation or without its recommendation. But I think the Foreign Relations Committee is entitled to that consideration from the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on this, because I do not like to be left in the position of appearing to be an unreasonable man. I understand the wishes of the Foreign Relations Committee in respect to this subject.

Back in 1953 or 1954, I offered to invite the two ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee into the sessions of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee—that was before the Appropriations Committee started meeting with us—and extend to them the privilege of examination. The offer was not accepted. They wanted to have a special joint committee at that time.

Since that time I have invited the distinguished majority leader also. He has attended some of the hearings.

When the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] came to see me about this matter this year and discussed it with me, I tried to be reasonable. I said, "Well, I will be glad to see what I can do about it, Senator FULBRIGHT, but, of course, if we invite members of your committee, you will have to adhere to the seniority rule, because we have followed it strictly in the Armed Services Committee and in the Appropriations Committee."

The Senator from Arkansas said that under the circumstances he could not agree to follow the seniority rule.

For that reason that proposal fell through.

I have not been unreasonable on this matter. I have gone out of my way to try to reconcile this matter and to recognize the desires of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have representation on this subcommittee.

I think I have gone the last mile. But I am not going to say, with a pistol pointed at my head, that I will do this or that, when I have already gone farther than the facts justify in some respects in yielding the legislative jurisdiction of my committee. That is the reason why I think we should vote on it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I had a very interesting conversation with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He, in very brief and forceful terms, stated that the initial purpose in giving jurisdiction to a committee over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency was to confine it within the smallest circle of Members. He further stated that it was subsequently decided that, inasmuch as the Appropriations Committee had to provide the money, it was only reasonable that it ought to be included within that small circle.

Today it is proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee that the circle of six be expanded to nine. That means an enlargement of the number of members through whom leaks can occur.

The primary objective has always been to avoid leaks.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I have been discussing the matter, and he agreed with what I shall now say. He is against, and I am against, the expansion of the number of members of that committee. He believes the membership should be kept at six, and that number of six might include two members of the Foreign Relations Committee. In that way there would be on that subcommittee two members of the Appropriations Committee, two members of the Armed Services Committee, and two members of the Foreign Relations Committee, with the membership to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States.

If that is done, the Vice President, in the faithful performance of his duties, would avoid the pitfalls described by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] earlier this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on sustaining or rejecting the point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to take a moment or two. I do not have much to say. I wish to clarify one point made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] when he asked me about adhering strictly to seniority in the assignment of Members.

There is another customary rule in the Senate that when a Senator sponsors a bill or resolution, or takes a special interest in it, we often vary seniority in his favor. In this case, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] has been active in this matter and had sponsored the resolution out of which this particular move has developed. I mean the original one has been changed, but it developed from his initiative. I said to the Senator from Georgia that under the circumstances I was not willing to agree to exclude him. I believe the Senator will confirm that.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Was not this before the resolution was prepared? I thought the Senator had come to me before the resolution was prepared and we were trying to come to some understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This was shortly after the original resolution was submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Does the Senator mean the resolution to investigate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Of course, that is a horse of an entirely different color.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was the beginning of this whole interest in this session. There have been some 200 resolutions in the past dealing with CIA, none of which has come to fruition, largely because of the great respect and influence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arizona. At any rate, we have not come to any result. However, when this resolution was introduced, many objections were raised to an investigation, public or otherwise, of the CIA. I also realized that if it did not choose to be investigated, we had no effective way to investigate it. We began to explore what the alternatives were.

My objective, although perhaps not of the Senator from Minnesota—I do not know—but all along I had the idea—and I believe we discussed it informally with the Senator from Georgia—that it would be appropriate for the Foreign Relations Committee to participate. This need has become much more acute, in my view, because of the recent developments in the last 2 or 3 years.

During that time the operations of the CIA have been much in the news. Refer-

ence has been made to a best-selling book, published about a year ago, written by Ross and Wise, I believe, two journalists representing two of the most important newspapers in the country, and in a series of articles in the New York Times, and rumors and accounts of various kinds. * * * [Deletion.] We know these sad stories which I do not have the time to relate. But this has been published both in books and in articles. It was a succession of this type of thing that led me to believe that if we were to understand and to have any real important influence in this field of foreign relations, we ought to know about the activities of the CIA. I have already related one, about the Bay of Pigs, from my personal experience, and that of many others here secondhand.

That operation was essentially a CIA operation. I have heard in the committee, in the old days, about other operations, * * *. [Deletion.]

The CIA is a much more important and much bigger agency today, and has more influence in the course of events in our foreign relations; and that is why I think the Foreign Relations Committee should be a participant in the CIA subcommittee.

Much of the debate here seems to be under the false impression that we are trying to oust the existing committee. We are not doing any such thing. It is merely participation in their deliberations and access to knowledge which we hope will be mutually beneficial.

That is about the sum and substance of it. I think it is a very reasonable resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall not again undertake to reply to the arguments of the Senator from Arkansas, based on rumors, New York Times articles, and a book by two journalists.

I do, however, wish to absolve myself of any personal feeling insofar as service on the subcommittee by the Senator from Minnesota is concerned. I told the Senator that we had always strictly followed seniority rules, and it would be necessary to continue to do so. One reason was that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has been a member of the Armed Services Committee for 14 years, started talking to me about getting on the CIA committee shortly after he came on.

I said, "I am sorry, Stuart, but we have followed seniority rules since the beginning, down to the letter."

The Senator from Missouri talked to me several times, before the time of the retirement of Senator Harry Byrd, Sr., when the Senator was appointed to the subcommittee, as a result of his seniority.

For that reason, and because the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees had strictly followed the seniority rules, I told the Senator from Arkansas that I thought Foreign Relations should do the same. He said he could not do so.

Therefore, the suggestion collapsed. I have no apologies for that, there is nothing personal. I have the highest regard for the Senator from Minnesota, but I thought that inasmuch as the other two subcommittees had followed the seniority rule strictly all the way through, that it was not asking too much of the Foreign Relations Committee, which was entering the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, should do the same thing. I still do not think it was an unreasonable request. I do not believe I have had an unreasonable position in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. It seems to me that that is the very thing that could be acted on or covered by the report that would be brought back to the Senate. I have the feeling that during the hearings, such difficulties as that could be ironed out.

But it does not seem to me that this has very much bearing. The real problem which confronts us now is whether we can resolve this problem this afternoon and come out working together, as a united Senate team again, when all we need is some assurance that those of us who hold the point of view that those on the Foreign Relations Committee hold will get the chance to vote on the merits before we go home at the end of this session. What is so unreasonable about that?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I had not challenged the Senator from Oregon. I must say that I am delighted to hear him say that he hopes the Senate can work as a team.

Mr. MORSE. I am proud of the way we work as a team when it comes to a matter involving the work of the Senate itself. But I think we have a procedural matter here that we ought to resolve as teammates, and not as opponents. We differ only on substantive matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Since the Senator from Georgia mentioned my name, all this has been difficult for me because of my great respect and admiration for the chairmen of both these committees, on both of which I serve.

The facts are that after I had served on the Armed Services Committee 10 years, I went to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and said, "I have been on this committee for 10 years, and now would hope to be a member of the Committee on the Central Intelligence Agency."

The chairman said, "Well, let's talk about it." He said, "You can go over and get any information you want from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I have arranged that for you before. But these are the reasons why I do not think this committee should be enlarged." I listened to his reasons, and then said—and he will verify it—"I think you are right. I do not think the committee should be enlarged."

What runs through my mind as we continue this discussion: On yesterday's front page, there was an article about a retired Army colonel who is apparently in trouble, being accused of espionage. There were also two stories of Czechs who have been asked to leave the country because, with a double agent, they thought they were monitoring the office of the Under Secretary of State.

Whether or not we like it, gentlemen, this is the world in which we live today; and we have no right, in my opinion, to send our sons and neighbors out to wage battle for this country in open war, and not do our best to protect them in the war in which we are relative neophytes, and the Communists are the masters and experts, in the hidden war that goes along with intelligence and counterintelligence.

It was for those reasons, after it was explained to me why the committee should be held small, that I agreed with the chairman. It is for that reason that, although I have the greatest respect for the Foreign Relations Committee, and above all for its chairman, in this particular case I disagree. Having been on both sides of it, with some experience in the Pentagon, I bring up just one more point for the Senate's consideration: There have been some figures used about money. I shall not use them again, even in this secret session.

But it is a fact that a small percentage of the money that goes into intelligence goes to the Central Intelligence Agency and a relatively large percentage of that money goes into the Pentagon. I would be the first to agree, not only because the KBG is dominant in the civilian intelligence activities of Russia, more authority than GRU, the military intelligence, but also because it is the right way to run our Government, that we should have an intelligence agency independent of the military. Intelligence recommendations to highest authority should not be decided only by generals and admirals. But if, for whatever reason, these consistent attacks against the CIA continue, some of which have been referred to on the floor today, what it will do is denigrate the Central Intelligence Agency to the point where it will all go back in the Pentagon and the people who decide what is to be recommended—intelligencewise—to the President of the United States, will be military men. Although I have the greatest respect for the military academies and their graduates, I cannot think of anything worse, from the standpoint of the future of my children and their children, than to have only the military advise the President as to whether, say, we should or should not declare war, based on their presentation alone of intelligence information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not believe there is any marrow left in this bone. I suggest we vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was absent from the floor the last 5 minutes or so. I understand that my name was mentioned in connection with possible appointment to the committee.

I want the record to show that I never asked that I be put on the committee. I would be glad to have the question of the possibility of my being put on the committee settled by a test vote. But I would rather not have the vote on the point of order.

The question of seniority as a requirement for appointment as a member of the committee is one which causes me some concern. There is nothing in the rules which says that when you move down subcommittees below chairman you take the senior top members. But I have no objection at all to having the practice followed by the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees in appointing their senior members followed by the Foreign Relations Committee, if its members are to be included on this committee. But I have never made it a condition that I be included on the committee.

There is something to be said for seniority. Chesterton explained the case best when he said that no rational case could be made for the practice of having the eldest son of the king succeed his father, but that it saved a lot of trouble.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not hear what the Senator said. If he had heard what I said, I do not think he would have taken any offense whatsoever, nor would any other member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not take offense.

Mr. President, if we are ready to vote, I should like to move the question, but if other Senators wish to speak, I shall wait.

Mr. RANDOLPH. First, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope it is an appropriate inquiry to make at this time. Perhaps it has been anticipated by the majority leader. I wondered whether the vote was to be taken in secrecy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; in public. That is one of the things I was going to mention.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but since I have, along with the Senator from Missouri and one or two other Senators, the unenviable position of being on two of the committees involved in this controversy, I would like to point out just two things.

It seems to me we are all over emphasizing the fact that the vote we are about to take is an alternative vote. Both the Senator from Louisiana and our respective majority leader suggested a possible compromise, to the effect that this legislation should be referred to the Armed Services Committee without a date certain or any mandate on reporting it.

I submit that by sustaining the point of order, Mr. President, we effectuate exactly that. We will bring about precisely the condition that the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Montana propose we do by a vote. In fact, our vote is, in effect, a vote to send this to the Armed Services Committee without any instructions whatsoever, depending upon their good judgment and depending upon their own responsibility to make a report.

The only other point I wish to make is this: So many Senators talk as if this were a final approach to this problem. Let us suppose that all the bad suspicions that have been ventilated this afternoon are true, and that sending this, by sustaining the point of order, to the Armed Services Committee means that it is buried there. I do not think it would be, but let us assume that. May I point out that the Senate is not without a great family of legislative tools by which we can reactivate this discussion. There is no way, by sustaining the point of order, that we bury this issue in the Armed Services Committee, in limbo and in perpetuity. If a majority of the Senate decide they want to bring it back for decision and for amendment to protect seniority rights if we so desire, we can do it through a series of approaches. We can do it by an amendment to an appropriations bill dealing with the appropriations for the CIA, because we can put it on as a restrictive rider. That has been done before. We can do it by an amendment to some other piece of legislation. The Senate can force its will, and I think that the proper thing to do, under these circumstances, is to sustain the point of order, see what happens for a given period of time in the Armed Services Committee, and then, if a majority of the Senate is dissatisfied with what they have done, reactivate it by any one of a whole series of legislative tools we have available. We are not deciding the issue forever and a day as of now.

Mr. PASTORE. But does not the Senator feel that since we have been behind closed doors now for about 3 or 4 hours, the eyes of the country are upon us?

Mr. MUNDT. And they are not seeing anything.

Mr. PASTORE. They are not seeing anything, but they are wondering what is transpiring here. Would it not be more comforting and reassuring to the people of the United States of America, when we go out of here, if they learn that as gentlemen we agreed to do something, not that we had to split our lines and be recorded as being pro or con on the proposition.

As the Senator has pointed out, this is not a final vote. It will decide nothing. This is merely a vote on jurisdiction; and many of us feel—I, for one—that possibly there ought to be some participation on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee on some sort of committee, whether a standing committee, a select committee, or some group of the Senate.

I am one of those who feel that the Armed Services Committee has primary jurisdiction, and they should be given an opportunity to look at this. If we can do it by agreement, I think it would look a lot better.

Mr. MUNDT. That would suit me perfectly.

Mr. PASTORE. And it would look as if, after all, we sat here as reasonable people and decided that on an amicable basis. If we did that, the country would be refreshed, and reassured.

Mr. MUNDT. If that could be done.

Mr. PASTORE. But this insistence that "I will prove that I am right and you are wrong" is not going to decide anything, because this is going to brew and brew until one day we decide whether it is right or wrong to have members of the Foreign Relations Committee participate.

Mr. MUNDT. It would make me very happy if we could do it by an amicable process. I simply wish to point out, that however we do it, we arrive at the same legislative home, with the same results and the same opportunities to reactivate it at any time a majority of the Senate desires.

Several Senators. Vote. Vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am quite certain in my own mind, at least, that the distinguished Senator from Georgia and his committee will not be too unreasonable in seeking a solution to the question which is before us at the moment.

But, having said that, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a sanitized version of these proceedings prepared, that it be under the authority of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee; that they will take out anything which might be detrimental, and that the record be made public and that any Senator who participated shall have the right to correct his own remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now go out of closed session and return to regular legislative session, for the vote,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Senate returned to open legislative session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Chair state the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the point of order of the Senator from Georgia, that under rule XXV the original resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations consists of subject matter predominately under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services and therefore is improperly before the Senate and must be referred to that committee before it can properly be placed on the Senate Calendar.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I just bring this to the attention of the Senate. Immediately following this vote, there will be a vote on the Interna-

tional Wheat Agreement Treaty, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which I understand is up against a time limitation tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The vote "yea" sustains the point of order; the vote "nay" is to overrule the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. When is it the intention of the majority leader that the Senate again take up the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. At what hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twelve o'clock tomorrow, Mr. President.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow; and, furthermore, I ask unanimous consent that after a 15-minute morning hour the unfinished business, the agriculture appropriation bill, be laid before the Senate and debate begun.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has heard the question. The yeas and nays have been orderd, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Allott	Hayden	Neuberger
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bayh	Hill	Pearson
Bennett	Holland	Prouty
Bible	Hruska	Randolph
Brewster	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, Ga.
Carlson	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cooper	Lausche	Simpson
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smith
Curtis	Long, La.	Stennis
Dirksen	Magnuson	Symington
Dominick	McClellan	Talmadge
Douglas	McIntyre	Thurmond
Eastland	Miller	Tower
Ellender	Montoya	Tydings
Ervin	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Mundt	
Harris	Murphy	

NAYS—28

Aiken	Hartke	Moss
Boggs	Javits	Muskie
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Church	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gore	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Monroney	
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Gruening	Scott
Bass	Mansfield	Smathers
Clark	McGee	Sparkman
Dodd	Nelson	

So the point of order of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was sustained.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for the purpose of considering Executive F—89th Congress, 2d session—a protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, which was read the second time.

EXECUTIVE F—PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT, 1962

The Governments signatory to this Protocol,

Considering that the International Wheat Agreement, 1962 which was extended by Protocol in 1965, expires on 31 July 1966, and

Desiring to extend the Agreement, in accordance with the recommendations of the International Wheat Council under paragraph (2) of Article 36 of the Agreement, for a further period,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962

The International Wheat Agreement, 1962 as extended by the 1965 Protocol (hereinafter called "the Agreement") shall continue in force between the parties to this Protocol until 31 July 1967.

ARTICLE 2

Signature, acceptance, approval and accession

(1) This Protocol shall be open for signature in Washington from 4 April 1966 until and including 29 April 1966 by the Government parties to the Agreement, or which are provisionally regarded as parties to the Agreement, on 4 April 1966.

(2) This Protocol shall be subject to acceptance or approval by the signatory Governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures. Instruments of acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America not later than 15 July 1966.

(3) This Protocol shall be open for accession:

(a) until 15 July 1966 by the Government of any country listed in Annex B or C to the Agreement as of that date, in accordance with the conditions specified in the Agreement or prescribed by the Council before its accession to the Agreement, or

(b) as provided in paragraph (4) of Article 35 of the Agreement.

(4) Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America.

(5) Any Government which has not accepted, approved or acceded to this Protocol by 15 July 1966 in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3)(a) of this Article may be granted by the Council an extension of time for depositing its instrument of acceptance, approval or accession.

ARTICLE 3

Entry into force

(1) This Protocol shall enter into force among those Governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance, approval or accession in accordance with Article 2 of this Protocol by 15 July 1966, as follows:

(a) on 16 July 1966, with respect to Part I and Parts III to VII of the Agreement, and

(b) on 1 August 1966, with respect to Part II of the Agreement, Provided, that such Governments and the Governments which have deposited notifications in accordance with paragraph (3) of this Article by 15 July 1966 are Governments which held not less than two-thirds of the votes of exporting countries and not less than two-thirds of the votes of importing countries under the Agreement on that date, or would have held such votes if they had been parties to the Agreement on that date.

(2) This Protocol shall enter into force for any Government which deposits an instrument of acceptance, approval or accession after 15 July 1966 on the date of such deposit except that the Protocol shall not enter into force with respect to Part II of the Agreement earlier than 1 August 1966.

(3) For the purposes of entry into force of this Protocol in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article, any signatory Government or any Government entitled to accede in accordance with paragraph (3)(a) of Article 2 of this Protocol or any Government whose application for accession has been approved by the Council on conditions established under paragraph (3)(b) of Article 2 of this Protocol may deposit a notification with the Government of the United States of America not later than 15 July 1966 containing an undertaking to seek acceptance, approval or accession to this Protocol as rapidly as possible in accordance with its constitutional

procedures. It is understood that a Government which gives such a notification will provisionally apply the Protocol and be provisionally regarded as a party thereto for a period to be determined by the Council.

(4) If by 15 July 1966 the conditions laid down in the preceding paragraphs of this Article for entry into force of this Protocol are not fulfilled, the Governments of those countries which by that date have accepted, approved or acceded in accordance with Article 2 of this Protocol may decide by mutual consent that it shall enter into force among them or they may take whatever other action they consider the situation requires.

ARTICLE 4

Final provisions

(1) For the purposes of the operation of the Agreement and this Protocol, any reference to countries the respective Governments of which have acceded to the Agreement on conditions prescribed by the Council in accordance with paragraph (4) of Article 35 of the Agreement shall include a country which has acceded to this Protocol in accordance with paragraph (3)(b) of Article 2 of this Protocol.

(2) The Government of the United States of America shall promptly inform each Government which is a party or is provisionally regarded as a party to this Protocol, or which on 4 April 1966 is a party or is provisionally regarded as a party to the Agreement, of each signature, acceptance or approval of, or accession to this Protocol, of each notification made in accordance with paragraph (3) of Article 3 of this Protocol, and of the date of entry into force of this Protocol.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Protocol on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

The texts of this Protocol in the English, French, Russian and Spanish languages shall be equally authentic. The originals shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall transmit certified copies thereof to each signatory and acceding Government.

DONE at Washington this fourth day of April nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

For Argentina:
For Australia:
For Austria:
For Belgium and Luxembourg:
For Brazil:
For Canada:
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
For the Dominican Republic:
For Ecuador:
For El Salvador:
For Finland:
For France:
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
For Iceland:
For India:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
For Japan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For Mexico:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
For New Zealand:
For Nigeria:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Peru:
For the Republic of the Philippines:
For Portugal:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Sierra Leone:
For the Republic of South Africa:
For Southern Rhodesia:
For Spain:
For Sweden:
For Switzerland:

F. SCHNYDER,
April 4, 1966.

For Tunisia:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Arab Republic:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
For the United States of America:

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
April 4, 1966.

For the Vatican City State:
For Venezuela:
For Western Samoa:

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OPERATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, although I know we are in executive session, I should like to ask the Chair as to the disposition of the resolution just voted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is automatically referred, under the point of order, to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this protocol, the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee. It is merely a 1-year extension of the wheat agreement which just came in force in 1949 and has since been revised and extended.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who is an authority on this agreement, is a member of the committee. There is no controversy about it. I do not believe there is any point in delaying the Senate with any further explanation of the protocol. The report has been filed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that I do not feel that the extension of this agreement is in the interests of the U.S. wheat grower; but, in view of the actions now being taken in Geneva and the Kennedy round, I feel that it should be extended for another year.

For that reason, I supported it in committee, and I support it now on the floor of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by John A. Schnittker, Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to Mr. J. M. Stuurman, Chairman of the International Wheat Council, in London, England, on February 11, 1966.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1966.

Mr. J. M. STUURMAN,
Chairman,
International Wheat Council,
Haymarket House, Haymarket,
London S.W. 1, England

Attention: Mr. R. E. Moore, Executive Secretary.

DEAR MR. STUURMAN: This is to inform you that the United States of America will not request further consideration by the International Wheat Council of the recommendation to extend the International Wheat Agreement until July 31, 1967.

Acceptance of the recommendation to prolong the current Agreement for one more year does not mean, however, that the United States is satisfied with the IWA as it presently functions. The present Agreement concerns itself essentially with wheat pricing.

The United States is actively striving to achieve a meaningful and effective international arrangement for grains, including wheat. The principal objectives of this arrangement should be:

(a) To provide for acceptable conditions of access in major world markets in furtherance of a significant development and expansion of world trade in cereals.

(b) To establish an equitable arrangement whereby importers and exporters would share the responsibilities of adjusting world cereals supplies to demand, including food aid.

The United States would insist that any international grains agreement must contain provisions to accomplish these objectives. Without such provisions the agreement would not serve the long-term interests of either exporters or importers, including the developing nations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the report pertinent to this legislation now before the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from April 4 until and including April 29, 1966 (Ex. F. 89th Cong., 2d sess.), having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the Senate gives its advice and consent to ratification.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the protocol is to extend the International Wheat Agreement for one year beyond July 31, 1966, and thereby preserve the status quo pending negotiations for a new and broader agreement as well as a grains arrangement with the European Common Market. The protocol makes no other change in the agreement.

BACKGROUND AND COMMITTEE ACTION

The International Wheat Agreement first came into force in 1949. It was revised and extended in 1953, 1956, 1959, 1962, and 1965.

The agreement establishes a basic price range of $1.62½ to $2.02½ for No. 1 Manitoba northern wheat in bulk in store Fort William/Port Arthur. Importing countries agreed to buy specified quantities of wheat at not less than the minimum price, and exporting countries agree to sell specified quantities at not more than the maximum price.

The agreement has generally worked well, but has become outdated. The provisions of a new agreement, however, must obviously be related to the outcome of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations and to the agricultural policies of the European Common Market.

The pending protocol to extend the agreement for one year was sent to the Senate by the President May 23. The Foreign Relations Committee held a public hearing on the matter June 12 and subsequently in executive session ordered the protocol fa-

vorably reported to the Senate. The transcript of this hearing, at which Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker appeared on behalf of the administration, is appended to this report.

The committee urges the Senate to act promptly, because the U.S. instrument of ratification of the protocol must be deposited no later than June 15 if it is to be effective.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the respective resolutions of ratification.

The resolution of ratification of Executive F, 89th Congress, 2d session, the protocol for the further extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, will now be read.

The resolution of ratification to Executive F was read by Hon. Emery L. Frazier, Secretary of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol for the Further Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from April 4 until and including April 29, 1966 (Ex. F, Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted: yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 138 Exec.]

YEAS—89

Aiken	Hart	Moss
Allott	Hartke	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Murphy
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bennett	Hill	Nelson
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Boggs	Hruska	Pastore
Brewster	Inouye	Pearson
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Case	Kuchel	Robertson
Church	Lausche	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	Long, La.	Saltonstall
Curtis	Magnuson	Simpson
Dirksen	Mansfield	Smith
Dominick	McCarthy	Stennis
Douglas	McClellan	Symington
Eastland	McGovern	Thurmond
Ellender	McIntyre	Tower
Ervin	Metcalf	Tydings
Fannin	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Monroney	Yarborough
Gore	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Morse	Young, Ohio
Harris	Morton	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Gruening	Smathers
Bass	Javits	Sparkman
Clark	McGee	Talmadge
Dodd	Scott	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this resolution of ratification.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States;

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screw-worm eradication in Mexico; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, District of Columbia, in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Incorporated, on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the majority leader?

We are waiting for a report from the minority side, but the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is here. I seek unanimous consent for a meeting of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. I assure the Senator that the Republicans on the subcommittee thought that we ought to meet to get it out of the way.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder if my able friend will withhold making that request? I shall see if it is possible for the minority to agree to the request.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a most informative article appearing in the July 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "What's 'CIA'?"

This interview with Adm. William F. Raborn, retiring head of CIA, is most informative, especially as to the scope of CIA's operations and how it is directed, supervised, and controlled by the President of the United States, various agencies of the executive department of the

Government, as well as the Congress of the United States.

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

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 18, 1966]

WHAT'S "CIA"?—INTERVIEW WITH ADM. WILLIAM F. RABORN, RETIRING HEAD OF AMERICA'S MOST SECRET AGENCY

(NOTE.—Once more, the Central Intelligence Agency—CIA—finds itself a center of controversy.

(Congress is studying a proposal to broaden its control and surveillance of the wide-ranging intelligence organizations.

(Now questions are raised. Just what is CIA? What does it really do—and not do? Does anybody know all its secrets, control its activities?

(In this exclusive interview, the man who headed Central Intelligence this past year takes readers of "U.S. News & World Report" behind the scenes of CIA, describes its workings in detail.)

Question. Admiral Raborn, what is the specific charter of the Central Intelligence Agency within the intelligence community?

Answer. The National Security Act assigned five functions to the Agency:

To advise the National Security Council—and of course the President—on intelligence matters relating to national security;

To co-ordinate all foreign-intelligence activities of our Government;

To produce and disseminate finished national intelligence within the Government;

To undertake what we call "services of common concern"—that is, functions which serve all the components of the intelligence community and can best be undertaken centrally;

And finally, to perform such other services as the National Security Council may direct.

That is as specific as the Congress wanted to be. That fifth assignment is the Agency's charter for clandestine activities, and you will notice it puts CIA directly under the control of the President's National Security Council.

Question. The emphasis appears to be on information gathering. Wouldn't it be more palatable and just as accurate to call it the "Central Information Agency"?

Answer. Our principal responsibility is to gather, specifically, that information which relates directly to national-security problems and objectives. The United States Information Agency deals with information in the broader sense of the term, and distributes it outside the Government. It is useful both to their operations and to ours to preserve this distinction.

There is a further point in our professional terminology: "Intelligence," as we use the term, refers to information which has been carefully evaluated as to its accuracy and significance. The difference between "information" and "intelligence" is the important process of evaluating the accuracy and assessing the significance in terms of national security.

Question. You just referred to "finished national intelligence." What is that in your terminology?

Answer. When a raw report has been checked for accuracy, and analyzed and integrated with all other available information on the same subject by competent experts in that particular field, we call it "finished intelligence." When, in addition, it represents the conclusions of the entire intelligence community, then it is "national intelligence." In short, we find that we need a terminology which can be more precise and more limiting than the broad concept of "information."

Question. People seem to have the impression that the CIA is a big spying organization—that it is staffed almost entirely by spies. Is there anything to that impression?

Answer. This, of course, is the popular view of any intelligence organization, but it is highly distorted. Our job is to keep the top officials of the U.S. Government informed of what is happening around the world that may affect the national security of the United States.

Of course, much of the world's area and population is under a closed society, run by governments that seek to conceal their activities and their objectives. They may be hostile to us, and some classical espionage is required to give timely warning of when and how these activities and objectives might threaten us. But, to maintain proper perspective, let me point out that a great deal of the raw information is public, or available with a certain amount of digging.

The principal role of an intelligence organization is to take what is overt and what is secret and bring expert knowledge, background information, and scholarly analysis to bear in a way which has nothing in common with the heroes of modern spy fiction.

Question. Could you give us the proportions between the analysts at home and the men in the field overseas who are collecting this information?

Answer. We don't publish these figures, or even rough proportions, because the information would be of great use to the opposition, but I can tell you this much: The man who joins CIA has far less chance, in the course of his career, of identifying with James Bond or "The Spy Who Came in From the Cold" than he does of serving as an academic researcher, economist, scientist, statistician, administrator, accountant, or supply officer.

Question. Another idea is that the CIA is stirring up insurrections, or starting and maybe running little wars—

Answer. This again is a misconception. Our major business is national intelligence, and so-called covert operations are a relatively minor part of our over-all activities. The Government, after all, is organized on a pretty logical basis: The Department of State is in charge of foreign policy and foreign relations; running wars would be the business of the Defense Department; CIA has enough to do getting, coordinating, and disseminating intelligence without running any wars.

Question. The National Security Act of 1947 envisages a field of clandestine activities, however, where the CIA will play a role which cannot be undertaken by State, or Defense, or other overt agencies of the United States Government. Do you have a free hand there?

Answer. Absolutely not. Any such activities are by direction of the National Security Council. To be precise, they must have the prior approval—in detail—of a committee of the NSC on which top-ranking representatives of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense meet with the Director of Central Intelligence for this purpose. These gentlemen see to it not only that every activity of the CIA is completely in consonance with the established policies and objectives of the United States, but that it is also advantageous to the United States.

Question. With that approval, are you free to operate as you wish in the field? Would the U.S. ambassador in the country concerned know about your activities there?

Answer. Like other U.S. officials abroad, CIA's overseas personnel are subordinate to the U.S. ambassadors. We are certainly not in competition with other U.S. representation abroad—we complement and supplement the "country team" approach of the embassy to official U.S. activities. We operate with the foreknowledge and approval of the ambassador.

Question. But some of our ambassadors have denied any prior knowledge of activities which are known to be, or at least suspected of being, CIA operations—

Answer. Conceivably there might be an instance where the Department of State in Washington would have reasons for not informing the ambassador. Normal policy is to have him informed.

Question. Does the ambassador receive your intelligence in the field, or does he have to get it from Washington?

Answer. It is made available in the field to the ambassador and designated members of his staff. If the ambassador wishes, he also gets the ultimate finished evaluation from headquarters, along with intelligence on other countries which may be of interest to him. The Department of State may also send to its embassies and legations the finished intelligence reports prepared by CIA.

Question. You and your predecessors have stated, as have the President and Secretary Rusk, that CIA does not make policy, but the accusation persists. Could this be because your information contributes to policy decisions?

Answer. To maintain that record, let me say again flatly that CIA does not make policy, and does not operate outside or contrary to established policy. Now, certainly nobody would expect the top officials of a government to make their decisions without considering all available information. It is the mission of CIA to provide the most accurate, the most comprehensive, and the most objective information available about matters which interest our Government, together with whatever we can learn or project about possible impending developments. In specific answer to your question, put the emphasis on "objective" information.

Question. But this information does play a part in the decisions of Government—

Answer. The top officials of the Administration, and for that matter, the legislators, obviously find it useful, because there is a constant increase in the demand for our current intelligence and our projective estimates. Let me point out that there is one unique contribution the CIA makes to Government officials facing a choice between alternative possible courses of action. Precisely because the CIA does not commit itself to any one choice among the alternatives, our intelligence input is free from partisanship or advocacy, and recognized by the recipients as objective.

Question. Isn't it true that much of the information you gather isn't really secret at all, but would be available to anybody in the right spot at the right time?

Answer. Yes. In fact, a considerable part of the information used by the Agency in preparing its finished intelligence reports is derived from the foreign press and radio, from technical journals of foreign countries, and from official publications of these countries. We don't disregard information simply because it is not secret. Finished intelligence, however, consists of the expert correlation and interpretation of all the information we can obtain, by both overt and clandestine means.

CIA'S BROAD INTERESTS

Question. Do you gather information about domestic events in foreign countries, as well as the operations of foreign governments?

Answer. Our interests and responsibilities may vary from country to country, but they are pretty comprehensive. It is obviously impossible to confine yourself to a nation's foreign affairs if you are responsible, for instance, for assessing the stability of the regime, the health of the economy, or the prospects for subversion in the boondocks.

Question. Do you collect information of a business nature?

Answer. We collect economic information which may be useful to the security interests

of the U.S. Government—and we collect it exclusively for that purpose.

Question. Do you have to cover every corner of the whole world?

Answer. Of course we have priorities, but our intelligence requirements are worldwide. Our top Administration officials need factual and unbiased intelligence on a timely basis as one of the many elements which go into the decisions they have to make. At a minimum, we have to have certain basic information on hand about virtually every country in the world. Country X—you name it—might appear remote and totally unrelated to our national security, but it is nevertheless impossible to state with certainty that detailed information about country X will not become necessary to our Government on a crash basis some day.

Question. How detailed?

Answer. The basic information on foreign countries which is compiled in what we call the National Intelligence Surveys already adds up to more than 10 times the size of "The Encyclopaedia Britannica." Much of this information, of course, is hardly secret. It has to cover such prosaic matters as economic statistics, legal codes, sociological conditions and transport facilities, but it comes in handy when our customers start playing "20 Questions."

Question. At what point do you feel that this type of information—the basic data, the information which is open to the public—should be reported back on a running basis to our Government—as fast as you get it?

Answer. This goes back to the distinction between information and intelligence—and the needs of our Government. If everything is quiet, there may be an occasional situation report based largely on open information. If the situation has a direct relation to U.S. national-security interests, particularly in a crisis, we will be trying to get as close to "real time" reporting as modern communications permit.

Question. Is the information which you collect interpreted by somebody on the scene, or does it reach you in raw form so that you can sort out the facts from the opinions?

Answer. We require the original report, or the original statement of the primary source, whenever we can get it. When this "raw material" reaches us, it may be accompanied by the opinions and interpretations of intermediaries through whom the information has passed, and by the informed comment and preliminary evaluation of our own collectors in the field, but these additions are clearly labeled as such.

Question. How do you co-operate in the field with the other elements of your intelligence community? Aren't CIA and State and the military-intelligence people all looking for much the same information?

Answer. Our finished national intelligence derives from the work of all of the elements of the intelligence community. Foreign Service officers provide the Department of State with political intelligence, commercial attachés are responsible for economic information, the military attachés send military intelligence to their respective services, and, for that matter, there are agricultural attachés and labor attachés. All of them provide departmental intelligence for the specific needs of specific departments. All of these reports are also available to CIA.

The Agency has been added to supplement and expand the collection and fill any gaps. It has a broader charter for all types of intelligence necessary in the national interest, and—as I mentioned at the outset—the added statutory responsibility to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security, and provide for . . . appropriate dissemination."

For example, a piece of political intelligence from one country and the Army attaché's report from another country may add up to a conclusion of major significance to the National Security Council, or specifically to the Atomic Energy Commission. It is CIA's responsibility to see to it that the two halves do get added up in Washington to make the whole, and furthermore that the finished evaluation reaches the department which needs it.

CONTROLS ON INTELLIGENCE

Question. But how do you avoid duplication of effort in the field?

Answer. The United States Intelligence Board, which represents the entire intelligence community, establishes guidelines and priorities for the intelligence-collection effort. This machinery can control unnecessary duplication, but when you are after the closely guarded information that affects our national interest, duplication of effort is often desirable rather than unnecessary.

Question. Are the State and military-intelligence people operating under handicaps, in comparison to CIA, in obtaining information?

Answer. You have to take into consideration, firstly, that the collection of intelligence is not the primary responsibility of the Department of State and the Department of Defense, and, secondly, that the representatives they send abroad must operate in the open as recognized officials of the U.S. Government. In effect, CIA often is in better postion to obtain necessary intelligence because CIA is specifically organized for this kind of collection and can give it first priority.

If, by handicaps, you mean the obstacles which foreign governments place in the way of intelligence collection, foreign governments make every effort to preserve their essential secrets, just as we do. Year by year, security procedures become more sophisticated and harder to circumvent, so that skill and specialization are even more necessary. On the other side of the coin, there are few, if any, countries in the world today which are as much of an "open society" as the United States.

Question. What about co-operation with the intelligence services of friendly countries? If we collect information which is important to one of our allies, is it passed to them?

Answer. I am not at liberty to go into detail, but wherever it is of mutual interest and advantage, there is substantial co-operation among the intelligence services of friendly countries.

Question. Does machinery exist to correlate all of the information that flows into Washington, and refine it into firm and useful conclusions?

Answer. Yes—specifically, the United States Intelligence Board, or USIB, which advises and assists the Director of Central Intelligence and is under his chairmanship. This Board meets every week, or more often if necessary, to co-ordinate the work of all of the intelligence components of the U.S. Government. It consists of the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, who represents CIA so that the Director, as USIB chairman, will be uncommitted; the Director of Intelligence and Research, Department of State; the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency; the Director of the National Security Agency; an Assistant Director of the FBI; and the Assistant General Manager for Administration of the Atomic Energy Commission. The heads of Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence meet with the Board as observers.

USIB assigns intelligence priorities to see to it that there are no gaps in our coverage, and insures that the judgments which go forward to the President are finished national intelligence.

This job of correlation and co-ordination, however, starts long before the product reaches USIB for final review. More and more, as we develop and refine the concept of an intelligence community, the analysts and the specialists in one component are in constant touch and interchange with their opposite numbers in the other departments and agencies, so that the national-intelligence process begins as soon as the raw information reaches Washington, if not before.

As for moving from the raw information to a firm and agreed conclusion, in many instances this can be done by the expert analysts available, backed up by our storehouse of background knowledge. There will always, of course, be the "unknowables"—questions which have no definitive answers, possibly because the future is open to the effects of many variables, or because the future depends on decisions which certain foreign statesmen may not even have made yet. Who will succeed the Premier of country X? When and by whom will there be a coup in country Y?

Our Government leaders need and request our best answers on the "unknowables." This we do in our National Intelligence Estimates. From what we do know, the best thinking available in the entire intelligence community makes rational inferences about the unknown—with varying but specified degrees of confidence, and an occasional footnote reflecting an individual dissent from the agreed opinion.

Question. How many of these estimates do you produce?

Answer. It varies with the need. The Estimate is not a global periodical, on a weekly or daily basis; it addresses itself to the probable course of one development, or one country. Many of the Estimates come out with a scheduled frequency—annually, for instance, if necessary. Some are produced in times of crisis in a matter of hours. All are geared to the intelligence needs of the top Government officials. All reflect the greatest possible professional skill and dispassionate objectivity we can bring to bear. CIA has no ax to grind, and does not permit itself to become advocate of a specific policy in preparing an Estimate.

All aspects of every Estimate get the fullest consideration, by the interagency working groups which begin the drafting, by the Board of National Estimates—a group of distinguished senior officers of long experience and proven competence in diverse fields of Government—and by the United States Intelligence Board. In the end, the National Intelligence Estimate is the report of the Director of Central Intelligence to the President and the National Security Council.

Question. Can this machinery operate fast enough to permit quick action when the flow of information suggests impending danger or trouble?

Answer. The process is extremely flexible. Conceivably, when the schedule permits, the draft of an annual Estimate might start two or three months before the target date, to permit comprehensive and deliberate consultation, reference to the field, and so forth.

On the other hand, the Board of National Estimates when required can complete what we call a "SNIE"—a Special National Intelligence Estimate—in a matter of hours, as I said.

As for immediate intelligence on current developments, we are geared to receive information, evaluate it, produce intelligence and react 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Nobody in the Agency, from the analysts to the Director, is guaranteed a night's uninterrupted sleep, or an unbroken week-end.

WORKING WITH THE FBI

Question. As we understand it, the Central Intelligence Agency does not run clandestine operations of any kind within the United States. Is that left entirely to the FBI?

Answer. The CIA has the responsibility for conducting operations outside the country; the FBI has as its principal mission the internal security of the United States and its possessions.

There is, of course, close co-operation and considerable interplay between our organizations, because we are combatting an international conspiracy whose operations and agents move back and forth between this country and foreign nations. The FBI and CIA therefore work very closely together and keep each other intimately informed on items of potential interest or concern to each other. This allows us to combat international conspiracy in the most effective possible manner.

The division of responsibility for clandestine operations, of course, should not be confused with the perfectly overt contacts CIA has domestically—for example, with experts in the profesional world to discuss international situations and exchange analyses.

Question. Do you work largely in a vacuum, with little or no contact with the rest of the Government outside the intelligence community?

Answer. By no means. It is inherent in the concept of a Central Intelligence Agency that any branch of the Government which has a legitimate need for information can call on us for it. By the same token, when we need expertise to help us in evaluation, or in the accomplishment of any of our missions, we will not hesitate to go anywhere in the Government or outside it, within the limitations of security, where we might expect to find the necessary help. But our closest ties, of course, are within the intelligence community, and to the top officials of the executive branch.

Question. What form do your intelligence reports take?

Answer. We disseminate finished intelligence in an infinite variety of formats, tailored to specific purposes. I reported frequently in person, of course, to the President and to the National Security Council. I have mentioned the Estimates, and our "55-foot shelf" of basic background information.

In addition, we have daily, weekly and monthly publications, some global in scope, some for a specific country or crisis. When the situation is truly critical, I have on occasion ordered situation reports as often as every hour on the hour, around the clock. Then there are individual memoranda which give us great flexibility in scope, format, deadlines and distribution. And we also turn out studies in depth which are the equivalent of a scholarly book or a doctoral dissertation. Various publications have dissemination lists, depending on their sensitivity and purpose, which range from less than half a dozen copies to hundreds.

Question. What is the "ancestry" of the CIA in U.S. intelligence activities? Does it operate differently from its predecessors?

Answer. The Agency grew from the need to establish a centralized and objective intelligence organization in peacetime. A primary impetus, of course, was the experience of Pearl Harbor, and the determination to insure against such surprises in the future.

The requirement for a centralized organization stemmed from the successful experience during World War II of the Office of Strategic Services under General Donovan. The requirement was made all the more real by the threat posed by an evangelistic international Communism which became readily apparent shortly after the close of World War II. There was general agreement within the Government that there was need for a nonpartisan co-ordinating agency in the intelligence field. As a result, the CIA was created in 1947.

In some respects the Office of Strategic Services of World War II was our ancestor, but it did not have CIA's responsibility for co-ordinating the work of the entire intelligence community, or our requirement for across-the-board coverage.

Question. Does CIA have anything that might be called regulations to govern its activities? Who prescribes them?

Answer. Is there a Government agency nearly 20 years old that doesn't have a rule book? Start with the original legislation, which spells out the mission of CIA and provides that we function at the behest and under the control of the President and the NSC. Under that charter, CIA is governed by several layers of regulations known as the "Nonskids," or National Security Council Intelligence Directives; the DCID's, or Director of Central Intelligence Directives, issued by the Director in his capacity as chairman of USIB, and head of the intelligence community; and finally, as in the case of any other governmental component, CIA's own Agency regulations.

HELP FROM "BEST BRAINS"

Question. Do you have any counsel or advisers outside the Government?

Answer. We have several panels of technical experts, both inside and outside the Government, to keep us informed on new developments and techniques which could be of us to us. On these panels are the best brains in this country, on virtually the entire range of human endeavor. We contract for studies and research projects, wherever in the United States these can best be performed.

CIA has long made it a practice to discuss its evaluations of the international situation with top men in the civilian world. We have done a great deal of this, but we must do still more. One of my last acts with the Agency, for instance, was to order even greater interchange with the nongovernmental experts on China.

Question. Have you found that the sporadic criticism, along the lines that spying is a devious business and that CIA operates without any control, has made people reluctant to work with you?

Answer. I have found no measurable reluctance on these grounds, although there is always the more general concern of the academic world that governmental funds and governmental projects must not be accompanied by unwelcome controls or commitments. On the whole, patriotic citizens in all walks of life are glad to work with us in serving the national-security interest. The intelligence community finds this very gratifying, because it helps us give the President, the executive branch, and the legislative branch the very best judgments that the best minds in this country can arrive at.

"UNDER FULL SCRUTINY"

Question. Is there any other Administration control of your operations besides the special National Security Council committee you mentioned?

Answer. The CIA and its activities have been reviewed in detail in the past by Hoover Commission task forces, the Doolittle Committee, the Clark Committee, and several special investigating bodies for specific purposes. On a permanent basis, the entire intelligence community is under continuing and full scrutiny by a most knowledgeable and distinguished board of private citizens appointed by the President. This is the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, first established in January of 1956 as the Killian Committee, and now under the chairmanship of Mr. Clark Clifford. The present membership includes Dr. William O. Baker of Bell Telephone Laboratories; Mr. Gordon Gray, former Special Assistant to President Eisenhower and onetime president of North Carolina University; Prof. William Langer of Harvard; Gen. Maxwell Taylor; Ambassador Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State; Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., former Secretary of the Army and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Dr. Edwin Land, head of the Polaroid Corporation; Adm. John Sides, USN (ret.); and Mr. Augustus Long, formerly the top executive of the Texas Company.

This Board meets in full session about every six weeks, to examine in depth and detail the work and the progress of the entire U.S. intelligence program. The meetings last two or three days and include comprehensive discussions with the Director and his senior officers, heads of other intelligence components, and senior officials of the Government who are our "customers."

Upon completion of each such session, the Board reports to the President and makes recommendations for the improvement of the intelligence effort. In addition, the Board has a number of two-man or three-man panels and subcommittees to delve more deeply and on a full-time basis into specific aspects and categories of intelligence work.

Question. What about control of your funds?

Answer. The Central Intelligence Agency budget is reviewed fully by the Bureau of the Budget, which requires the same assurances and justifications for expenditures by intelligence agencies that it requires from any other part of our Government. We are not immune from detailed examination of our requests by the Bureau, nor are we exempt from its skillful pruning knife.

We have to go to Congress for our funds, just like other agencies. The only difference is that, after our requests have been approved by certain special congressional subcommittees, the specific appropriations are then lumped in for passage with other appropriations, to deny hostile intelligence services information about our activities which would be very useful to them. We have meticulous auditing procedures to insure the tightest possible control over the expenditure of funds entrusted to the CIA.

Question. In light of the recurring arguments about a so-called "watchdog committee" for CIA, how much information does Congress actually get—not your intelligence reports, that is, but information about your activities, your budget, and so on?

Answer. Ever since CIA was first established, the Director has been authorized and in fact directed to make complete disclosure of CIA activities to special subcommittees in both the Senate and House.

In the House, the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee each have a special subcommittee for this purpose.

In the Senate, there are corresponding subcommittees which usually meet jointly.

In addition, the Director reports regularly to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on intelligence matters in that field.

Now, when I say "complete disclosure," I mean complete—and frequent. The CIA is completely responsive to their questions, no matter how sensitive. I have discussed matters with these special subcommittees which are so sensitive that only a small percentage of the personnel in CIA have access to them. And in case there is any suggestion that these meetings are sporadic and casual: In my first 12 weeks as Director I found that I was called to 17 meetings with these congressional committees. Our legislative log for the year 1965 shows that the Director or his senior aides met a total of 34 times with the four special subcommittees.

Question. Are they the only Congressmen who receive information from CIA? Intelligence, that is, as opposed to operational matters?

Answer. No, there were also 19 other committee hearings in 1965, for instance, to obtain substantive intelligence from CIA—and some of these hearings ran as long as three full days to cover the intelligence apprecia-

tion of the global situation. We also frequently brief individual members of Congress.

Let me make this distinction clear: I had authority to brief any congressional committee having a jurisdictional interest on substantive global intelligence. But discussion of CIA activities, methods, and sources is another matter. Public Law 80-253 of 1947—that's the National Security Act—makes the Director of Central Intelligence exclusively responsible for protecting the security of the sources and methods of the entire intelligence community. I was authorized by the President and by National Security Council directives to discuss such matters only with the special subcommittees designated for this purpose, not with any others.

PROTECTING CIA AGENTS

Question. What is the reason for this limitation?

Answer. It is not arbitrary or bureaucratic—we are safeguarding the lives of trusted agents and our own staff people all over the world who contribute to our Government's intelligence objectives.

We owe it to them to take every precaution to protect them—and we owe it to our Government to deny hostile intelligence services even indirect hints or the slightest clues which might enable them to take steps to blunt our intelligence operations, methods and sources.

Question. Do you mean it is a question of security leaks?

Answer. I prefer to say inadvertent disclosure. Even a professional intelligence officer has to be alert to draw the line between information which helps to evaluate or authenticate a piece of raw intelligence, and information which might point to the source or the method we used to obtain it. The more people who have both types of information, the more you multiply the chance that somebody will overstep that line by accident.

Question. How damaging can such disclosures be?

Answer. Well, the minute you even hint that you have information the other fellow has been trying to keep secret, it is one of the first principles of the art that he will do everything possible to locate and destroy your source, or disrupt your method of operation. If the opposition is given any clues to help pinpoint the source, the counterintelligence job is that much easier.

INFORMATION FOR CONGRESS

Question. Have the special CIA subcommittees in Congress expressed any dissatisfaction over the years that they were not getting enough information?

Answer. We have never withheld any information, substantive or operational, from the four special subcommittees. On some occasions, in fact, they have asked us not to give them the identities of very sensitive sources, because they did not wish to know, and we have complied. If you refer to dissatisfaction with the amount of information which we have—rather than the amount we give them—no professional intelligence operation anywhere in the world is ever satisfied with the extent of its knowledge, and these gentlemen have been working with us long enough so that they have probably acquired this same professional dissatisfaction.

Question. What about the effect of the criticism on your own personnel?

Answer. I think it is an eloquent testimonial to the dedication of the people in CIA that the criticism has not affected their morale. Bear in mind that, by our rules, they cannot answer, deny, or refute the adverse comment, even when it is patently and sometimes viciously false. Add to that the grave responsibilities for the nation's security, the pressure, the anonymity of achievement, and the constant need for security alertness—it is a source of pride, and nothing short of amazement, that we keep our people, and keep getting more good ones.

I asked recently for some statistics on how long our personnel had been with us. The answers showed that more than a quarter of our professional personnel—as differentiated from the clerical—had been with CIA more than 15 years, and that an astounding 77 per cent had 10 years or more of intelligence experience. About 15 per cent have graduate degrees; 5 per cent have the doctorate.

When you consider only the analysts who have the direct responsibility in headquarters for analysis of a foreign area, six out of 10 of them had lived, worked or traveled abroad even before they came to CIA. When you combine all the years required for graduate study, foreign experience, and then 10 to 15 years of intelligence work, it adds up to an impressive depth of knowledge, competence and expertise at the service of the nation.

I have been careful to stick to percentages, but in actual numbers, we could easily and adequately staff the faculty of a university with our experts. In a way, we do. Many of those who leave us join the faculties of universities and colleges. Some of our personnel take leaves of absence to teach, and renew their contacts with the academic world. I suppose this is only fair; our energetic recruiting effort not only looks for the best young graduate students we can find, but also picks up a few professors from time to time.

Question. What about the criticism that the CIA uses "dishonorable" methods? Do you operate on the principle that the CIA, as a participant in the cold war, is justified in adopting any measures that may be used by the opposing governments—"fighting fire with fire"?

Answer. Let's be quite clear in our minds that an adversary does not go by the Marquis of Queensberry rules. It is a rough fight, and the CIA may have to be clandestine from time to time, but I emphatically reject the word "dishonorable."

The men and women in CIA are, after all, Americans with the same ideals, the same ethics, the same moral codes as the rest of the nation. I have with me a copy of a remark Secretary Rusk made to a press conference last winter, which I would like to read into your record if I may:

"I would emphasize to you that CIA is not engaged in activities not known to the senior policy officers of the Government. But you should also bear in mind that beneath the level of public discussion, there is a tough struggle going on in the back alleys all over the world. It's a tough one, it's unpleasant, and no one likes it, but that is not a field which can be left entirely to the other side. And so, once in a while, some disagreeable things happen, and I can tell you that there is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

And President Johnson, when he swore me in as Director of Central Intelligence on April 28, 1965, put it this way:

"We have committed our lives, our property, our resources and our sacred honor to the freedom and peace of other men, indeed, to the freedom and peace of all mankind. We would dishonor that commitment, we would disgrace all the sacrifices Americans have made, if we were not every hour of every day vigilant against every threat to peace and freedom. That is why we have the Central Intelligence Agency."

Question. Just what are the duties of the Director of CIA?

Answer. The National Security Act of 1947 created the position of Director of Central Intelligence, or DCI, for short. The DCI is not only the Director of CIA—he is also first and foremost the principal adviser on foreign intelligence to the President and the National Security Council. And he is also chairman of the United States Intelligence Board, or USIB, which brings together the entire intelligence community.

Question. Now that you have just left the Central Intelligence Agency after more than 14 months as Director, what is your opinion of the Agency?

Answer. Excellent. It is the finest organization I have ever been associated with. The people at CIA are dedicated, loyal and highly capable. I found the Agency well up to its exacting requirements as our first line of national defense.

AFTER DOMINICAN CRISIS

Question. Why are you leaving now?

Answer. When President Johnson called me out of retirement from Government service, I asked him first how long I would be needed. He told me I could serve six months, or a year, or as long as he was in office, or until I was satisfied with certain administrative tasks, including, in particular, long-range planning.

I'm taking the fourth option, but I also came close to the one-year hitch. Actually, the President had had my resignation in hand for about three weeks when he announced it. I came in with the Dominican crisis; and you might say it behooved me to stay until peaceful elections brought a duly constituted Government into being.

Question. Admiral Raborn, what are you going to do now?

Answer. I plan to take a short rest and then return to American industry with the Aerojet-General Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request which has been cleared with the other side and with the chairman and with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12:15 tomorrow afternoon, when the agriculture appropriation bill becomes the pending business under order of the Senate, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment, 30 minutes to be allotted to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida, and the other 30 minutes to be allotted to the proponent of the amendment, and that there be 1 hour allotted on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, July 15, 1966, at the hour of 12:15 p.m., during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14596) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is in favor of any such

amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 15, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

If any man walks in the day, he does not stumble because he sees the light of this world.—John 11: 9.

O God, our Father, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting and whose truth endureth forever, in all humility and reverence we bow in Thy presence offering unto Thee once again the devotion of our hearts. Amid all the traffic of our ways, turmoils without, within, make in our hearts a quiet place and come and dwell therein. Sure of Thy presence may we face the tasks of this day with a dauntless courage, a quiet faith and with a never failing good will.

In the struggle between light and darkness in our time may we walk in the light and live in the light that we and our Nation may continue to be the light of the world: in the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act.

THE 53D BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to notify the House of a very important occasion that takes place in our country today. In France they may be celebrating Bastille Day, but here we are celebrating GERRY FORD's birthday.

Born on July 14, 1913—the year, I do not need to remind you that the 16th amendment empowering Congress to levy and collect income taxes became law—GERRY is 53 years old today.

He is young and vigorous, and I am sure many of you recall the home run he hit a few years back at the annual congressional baseball game. And the responsibilities he has carried in the 89th Congress have not aged him so much that he could not do the same thing today.

GERRY is talented. He is respected. He is dedicated to good government. My only regret is that we do not have more troops on the Republican side of the aisle to help him celebrate his birthday this year. But the way he has conducted himself as minority leader during the past year and a half may very well correct the situation.

In fact, GERRY, I can think of nothing better to wish you as a birthday greeting than for you to have a whole battalion of new Republicans under your guidance in the 90th Congress.

Our friends on the other side understandably cannot join me in this hope. However, I am certain they will join all Republicans in wishing you a most happy birthday and a successful 53d year.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I certainly could not let this occasion pass without extending my own greetings and felicitations to the distinguished, beloved, and able minority leader on the occasion of his birthday. I desire also to say to the House that while GERRY has not always been in agreement with political policy on this side of the House, he has always been most cooperative with the majority leadership in processing the business of the House. I do not think that there has been one single disagreement during this entire session on any important procedural matter. This is as it should be. We are all interested in processing the business of the House. Of course, we differ on political issues.

Now, GERRY has done such a good job and has cooperated so well and has earned the accolades of his colleagues on the other side of the House so well that I think it would be in keeping with his performance that he should keep the same number of troops next year that he has had this year. Happy birthday, GERRY.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, all of us join in wishing you, GERRY, a very happy birthday.

ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. JACOBS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, America lost Adlai Stevenson 1 year ago today.

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

CURRENT STRIKE BY THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. HULL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the current strike by the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines underscores the urgent need for the establishment of procedures to settle such disputes which paralyze our Nation's transportation and damage the economy.

It no longer suffices for Congressmen to wring their hands and extend their sympathies to the hundreds of thousands of people who have been seriously inconvenienced by this strike. It accomplishes little to assign culpability to the union or the airline companies. This will not reclaim the profits lost by the airlines or put lost paychecks back into the pockets of airline employees.

Trans World Airlines, one of the affected companies, is headquartered in my congressional district and has been forced to furlough 5,700 employees in the Kansas City area, a disastrous blow to the economy of that area. This involves the dilution of TWA's $3,600,000 payroll in the Kansas City area.

I have received a telegram from Mayor Ilus W. Davis of Kansas City, who states:

The National Association of Machinists' strike against the five major airlines is substantially affecting the business and economy of the Greater Kansas City area. I know that you are concerned about this national emergency and I hope that you, in your legislative role and collectively with your colleagues, will take every possible action to bring this national crisis to an early and successful conclusion.

In a separate communication, I have advised the President of the United States of my interest in this matter for I am convinced that this should be a concern of all levels and divisions of government. I want you to know that this office stands willing to be of assistance in resolving this serious labor dispute.

What is needed immediately is an end to the strike, followed by establishment of procedures to guarantee that such strikes, so injurious to the national interest, do not recur.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] concerning this uncalled for and unwarranted airline strike.

This is one of the most classic examples of irresponsibility I have ever witnessed in my 26 years in this Congress. The excuse that the papers write for calling this strike is that the leaders of this walkout do not like the profit that is made by the airlines. The President's panel recommended a 3.2 percent raise for these employees, but this was of no avail. Now the employees do not even want to go to the conference table.

This strike is costly to the military and it is costing us untold millions of dollars at a time when air service is critical, to say nothing of the millions of people who are cut off in their respective towns and hamlets across this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit on our hands much longer and fail to respond to the demands of the American people that this farce be called off so that this really tragic situation will cease to exist. Let the interested parties get together around the bargaining table, especially at this time when we are in the midst of a terrible war. If not, then the Congress—in the national interest—must act.

SOLDIER IS BEATEN AND ROBBED WHILE ONLOOKERS CHEER

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in last night's issue of the Evening Star, I read a very disturbing story, under a Chicago AP dateline, as follows:

SOLDIER IS BEATEN AND ROBBED WHILE ONLOOKERS CHEER

CHICAGO.—A soldier stationed in Chicago was beaten and robbed aboard a subway train yesterday while detectives said, 25 passengers cheered his assailant.

The victim is Richard Bloomfield, 25, an Army specialist fourth class assigned to a nike base on the South Side. His home is in Portsmouth, Ohio.

He was treated in a hospital where stitches were taken in a cut above his right eye.

Two Chicago Transit Authority detectives, Charles Berglund and Joseph Ezerski, came into the subway car while Bloomfield was being assaulted.

"We had to draw our guns on the whole crowd," Berglund said. "We had no choice. They were all chanting—cheering on the assailant."

The detectives seizes James Person, 18, who was charged with robbery and battery.

The soldier is white; Person is a Negro.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to make it a Federal offense to assault a man in uniform without justification. If we can have such a law applicable to those who assault civil rights workers, certainly we ought to have it available to men who wear the uniform of their country.

NEAT TIMING OF TWO RELEASES

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on two stories which appeared in our morning newspapers. I refer to the statement by the Solicitor General that the Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, was responsible for the illegal bugging of a hotel room in the city of Washington, and the release by the State Department of an attempt by two Czechoslovak diplomats to plant a listening device in the State Department.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the appearance of these two stories at the same time is totally coincidental. But I think it is more than passing strange that the two releases were so neatly timed. Indeed, I wonder whether the spy story would have appeared at this time if it had not been for the image-damaging aspects of the statement by the Solicitor General. It is common knowledge that Mr. Hoover is a master of the art of public relations. This is a valuable asset to any public figure. But I most seriously question the release of information, of potential consequence to our own intelligence and security operations, for the purpose of "blanketing" a negative story about Mr. Hoover.

AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. BOLLING. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the current airline strike has seriously affected individual plans and economic and other activity in the Nation and in my congressional district in Kansas City, Mo. One of the affected carriers, TWA, has headquarters there. Indeed, its payroll is one of the largest in the Fifth Missouri District. Consequently, I am eager to see the strike settled. As always in such a situation the emotions which are high on both sides bring more fog than light to the issues in dispute. The basic ingredient in the formula for industrial peace is determined good-faith bargaining on both sides. As a private citizen and public servant I urge this upon both parties.

A 12-MILE FISHING ZONE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I received a long distance telephone call from representatives of Pacific Northwest fishermen; they informed me that a Russian fishing fleet consisting of 119 vessels is now fishing around the Columbia River Lightship, which is 4½ miles off the mouth of the Columbia River.

Mr. Speaker, our fishermen have made great sacrifices and limited their fishing in order to try and conserve fishery resources. But, when a foreign fishing fleet comes in close to our shore all this sacrifice is in vain.

I am joining other Representatives in Congress from the Pacific Northwest and urging the President and our State Department to request the Soviet Union to withdraw this fishing fleet. Meanwhile, it becomes more and more evident that a 12-mile fishing zone such as would be established by legislation now before Congress is absolutely essential.

GREAT SOCIETY CATALOG OF CATALOGS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has become so fat with layers of confusing, conflicting bureaucracy, so entwined in repetitive red tape, and so involved in cross-purpose planning and programing between the Departments that the Congress has found it necessary to publish a "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments." Now, apparently, this congressional publication is inadequate in the omnipotent eyes of the Great Society planners and we find the Departments coming up with their individual versions of what the Federal "wish book" should be. So far I have discovered two and feel confident that if others are not already in existence they are now being conceived.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has published a "Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement." It covers all of the department and agency programs offered by the Federal Government. The Department of Commerce's pride was dented because OEO chose to advertise programs outside of its bailiwick and has countered with their own "Handbook of Federal Aid to Communities" including a section in their catalog on Sergent Shriver's poverty war.

Mr. Speaker, at this rate it will not be long before we will all need a Federal catalog to catalog the catalogs.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 15111.

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

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may sit during general debate during the week of July 18.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this request for an entire week been cleared with the minority Members?

Mr. ALBERT. The memorandum which was sent to me indicates it was cleared with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 163]

Baring	Farnsley	O'Neal, Ga.
Bell	Flynt	Powell
Blatnik	Fraser	Rivers, Alaska
Casey	Grider	Scott
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Senner
Clark	Harsha	Stephens
Conable	Hathaway	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	Hays	Thompson, N.J.
Corman	Herlong	Toll
Cunningham	King, N.Y.	Trimble
de la Garza	Mathias	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Matsunaga	White, Idaho
Edwards, La.	Mills	Whitten
Ellsworth	Morris	Willis
Evins, Tenn.	Murray	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMEND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Virginia" insert ", and shall include those areas adjacent to the District of Columbia within a radius of thirty miles from the United States Capitol Building".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act—Public Law 86–708, effective as of July 29, 1961—so as to permit the licensing without any written examination of an applicant otherwise qualified to be a licensed practical nurse, who, for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act, has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington Metropolitan area.

The bill as passed by the House defines the "Washington Metropolitan area" as "that area comprising the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md., the counties of Arlington and Fairfax, Va., and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Va."

The Senate amended this definition by adding the words "and shall include those areas adjacent to the District of Columbia within a radius of 30 miles from the U.S. Capitol Building."

The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia stated in its report that certain portions of nearby counties in Maryland and Virginia would not qualify under the House definition even though they are located geographically much closer than some portions of the immediately adjacent counties now included in the definition.

For this reason the committee was of the view that a radius mileage definition should be included as part of the definition in order to establish a more uniform geographical definition of "metropolitan area" for the purposes of this act.

This bill passed the House without objection, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISH THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL AGENCY

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out "3(a)(1)" and insert "3(1)."

Page 7, line 5, after "necessary" insert ", but not to exceed $130,000 in any one fiscal year,".

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15860 as amended is to create a fact-gathering-and-reporting agency to provide to any judicial officer as defined in the bill, in the District of Columbia reports containing verified information concerning any person about whom the judicial officer is to make a bail determination.

The Senate added two amendments. One is a technical amendment. The other would limit the sums authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill to "not to exceed $130,000 in any one fiscal year."

This limitation amply covers the estimated annual costs of operating the District of Columbia Bail Agency created by the act, as established by the testimony before the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

This bill passed the House without objection, and the Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendments.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 13290.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman indicate what the bill is.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. This is the highway safety bill, Mr. CRAMER.

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

There was no objection.

THE SHOCKING, HEINOUS CRIME IN CHICAGO

Mr. SCHEUER. 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. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, this heinous crime that occurred in Chicago shocks all of us. Above all it highlights the fact that we do not know enough about the root causes for these horrible crimes to prevent their occurrence or apprehend the perpetrators.

Mr. Speaker, this crime highlights the desperate inadequacy of present Federal efforts to assist State and local law enforcement agencies to meet the problem of crimes of violence, a problem which, qualitatively and quantitatively defies our existing laws, the present state of our knowledge, and the resources we are applying to the problem of crime on our streets and in our homes.

The Federal Government is now spending about $23 billion a year in research. We are spending a billion dollars a year to support the National Institute of Health, alone. We are spending more in the National Institutes of Health program to study dental decay than the entire Federal effort in the study of the moral decay which produces these appalling and horrifying crimes.

Instead of spending somewhere between $13 million and $15 million a year in studying the causes and nature of crime on the streets of this country, and developing more effective measures of crime prevention and criminal law enforcement, we should be spending at least $100 million a year on this problem.

We must galvanize our efforts—our scientific knowledge—our best brains in the field of criminology, sociology, and the communications sciences, and bring these resources and talents to bear upon the problem of crime in our neighborhoods.

The cities and States cannot go it alone; none of them have the resources to make a meaningful attack on the problem. The effort that the Federal Government is making toward helping States and municipalities across the country is shockingly and shamefully inadequate, and this horrifying episode highlights that fact.

Mr. Speaker this is why I introduced a measure, H.R. 14416 to establish a National Institute of Crime Prevention and Detection, with an initial annual budget of $100 million. Such a definitive program would finally place the Federal Government forcefully and effectively behind the effort to harness existing scientific knowledge to crime prevention and law enforcement, and to direct major professional and research skills, organized on an interdisciplinary basis, to developing the knowledge we need to devise new tools, new methods and procedures, and new laws to bring tranquillity and security to every American street and every American home.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 15750, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 101, ending on line 7, page 2 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Title I—Development Loan Fund

SEC. 102. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 201(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting after the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this title, the President shall seek to encourage each recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development."

(b) Section 202(a), which relates to authorization for the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out "$1,200,000,000" and all that follows down through "succeeding fiscal years" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971".

(2) In the second proviso, strike out "June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, through June 30, 1971".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PURCELL: On page 2, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"(a) Strike out the first sentence of section 201(b), which relates to general authority, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(b) The President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars upon such terms and conditions as the President may determine except that the length of such loans shall not exceed twenty-five years nor shall the grace period of such loans exceed five years. Such loans shall be utilized to promote economic development of less developed, friendly countries, and areas, with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities.'"

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment deals with section 201(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act dealing with general authority under the Development Loan Fund. Specifically, it would limit the maximum terms for development loans to 25 years and the maximum grace period to 5 years. At the proper time I will offer a similar amendment to section 251(a) which would have the same effect on Alliance for Progress loans.

The existing law permits the President to make loans "payable as to principal and interest in U.S. dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine." In actual practice, the Agency for International Development has extended loans on terms generally of 40 years' duration, with a 10-year grace period. The interest charged is 1 percent during the grace period and 2½ percent thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in this matter has greatly increased with the passage by the House of the food-for-freedom bill. This bill, as I explained in a letter to all Members of the House yesterday, ties the terms of dollar credit sales under Public Law 480 to section 201 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Under title IV of Public Law 480, the terms since 1960 have been 20 years with a 2-year grace period. Over $1 billion in title IV sales have been made, often on terms harder than this. During the markup of the food-for-freedom bill, the Committee on Agriculture voted 21 to 12 to limit dollar-credit sales to this 20-year term with a 2-year grace period.

It was argued that this would discriminate against the farmer to require that his products be sold on a 20-year term while U.S. manufacturers are selling their products on 40-year terms under the current foreign aid program. So, on June 9, the House voted 193 to 165 to put Public Law 480 dollar-credit sales on the same terms as foreign aid.

I favor, and I think a number of my colleagues in the Agriculture Committee favor, a revision of all foreign aid terms—Public Law 480 and dollar foreign economic assistance—to a maximum of 25 years with a 5-year grace period.

This shorter grace period will be of real benefit to the U.S. balance of payments. I think this is a most important consideration in view of our many long-term commitments abroad, including Vietnam. At the same time, when we look at what other nations are doing in their economic assistance programs, these terms I propose are still very liberal. They provide a sufficient repayment period if there is any realistic prospect for repayment.

The argument most often used against more realistic repayment policies such as I am proposing is that of the growing debt burdens of the less developed countries. We should not, in our efforts to help other countries, forget our own debt burden. Our balance-of-payments problem is serious. We have had a deficit in every year since 1950 with the single exception of 1957. And this problem is showing little, if any, improvement.

As I explained in my letter of yesterday in some detail, what we are now doing is making it possible for the less developed countries to use the foreign exchange it earns to repay their existing hard-term debts, both public and private, to the European countries, Canada, Japan, and the World Bank. I believe it is not good policy for us to supply large amounts of extended credits while the other industrialized, capital-exporting countries are repaid on their hard credits.

This Nation is virtually alone in extending such long-term credits as 40 years with a 10-year grace period. In 1964, the United States made 98 percent of all loans of 40 years or more.

The weighted average maturity of loan commitments of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries, exclusive of the United States, in 1964 was about 17 years. The U.S. weighted average maturity was 33 years.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude that a 25-year term with a 5-year grace period is substantially more liberal than what the other developed nations of the world are presently extending. They are liberal enough if aid funds are being used efficiently and economically. The shorter

grace period would assist our very serious balance-of-payments situation. Hopefully, these sounder terms would foster a greater sense of responsibility and urgency in the governments of the less developed countries concerning the utilization of foreign assistance. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman has presented an amendment or has indicated that he will do so. Would the gentleman clarify what the terms of the amendment are or would be? I understand there would be a 5-year grace period. What would be the interest rate beyond the 5-year period?

Mr. PURCELL. Three percent.

Mr. FINDLEY. Three percent interest. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I was about to make a reservation of objection, but I am not going to object to the present request. Time will be short today, and I think the House should proceed in regular order. If there are any further requests for time, I am going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman. As the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to say that we have carefully considered Public Law 480 since its inception, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his amendment and express the hope that it will be adopted. It is a timely amendment, and one that is sorely needed.

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

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for indicating that he will offer an amendment as he indicated at the proper time. As the gentleman knows, the subject was a very important controversy when we considered the food-for-freedom program. I think it is a worthwhile and needed amendment.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank my colleague. In order that the House Members may understand, I have now offered an amendment. If it is necessary to do this totally, it will take another amendment. But I have now before the House an amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. While I certainly cannot but stand against the gentleman's amendment, the question nevertheless is not on the real interest yields themselves. The question is whether or not we want to help these people, whether or not we want to make these loans. The programs we had for many years were primarily on a grant basis. We have shifted from the grant basis onto dollar repayable loans.

The issue is whether or not we can make realistic repayment loans, as the gentleman said. The fact of the matter is that if realistic bankable loans could be made, and those loans could be applied for at the Export-Import Bank. There are financial institutions structured to make realistic loans where repayment capability is not the significant factor.

The problem is, why should we make a loan so difficult that it cannot be repaid? At that point, then we either have to extend the terms or move toward a position where the countries themselves cannot pay at all and they go into default.

The whole purpose of this is whether or not we can make loans that are loans that these countries can handle. While the gentleman's amendment is certainly worthwhile and motivated in the right direction, the fact of the matter is that we have a choice either to make these loans or to get back onto a grant basis.

The will of the House down through the years has been to get away from grants and to get onto loans. These loans are sufficiently flexible so that they can be tailored to a nations ability to repay. The question is whether the United States will try to make loans and adjust those terms to the future abilities of the countries to pay. For these reasons, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, the proposal of this amendment points out some of the difficulties which some people may want to approve of—the diversification of foreign policy among committees. I do not see any particular virtue of fixing a foreign policy by the Agricultural Committee, but it is their prerogative since that law happens to come under their jurisdiction. But it does point up the fact that the action of that committee puts it into competition with a good program operating under the foreign aid program. There is no logic in this, that because they seek to change that program, that a good program working under the foreign aid program ought to be changed. That logic is not necessarily correct.

As a matter of fact, all Development Loan Funds are repayable in dollars, and AID makes most of its loans on minimum terms set by Congress in 1964—1 percent during a 10-year grace period, and 2½ percent for the remaining 30 years. AID makes loans on harder terms to countries which are able to pay the costs. For example, to Israel we lent $4 million for development of its telephone system, with loan terms of 3½ percent for 20 years, with a 5-year grace period.

I do not see any virtue in removing the flexibility which exists under this program. Furthermore, last year at the request of this Congress, we made a study of the relation of loan-terms and debt burden on the development of countries. That was called the "Loan-Term, Debt Burden and Development" study. It documented the mounting foreign debt burden of many underdeveloped countries and concluded that hard term credit made it not only difficult for the United States to attain its objectives, but in the long run would be of greater cost to the United States in attaining the objectives and furthering programs for growth.

Further, by hardening the credit terms, it would be self-defeating, particularly in the case where we have had, since 1946, $32.8 billion in loans and have repayable on those loans $12.5 billion.

So, having shifted the emphasis from grants and putting it on terms which, yes, are soft, but on which repayment has been good, and having achieved our objectives at the best net cost to the United States, I see no logic in saying that just because some members of the Agriculture Committee thinks this is good for the food for peace program, it ought to be good for the Development Loan Fund.

I submit, under the evidence we have, the amendment ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I believe the gentleman misunderstood what my statement at least intended.

The Committee on Agriculture became interested in this problem because of its connection—and I believe perfectly logically—with the Public Law 480 program. At one time the Committee on Agriculture did vote to put in a 20-year limitation for the Public Law 480 program. That action was reversed by the House, and the present language in the food-for-freedom program or bill sets the terms for that program to be exactly whatever the foreign aid terms are.

I realize it is not always a compliment to be on the House Committee on Agriculture, but I do not believe it prohibits me from a license to come before this body and to ask that this body consider the ideas of those of us who have gone into some detail in regard to our foreign aid program as it is connected with food.

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly meant not to cast any reflection either on the gentleman or on the committee. I know he and they are sincere, dedicated, and knowledgeable.

Certainly we have a right to consider the proposal, as was done in the original food-for-peace program. We do have, from a practical standpoint, some division with respect to the setting of foreign

policy in the two programs; one, Public Law 480, in the Committee on Agriculture, and the other in our committee.

I believe the House wisely settled that policy by trying to put the two together and leaving the policy questions fundamentally with the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PURCELL. I have no argument with that in any way. I merely wish to convince those who are on the Foreign Affairs Committee that we on the Committee on Agriculture are not arguing about jurisdiction.

I am for the bill. I have been for every foreign aid bill which has come up since I have been in the Congress. I intend to vote for this bill, whether it does or does not include this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to his purpose.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so reluctantly, because I know the gentleman from Texas has been a supporter of this bill over a period of years.

I should like to repeat what the gentleman from New Jersey said. The basic reason for having an economic aid bill is to enable the United States to assist countries to improve the condition of their people. Those countries cannot do that with their own resources. We must have some flexibility in adjusting terms of repayment on these loans so that the conditions which confront the borrowing country 5 or 10 years from now can be considered.

When Public Law 480 first came before the Congress there was a jurisdictional question as to whether the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs or whether it should go to the Committee on Agriculture. It was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Many of us may lose sight of the fact that 50 percent of our foreign economic aid program involves agriculture and agricultural surpluses. So the Committee on Agriculture has a lot to say about the direction of foreign policy by virtue of its control over Public Law 480 and the food-for-peace program.

During our hearings the American Farm Bureau Federation appeared. The Farm Bureau is one of the most outstanding farm organizations in the country, Mr. John Lynn, legislative director, said this:

Last year—

And again this year—

we recommended that the authorization and appropriation for Food-for-Peace (P.L. 480) be transferred from the Department of Agriculture to AID.

It is clear that the so-called Food-for-Peace program is for all practical purposes a foreign aid program. It has become an important tool of foreign policy and has become less and less a surplus disposal operation. Agricultural commodity aid provided through P.L. 480 represented nearly 50 percent of total net U.S. economic aid supplies to underdeveloped countries in the last few years.

We see the Committee on Agriculture has an important influence over the making of the foreign policy.

I say if we put the gentleman's amendment in the bill we take away an important element of flexibility in this regard. The program has worked very well, as the gentleman from Florida has pointed out, over a period of years. These loans are working very well—it would be a mistake to interfere with it.

This has been a successful program. It has been a program that was recommended by President Eisenhower first in 1957 on a soft loan basis to be financed in part with local currencies. Then in 1961 we made them hard dollar loans. Not all of the loans are for a 40-year period. Some of them are for 20 years, and some of them are 5- and 10-year loans, but this flexibility must remain if we are going to be successful in helping the underdeveloped countries.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is spending his time discussing a jurisdictional fight, but the issue here is whether the House will reduce the grace period to 5 years and the total loan period to 25 years.

Mr. MORGAN. I wanted to tell the House that the Committee of Agriculture now controls about 50 percent of the foreign aid program. Therefore, I think that the jurisdiction over the food-for-peace program should be moved back into the Committee on Foreign Affairs where it belongs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for making that statement which many of us have been arguing for years. This is exactly what should be the case. It was ridiculous in those past debates on foreign aid that we did not relate them to Public Law 480. Hopefully, the Congress will get around to this much-needed coordination.

However, I took the floor today because yesterday I was pointing up what I felt was the failure of the committee, that is, our House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to give appropriate attention to the report of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid dated July 1965. I was calling attention to the fact that we, in the present debate, were not giving it proper attention. Second, I was calling attention to the fact that the AID organization had not given it proper attention. This morning, completely out of the blue as far as I am concerned, I received two letters, one from the Catholic Charities, Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, signed by Father Lawrence J. McNamara, enclosing a letter to him of June 29, 1966, from Bishop Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., pointing up in a much more forceful way what I have been trying to point out and thought was accurate. However, of course, I am limited in my ability to dig into these matters. I am going to put both letters into the RECORD at this point. They read as follows:

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: There is one other legislative matter which is of tremendous personal interest to me.

I am not thinking at the moment of any one particular bill as much as I am of the relationship between the Agency for International Development (AID) and the voluntary agencies cooperating with the Government in the Food for Peace program.

There are some serious problems that seem to be arising for the voluntary agencies—in fact, for the total effort on the part of the United States to confront the problem of world hunger and to develop deep friendships with the governments and peoples of undeveloped nations. I am enclosing some excerpts from a letter recently received from Bishop Edward Swanstrom, the Executive Director of Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference.

In the excerpt from Bishop Swanstrom's letter, mention is made of the report submitted by a special Task Force to the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of AID. Bishop Swanstrom seems to feel strongly that this Task Force report has received very limited circulation in the Government. He is "on top of" the situation on a day by day basis and is one of the best advised people in the world in terms of the problems of undeveloped nations and the American effort to participate in solving those problems. I have unquestioned confidence in his observation that AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report even exists.

I have read the report in detail and would very much like to see it put into effect by AID. An expression of interest from yourself along similar lines would be a really big help to the hungry people of the world, to the voluntary agencies—and to the United States. I earnestly ask you for whatever word of encouragement or support you can give in the right places to the effect that you would like to see the recommendation of this report put into effect.

Copies of the report probably are available from AID. They are surely available from the Most Reverend Edward E. Swanstrom, Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10001.

Very truly yours,
Father LAWRENCE J. MCNAMARA.

CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N.Y., June 29, 1966.

Rev. LAWRENCE J. MCNAMARA,
Catholic Charities,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR FATHER MCNAMARA: First of all I want to express to you the very deep appreciation of my associates and myself for your invaluable help and cooperation in the promotion of this year's Bishops' Fund for Overseas Relief campaign. I have been told that it is already evident that the proceeds this year will surpass anything in the past. We will not know the full result until the Bishops' meeting in the fall when all the reports will be in, but it will not surprise me if the total reaches over $8,000,000 this year. I say it won't surprise me—first of all because of the tremendous help you offered us, and secondly because of the concern I know there was at the time for the situation in Viet Nam and India and other sorely tried areas around the globe. May God bless you for your generosity and kindness.

During the meetings to promote the campaign, those Directors who were there will

recall that I indicated that there may be times when you can be very helpful to us by bringing some of our concerns to the attention of your representatives in Congress.

If you have an opportunity to review the enclosed report, it will point out to you a problem which now faces all of the voluntary agencies in the foreign relief field who participate in the Food for Peace program by distributing American commodities to the needy overseas. It is a report prepared by a special task force appointed by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Agency for International Development, Washington, to study the problems relating to our partnership with the United States Government. The report would seem to indicate that we have not been too successful recently in interpreting some of our problems to those who administer our governmental agencies. It is our feeling that unless some of the procedures, policies and regulations under which voluntary agencies accept governmental support are drastically revised, it will become more and more difficult for us to continue to participate adequately in the Food for Peace program.

The Advisory Committee's task force seems to recognize this when it points out that the voluntary agencies find themselves overaudited, required to conform with unenforceable and unrealistic regulations, embarrassed by intermittent food availabilities and harassed for the payment of claims for "misuses" or program irregularities beyond their control. Perhaps, most unfortunately, voluntary agencies, like our own, are beginning to reap a back-swell of resentment from the leaders of the private sector overseas, harmful not only to their own interests and objectives, but to those of the American people as a whole.

Volagencies must be accorded a radically different type of relationship if they are to preserve their integrity. Pyramiding governmental regulations, which almost completely becloud voluntary agency philosophy, have strained the partnership between government and the volagency to the point of almost total collapse.

Frankly, we need your help to bring this matter to the attention of those who represent you in Congress. The task force report has received but limited circulation in government. Only a few days ago I took it upon myself to send copies of it to all the members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. So far as volagencies are concerned, AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report even exists.

You can help us to put the recommendations of this report into action. Since you believe in people-to-people programs instituted and conducted on the basis of human need as contrasted with government-to-government programs necessarily intertwined with politics and other pressures, we urge that you make known your support of the task force report.

With every kindest personal wish,

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

So far as both agencies are concerned, the AID has given little or no indication of the fact that this report of the advisory committee even exists. The bishop points out in this letter that he, on his own initiative, sent copies of this report to all the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Committee on Agriculture, because he felt that these recommendations were so important.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can personally testify that it took my office over 2 weeks to obtain a copy of this report. And, certainly, I know AID in its own report which I read into the RECORD, devotes only one little paragraph, in a document of some 267 pages long, one little paragraph, telling that there is this committee; that it did make a report, that it has made recommendations, and that AID adopted some, and was proceeding to adopt others, but does not spell out anything about the recommendations beyond these meaningless generalities.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I can see AID is doing very little, really, to counteract the "Curtis corollary" that Government money will drive out private money.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want with the name of "Gallagher" to oppose "Monsignor McNamara," or Bishop Swanson. But the fact of the matter is that Bishop Swanson did testify before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and we did listen to his views and we did take them into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the Watson report about which he testified was mentioned several times.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman means in the hearings, but we established the fact that your committee——

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Did not even think enough of it to even mention it in your report. Am I not correct? You did not even think enough of it to mention it in your report?

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is not mentioned in the committee report, but I want to assure the gentleman from Missouri that we did give it full consideration, and Secretary of State Rusk did, as well as the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Then, may I state to the gentleman from New Jersey, and you can defend it, but obviously the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not think these recommendations were of very much significance.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to put in perspective the position of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to this amendment and with respect to the Food for Freedom program.

No. 1, Mr. Chairman, there were many of us on the committee who did oppose this limitation on the loans that are included in the food for freedom.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to whether or not the Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Foreign Affairs should handle this program, I would like to point out that the commodity programs in this country are going from time to time to have to be adjusted, as this program moves forward.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this year we look toward increasing wheat production to the extent of about 15 million acres.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if you are going to take this program away from the Committee on Agriculture, then somehow, somewhere there is going to have to be some coordination between the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in respect to this production.

Mr. Chairman, this is true, because as of now our wheat surpluses are gone. This means increased wheat production.

Mr. Chairman, we have no soybean surplus and we have no butter surplus. Also, Mr. Chairman, the feed grains surpluses are about gone.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this House give every consideration to this problem before we start talking about adjusting the program and changing the program from Agriculture to Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CALLAN] and also add the fact that I am very concerned that the specter of jurisdiction of committees which has been brought into this debate.

Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, it seems to me that this represents a kind of a "ghost" that has been raised here, and very suddenly.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture, through the years, has been diligent in its efforts and we are at this point making the crest with respect to foreign agricultural programs insofar as food is concerned.

During the preceding years, 1 year was not very important, in terms of total dollars and no one raised the question.

And they did not argue whether we had jurisdiction or not. It is only when this particular program has assumed its present proportions that the argument has been raised.

I want to compliment the gentleman on his argument, and I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. CALLAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana was not around here during the Marshall plan days, but I just want to tell the gentleman that we used some millions of dollars worth of farm surpluses in the Marshall plan days under the old section 402 of the Mutual Security Act and it worked very well.

I am not trying to make a jurisdictional fight here today. All I am doing is trying to point out that the Committee on Agriculture has a stake in our foreign policy because of their jurisdiction of the food for peace program. I cannot see why we should try now to model our development loan program to fit the conditions that apply to loans relating to sales of agricultural commodities and thus destroy the flexibility of the loan program. That is the only argument I am making. I am not trying to get in any jurisdictional fight here. I am arguing against the Purcell amendment be-

cause it will destroy the flexibility of the development loan program.

Mr. CALLAN. I agree with the gentleman, and I am opposing the amendment also.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think it might be worth while to note that if the Purcell amendment is adopted it would add approximately $850 million to the debt burden of developing nations. Certainly this in itself is a burden, I think the gentleman will admit. The food-for freedom program is now switching over to dollars instead of local currencies. So I think we are moving in the right direction, but to move too rapidly I think would result in the opposite of what we are trying to do through the aid program.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the Purcell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we went over this matter of the length of time of loans in the Committee on Agriculture. I would have liked to see a 20-year limitation placed on Public Law 480 loans, but an agreement or decision was made by the majority that an effort would be made here on the foreign aid bill to make them all similar, and for that reason I am supporting this amendment.

I did not see any sense whatsoever in lending money to a country for the purchase of food and then not have them to pay anything for 10 years. In other words, to have a 10-year grace period and then paying the total amount after 40 years. Not only will they have eaten up the food long before then, but it is very doubtful if many of these developing nations will actually be the same nation at the end of 40 years, what with the rapid changes in governments, anyway. We cannot expect anything to be very similar to what it is right now. In fact, a 40-year loan with a 10-year grace period for food or tobacco is about the same as a grant.

With all of the loans that are given for nondurable commodities, both for AID and Public Law 480, which is affected by this language, we will find that the expropriation of property will not be the main problem any more because there will not even be that property to be expropriated in these consumer loans.

You can imagine yourself paying your grocery bill 40 years from now. If there ever was a temptation not to pay what you owe to a rich relative, I would say that this surely would be such a temptation. In order to give some direction to those who are administering this program I believe we at least need the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] because these new and developing countries are like a young person who is growing up in the family. They need to learn responsibility. If they know they must meet their first payment within 5 years, if that were the longest grace period, they will have a greater sense of responsibility toward this loan than they would have with the 10-year grace period. Also if they know they must be repaying this debt in 25 years—25 years is a generation. Any of us here can think of 25 years from now, but to think 40 years from now, there may not be any of us, or at least very, very few of us who will be in this Chamber who will be in a position of leadership any place whatsoever. And this is also the case with the leadership of those countries as well.

Twenty-five years is about all that one can conceive of in the future, so far as having responsibility for anything, or that we provide assistance for. Therefore, I certainly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In addition to supporting the gentleman's views, I also would like to add the fact that the argument that has been made that this would increase the responsibility of foreign nations, that is, their currency responsibility, I believe is a factor that is sorely needed. Therefore I certainly believe that that would be a good argument in favor of the amendment.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. During his remarks the gentleman from Texas said that this amendment was voted on in the House by a vote of 191 to 165.

The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture. I wonder if he would explain to the House whether this was a motion to recommit or whether this was a separate vote on this amendment.

Mr. QUIE. This was a separate vote on this amendment, because at the time a committee amendment was proposed to go to the 40-year provision in Public Law 480, the motion to recommit did not include this language because we had already had a separate vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Then did not the House have a rollcall vote on this very amendment?

Mr. QUIE. If the point of view of the Members of the House is the same as the point of view of the majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, then they have not taken a position. The majority point of view of the Committee on Agriculture was that we ought to make these two programs the same, that the same language should prevail in both AID and Public Law 480. Therefore, the decision was made on their part that they would come before the House when this bill was up and try to change both of them down to some lower period. The only thing that the House decided was that the majority wanted Public Law 480 to conform to this bill. So now we must make our decision, whether we want both of them to be for 25 years or both of them to be for 40 years.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

Mr. Chairman, concern has been expressed here about the matter of flexibility and the ability of our agencies to extend assistance to developing countries. In that context we are frequently told that other developed nations of the world are extending extensive assistance to these newly developing nations. But the point that is noteworthy is that the assistance being extended by other nations, such as West Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom is almost invariably on terms much more strict, much more severe than even the terms included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. Therefore, I say we should adopt the gentleman's amendment. We would still be in a position to extend assistance to many developing countries on a far more generous basis than almost any other nation, if not any other nation in the world.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Could the gentleman provide us with the name of any country which has ever given credit beyond 25 years for goods of a noncapital or consumable type?

Mr. ADAIR. I am not able to give the gentleman such information. I do not think such assistance has ever been given.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. One of the grounds upon which the administration opposes this kind of an amendment is that we are bringing pressure on other developed countries to make softer loans. I think the gentleman will recall that, for example, in the committee there was mention that Great Britain was giving some interest-free loans. So we are making headway. We are urging the developed countries to make loans on more reasonable terms, and for this reason I think we should not now be raising our own terms when they are at the stage at which they are reducing their terms.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is quite correct in saying that there is testimony before the committee to the effect that we are urging other lending nations to make their terms more liberal. There was some testimony to the effect that this was being done. But even in the light of these allegedly more liberal terms, such terms are still far from being as liberal as the terms permitted under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think we have lost sight of the fact that one title in Public Law 480 provides that outright gifts in the form of great amounts of food have gone abroad on that basis, so when you start to compare our activities in this area with those of other nations, I do not think that you will find any nation in the world that is comparable with regard to the actual nutritional help we have given freely to these underdeveloped nations.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. It is a hope, and I say an unfounded hope, that those countries will liberalize the terms of their loans, both as to amounts of money lent and as to the terms of the loans.

It is strictly a hope. That is all.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct. In the effort being made, there is very little definite indication that it is fruitful.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the British loan, to which the gentleman from New Jersey referred, included an interest-free period as long as 5 years with a length of repayment in total extending 25 years? My guess is that our terms, as proposed in this amendment offered by the gentleman, are still a mile ahead in the sense of liberality as compared with the terms of the British proposal.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The British are now negotiating for some interest-free loans. I think this should be taken into consideration also, that there are only 10 countries involved in all this.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of pursuing this colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey and asking if the terms of the loan that the British are undertaking does include an interest-free period as long as 5 years, or with total terms beyond the 25 years?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, it would. If the loan is interest free, that would extend beyond the 25 years. That is the kind of loan the British are discussing with India. These loans are with countries like India, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Chile, and Nigeria. It is only the large countries which are involved in these loans.

Britain is negotiating for some interest-free loans rather than grants, and this is at our urging.

Mr. ADAIR. Are they repayable in hard currencies of the lending countries?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, they are repayable, although I am not quite sure what the terms are. They are flexible, such as ours are.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the British are so well heeled that they can get into this racket of making practically interest-free loans, what are they doing asking us to extend credits to them to prop up the pound sterling? We have had millions of dollars dedicated backing up the pound sterling.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think the gentleman makes a good point.

Mr. GROSS. It just does not make good sense.

Mr. FINDLEY. I doubt whether we need fear the British outcompeting us for interest-free loans.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would invite the attention of the members of the Committee, and particularly the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey to the table printed at page 72 of the hearings, which is entitled, "Average financial terms of official bilateral commitments by DAC"—that is the Development Assistance Committee—"countries, 1962 to 1964." These are weighted figures. It is very clear that the majority of the loans as to the interest rates by other nations are by no means as favorable as those we have given traditionally. After the gentleman's amendment is adopted, there is still plenty of room for them to meet our loan terms.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, if we refer back to the year 1941—25 years ago—and think of the vast changes that have occurred in the composition of nations on the face of the earth, I think we will have to admit to ourselves that loan terms which extend to 1991—which is 25 years from right now—are indeed generous and adequate and certainly realistic.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman has the table, which states the case since 1964. I think the gentleman should read the footnote under that table, which reads that Great Britain since 1965 has started to lend long-term loans interest-free.

Mr. ADAIR. I think that is the point we made earlier in our discussion. We both agreed that Britain was moving in that direction, although she had a very long way to go.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is the record clear that as of today no other nation has extended more favorable credit terms than are proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas?

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. The table sent around by the author of the amendment I believe gives the figures for the United Kingdom. In 1963 they made $9.1 million of 40-year loans, and in 1964 they made $7.3 million of 40-year loans.

Mr. FINDLEY. Are those figures for the AID agency?

Mr. MORGAN. No. I am talking about the 40-year loans of Great Britain, of the United Kingdom. They did make 40-year loans starting in 1963, in the small amounts I have just mentioned.

Mr. FINDLEY. Do they still continue this practice?

Mr. MORGAN. This table includes only figures for 1964. There is no figure for 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 32, noes 62.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

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

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 84, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, immediately after line 18, insert the following:

"(b) Section 201(d), which relates to interest rates applicable to development loans, is amended by striking out '2½ per centum per annum commencing not later than ten years following the date on which the funds are initially made available under the loan, during which ten-year period the rate of interest shall not be lower than 1 per centum per annum, nor higher than the applicable legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made' and insert in lieu thereof 'the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States having comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum'."

And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It simply provides for the wiping out of the 10-year grace period that presently carries an alleged 1-percent interest rate. Of course, everyone knows that it costs approximately three-quarters of 1 percent to service these loans.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no interest charge, actually, during the first 10 years. I say again that my amendment would repeal the 10-year grace period, and provide that those foreigners who obtain money from this Government through these alleged loans pay the cost to the Federal Government of obtaining the money which today is at the rate of approximately 4⅝ percent.

Mr. Chairman, by what logic and by what standard of justice and decency do we demand that an American citizen and taxpayer who wants to build a home must pay 6 percent or 7 percent interest, while chiseling foreigners are permitted to obtain the same money at the rate of 2½ percent to be paid only after a grace period of 10 years?

Mr. Chairman, can the elderly of this country—beyond the prime of earning capacity, but who need housing, obtain interest-free financing for 10 years and then only 2½ percent for the remaining 30 years? The answer is self-evident, and it takes an inordinate amount of gall for the foreign "do-gooders" to deliberately create such an injustice and inequity.

Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the "foreign aiders," operating out of Foggy Bottom, made a 40-year loan to Turkey, with a 10-year grace period, and at 2½ percent interest for the remaining 30 years. That $3.6 million loan is for the purpose of providing 1,400 jeeps to haul family planners around Turkey.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, if it requires 1,400 jeeps to haul foreign aid family planners over Turkey, what will it take in terms of jeeps and planners when it is decided to "family plan" in India, for instance?

But, Mr. Chairman, back to Turkey—what is the collateral for this loan of $3.6 million on the terms that I have just stated? It will take a jeep, built on the lines of a Rolls Royce, to last for 40 years, or any part of 40 years, and everyone in this Chamber knows it.

The fact is that there is no collateral for this 40-year loan, and the members of this committee know it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time and place to stop this financial double dealing. No Member of Congress can face his constituents, and with a straight face explain why there is one standard of financing for them and another for foreigners.

And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, those of the committee who believe they are doing so well with this foreign loan program might take time to look at the March 1966 report from the General Accounting Office, which shows that some sizable cracks are beginning to show up irrespective of the softness of it.

As of June 30, 1964, according to the General Accounting Office, "AID loans show that the net aggregate exchange rate loss incurred by the loan program, after AID was established in 1961, amounted to the dollar equivalent of $351.2 million."

This report by the General Accounting Office goes on to state that loans already are being converted to grants. In other words, it has been found that these foreigners cannot or will not pay out on them, and this Government has converted them to grants, which means, of course, a gift.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Does the gentleman think that the interest, regardless of what the rate is, is going to be repaid? Or does the gentleman think that any of these loans, whether they are for 25 years or 40 years, are going to be repaid?

Mr. GROSS. Of course these so-called loans will never be paid, but the point is, as the gentleman from South Dakota is well aware, that this program is going to be continued. What I hope to do is to make foreigners do what our American citizens and taxpayers have to do, and that is to start paying the going rate of interest when they get Government money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we have just been up and down the same path on the previous amendment, except that this amendment goes a little beyond the point that the last amendment went as to the restriction of loan terms and the hardening of loan terms.

The main question—the key question again is whether or not we want to assist people. If we do not want to assist these developing countries, then we should vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. On the other hand, if we do want to assist them, then of course we should oppose it.

The fact of the matter is we are getting out of the grant business and into loans. We cannot immediately get into loans as bankable as we would like to see them. Nevertheless, these are hard-dollar, repayable loans. The British terms are less than what the gentleman asks. The British are now giving interest-free loans with a 7-year grace period, and the repayment in 30 years.

Canada is giving loans at three-fourths of 1 percent, with a 10-year grace period and repayment in 50 years.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicated a few moments ago that the British have put out a grand total of about $16 million on the terms that the gentleman is talking about—$16 million.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Whatever the terms are, the fact is that we have come a long way, and we are now converting from the grant business to hard-dollar loans. That is what this program is about. If you want to get back to the grant business, then we should adopt your amendment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true also if this amendment is adopted the net effect of it would be to increase the cost to the taxpayer because, as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, we have changed from the grant program to a loan program, and at least we get some interest that is repayable in American dollars, and the loans are tied to procurement in the United States.

If we should go back to the grant business we will have wiped out the repayment of any interest which we received on loans to date, which is $555,500,000. So if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa we will in effect say that what we want to do is to pass on to the American taxpayers the amount of interest that has been repaid under the loan program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman has made a very profound point, and that is something that we should keep in mind in voting on this amendment.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, if the amendment is adopted, we will be moving back to the grant business again. If we make grants we will have no chance of getting any of this money back because, if a nation could pay normal interest rates it would go to the World Bank or to the commercial banks to borrow. We would not need a development loan program if we accept the philosophy of the gentleman's amendment. We would be back in the grant business again.

We have been moving away from the grant business since 1957. We are making progress. These loans are being repaid as they come due. If we are going to stay in this foreign aid business and be successful in our efforts we must have a development loan program which provides for a grace period and a low rate of interest.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I agree with my distinguished chairman. If we want to get back in the grant business, then we should vote for this amendment, and if not, we should defeat it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 2, beginning in line 23, strike out "$1,000,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$750,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1969".

On page 3, line 3, strike out "June 30, 1971" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and clear. It would reduce the authorization period of the Development Loan Fund from 5 to 3 years. It would reduce the annual authorization for each of the 3 fiscal years from $1 billion to $750 million. If the amendment is adopted, it would have the limiting effect of reducing the authorization by $2,750 million.

Mr. Chairman, it is again worthwhile to look at the pipeline for the development loan program. This year it is estimated to be at almost the same figure that it was a year ago; that is, $1,900 million. There is that much money unexpended in the development loan pipeline at this time.

When this bill was first presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the request for development loan authorization for each of the 5 years was $1,250 million. The committee reduced that amount by $250 million each year to an even $1 billion.

Let us compare that figure with the appropriation request. The appropriation request for this year is, in round figures, $665 million. If my amendment is adopted there is still a margin of $85 million between the authorization ceiling and the appropriation request. Look at it another way. What was appropriated last year for this item? Speaking again in round numbers, $618 million

Let us take still another perspective. What has the committee in the other body done with respect to this item? It has recommended an authorization ceiling of about $620 million. If my amendment is adopted, we will still be approximately $130 million above the authorization ceiling presently imposed by the other body.

In addition, the other body has put a 1-year limitation on development loans. So in all respect, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would be far more liberal than that recommended by the other side of the Capitol.

Finally, it ought to be pointed out, because Members are concerned about this, that there is no money for Vietnam in this section of the bill. It cannot be said, if you vote for this reduction, you are in anywise affecting our program in Vietnam. The money for Vietnam is in the section on supporting assistance. So you can support this amendment reducing the development loan program, knowing that there are almost $2 billion in the pipeline, knowing that we have acted more generously than the other body, and knowing that we have provided more money than was appropriated and used last year. In short, you can effect an economy; you can continue closer congressional control without in any way impairing the program.

If this 5-year program continues, what we are doing in effect is removing from the next two Congresses any real policy consideration with respect to development loans. Certainly there will still be the matter of annual appropriations of dollars, but the policy will be fixed for the next 5 years.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. As I understand the proposal of the gentleman, it reduces this program to 3 years. The present 5-year period has just expired, and the bill would authorize it for 5 years, and the gentleman would reduce it to 3?

Mr. ADAIR. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. The committee reduced the amounts requested by——

Mr. ADAIR. By $250 million for each year.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman's amendment would reduce it to what amount and by how much?

Mr. ADAIR. To $750 million—a reduction of $250 million each year.

Mr. FASCELL. Did the gentleman offer this amendment in committee?

Mr. ADAIR. I spoke about the amendment and said that it would probably be offered on the floor.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentlemen's amendment would shorten the time period covered by the Development Loan Fund authorization in the bill by 2 years and cut the amount by $250 million each year.

The original Executive request was for a 5-year program with $1,250 million for the 5 years. In an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] within the committee, the 5-year period was retained and the amount agreed to was reduced from the requested $1,250 million to $1 billion for the 5 years.

Those of us who believe in the Development Loan Fund believe this is a necessary amount that should remain in the authorization bill.

The Executive has a very good record of holding down the requests for development loans. Those of us who were around here in 1961, when this House adopted the 5-year authorization for the Development Loan Fund, know we have operated with an authorization of $1,500 million over a 5-year period. The Executive at no time from 1961 until the 5 years expired on June 30 of this year has requested the full amount of the authorization of $1,500 million for the Development Loan Fund.

In 1966, the last year of the Development Loan Fund, as the gentleman from Indiana stated, even though there was an authorization of $1,500 million in the 1961 act, the Executive requested only $618,225,000. This year, even though they are requesting an authorization of $1 billion, they are only making an appropriation request of $665 million.

So this is a just a paper cut. This is not going to save one single dollar. This authorizes more than the Executive wants for fiscal 1967. Those of us who have worked with this bill since the Development Loan Fund began in 1961 know that the authorization request for the Development Loan money has always been greater than the appropriation request. These figures ought to be flexible. There are only 10 countries now scheduled to share in this program. The executive came in with a request for an appropriation of $665 million and programed this amount of money. The executive has in the past been strict in holding down the authorization.

I believe the amendment is nothing but a paper cut and ask for a defeat of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the statements made by the gentleman support in part the position I have taken. I see no reason why we should authorize, particularly for a number of years ahead, so large an amount as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just pointed out, when the appropriation requests are invariably much smaller. It seems to me that that is not a responsible way to legislate. I tried to make that point.

Mr. MORGAN. If that is not responsible, then this House has not been responsible since 1957.

Mr. ADAIR. Some of us have tried to make that point since 1957.

Mr. MORGAN. We have always had a higher authorization than the appropriation requested by the executive branch, so, according to the gentleman, this House has not been responsible since 1957.

Mr. ADAIR. Would not the gentleman admit if my amendment is adopted it would still leave a margin of $85 million between the request for appropriations and the ceiling to be imposed by the amendment?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman's amendment exceeds the amount which the Executive has put in the appropriation request, and therefore allows some flexibility.

The damage done by the gentleman's amendment is that it would reduce the loan program from a 5-year request to a 3-year request. This would impair the long-range principle of the development loan program.

I have confidence that the Executive will hold down the requests, because for 5 years the Executive has never come in for the full amount previously authorized.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 35, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 2, immediately after line 12, insert the following:

"(a) Strike out the first sentence of Section 201(b), which relates to general authority, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(b) The President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars upon such terms and conditions as the President may determine except that the length of such loans shall not exceed 25 years nor shall the grace period of such loans exceed five years for other than capital developments. Such loans shall be utilized to promote economic development of less developed, friendly countries and areas, with emphasis upon assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities.'"

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, Members will recognize that this amendment is very similar to the one which was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL]. If Members have copies of that amendment before them, it would be changed to the extent that at the end of the first sentence it would strike the period and add the words "for other than capital developments."

What this amendment would do is permit authority to remain for loans to be made up to 40 years for capital developments but, for consumer goods, like the food available under Public Law 480, to limit it to 25-year loans and 5-year grace period. There is a tremendous amount of aid, as the chairman of the committee indicated, under Public Law 480. Public Law 480 is about equal with this program. There is just no sense in providing 40-year loans for food.

One of the examples used in the Committee on Agriculture why the Public Law 480 loans should be the same as AID was that under AID you could make 40-year

loans for fertilizer, which is a consumable commodity. If my amendment is adopted, it would mean that you could make the loan for a fertilizer plant in another country for 40 years but not for fertilizer, which they buy from the United States. I can see that there are reasons for long-term loans for a fertilizer plant or a bauxite plant or for highways or waterworks in some countries, because no matter what the government would be, the project is durable and would still be there for the next government and the people to use. However, when it comes to loans for countries to buy food, then I think we do need a limitation of this nature. To me this is very reasonable. We need this kind of a guideline. We could not make this kind of an amendment to the Public Law 480 bill. We wanted some uniformity between the consumable items that could be procured under Public Law 480 and the consumable items that could be procured under this program. Therefore, I believe that this would be the type of language which would give a direction that this House would want to give to the administration that they make their loans differently between the capital development and the kind of loans for which they would buy food or fertilizer or some item that would be immediately consumed and have really nothing to show for it in the years ahead.

However, if it is some kind of development where there is capital available for them for years beyond the length of the loan or for a good long period of time during the loan, then this would be permitted for a full 40 years as the bill now provides.

Mr. Chairman, that is a brief explanation of my amendment, and I believe you can all understand it. Therefore, I ask you to support this amendment in order to make this program and Public Law 480 operate in a way that we could feel is a responsible fashion.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I have had any complaint from my businessmen who deal with foreign governments or foreign businesses, it is the fact that they find it is extremely difficult to compete on the market in providing competitive terms and interest rates. I cannot see where it makes sense to put our businessmen in a noncompetitive position with foreign businessmen. I just do not understand that kind of logic.

Therefore, I think, if I understand this amendment correctly, it would do two things: It would make one policy for capital goods and one policy for consumable items and, in a sense and in a very real sense, it would make it very difficult for our businessmen to be competitive in sales of consumable and agricultural goods in the world market.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 34, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants

SEC. 103. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 211, which relates to general authority, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Not to exceed $10,000,000 of funds made available under section 212, or under section 252 (other than loan funds), may be used for assistance, on such terms and conditions as the President may specify, to research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries."

(b) Section 212, which relates to authorization, is amended by striking out all after "President for" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 to carry out the purposes of section 211 not to exceed $231,310,000. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

(c) Section 214, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), strike out "to hospitals outside the United States founded or sponsored by United States citizens and serving as centers for medical education and research" and insert in lieu thereof "to institutions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, and to hospital centers for medical education and research outside the United States, founded or sponsored by United States citizens".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out all after "this section, for" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $10,989,000. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

(3) At the end thereof, add the following new subsection:

"(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of section 214(b), in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1967, $1,000,000 in foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States."

Mr. GROSS (during reading of the title). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this title?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no amendments.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to an application for assistance filed by the Ludhiana Christian Medical College in India. The sum of $450,000 is needed for the construction of an additional 72-bed wing at this college for the treatment of patients.

Bishop J. Waskom Pickett, counselor for the college here in the United States, and the Reverend Charles Reynolds were in Washington recently to discuss the project with AID officials and I am informed that AID is very favorably inclined, having conducted an inspection of the facility. However, it was also reported that all of the funds anticipated for the next fiscal year already have been assigned to other projects.

I would like to urge AID to reconsider this application carefully and to make every effort to fund this project. This is an excellent way to make use of foreign currencies and we can make no better contribution to international understanding than by the expansion of American health and educational facilities serving the people of other lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title III—Investment guaranties

SEC. 104. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 221(b), which relates to general authority for investment guaranties, is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (1), strike out "$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000,000,000".

(2) In the third proviso of paragraph (2), strike out "$300,000,000" and "$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$375,000,000" and "$215,000,000", respectively, and strike out "Federal Housing Administration" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(3) In the fourth proviso of paragraph (2), strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

(b) Section 221(c), which relates to limitations on investment guaranties, is amended by striking out "twenty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirty years".

(c) Section 222, which relates to general provisions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In the case of any loan investment for housing guaranteed under section 221(b)(2) or section 224, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall prescribe the rate of interest allowable to the eligible United States investor, which rate shall not be less than one-half of 1 per centum above the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In no event shall the Administrator prescribe an allowable rate of interest which exceeds by more than 1 per centum the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by such Department."

(d) Section 224, which relates to housing projects in Latin American countries, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)(1), strike out "Federal Housing Administration" and insert in lieu there of "Department of Housing and Urban Development".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out $400,000,000" and insert in lieu there of "$500,000,000: *Provided*, That $350,000,000 be used for the purposes of section 224(b)(1)".

(3) In the last proviso of subsection (c), strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1970".

Mr. FASCELL (during the reading of title III). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do this to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a question with respect to investment guarantees.

I understand from testimony on page 516, or 616, of the hearings—I am not sure—that the Export-Import Bank is endeavoring to compel U.S. investors in less-developed countries either to assign that portion of the aid investment guarantee giving coverage for retained earnings and the like over to the Export-Import Bank, or to prohibit them from securing special coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this type of protection is specifically provided for under our act.

What is the chairman's view with respect to the actions of the Bank, as alleged?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I think that the legislative history of the investment guarantee program is clear, that the program is intended to encourage U.S. investors and not for the benefit of the Export-Import Bank or any other Government agency.

Mr. Chairman, if we encourage investors to go to the less-developed countries through the investment guarantee program, then I do not think that any agency of the U.S. Government should either try to benefit itself from that program or to prohibit U.S. investors from participating to the full extent in that program.

Mr. Chairman, the Export-Import Bank makes its loans to foreign corporations or groups. The AID guarantee program is for the U.S. investor.

Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that this would have been crystal-clear to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for that very clear explanation, and I believe it is a very important one, Mr. Chairman, because one of the most successful programs we have had has been the investment guarantee program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be unfortunate if in another program, which is also very good, the investment guarantee under AID would be sought as a collateral or means of collateral to insure, either directly or indirectly, transactions involving the Export-Import Bank. If there are some additional needs for collateral or security, or for other measures on the part of that institution, I believe they should be developed independently by the Bank or through the medium of additional legislation.

I think it would be unfortunate to mix up these two programs by having the investment guarantees issued under aid as security under another program.

Mr. Chairman, section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act provides the authority for the guarantee of investments by U.S. citizens in pilot or demonstration housing projects in Latin America. I supported this legislation in the original Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It was evident to me then that one of the major problems in Latin America which was causing social unrest was the lack of housing. I felt that one way to help provide the greatest impact on this housing deficiency was through American technological know-how and financial support. The authority provided by section 224 made possible the demonstration by American homebuilders and financial institutions, proven U.S. techniques for building, financing, and marketing privately developed housing.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have pushed for the continuation of this authority. Over the last several years, I have offered and had accepted in committee important amendments which have facilitated the operation of the housing program and made it a more attractive source for the supply of homes in many Latin American countries today.

In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, I sponsored the amendment in committee that raised from 75 percent to 100 percent the amount of the loan investment that could be guaranteed under this program. This was necessary at that time because the program was hampered by the inability to obtain long-term investment funds with only a 75-percent guarantee, when the FHA, in this country, could offer a 100-percent guarantee.

In 1962, 1963, and 1964, successively, I cosponsored and supported amendments which raised the total face amount of the guarantees available to build housing projects from $10 million to $250 million. These increased amounts were essential in keeping the program moving ahead as more and more American firms became aware of the guarantee availability and the importance of the program to the Alliance for Progress increased.

In 1965, I sponsored in committee the amendment that retained in the law the authority to continue guarantees for pilot and demonstration housing projects. At that time, the Agency for International Development did not propose to continue support for projects of this sort beyond the $250 million which was then provided for in the act. It was my feeling, however, and the majority of the committee agreed, that housing projects of this nature make a substantial contribution to economic development and have immediate impact upon social conditions by alleviating housing shortages. Also, I actively worked for and supported the amendment in 1965 that increased the authorized amount for guarantees from $250 million to $400 million.

During the committee markup of the Foreign Assistance Act for this year, I proposed and the committee accepted an additional amendment to the Latin American housing section which will further facilitate the use of this authority. The amendment prescribed a minimum rate of interest that the Administrator of AID could allow eligible U.S. investors to earn on loan investment for housing not only in Latin America but worldwide as well. The housing guarantee program was being adversely affected by the low-interest-yield rate of 5½ percent fixed by the Treasury Department for investments in these oversea housing projects. The Department had fixed a rate of 5½ percent which unfortunately not only was below the current money market but below the FHA rate which currently is 5¾ percent. This made it extremely difficult to obtain commitments of funds from investors for oversea housing projects when a higher yield was available domestically. It therefore represented a major handicap to the housing guarantee program.

Under my amendment the Administrator was required to allow a rate of interest for investments of not less than one-half of 1 percent above the current FHA rate. This increased yield will make investments in these housing projects more attractive and enhance further the program's success. The amendment also permits the Administrator, if he finds it necessary in order to obtain adequate financing, to allow an interest return rate up to 1 percent above current FHA rates.

I also supported in committee an amendment which increased from $400 million to $500 million the amount authorized for the overall Latin American housing program including these pilot and demonstration housing projects. Further, I offered in committee the amendment that earmarked $350 million of the $500 million authorized to be used solely for these pilot and demonstration private housing projects. I wanted to be assured that the guarantee program would continue to support private housing projects which were so successfully demonstrating U.S. techniques of building, financing and marketing. The success of the program was unquestionable. Nearly $250 million of the total amount that had been provided was already being used to construct houses or was in process of development. Through February of this year, 14 housing projects had been completed or were under construction. They involved a total investment of $82.2 million and covered the construction of 16,000 dwelling units. Another 36 projects involving $157.2 million in investments and 28,000 dwelling units had been authorized and final plans were in process of development.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Latin American housing program is additional evidence of the immense contribution that private American know-how and investment can make toward national progress in these countries. I fully support the program and urge its continued support by the Congress.

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

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word about the Latin American housing program.

I have supported this program from its inception. I believe that this undertaking, particularly the private pilot

projects, has served a dual purpose. On the one hand it has helped to alleviate at least in some small measure the critical housing shortage in Latin America. On the other hand it has also demonstrated how through the use of private enterprise and individual initiative this great problem can be ultimately advanced toward solution.

Last year the administration requested an increase of $100 million in the ceiling on the amount of guarantees that may be outstanding for Latin American housing. At the same time, however, the administration proposed to terminate the self-liquidating pilot or demonstration housing program which had been such a success in the past.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs did not go along with the later proposal. Instead the committee adopted an amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and myself which reinstated the pilot housing program and and increased the amount of guarantees available for this purpose by $50 million.

During the hearings this year, the administration again expressed its desire not to continue the pilot housing program in Latin America and to use the available funds for other, but related, undertakings.

Again, the Committee on Foreign Affairs rejected this approach. In strong language the committee expressed its belief that this endeavor is one of the most successful ones in the Alliance for Progress. And we went a step further by increasing to $350 million the total amount of guarantees that may be used solely for pilot or demonstration private housing projects of types similar to those insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my strong support for this program. It is a tool for demonstrating U.S. techniques for the building, financing, and marketing of privately developed housing. It is a program which has demonstrated its merits. I trust that the executive branch, spurred by these repeated expressions of congressional intent, will apply itself to the administration of this program with the energy and the resources which it deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—Alliance for Progress

SEC. 105. Title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Alliance for Progress, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 251(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting immediately after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In carrying out this title, the President shall seek to encourage each recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development."

(b) Section 252, which relates to authorization, is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "use beginning" the first place it appears and all that follows down through "year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 through 1971, $850,000,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended and which, except for $150,000,000 in each such fiscal year".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out "1964 through 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1968 through 1971".

(3) In the last sentence, strike out "June 30, 1965 and June 30, 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1967, through June 30, 1971".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 7, line 16, strike out "$850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "750,000,000."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is a practical, constructive amendment. It merely seeks to save $100 million from the expenditures of this act, and it is aimed at the Alliance for Progress where we have been more than generous over the years.

I would like to point out to the Members that we had fond hopes—I should not say that we had fond hopes—but the proponents of the Alliance for Progress program had fond hopes 5 years ago when this program was developed with great fanfare, that one of the products that would be immediately visible from our new investments in Latin America would be stability in Latin American governments. Yet less than a month ago Argentina, supposedly one of the three great powers of Latin America, went through another upheaval in government despite all the funds that have been poured in under this program.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, this is a very judicious, very mild and a very constructive amendment. I do not believe it would endanger the program. I think it would impose necessary restraint on the administrator of the program. I think that at least at some point this afternoon we ought to give the taxpayers of America some relief, and I think a $100 million cut in the authorization for the Alliance for Progress is the place to start.

I suspect that there might be some opposition to my amendment. I am not so optimistic as to think it will be accepted quickly. I did have the good fortune in committee to have a number of amendments accepted by the chairman and the majority, and this, of course, inspired me to try to develop other constructive amendments, one of which is this amendment that I offer at the present time.

But I think a $100 million cut is small. I think it at the same time shows a constructive effort on the part of the House to put a minimum of restraint on the spending under this program. I think as long as we are not going to touch the 5-year phase, which is so sacred to many of the Members, that this amendment has great merit, and I am hopeful that it will receive substantial support, more so, perhaps, than the other amendments which have been turned down this afternoon.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I know that the distinguished gentleman, who is a member of the committee, attempts to be constructive. I think he has pushed his batting average a little bit too far. I do not recall that he offered this amendment in committee. Of course, he has a right to offer it on the floor of the House for Members to consider. But I must agree with him that it is probably asking a little bit too much that he could get it accepted here without opposition, because notwithstanding the sincerity of his attempt, all he would do would be to gut the Alliance for Progress. That can hardly be called constructive.

At the same time the amendment is most unfortunate in its interpretations. Notwithstanding the fact that the Alliance for Progress has been and is understood to be a long-term program, it has moved along surprisingly well. Governments in Latin America are taking actions which we thought just a few years ago were not even possible—for example, tax reforms and land reforms, among others.

But in the middle of this program, when we are beginning to see some daylight and when we are gaining some momentum, and when we are attempting, from both an administrative standpoint and from a legislative standpoint, to make what amounts to a clear commitment to a program that should be extended, we should not suddenly substantially cut it without reason or explanation. That does not seem to me to be logical, particularly when it would have the interpretation placed upon it which it would have within our own Western Hemisphere.

Notwithstanding the trouble we have all over the world, I think all of us here are very cognizant of the fact that tremendous strides have been made in Latin America in recent years. This is no time to be taking any kind of a step backward in the question of funding those programs which are giving these people some encouragement to do for themselves what needs to be done. I think it is very, very important that the Alliance for Progress continue to be authorized at the funding level which has been set forth by the administration in view of the progress that has been shown.

U.S. policy in the Western Hemisphere has been truly bipartisan almost since the founding of the Republic. This spirit was reflected most recently when the leadership on both sides of the aisle joined with the President on his visit to Mexico.

In recent years we have forged ahead in promoting and strengthening relationships in the hemisphere. In the spirit of foreign policy bipartisanship it is only proper that we should note the contribution to our present hemispheric policy by President Eisenhower, his brother, Milton Eisenhower, Douglas Dillon, the former Secretary of the Treasury, and Robert Anderson, also a former Secretary of the Treasury. The first three made significant contributions to building the policy now known as the Alliance for Progress. Robert Anderson is leading the negotiations with Panama.

With the help of the Alliance for Progress, Latin American overall economic growth is now going forward at a healthy rate—about 6 percent annually. And even if one discounts the population growth rate, the per capita growth rate is still over 2.5 percent. While we would all like to see more, this is hardly stagnation.

Latin American exports are growing at the rate of 3 percent per year and imports at the rate of 3.5 percent.

U.S. financial assistance to Latin America is now running at the rate of over $1 billion annually. In Latin America the annual volume of national savings has increased by $1.5 billion.

In the words of the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—CIAP:

The basic factors of Latin American economic development during the last 2 years and the prospects for the coming year are encouraging.

On the social side, this committee noted with satisfaction the widespread effort going forward to create institutions which finance social projects and private external assistance of at least $160 million devoted almost entirely to social programs. Nevertheless, the committee added that the solution to social problems in Latin America—as indeed it does in the United States—depends fundamentally on the adoption of suitable tax and tax collection policies.

The committee's points on expanded educational efforts and cultural exchanges are exactly in line with the administration's policies and action.

The record shows that one of the most significant overall results in Latin America over the past 18 months from the Alliance for Progress has been the strengthening of democracy. For in this year and a half there has been only a single case in which a democratically elected government has departed from office by other than constitutional means. Eleven countries have held elections at the local or national level during the period and the results have been respected, even where opposition candidates have won by narrow margins. Four of these elections occurred within the last 2 months and three others are scheduled in the next several months. In the Dominican Republic, where a few months ago some were saying an election was impossible, the free elections were held on June 1, 1966, and prospects for continued expansion of democratic institutions will proceed.

U.S. policy is in strong support for private enterprise, and realistic in its awareness of communism.

As pointed out by David Rockefeller, in an excellent article appearing in the April 1966 issue of Foreign Affairs, recent performance on the private enterprise side has been relatively good. He notes that private foreign direct investment is increasing. If reinvested earnings of U.S. companies are counted together with direct investment flows from the United States, the target of $300 million annually for such investment set in 1961 has been exceeded. Capital flight from Latin America is not now a serious problem.

The issue of communism has to be placed in its proper perspective. Certainly it is a problem. As the President pointed out in his speech in Mexico City on April 15:

We believe the struggle for social justice and more efficient and equitable use of natural resources must be led by each country in its own behalf. My administration will not be deterred by those who tenaciously or selfishly cling to special privileges from the past. We will not be deterred by those who say that to risk change is to risk communism.

We do not wish to see communism spread in this hemisphere, but we believe that the threat to the liberty and independence of the Latin American peoples from communism cannot be met merely by force. We will continue to concentrate our assistance mainly in economic and social fields and to encourage our Latin American neighbors, where possible, to limit their outlays for military purposes. We are encouraged that democracy flourishes in countries such as Mexico where expenditures for education and development are high.

We do not underestimate for a moment the significance of the Tri-Continental Conference that was held in Havana in January 1966. Cuba, the Soviet Union and Communist China clearly put the world on notice that Latin America is a prime target for subversive aggression. Democratic Latin America responded immediately and with vigor. The threat posed by the Tri-Continental Conference was immediately discussed within the Organization of American States and the American Republics put Communist countries on notice that they would not tolerate Communist subversion in this hemisphere. The Latin American Republics also discussed the issue in the United Nations. In a letter to the Secretary General they brought out sharply the inconsistency between the pious approval by the Soviet Union and Cuba of a resolution on nonintervention and the openly interventionist activities of the Soviet and Cuba representatives at the Tri-Continental Conference. In sum, none of the free countries in this hemisphere have ignored the threat which the Tri-Continental Conference posed to freedom. At the same time, none of them intend to be deterred by this threat from the equally important work of the hemisphere which is economic and social progress.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI], would not agree with me that if we cut 15 cents out of this bill the proponents would say we were gutting it. I have heard that expression used time after time in this debate and, of course, time after time in previous years. It seems if we take anything at all out of this bill, it is being gutted. Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. May I make one observation? The gentleman from Iowa and I have listened while the gentleman from Florida delivered a scorching attack on this amendment. We have heard the argument that the Alliance for Progress has supposedly brought countries in Latin America into the 20th century. If we would study history we would find that, in proportion, there were fewer revolutions in Latin America prior to the social unrest generated by the Alliance for Progress program than there have been since. Where is the progress from the spending?

Mr. GROSS. I seem to recall that everything was supposed to be lovely and the goose was hanging high down in Argentina. We have turned loose substantial Alliance for Progress and other giveaway funds in Argentina. But the other day, out of thin air—at least the State Department had no prior knowledge of it—there was another military takeover in Argentina.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] talks about this hemisphere and the need to keep out communism. Why, bless his heart and soul, we had a Communist government planted in the Western Hemisphere for the first time under the Democrats.

The Alliance for Progress has not stopped communism in the Western Hemisphere. We got it here after the Alliance for Progress was put in motion.

I would think somewhere along the line the gentlemen who are the proponents and sponsors of this giveaway program would begin to have some regard for the taxpayers of this country and the burdens that they are going to have to carry, and the burdens upon their children. I would think that some day that would give them a little pause.

This bill started out at $3.4 billion for 1 year. It is now a 2-year program providing $4.1 billion in the first year, and $4.2 billion in the second year. Those are the approximate figures. This is not even the bill that the administration asked for originally. We moved in—not "we," but you moved in and added hundreds of millions of dollars to it.

In all conscience I ask when are we going to give the taxpayers of this country a break?

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we are going to give them a break right now, because we are setting up a program which is independent, which meets the requirements of the administration's request in a great measure, but which is not a rubber stamp. I think the gentleman should be pleased on that point.

Since the gentleman used my name, I may say I did not talk about communism. I talked about freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. GROSS. Can there be communism and freedom at one and the same time?

Mr. FASCELL. I would not want to quibble with the gentleman on sematics. The Alliance for Progress came about after that to prevent any more Cuba's, and we have not had any more Communist invasion since that time.

Mr. GROSS. Who engineered the fiasco of the invasion of Cuba? Who was around at that time? Communism could have been stopped in its tracks at that time in the Western Hemisphere and stopped in its ability to spawn communism all over the rest of the Western Hemisphere. What happened on that fateful day in April 1961?

Mr. FASCELL. First of all, we did not have any Alliance for Progress. Sec-

ondly, we had to have a bad situation in order to have a fiasco.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 36, noes 42.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

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

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VIII—Southeast Asia multilateral and regional programs

SEC. 106. Chapter 2 of part I the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new titles:

"TITLE VIII—SOUTHEAST ASIA MULTILATERAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 271. GENERAL PROVISIONS.—The acceleration of social and economic progress in southeast Asia is important to the achievement of the United States foreign policy objectives of peace and stability in that area. It is the sense of Congress that this objective would be served by an expanded effort by the countries of solutheast Asia and other interested countries in cooperative programs for social and economic development of the region, employing both multilateral and bilateral channels of assistance.

"SEC. 272. SPECIAL PROVISIONS.—In providing assistance to further the purposes of this title the President shall take into account—

"(1) initiatives in the field of social and economic development by Asian peoples and institutions;

"(2) regional economic cooperation and integration in southeast Asia;

"(3) the extent of participation by other potential donor countries;

"(4) the degree of peaceful cooperation among the countries of southeast Asia toward the solution of common problems; and

"(5) the ability of multilateral institutions or other administering authorities to carry out projects and programs effectively, efficiently, and economically.

"SEC. 273. AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to utilize funds otherwise available to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act (other than title VI of this chapter) to furnish assistance under this title on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in order to promote social and economic development and stability in southeast Asia.

"TITLE IX—UTILIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS IN DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 281. In carrying out programs authorized in this chapter, emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental institutions."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this title be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that be over to line 18, page 9?

Mr. MORGAN. I think it would be over to page 10, line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that takes us to page 10, line 2.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ADAIR

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 8, beginning in line 17, strike out ", employing both multilateral and bilateral channels of assistance".

Page 9, line 8, strike out "multilateral institutions or other".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to change the language of the new title VIII, sections 271 and 272, to eliminate any authority granted to the President to channel bilateral aid funds through multilateral agencies.

We had testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that such channeling had a serious adverse effect upon the balance of payments because it did not retain the restrictions placed in this act to protect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

Second, Mr. Chairman, if this provision remains in the law, it negates section 620(e)(1), which protects U.S. foreign investment by providing for the cessation of U.S. bilateral aid to countries expropriating U.S. property without making prompt and full value compensation.

Third, if this remains in, there will be no effect to congressional policy directives regarding foreign aid contained in section 620(e) through 620(m), which include restrictions on aid to Cuba among other things.

Another objection to this language remaining in the bill would be that it would negate the congressional directives in sections 202 and 252 requiring the use of not less than 50 percent of development loan funds for economic development through private enterprise.

Another objection if this language remains is that the regular authorization and appropriation procedure for our U.S. contributions to multilateral financial institutions which provide the important opportunity for congressional review and public discussion would be nonexistent.

Lastly, the policy of minimum interest rates on development loan and cargo preference requirements on AID-financed ships would no longer be effective.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in existing law, in section 205, as follows:

The President, after consideration of the extent of additional participation by other countries, may make available, in addition to any other funds available for such purposes, on such terms and conditions as he determines, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for this title to the International Development Association, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or the International Finance Corporation for use pursuant to the laws governing United States participation in such institution.

However, in recent years the Committee on Appropriations has written language into the appropriation bill which removed the effectiveness of that section.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope, based upon last year's Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, since it contains substantially the same language that has been in the appropriations act for several years, that this amendment would be adopted. That language provides that no part of this appropriation may be used to carry out the provisions of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as mended.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of what I have been saying is this: that section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act says, in effect, that you can use 15 percent of development loans through specified, multilateral agencies, but the Congress in the appropriation law said this could not be done.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment if adopted would carry on the same policy in the new section of the law.

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

Mr. Chairman, one of our prime objectives in the foreign aid bill and in related legislation which we have considered in the past, has been to encourage self-help and to encourage other countries to cooperate with each other on a regional basis.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most dramatic results of our efforts in this regard, occurred in southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's amendment should prevail, it would disrupt some of the most progressive steps that have been taken on the part of the various countries in southeast Asia. It would certainly cause havoc with the Asian Development Bank and the Mekong River Valley project and the southeast Asia highway program.

The very purpose of the proposed title VIII is to further encourage those countries to cooperate with each other and to undertake other multilateral self-help programs.

This title reaffirms the very policy of the United States by promoting progress through cooperative, self-help efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana would cause great damage.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree—and perhaps I did not have the time to develop this as fully as it should have been developed—to the extent that we channel money under this new section VIII through multilateral agencies, we are depriving those funds of many of the safeguards and many of the guidelines that we have laboriously written into this legislation through the years for bilateral assistance?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As the gentleman knows, there are no funds authorized or requested under this title for this year. However, it is our committee's intent, expressed in the report, that such funds as may be used pursuant to this title, be

used subject to the safeguards and basic conditions which are in the law. I can assure the gentleman we will have an opportunity to review the implementation of this title next year and to pursue the issues that the gentleman is concerned about.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. Is not the gentleman then making an argument for a 1-year rather than a 2-year extension of this program if the gentleman says that in another year we will have, and we ought to have, the opportunity to review these deficiencies which I allege exist, because of the failure of protections which we have written into the law, and if we do not have the bill before us next year we will not have that opportunity?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As I said, we will have the opportunity to check on this matter further next year. Also, if the President should use development loan funds for the purposes of this title, the committee expects that he will use such funds in accordance with the provisions of title I governing development loans.

I do want to point out, and I am sure that the gentleman will not disagree, that if his amendment prevails, the programs that are now underway, such fine cooperative programs in southeast Asia as the Mekong River Valley project, would be placed in jeopardy.

I wish the gentleman had seen, and I am not sure whether he did or not, the documentary film which showed the kind of cooperation that every country in the area has given to this project, and how they helped each other in order to make the project work.

The gentleman's amendment would defeat this type of cooperative effort. I therefore hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 3—INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 301(a), which relates to general authority, is amended by inserting immediately after "by such organizations" the following: ", and in the case of the Indus Basin Development Fund administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to make grants and loans payable as to principal and interest in United States dollars and subject to the provisions of section 201(d),".

(b) Section 301(b), which relates to general authority, is amended by striking out "United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the United Nations Special Fund" and inserting in lieu thereof "United Nations Development Program" and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by this Act shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime."

(c) Section 301(c), which relates to assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Contributions by the United States for the fiscal year 1967 shall not exceed $13,300,000. No contributions under this subsection shall be made except on the condition that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization."

(d) Section 302, which relates to authorization, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for grants to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds available under any other Act for such purposes, for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $140,433,000.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for loans for Indus Basin Development to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds available under this or any other Act for such purposes, for use beginning in the fiscal year 1968, $51,220,000.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the fiscal year 1967, $1,000,000 for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund during the calendar year 1967. Funds made available under this subsection shall be in addition to funds available under this or any other Act for such contributions and shall not be taken into account in computing the aggregate amount of United States contributions to such fund for the calendar year 1967.

"(d) None of the funds available to carry out this chapter shall be contributed to any international organization or to any foreign government or agency thereof to pay the costs of developing or operating any volunteer program of such organization, government, or agency relating to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower."

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of this title be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 12, following line 12, insert the following:

"(e) None of the funds provided in this act shall be made available to any international organization, located within the United States, a member of which employs directly or indirectly, or otherwise gives sanctuary to any foreign national who has been determined to have been a spy or espionage agent, or who has sought by other clandestine means to violate the security of the United States Government."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is one amendment that will not and does not seek to cut the funds, and therefore will not gut the bill.

As a matter of fact, it just might save some money.

I am prompted to offer this amendment by the story which appeared in the paper this morning about the two Czechoslovakian spies who have been discovered in this country. Our Government has asked that one of them be deported, and he probably will be deported, but the other, the prime mover, a Czech by the name of Pisk, is located in the United Nations. He is the individual who originated this espionage effort in the State Department. He is the one who, apparently, first made contact with a State Department employee and exchanged ideas on how to steal the secrets of this Government by planting a listening device in the State Department.

It is incredible that this spy, the originator of this business, should be able to remain overnight in the United States.

Let me read what a spokesman for the U.S. delegation in the United Nations is quoted in this morning's newspaper as saying:

In New York, U.S. delegates to the U.N. indicated that Pisk would not be expelled from the United States. "Mr. Pisk has done nothing to violate the U.N. headquarters agreement," the sources said. "Therefore, no action is contemplated on him here at this time."

I want to see this spy kicked out of the United States. I want to see some kind of showdown here and now as to whether Congress is going to tolerate the United Nations as a sanctuary for spies in this country. The purpose of my amendment is to see that no international organization gets any funds through the Congress of the United States and from American taxpayers if it provides a sanctuary for any foreign agent who has sought by clandestine means to violate the security of the United States.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. I certainly wish to join in the sentiments expressed here and to lend my wholehearted support of this amendment. I fail to see how anyone could refuse to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. This is a great and free country, and because of that freedom and the unlimited opportunities and lack of restrictions here, it is very easy for any citizen to engage in espionage. But I think it is unconscionable that this country should help pay the bill of any organization which engages in espionage activities, as this particular Czechoslovakian has done.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking in favor of this amendment, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of my objections to the passage of this entire measure.

First, I fail to see the propriety for the United States to continue to pour millions of dollars into the United Nations and its satellite organizations while we find some of these funds being used directly against our best interests. I am speaking specifically of the $37.5 million

which is 40 percent of the total funds for the operation of the U.N. Special Fund. This fund is being used to help finance the teaching of technology at the University of Havana, and it is unbelievable that American taxpayers should be required to help finance the teaching of Cuban soldiers in advance technology.

Second. I do not believe that we are getting full benefit from the military assistance which has amounted to over $37 billion since World War II. The $917 million for military assistance included in this bill does not include at least another billion dollars for paying and supplying the South Vietnamese Army.

What disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that of the 55 nations designated for military aid this year, only 1, Korea, has sent troops to Vietnam.

Third, we are grateful to Australia and New Zealand for assisting us in Vietnam, but neither of these countries is listed for military assistance in this bill.

Fourth. I oppose this foreign aid bill because this year we will be virtually abdicating our congressional review through the 2-year authorization proposed. Constantly, the Congress is under pressure to relinquish more and more of its constitutional prerogatives of controlling our Nation's purse strings, and I, for one, am not willing to acquiesce further in this regard. We have a responsibility to the American people to keep some sort of lid on our foreign aid expenditures.

Fifth. The amount included in this bill is greatly excessive and without justification. The President requested, in his words, a "barebones" appropriation for foreign assistance. The facts are that we presently have over $6.7 billion available from prior years' funds for expenditure in the foreign assistance field. When you couple this amount with the approximately $5.6 billion being authorized through the various organizations for foreign assistance, we find that the appropriations will be about four times the amount of the so-called barebones request made by the administration.

Sixth. Mr. Chairman, the terms and interest rates on the loans being made under our foreign aid program are totally unrealistic, and, in my judgment, adverse to our best interests in many areas. While we are granting 40-year loans at 2½ percent with a 10-year grace period, we find the Communist countries presently granting loans on a 10- to 12-year term at much higher rates. Actually, Mr. Chairman, some of the loans made by this country are being used by other countries to repay obligations or debts to Communist countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, instead of continuing unabatedly this foreign giveaway program, we should limit our foreign assistance to those nations, and only those nations, which have bona fide strategic value to the U.S. interests. We should terminate assistance to those countries aiding the Communists in any manner or form, or to those countries which play one side against the other in accepting handouts from both the United States and the Communist nations. Additionally, the report of the committee shows that we could substantially reduce the personnel complement of the Agency for International Development bureaucracy without adversely affecting its responsibilities.

I believe further, Mr. Chairman, that our economic aid programs should be changed from a line of credit to a real resource basis providing U.S. goods and technical services for specific projects. If this were done, program loans should be phased out as quickly as possible because of the adverse effects this type of aid is having on the U.S. balance of payments.

In my judgment, this foreign assistance bill is just another step toward the great international society, which will be financed by the American taxpayers. After all, we represent them, not the people of the world, and it is high time that we considered the financial problems of our overburdened taxpayers here at home, instead of trying to buy friends throughout the world.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe the gentleman has a good point. In fact, this particular individual did violate his employment under the United Nations organization, the United Nations Charter. No employee is to act as an agent of any particular country, but must act only on behalf of the United Nations, and this fellow completely broke his agreement and broke the United Nations Charter in that regard. I agree with you.

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. I did not understand that the individual to whom the gentleman referred was in the employ of the United Nations at the time of the alleged acts. Was he?

Mr. GROSS. He is in the employ of the Czechoslovakian Government's delegation to the United Nations. He is in the United Nations at the present time, if the reports in the newspapers are accurate.

Mr. FASCELL. I know, but in response to the point raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the issue is whether he violated the terms of the agreement with respect to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I am not concerned with whether he violated a United Nations agreement. I am concerned with Congress tolerating and the American taxpayers putting up money for any international organization within the United States to give sanctuary to a spy.

Mr. FASCELL. So am I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think there is no one here on either side of the aisle who would want to tolerate spies in the United States. Certainly the State Department does not want to tolerate spies. They are the ones that broke up the operation to which the gentleman has referred.

This is a very simple amendment. All it really does is to prohibit the United States from giving any money to the United Nations. If we want to break up the United Nations, then I say let us vote for this amendment. On the other hand, let those authorities entrusted with the security of the United States pursue, prosecute, and take whatever measures are necessary against spies who operate in this country.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not do anything of the kind. If the United Nations—located on the soil of the United States—gets rid of this spy, it gets its money. If it does not, there would be no contribution by the United States. It is just that simple.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Who is to judge who is the spy—you, or the State Department, or our Government?

Mr. GROSS. Who usually determines who is the spy?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The courts do.

Mr. GROSS. The courts could not prosecute this individual because of diplomatic inmunity.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They still have that prerogative. We are still pursuing them. The FBI is still tracking them down.

Mr. GROSS. We cannot get this individual out of the country.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is not true. We have had over 700 of this type of people deported, who were operating through the United Nations or in the embassies.

I agree with the gentleman. The problem is that I do not believe this is the area where we should adopt this kind of action. What in effect the gentleman will do is to throw the United Nations into a turmoil at the very time when we are trying to find ways to peace.

Let us get rid of the spies. I am all for it.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman propose to get rid of these spies?

Mr. GALLAGHER. In the same way as we always do. We root them out, as the State Department did.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman propose to get rid of them?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We try them and convict them.

Mr. GROSS. We are not going to try this man. We are not going to deport him unless his government wants him to go.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would say to the gentleman that this is presently under investigation.

This is not the day to gut the United Nations. That is what this does.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that my good friend from Iowa—and I regard him as one of my close dear friends—has

seen fit to bring into this discussion the name of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, it was my great honor and my great privilege to serve as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was an experience that has enriched my life. Before I went there, I had always supported the United Nations. I believed in it. But I have never fully appreciated the vastness of the work of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, it is truly our only bridge to peace and to world understanding. It may be a frail bridge, but it is our only bridge. Serving there, Mr. Chairman, with the great statesman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], my fellow delegate, and serving with the delegates from 117 other nations of the world, all seeking to find planes of common agreement on which could be rested the conscience of the universe, has convinced me of the depth and worth of the United Nations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that my beloved friend from Iowa—whom I salute as a great statesman, and who is doing a great job, even though he is not always in agreement with me, and is one of the most industrious Members of this body—I do regret that he has brought into this discussion the United Nations. Respectfully but firmly I now ask him to withdraw his amendment. Will he do it?

Mr. GROSS. Not the longest day I have ever lived would I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, much as I admire and love my friend, I am sorry I cannot shed my blood with him and, perforce, must leave him to die alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 52, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: On page 11, immediately after line 11, insert the following:

"(d) Section 301 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The President shall seek to assure that no payment or contribution by the United States to the United Nations or to any agency or activity thereof shall be used for any program or activity which is contrary to the policies of the United States.'"

And redesignate the following subsection accordingly.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this matter yesterday, as shown on page 15412 of the RECORD and I have altered the amendment today to exclude the last sentence and to make it conform thereby with the "Cuba section" of the pending bill.

I am pleased that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has included in this year's bill a policy statement that:

The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United States Development Program . . . shall be used for projects for economic or technical assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

In recent years I have testified before the committee in support of my bill to provide that U.S. payments to the United Nations shall not be used for programs contrary to the policies of our country. I have also offered similar legislation as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. This year, on May 11, 1966, I testified in behalf of my bill, H.R. 53, calling for a halt to this misuse of funds to nations who have vowed to destroy us, or who are openly assisting our enemies.

The evidence in support of the need for my legislation has been clear. In January of this year, the United Nations Special Fund, now the U.N. development program, approved a project at the University of Havana to train engineers and other technical persons, costing, $2,096,500. Castro's Communist teachers, many of whom are Russians, were handed this money to carry out a program certain to undermine our efforts to keep the Western Hemisphere free from Castro and Russian totalitarianism. Our representatives at the United Nations objected to this, and voted against it, but it did no good. Just 2 years ago, the U.N. Special Fund also approved a grant to help Castro's ailing economy, which cost U.S. taxpayers $500,000.

The language in this year's bill would require the President to seek assurance that U.S. funds given to the United Nations will not go to Castro's Cuba. This is good and establishes a basic policy which our freedom-loving people demand. It is idiotic that our country, which contributes over 40 percent of all funds going to the U.N. development program annually, should thus support the totalitarian designs of Castro and his Communist government to the tune of millions of dollars. I congratulate the committee on providing the language it did about Cuba.

While the bill includes the provision to ban U.S. contributions to the U.N. development program which go to Cuba, the legislation needs to be further amended to cover all United Nations programs in which funds might be used contrary to our national interests, and it needs to cover all nations not just Cuba.

The evidence for the need of this amendment, which would provide that no payment by the United States to the United Nations shall be used for any program contrary to the policies of the United States is readily available. There is no requirement by the U.N. Charter that we make these contributions.

The most flagrant and disheartening example outside of Cuba involves Cambodia and our fight for freedom for the Vietnamese people.

In the last 4 years, Cambodia has received almost $3 million from the U.N. Special Fund for various projects, which cost U.S. taxpayers $1.2 million. The most recent grant was for $611,900 in January 1965. This is the same country which is led by Prince Sihanouk, who said on March 23, 1966, in announcing that Cambodia had given the Vietcong a shipment of rice:

We have given this aid to them by closing our eyes because we and the Vietcong have a common enemy, which is U.S. imperialism.

Foreign relations expert and columnist C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times has recently reported that Cambodia is "a sanctuary and supply source for the Vietcong on such a scale that the Pnom-Penh government must know it. From the extreme south to Laos in the north, Cambodia is violating its proclaimed neutrality."

I will read here a recent news dispatch from Cambodia:

PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA.—Prince Norodom Sihanouk has sent a message of solidarity to North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh on the U.S. bombings of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong, the government reported.

Sihanouk expressed "profound indignation" for the raids and pledged "total support to (North) Viet Nam."

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would allow the President to put a stop to the often times wholesale support and taxpayer's dollars to people who have flatly stated: "We will bury you." It is a sickening thing to realize that our dollars are helping to aid a country which gives sanctuary to the Vietcong.

Once this amendment is passed the President will have a firmer base on which to demand that U.S. funds not be used by anti-American programs.

I urge that the House adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed in the basic idea of using U.S. dollars as a tool for world peace and our own security. When I felt our foreign aid program was excessive and mismanaged I have recorded my vote against it as a protest against day-to-day imperfections rather than against the basic idea of foreign aid, substituting dollars for lives. Too often we have seen vast amounts of taxpayers' dollars go down the drain through extravagance or bad guessing on political motives of various countries or through other misconduct of the aid program; but no one can seriously quarrel with the objectives.

I am certain that the foreign aid program as now constituted is not the only answer to world peace and the uplifting of underdeveloped nations. I believe our State Department should have a U.S. Agency for World Peace, which would do intensive research into finding ways of achieving peace. I have introduced legislation on this, H.R. 16038, and have asked for departmental reports and hearings on the bill. I am hopeful for early action on this measure, which I believe would be a great move toward peace.

Concerning the foreign aid legislation before the House today, it comes to us significantly when we are engaged in an all-out war in Vietnam. One-fourth of the total budget administered by the Agency for International Development is for Vietnam. These funds in the past have been used to construct 2,300 schools and in the next 2 years 13,000 new classrooms will be built for more than three-quarters of a million children. These

funds will also go to medical facilities, resettlement of the 900,000 Vietnamese people who have been driven from their homes because of the war, and for development of farming and fishing opportunities, in which four-fifths of the Vietnamese people are engaged. The bill, moreover, provides weapons of war to our allies in South Vietnam. We are fighting a military war; then, a political war and thirdly an economic war. We must win each to eliminate the military war.

Today, with our Nation's energies and manpower devoted to securing peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, we must act favorably on the legislation before us; and I expect to cast my vote for the bill on final passage even though I realize that the things that will be done under the bill will not always be perfect.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the gentleman has consulted the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] on the minority side.

Mr. BENNETT. I did.

Mr. MORGAN. The amendment has been modified. It now brings the amendment into conformity to the Cuban amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORGAN. The majority has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am the author of the amendment which appears in section 107(b) of the bill which seeks to prohibit the use of voluntary contributions made by the United States to the United Nations development program for technical assistance projects to Cuba, while that country is governed by the Castro regime.

This amendment is fully consistent with the policy which the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress have endorsed in years past.

I should like to say, for background purposes, that I initiated efforts to prohibit the use of U.S. funds donated to the United Nations for technical assistance to Cuba as far back as 1963 when the first project of this nature was approved by the United Nations Special Fund.

That particular project, as the membership of the House will recall, proposed technical assistance for an agricultural research station in Cuba.

That year the Committee on Foreign Affairs and then the House of Representatives adopted my amendment which proscribed the use of the U.S. funds donated to the United Nations Special Fund for that project in Cuba.

Unfortunately, the other body of the Congress did not go along with our proposal and the provision was deleted in conference.

This did not dissuade us from continuing in the effort to deny the Castro regime any type of American assistance.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I made representations to our Department of State and to our representatives in the United Nations. We were happy to receive assurances at that time that administrative arrangements would be worked out to prevent the use of any U.S. funds for the Cuban project.

Early this year when the governing council of the United Nations development program approved a technical assistance project for the University of Havana, I immediately objected to the Department of State and to our representation at the United Nations.

I am pleased to say that our representative in the Governing Council lodged a strong protest against the approval of this project. Further, we were again instrumental in receiving assurances that no U.S. funds would be used to provide aid to the Castro regime. These assurances are spelled out in the record of hearings held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 19, 1966. On that date Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco said the following:

> With respect to the project that I mentioned for the University of Havana, the U.N. has also stated that no U.S. dollar contributions would be used for its financing.
>
> The question is asked, Are not all contributions to the United Nations development program merged? If so, how can we be sure that no U.S. contributions are being used for Cuban projects?
>
> The answer is this: It is true that 40 percent of the total financial resources of the Special Fund are supplied by the United States. But, over 100 other countries also contribute to the Fund. Most of these contributions, making up the remaining 60 percent, are in currencies other than dollars. These contributions are held in separate accounts outside of the United States; they are not integrated with U.S. dollar contributions and their end uses are clearly identifiable. It is these nondollar currencies which will be used for the Cuban projects.

Nevertheless I have felt, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs concurs, that we ought to have a clear and unequivocal expression on this point in the legislation before us. It was for that reason that I offered my amendment embodied in section 107(b) of H.R. 15750. It was for that same reason that the Committee on Foreign Affairs overwhelmingly adopted the amendment.

At another point in this debate, I shall detail all of the efforts which I exerted in the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the floor of this body and in other committees, to deny any type of economic aid or trade to Cuba while that country is governed by the Castro regime. At this point I wish to conclude with just this observation:

The amendment in section 107(b) is a needed and an effective amendment. It accomplishes the purpose on which we are all agreed. It provides further reenforcement to the administrative arrangements which have been put into effect to deny Castro any portion of the funds that the United States is contributing to the U.N. development program. I believe it is an amendment which merits our wholehearted support.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment Offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 11, beginning in line 17, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1967".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion yesterday the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee characterized the amendment offered by the gentleman from California with respect to a cutback in the authorizations from 2 years to 1 year as a meat ax approach to the problem. Of course it was no such thing. It was merely an attempt to strike all references to a 2-year authorization from this bill at one time, to avoid the necessity for the submission of separate amendments to strike the 2-year authorizations from various titles of the bill.

Since that particular amendment offered by the gentleman from California yesterday failed, I am offering a separate amendment with respect to the voluntary contributions to be provided to international organizations under this title.

I would like to begin my remarks with a quotation from the distinguished gentleman from Florida when he discussed the 2-year authorization yesterday. The gentleman from Florida said he did not accept the argument that the kinds of control insured through the appropriations process would give adequate policy guidance to the foreign aid program. A combination of policy and funding controls, in his opinion, exercised by both the authorizing committees and the appropriation committees, is vital.

In my opinion, this argument certainly applies to the voluntary contributions which this country makes to a wide variety of international organizations. I myself have been a strong supporter of such contributions by the United States, but I should like to point out that the sums involved are very considerable, running to some $140 million for the next fiscal year, together with some $4 million in carryover funds.

If we should keep the language presently in the bill, $140 million would be provided in 1968. I would suggest that this is an arbitrary ceiling. There is no indication now as to just how much money will be needed in that year for a wide variety of programs. The United Nations development program, for example, will need $70 million in fiscal year 1967 as compared to $65 million in the current fiscal year and $60 million in the fiscal year 1965. We do not know at all how much this kind of program will need in 1968.

Furthermore, as a reference to the bill before us indicates, the Committee on Foreign Affairs quite legitimately expressed policy considerations in proposed new language to be added to the act. I refer specifically to the language on page 10, beginning at line 21, which says, and I quote:

> The President shall seek to assure that no contribution to the United Nations Development Program authorized by this Act shall be used for projects for economic or technical

assistance to the Government of Cuba, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

I refer also to the language on page 11, starting at line 4 and running through line 11, which reads as follows:

Contributions by the United States for the fiscal year 1967 shall not exceed $13,300,000. No contributions under this subsection shall be made except on the condition that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency take all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

It is, of course, no secret that the United States has been providing over a period of years the lion's share of the funds to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. In the fiscal year 1965 the United States supplied a total of $24.7 million; in 1966 $22.9 million, including $8.9 million in food, was made available.

When I was a delegate to the 20th Assembly of the United Nations last September I was very much involved with the Relief and Works Agency. I know for a fact that there is a serious problem with respect to the provision of assistance to Arab refugees who are being trained by the Palestine Liberation Organization. As the representative of the United States, I protested against using United Nations funds for the sustenance of such trainees. A reflection of that same concern is found in the language of the bill before us, starting on page 11, line 5. It is entirely appropriate, indeed it is important, for the Foreign Affairs Committee to take this kind of policy position with respect to the variety of international organizations represented in this $140 million. There is no way in which the Committee on Appropriations could legally do the job that the Committee on Foreign Affairs does as a matter of course. There is no way in which that committee could write in a policy recommendation, or limitation, or restriction in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is essential that the Foreign Affairs Committee undertake the simple job every year of examining the request for funds for these international organizations, to set ceilings and establish policy restrictions, if they should be considered necessary.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has already pointed out, by prior vote today we have made a decision on the principal issue involved here with respect to whether this should be a 2-year authorization or a 1-year authorization and decided on 2 years. I see very little change in the basic argument.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has fixed the ceiling for fiscal 1968 at the same rate as it has fixed it for fiscal 1967, and has presented that issue to the House of Representatives for a multiyear authorization. We trust that the flexibilities built into this program are such that we would not have to ask for any additional increases, however, we would not hesitate to authorize an increase in 1968 if necessary and advisable.

However, Mr. Chairman, the balance of the program has been placed upon a 2-year basis, and we urge the Members to defeat this amendment and keep all of the bill on a 2-year basis, except for the Development Loan Fund and the Alliance for Progress.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Is there any reason that the gentleman can say why this authorization may not be decreased annually?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, it could be.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] has been the author of amendments with respect to the Palestine refugee relief program which reflects a decrease in the contributions made, and for 2 years now, as I recall it, these decreases have been made. If the committee follows the procedure, there would be a decrease next year. There might be decreases in other programs but, generally, we fix the overall limitation as is the rate for fiscal 1967 for fiscal 1968.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida seems to be agreeing with me that the 1968 ceiling which is established by this recommendation of the committee is essentially arbitrary. The gentleman himself said it might well be increased or it might possibly be decreased; they have no idea, and no projection was made as to the need for international organizations in 1968.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not believe I am agreeing with the gentleman from New Jersey. I believe the gentleman is agreeing with me, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has fixed the limitation for 1968, and we have done it on a sound basis, because we projected it on the basis of fiscal 1967 authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, the only point I am making is that some increases will be requested and, if so, they can be handled through supplemental requests or the committee can make its determination on an amended authorization.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I see no reason why an arbitrary ceiling is a sound one, as the gentleman from Florida seems to be favoring.

However, Mr. Chairman, we have no idea what the needs will be. I do not know what makes it sound, if we pass a ceiling.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not say that it was arbitrary at all. I said it was a reasonable figure and that the committee had a sound basis for it. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said it was arbitrary and the gentleman from Florida has never agreed to that interpretation.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Florida would touch upon the point of the advisability of annual consideration of policy questions with respect to these international organizations?

Mr. FASCELL. I have always indicated that this is good policy for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We need not only to review authorization figures but should spend more time studying, investigating, and acting on policy questions.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that our subcommittee undertook a recent study in depth with respect to U.S. policy and the operations of the United Nations. But, that was in the subcommittee. I would have much liked to have seen that entire study conducted by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, because that is a fundamental policy question which has very little to do with the authorization limitation for funding but is extremely important for the future foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday in discussing this question, while I believe funding limitations are vital and important, they are really very secondary to policy considerations.

I would hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs would give increased time to major policy questions.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I believe a 2-year authorization is so vital.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I fail to understand the point. How would our committee express its concern about policy with respect to international organizations except in such a form as an authorization for contributions to those organizations?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman presumes, in asking that question, that the only way you can effect policy is through funding. I do not agree to that at all.

I think our committee and the gentleman's own studies on the United Nations have made a valuable contribution in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I find myself here in the well of the House again speaking on what I think is the critical issue on this entire bill, and put in focus particularly well by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

As I said yesterday, the concept of the multiyear authorization is not one which offends me. But I am offended when the Committee on Foreign Affairs and this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is ready to approve an authorization for the fiscal year 1968 when absolutely no justification and absolutely no testimony as to the propriety of the amount authorized in the committee bill has been presented.

I challenge the gentleman from Florida, who I see is on his feet, to tell me exactly what the dollars that we have

authorized in fiscal year 1968 will be used for and, more important, to cite in the record of the committee, in the committee hearings, any testimony offered by any witness as to the amounts of money needed for the particular account for fiscal year 1968.

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

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to refer the gentleman to the very detailed presentation contained in these books which have been before the committee during the entire consideration of this over a period of several months with respect to the detailed program for the fiscal year 1967.

I refer the gentleman to my testimony in which I said in my judgment what we should do with respect to this program for the fiscal year 1968 is to fund it on the same basis as fiscal year 1967 because this to me makes sense, when you analyze the individual programs as presented for fiscal year 1967.

The gentleman can disagree with that basis but he cannot say that there was no basis for the decision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman's integrity and for the gentleman's intelligence; but I have no respect for his clairvoyance. I do not think this House should authorize a figure for the fiscal year 1968 simply on the conjecture of a single Member.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Most of these amounts have been clearly stated over the years, and there is no act of clairvoyance involved on this issue.

Mr. MORSE. If the gentleman will recall, there have been some very critical issues that have affected this particular account. He will recall the article 19 dispute, and the U.N. bond issue, both of which have relevance to this account.

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

I just want to say that this would put a ceiling on the bill. I am not one of those people who is worried about not spending the money. I believe if we fix this ceiling next year on the international organizations we are going to discourage the Executive from making increased commitments to the international organizations to which we belong during the next year. I hope they will regard this as a ceiling of $140 million.

This will have to run the gauntlet of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and I am sure he will be watching this mighty close next year so far as the funds are concerned.

So I think the fact that we establish a ceiling for 1968 is important, and I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the record of the many foreign aid programs that have been functioning since the end of World War II is not one that would inspire confidence. Nearly $150 billion, all of it borrowed money on which we have been paying interest and on which we will continue to pay interest for generations, has been scattered abroad—in Europe, Asia, Africa, and North and South America.

Ostensibly, the purpose of this tremendous outpouring of America's wealth has been to combat communism, to gain allies to make it easier for us to prevent war from breaking out or to help us fight wars once they start, and to help undeveloped infant nations to establish sound economies.

What has been the result?

Since foreign aid first became institutionalized, the United States has become engaged in two wars in Asia against Communist aggression. We fought in Korea for 3 years and the only nation that gave us substantial assistance was Turkey.

We are now fighting in Vietnam and are suffering heavy casualties. We are getting only token help from our numerous allies and many of them are trading with our Communist enemies. The bulk of the cargo entering the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong is being carried in the ships of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Speaking of NATO in connection with the war in Vietnam, I am reminded that we bailed out France in southeast Asia soon after NATO's establishment with headquarters in Paris and with France as the keystone. General de Gaulle has disapproved of the "ever widening war in Asia" and has expressed his desire for the neutralization of Vietnam. He has ordered us to get out of France and to move the military installations which were built there by the United States.

Our policy of buying friends has been a colossal failure all over the world, as our diplomats have been insulted, our embassies stoned, and our libraries burned. Canada sells wheat to the Soviet Union, Argentina sells it to both the Soviet Union and Communist China, and Chile sells nitrate to Red China, but it does not lie in our mouths to complain, because the Kennedy-Johnson administration insisted over almost unanimous Republican opposition that the United States send wheat to the Soviet Union.

Some of the countries that we have aided are also receiving help from Communist Russia. Many of the new nations, as well as some of the older ones, have turned out to be liabilities rather than assets, due to frequent changes of government that are often brought about by military coups accompanied by assassinations and followed by wholesale executions and massacres. Chaotic conditions are too often followed by one-man rule, banning of political opposition, suspension of constitutional rights, nationalization of industry, and expropriations of foreign investments.

In many instances our economic help has been short lived, as runaway inflation has dissipated the gains and left the masses of the people worse off economically than before. At the same time, inflation in the United States has been accelerated by the expenditure of vast sums for foreign aid year after year.

What does the present administration propose to do about the situation? It proposes a continuation of foreign aid spending, with the authorization of more and more billions. The bill now before us authorizes $4,109,119,000 for fiscal 1967 and $4,158,339,000 for fiscal 1968. Altogether the bill authorizes approximately $13,800,000,000, some of it to be spent over a 5-year period.

The administration wants us to authorize money for a 2-year period, part of which would run during the Congress that will follow the current one. I am going to vote against the foreign aid authorization bill on final passage, as well as against the scheme for a 2-year authorization period. We must not surrender the opportunity for an annual review of the foreign aid program.

At present it appears very likely that there will be many new faces in the Congress as a result of the summer primaries and the November election. A House of Representatives that is 2-to-1 Democratic may be foolish enough to yield some of its power by agreeing to a 2-year authorization period, but if the Republicans make substantial gains this fall, I doubt if the 90th Congress would seriously consider such a proposal, should the 89th Congress fail to agree to it. In any event, I do not believe the present Congress should place unnecessary obstacles in the path of its successor.

During the past few weeks my office has been flooded with replies to my recent questionnaire, as thousands of my constituents have taken the time to reply to seven questions on Vietnam and inflation.

While there was no question about foreign aid on the questionnaire, a great number of the respondents added strongly worded statements in which they expressed vigorous opposition to various phases and the administrative policies of the foreign aid program.

If a nationwide poll were taken on the continuation of the present foreign aid program, I am sure the vast majority of the people—who, incidentally, pay the cost—would reflect an attitude entirely different than that which the Congress and the executive branch of the Government have taken in recent years.

The bill before us provides for economic or military aid or both to 84 nations plus carryover aid to 10 other nations. Aid of one kind or another is going to 94 different countries throughout the world.

Economic aid is going to 72 nations plus carryover aid to 10 others. Economic aid is therefore going to 82 different countries all over the world.

Military aid will go to 55 different nations at a time when we are talking about peace. It seems inconsistent to me that we should be advocating peace throughout the world at the same time that we are supplying armaments of all kinds to countries large and small around the globe.

Many of these nations have used American-manufactured weapons against each other, while a number of others are

on the verge of fighting. At the same time we are getting almost negligible help from our so-called allies as our men fight in Vietnam.

Since the close of World War II, the United States has provided arms for half the nations of the world at a cost of $37 billion. In the present measure we are being asked to authorize an additional $917 *million* for military assistance. This does not include at least a billion more for paying and supplying the South Vietnamese Army.

France, one of the largest recipients of military aid, has turned its back on us in Vietnam, has demanded the evacuation of Americans from France, and wants to close our bases on French soil.

The United Kingdom, which we have given a tremendous amount of military assistance, continues to send her ships into Vietnam and Communist Cuba.

Latin American countries have received large amounts of military aid, but not one soldier has been volunteered from them for the Vietnamese forces.

It is interesting to note that in Africa, where we have sent considerable military aid, seven governments have been overthrown by military coups since June of last year.

Two of the largest current recipients of military aid, Greece and Turkey, are at swords' points over Cyprus.

India and Pakistan are also looking threateningly at each other. Both have benefited from our military assistance.

Mr. Chairman, while I have through the years opposed foreign aid authorizations and appropriations, this does not mean that I would never support the concept of foreign aid. If there were only some way of voting for responsible, well-considered programs, I might be induced to lend my support to them.

It seems to me that we should be considering three separate bills for authorizations, as well as three separate measures for appropriations. Military aid should be in one authorization, economic aid in another, and technical assistance in a third. Similarly, there should be an appropriation bill for each of these three items. In that way we would be able to consider each phase of foreign aid intelligently.

Channeling the money of American taxpayers and bond purchasers through the United Nations organization and other international instrumentalities would be dangerous, especially when we are fighting a war and there are many potential trouble spots throughout the world. While Secretary of State Dean Rusk believes that "foreign aid is basic to our security," I fail to see how such aid will help us to maintain our security if it is to be disbursed by international organizations to our enemies. This proposal should be dismissed without serious consideration.

Unless the administration presents us with foreign aid proposals in separate packages for military, economic, and technical aid and without such booby-traps as 2-year authorizations and the funneling of money through international organizations, I shall continue to vote against foreign aid authorization measures and appropriation bills.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 18, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week and our program for the remainder of this week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, upon disposition of the pending legislation, we will have finished the business for this week and it will be our purpose, after going back into the House, to make the usual unanimous-consent requests with respect to going over and dispensing with Calendar Wednesday.

In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are 14 suspensions:

H.R. 7315, relating to the National Museum of Smithsonian Institution;

H.R. 13783, authorizing the furnishing of books and other materials to other handicapped persons under books for blind program;

H.R. 14838, amending the National Science Foundation Act of 1950;

H.R. 2623, creating the San Juan Island National Historical Park, Wash.;

H.R. 13419, authorizing feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals;

H.R. 2450, providing retirement in highest grade held in any Armed Force;

H.R. 3313, providing career incentives for certain officers of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 5297, limiting revocation of retired pay of members of Armed Forces;

H.R. 9916, respecting selection of candidates for appointment to service academies;

H.R. 15712, authorizing transportation of motor vehicles of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 14875, improving the uniformed services savings deposit program;

H.J. Res. 421, providing appropriate flag ceremonies at Washington Monument;

S. 2822, simplifying laws administered by Farm Credit Administration; and

H.R. 14548, extending the leasing authority of the Postmaster General.

These bills will not necessarily be called up in the order listed.

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. Also on Tuesday H.R. 15941, the Defense Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1967, will be considered.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 15111, Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, under an open rule, with 8 hours of general debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for his inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 4—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 108. Section 402 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to authorization for supporting assistance, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $200,000,000. In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in Vietnam in each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 to carry out the purposes of this chapter not to exceed $550,000,000. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask that chapter 4 be considered as read from page 12, line 13, down to the bottom of that page, and open for amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to chapter 4?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: On page 12, line 23, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That where commodities are furnished on a grant basis under chapter 4 of part I under arrangements which will result in the accrual of proceeds to the Government of Vietnam from the sale thereof, such proceeds shall not be budgeted by the Government of Vietnam for economic assistance projects or programs unless the President or his representative has given his prior written approval."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as a result of the findings of the Subcommittee on Government Operations during its trip to Vietnam in May of this year. This is a very simple amendment. Its purpose is to give our diplomatic representatives in Vietnam greater control over the budgeting of U.S. AID funds by the Government of Vietnam for economic assistance projects and programs. I am offering this amendment in response to an undesirable situation called to the attention of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information by some of our diplomatic representatives during the subcommittee's recent inspection trip to Vietnam.

I wish to emphasize that this amendment does not affect the U.S. military effort in that unfortunate country in any way whatsoever. It does not pertain to or interfere with commodity import funds used to support the military budget in Vietnam.

It does not tie the hands of the President or the Agency for International Development. On the contrary, it gives the United States greater control over our own AID funds. The urgent need for this expanded control was demonstrated to us in many ways during our hearings in Vietnam.

At present, our control is limited almost entirely to a simple approval of economic assistance projects and programs already drawn up in the budget of the Government of Vietnam. U.S. participation in economic projects and programs of the Vietnamese Government in recent years has been on a very limited basis. With the great increase in funds generated under the expanded commodity import program for Vietnam, it is necessary for the United States to play its proper role in decisions on the use of these funds. This amendment would require stronger control. Simply put, it will make it clear to all that this control is not a subject for negotiation. Any ally of ours must understand that such huge amounts of money represent a considerable sacrifice on the part of our people. We must insist that these tax dollars are used only for economic projects and programs under conditions which guarantee full and proper U.S. participation.

Our Ambassador in Vietnam should be given this mandate by the U.S. Congress. This will give him the necessary leverage to make certain that our contributions to economic progress in Vietnam are strictly in line with U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply states that where commodities are furnished on a grant basis by United States supporting assistance under arrangements where the Government of Vietnam receives proceeds from their sale, they shall not be budgeted substantially reallocated without prior written approval by the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we need this control of our own funds. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

As a member of his subcommittee I traveled to Vietnam last May and I there became aware of the difficulties which had developed in the administration of the commodity import program there.

This amendment would give our administrators in that country greater control over this program—a control which is badly needed.

In fact, it would give us a control over our own funds—which inexplicably seems to have been lost or surrendered over the years.

The size of the amounts now generated and the fact that they are generated through commodities provided by U.S. taxpayers together with the questionable use of these proceeds requires that we exercise a greater control than we have hitherto.

This amendment will permit us to reassert the oversight to which our contribution entitles us, will allow the Vietnamese adequate freedom of operation and will contribute markedly to the overall efficiency of this vital aid program.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in substantial agreement with what the gentleman seeks to accomplish by this amendment. I understand he has consulted the minority side and he has consulted the members of my committee. I will accept it with the understanding that certain technical perfections, taking into account Vietnamese budgetary practices, may have to be made when the bill goes to conference. With the understanding that we will thoroughly examine such technical requirements before the conference, I urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Also, I want to say to the gentleman that over the years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has worked very closely with the committee he now heads. When the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], headed the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs worked very closely with his committee. Our staffs have always cooperated. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is willing to work with the gentleman's subcommittee. I believe we are both trying to perfect our foreign aid operations, and it is a pleasure to accept this amendment.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, in responding to the remarks of the distinguished chairman, I want to express my gratitude for the cooperation we have always received. I assure him that it is my desire, as I know it is the consensus of every member of the subcommittee, to continue to work closely, cooperatively, and constructively with his committee.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the minority side is ready to accept the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague and most cooperative coworker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly support this amendment. As the gentleman indicated, it came about as the result of our subcommittee's visit to Vietnam and the discussions in the Subcommittee on Government Operations as a result of that trip.

Is it the intention of the gentleman that this amendment would deal with the reallocations of a major or significant nature, but, on the other hand, that it is certainly not intended to create problems within AID down the line as to very minor reallocations? Is this basically the gentleman's feeling?

Mr. MOSS. In accordance with our discussion, we are not attempting to deal with trivia, but instead with the very substantial items of reallocation which can occur. Attempts have been made in the past to effect such reallocations.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I believe the amendment is a most important improvement to the bill. There is no question that the relationship which existed when the United States had but a handful of advisers in South Vietnam is out of date at a time when there are 300,000 Americans in that country. I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for approval of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 12, line 20, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$175,000,000".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I offered an amendment with respect to the Alliance for Progress, to cut the amount $100 million. That seemed to be too substantial a cut for the Members to swallow, so I am back with a very small cut of $25 million in supporting assistance.

I wish to point out to the Members, as we covered in our minority views, that as of June 30 there was $547 million in the pipeline for supporting assistance. Furthermore, this amendment would not touch the $550 million which is exclusively for Vietnam, so it would not in any way endanger activity in Vietnam.

What we are trying to do is to achieve a very small and practical cut of $25 million in the supporting assistance section, where there is more than a half billion dollars in the pipeline, for which we have made substantial authorizations over the years.

I point out to the Members that the authorization in the bill, $200 million, is in excess of the appropriation request. We certainly do not want to further upset the very precarious budget which the President submitted earlier in the year, and I might even go so far as to say that on the President's behalf I am offering this amendment to try to get these figures within a reasonable budget provision.

I do not believe that a $25 million cut in supporting assistance, when there is more than a half billion dollars in the pipeline, could be called gutting the bill. I believe it is a necessary thing for us this afternoon to show some restraint

on the part of the House over what appears to the public to be a complete runaway spending program.

I cannot conceive, interested as the Members are in the stability of the U.S. Treasury and in the stability of our dollar abroad, that the House would say, as to a bill before us, that every dollar of spending here authorized is sacred. I do not believe this $25 million of supporting assistance is sacred.

My amendment is a very practical and proper one. Certainly, considering the money in the pipeline and the fact that we are speaking of the portion of the funds not segregated for Vietnam, I am hopeful the amendment will meet with a minimum of opposition and might be accepted.

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

With a maximum of affection for my friend, I hope the gentleman will not consider it personal for us not to support his amendment, as some of his amendments did have our support in the committee.

I hope, since he has enriched the bill, the gentleman will now support the bill.

I believe this amendment must be opposed. One of the problems is that on the question of supporting assistance, this involves one of the highly concentrated areas of the bill. There are four countries which get 75 percent of the funds under this. I am not quite sure where the gentleman would like to cut, since he has not specified.

However, countries that would be affected seriously are Korea, Jordan, the Dominican Republic, and Laos. Any cut in these areas would substantially weaken world security. While it is true that Vietnam is not going to be affected by this, nevertheless this money is needed to back up the security requirements of the United States which exist in these areas throughout the world. Bases which are maintained, for example, in Korea certainly add additional burdens to that government. Therefore, this money is used to take up the necessary slack which exists in their budget as a result of our activities in those areas.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Will the gentleman explain to the Members what his concern is with over $500 million in the pipeline?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman knows the pipeline has nothing to do with forward projects. That is an old argument. I know the gentleman is forward looking and he certainly cannot rest on taking a glance backward as to what the pipeline now carries in it. It is necessary that this funding the projected into the future. Certainly 75 percent of the countries I have outlined are finding it necessary. Korea is sending additional troops to Vietnam, and we do not want to undermine them at this point. The Dominican Republic action terminated quite favorably, and the troops are being withdrawn from there. I may say that there are 20 countries that have been terminated already, and successfully so, under the supporting assistance program. It is a tightly run program, and I hope this cut will not prevail.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. During the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois in support of his amendment he mentioned the fact that the executive was not requesting the full amount of $200 million, but he did not mention the figure they were requesting. They are requesting in appropriations $197.2 million, but they are requesting that the full amount of $550 million for South Vietnam be appropriated. So the difference between the authorization and appropriation requests for the whole supporting assistance package is only about $2.8 million. However, as the gentleman stated in his remarks, this is a very important part of the program. This was what was known under the Mutual Security Act as defense support. Supporting assistance is very important to the seven countries named by the gentleman. This is used to build military strength to compensate for our base rights and otherwise assist in our general foreign policy.

I hope that the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 5—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 109. Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a), strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and strike out the last sentence.

(b) In subsection (b), strike out "the first sentence of".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERRY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERRY: On page 13, line 7, immediately before "and" insert the following: "; strike out '$150,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$70,000,000';".

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to bring this authorization in line with the authorization as provided by the other body. They are authorizing in their bill $70 million. I do not believe that we should be authorizing $150 million while they are authorizing $70 million, because we will give way to them and it will just simply make this body look a little bit foolish.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the Congress, I have understood that the "other body" is known as the "upper body" because it "ups" everything that the House of Representatives passes.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is not true in this instance and I believe that we should prove that it is not true.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the best argument I could make would be to read from the report of the other body on this $70 million authorization, and they say this:

This provision authorizes an appropriation of $70 million for the contingency fund for the 1967 fiscal year. This is the amount of the appropriation request, though the administration had asked for an authorization of $150 million for each of the next 5 fiscal years. The Congress authorized $50 million for the regular contingency fund and $89 million for use in southeast Asia in the 1966 foreign aid authorization bill. An additional $100 million for the contingency fund was authorized by supplemental legislation.

The committee understands that little of this additional $100 million will be used before the end of the fiscal year. In view of this, the committee's recommended authorization is actually an increase over the amount required this fiscal year for non-Vietnam operations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join with my distinguished colleague in his remarks and I trust that this amendment will be voted down.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. I did not say "wish"; I just said "I knew."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Oh, with that certain knowledge, I do not believe we ought to make a longer argument but, nevertheless, while I certainly join the gentleman in wanting to make this program as tight as possible, I cannot agree with the gentleman that this body could ever look foolish by following the example of the other body. I feel that we should certainly follow our own example, in the hope that that might happen over there.

Mr. Chairman, the request this year is a minimum request, based upon the experience of recent years and, in fact, is the second lowest request for such funds.

Mr. Chairman, the contingency fund is maintained in order to meet urgent needs. It is tight.

Mr. Chairman, we had a long discussion on this and it is the feeling of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this represents a tight request, second tightest in the history of the contingency fund.

Mr. Chairman, as such, I would urge that this amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], that I have had the honor to head the House conferees on the foreign aid bill for the last 7 years and we do not give on anything on which it is not absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have served as conferees on the foreign aid bill can testify that the House conferees are pretty rigid.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the conference lasted over 6 weeks and the position of the House was defended very effectively.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is proud of its record. I would say that last year 90 percent of the foreign aid bill, as finally agreed to represented the provisions of the House bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to the argument about the contingency fund.

We were here just last February to act on a supplemental authorization and appropriation for $100 million for the contingency fund.

Now, the executive this past year has requested in this year's authorization $150 million. The request for appropriation is only $70 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs over a period of years has looked very carefully at this contingency fund and the executive has made a good record of returning to the Treasury of the United States funds unspent from the contingency fund.

If I remember correctly, it was back in 1962 when the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under some prodding by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], began to take a stronger and harder look at the contingency fund. He saw that funds from the contingency fund were being spent for projects that he did not think could be regarded as involving unforeseen emergencies. As a result of some strong language in our report, the executive had done a very good job in limiting the use of these funds to real contingencies and in returning unused funds to the Treasury.

For instance, in 1963 we authorized $250 million and appropriated $250 million. Only $149 million was spent, and the balance was returned to the Treasury. There need be no fear here that by authorizing $150 million in this bill today we are going to have contingency fund dollars wasted. The executive branch has a very good record over a period of years in its use of this fund.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I join with my distinguished chairman. This is a matter of judgment, and they have exercised good judgment.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART II

Chapter 2—Military assistance

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

(a) Section 504(a), which relates to authorization, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In addition to such amounts as may be otherwise authorized to support Vietnamese forces and other free world forces in Vietnam, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this part (excluding the support of Vietnamese forces and other free world forces in Vietnam) not to exceed $917,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

(b) Section 508, which relates to reimbursements, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such amounts of the appropriations made available under this part (including unliquidated balances of funds heretofore obligated for financing sales and guarantees) as may be determined by the President shall be transferred to, and merged with, the separate fund account."

(c) Section 510(a), which relates to special authority, is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence, strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968".

(2) In the second sentence, strike out "the fiscal year 1966" and insert in lieu thereof "each fiscal year".

(d) Section 512, which relates to restrictions on military aid to Africa, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "each fiscal year."

(e) At the end of such chapter 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 514. ADMINISTRATION OF SALES AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS INVOLVING DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Programs for the sale or exchange of defense articles or defense services under this chapter shall be administered so as to encourage regional arms control and disarmament agreements and so as to discourage arms races."

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that part II of the bill, page 13, line 9 through and including line 25 on page 14, be considered as read, and be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONAGAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONAGAN: on page 13, immediately after line 24, insert the following:

"(b) Section 506, which relates to conditions of eligibility, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) No assistance shall be provided under this chapter to any country to which sales are made under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 until such country has entered into an agreement to permit the use of foreign currencies accruing to the United States under such title I to procure equipment, materials, facilities, and services for the common defense including internal security, in accordance with the provisions of section 104(c) of such title I.'"

And redesignate the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is quite obvious, from a reading of the text itself. It is to require that where we have large stocks of foreign currencies, these currencies be used—in this case, for the purpose of military equipment—prior to and in preference to the use of newly appropriated dollars.

In some countries the legal situation is such that that is required to be done. The contracts between the United States and the foreign country contain authorizing provisions. However, there are other countries in which there are hundreds of millions of dollars of excess currencies which are really owned by the United States. But under the agreements that have been made up to this time it has not been required that these currencies be used for the common defense, including internal security.

This amendment would simply limit the granting of military assistance until such time as these provisions were put in the normal agreement which is negotiated regularly.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. I am familiar with the gentleman's amendment. I believe that if we had had more time and if we had had more information on the amendment the amendment would have been incorporated in the bill during the marking up of the bill in committee.

Mr. MONAGAN. It is my fault that it was not submitted in time to be considered by the committee during the markup.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the amendment is good. I have consulted with my colleagues on the majority side, and the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we also agree that it is an excellent amendment and we accept it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, during Senate consideration of this legislation, an amendment was adopted to extend the present $55 million ceiling on grant of military equipment to Latin America to cover sales as well. The result would be to cut the existing program by more than half.

Proponents of the Senate amendment claimed that it will discourage military forces in Latin America from meddling in the political life of their nations. They further claimed that such a limitation will reduce the likelihood of an arms race among the Latin American countries. In addition, they averred that the cutback in U.S. military assistance will cause the Latin American countries to devote a larger portion of their resources to constructive purposes.

It is easy to sympathize with the motivations which insipired the Senate provision. The American people have historically felt an affinity for other democratic nations. Temperamentally and traditionally, we have abhorred militarism, at home as well as abroad. We

have consistently rushed to disarm after each unsought and unwelcome military engagement. We have assiduously maintained civilian control over our own military forces. As the United States assumed far-flung responsibilities for the defense of the free world against Communist onslaughts, President Eisenhower—himself a product of our Military Establishment—warned of the dangers of a developing military-industrial complex in the United States.

But the Senate amendment, however well-intentioned, will not achieve the desirable purposes attributed to it. On the contrary.

Consider the problem of military coups in Latin America. In those countries where the military appear to play a dominant role, there has not yet developed a workable and popularly accepted basis among civilian political groups for the orderly transfer of power. In this kind of situation, the role played by the military is less cause than result. With or without U.S. military assistance, where violence is the accepted alternative to peaceful resolution of political issues, the military—frequently prevailed upon by civilian factions—will step in.

Furthermore, it is imperative to make a distinction between the use of the military to protect the status quo—a role apparently imputed to them by the authors of the current amendment—and their role to protect the state against Communist-inspired or other totalitarian revolutionary movements. In countries where viable political systems do not exist, where contending forces are unable to achieve peaceful accommodations, the Armed Forces may perform a vital moderating function. Much as we may deplore military intervention, we cannot be blind to realities. Above all, we must learn to judge each Latin American country according to its own circumstances and to avoid making blanket indictments of countries in which situations differ markedly.

Until some of the basic social reforms called for by the Alliance for Progress are achieved, Latin America will remain a region in ferment. But without internal peace, the goals of the Alliance will be rendered impossible. In these circumstances, U.S. military assistance—directed as it currently is largely toward internal security, counterinsurgency, and civic action—can play a meaningful role in helping the Latin American nations maintain the domestic peace vital to economic and social progress.

In fact, U.S. military assistance in these areas can be crucial to shoring up democratically elected governments. Drastically reducing military assistance is hardly the way to assist such countries as Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, and the new Guatemalan Government, which face active—and undemocratic—insurgent movements.

As for the charge that U.S. military assistance induces an arms race in Latin America, the contrary prevails. By virtually cutting out the military sales program—which would be the effect of the Senate amendment—we cut the Latin American nations loose to purchase military equipment from every persuasive dealer in the world. The effect would be to undermine inter-American efforts to adjust defense measures to real exigencies. Those Latin American military forces that exercise dominant roles in their own countries would then have free reign to satisfy their temptations to acquire unnecessary, but prestigious, sophisticated equipment. And it is unlikely that the United States could bring much influence to bear upon foreign arms dealers, eager for sales and indifferent to their impact upon the Latin American scene. In this case, we would shortly find a miniature arms race on among those countries in Latin America which have old boundary disputes and rivalries. The unhappy result would also mean the expenditure of scarce resources for unnecessary, costly, sophisticated weaponry.

In short, the Senate amendment will not reduce the penchant of some Latin American military forces to intervene in domestic politics. It will weaken the hemisphere's efforts to cope with the wars of terrorism and insurgency promised by the Tri-Continental Congress, held in Cuba last December. It will free those Latin American military establishments who wish to enhance their prestige by acquiring sophisticated equipment to shop around. And it will start the arms race which the amendment's proponents seek to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important to note that no amendment of this nature was adopted or even offered in the House of Representatives, and I urge the House conferees when they meet with their Senate counterparts to strongly oppose this particular Senate provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART III

Chapter 1—General provisions

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

(a) Section 601, which relates to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), immediately after paragraph (1), insert the following new paragraph:

"(2) establish an effective system for obtaining adequate information with respect to the activities of, and opportunities for, nongovernmental participation in the development process, and for utilizing such information in the planning, direction, and execution of programs carried out under this Act, and in the coordination of such programs with the ever-increasing developmental activities of nongovernmental United States institutions;".

(2) In subsection (b), redesignate paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) There is hereby established an International Private Investment Advisory Council on Foreign Aid to be composed of such members of leading American business specialists as may be selected, from time to time, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection. The members of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Administrator, who shall designate one member to serve as Chairman.

"(2) It shall be the duty of the Council, at the request of the Administrator, to make recommendations to the Administrator with respect to particular aspects of programs and activities under this Act where private enterprise can play a contributing role and to act as liaison for the Administrator to involve specific private enterprises in such programs and activities.

"(3) The members of the Advisory Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their functions under this subsection.

"(4) The expenses of the Advisory Council shall be paid by the Administrator from funds otherwise available under this Act."

(b) Section 608(a), which relates to advance acquisition of property, is amended by inserting "(including personnel costs)" immediately after "costs" the first place it appears in the first sentence.

(c) Section 610(b), which relates to transfer between accounts, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated under section 402 of this Act for any fiscal year for use in Vietnam may be transferred to and consolidated with appropriations made under section 637(a) of this Act for the same fiscal year, subject to the further limitation that funds so transferred shall be available solely for additional administrative expenses incurred in connection with programs in Vietnam."

(d) Section 614(a), which relates to special authorities, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The limitation contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to any country which is a victim of active Communist or Communist-supported aggression."

(e) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of subsection (i) is amended to read as follows: "No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts, or is participating officially in any international conference to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion, directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased, or such participation has ceased, and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed, or that such participation will not be renewed or repeated."

(2) Subsection (l) is amended to read as follows:

"(l) The President shall consider denying assistance under this Act to the government of any less developed country which, after December 31, 1966, has failed to enter into an agreement with the President to institute the investment guaranty program under section 221(b)(1) of this Act, providing protection against the specific risks of inconvertibility under subparagraph (A), and expropriation or confiscation under subparagraph (B), of such section 221(b)(1)."

(3) Subsection (n) is amended by striking out "the President shall consider denying assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "no assistance shall be furnished".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the bill starting on page 15, line 1, part III, chapter 1—General Provisions—and going over to line 3 on page 19 be considered as read and open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBSTEIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: On page 19, immediately after line 3, insert the following: (4) At the end of such section 620, add the following new subsection:

"(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has already declared its feelings about the troublemaker of the Middle East, Mr. Nasser, in barring any renewal of aid to his country under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program. I believe the bill before us today would be deficient if a similar provision were not included. I, therefore, introduce an amendment to prevent any assistance to the United Arab Republic under this legislation. Admittedly, there is no provision for aid to the United Arab Republic in the current foreign aid bill. However, the door is not closed—particularly to development loans. I believe we must close it as decisively as we can. That is the intent of this amendment.

I need not dwell unduly on the proof that President Nasser pursues a policy diametrically opposed to ours in the Middle East. Our intention is to promote peace. His is to promote tension, instability and war. He keeps 70,000 soldiers in Yemen for aggressive purposes. He has sent arms to the Congo and elsewhere in the volatile lands to his south. He has sought to deprive us of the use of Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya. He has discriminated against our citizens. He has burned our libraries. Perhaps most outrageous, he uses the aid we give him to free his own funds so that he can buy arms from Communist countries with which to make war.

Many of my colleagues have joined me in pointing out this country's mistake in aiding the United Arab Republic. Congress has consistently, over the years, expressed its opposition to our encouraging the Nasser rampage, which is how our continued assistance must be interpreted. My amendment would end this unwise policy once and for all. I call upon my colleagues to join me in barring American assistance to an aggressor, once and for all.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALPERN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the amendment offered by Mr. FARBSTEIN: Immediately after the word "reports" on line 3 of the amendment add the following: "within 30 days of such findings", and immediately after the last word in the amendment, strike the period, add a comma, and add the following: "and further that such assistance will neither directly or indirectly assist in aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic."

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, for myself, I am satisfied in the interests of bipartisanship to accept this amendment to show the Arab countries that we in this United States are united in our disgust with the activities of Mr. Nasser.

However, I must submit to the wishes of the chairman, and, if he will agree to accept this amendment, I will be pleased on my part to do so.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not as vital as the argument would indicate. I have no strong opposition to either the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], or to the amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. The amendment prohibits assistance to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. There is very little assistance in this bill for the United Arab Republic, only a limited technical assistance program, that runs around $2,200,000.

What this program consists of, is a technical assistance program to provide a couple of university teams over there to show those people how to grow more food and to improve their production. All of this $2,200,000 is spent for services of Americans. The United Arab Republic does not get a dime under this act.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman believes this amendment is helpful and effective, the chairman of the committee is willing to accept both amendments.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed I rise to offer an amendment to the one now before us. I am in agreement with the intent of the amendment presented by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], who has done so much effective work in this field. I have a similar but broader, amendment at the desk, and the language I now offer would conform the amendments into one. In adopting my amendment, I believe the bill will thereby be perfected and strengthened. I could not be more pleased than with the acceptance of my amendment by the gentleman from New York.

I want to make clear that this language reflects the collective views of many of my colleagues. I want to particularly commend another able gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] for his efforts in helping to develop meaningful and unequivocal legislation which we trust will be included today in the Foreign Assistance Act. Likewise, much credit must go to the gentlemen from New York [Mr. RYAN and Mr. WOLFF] as well as to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], a member of the committee, all of whom have been most helpful. I would be remiss if I did not mention the superb cooperation and assistance given by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], the ranking minority members of the committee, who have contributed so much toward this bipartisan effort to cut off aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic.

It is significant and gratifying to know that the amendment has the full support of the minority leadership. I hail this unanimity.

Mr. Chairman, I feel my amendment is necessary in order to be more specific and to preclude any misinterpretation of the intent of this House.

Despite this overwhelming and enthusiastic expression of support, I feel it important to the legislative history of this legislation that I explain the amendment and its objectives in further detail. The amendment I offer adds the following language to the amendment previously read:

First. To the clause in the gentleman's amendment which asks the President to report to the Congress that assistance to the United Arab Republic is "essential to the national interests," my amendment specifies that the report be submitted within 30 days of such findings.

And, secondly, I would add a new provision in the presidential proviso by adding after the words "essential to the national interest," such phrase being in the gentleman's amendment, the following new language: "that such assistance will neither directly nor indirectly assist aggressive action by the United Arab Republic."

I have added a definite time limit of 30 days because I believe that the word "report" in the gentleman's amendment is vague and open to misinterpretation. The Congress must be informed of the reasons for and the amount of any assistance which the President determines essential to our national interest. So, if we are going to have a Presidential report, let us at least be specific and tell him both where and when to submit it.

And, most importantly, in order to indicate that we do not wish at any time, either directly or indirectly, to contribute to Nasser's aggression, I have added a further condition that the President must prove that any waiving of our no-aid provision will not in any way assist, directly or indirectly, aggressive actions by Nasser. Further, this provision should close the door once and for all for any possible assistance to Nasser under this act. By his own avowed aggressive policy, and his offensive actions in Yemen alone, he would be eliminated from any Presidential waiving of this amendment. That is why I recommend

writing it into the bill as my amendment does.

Why is this new condition needed? I will tell you why. There is already a very broad antiaggressive clause as part of the existing act, section 620(i). But I must point out that this is a general clause and does not pinpoint specific countries, such as my amendment does in the case of the United Arab Republic. This is important, I believe, because the clause in the general sense has, to my knowledge, never been implemented by the State Department. Despite Nasser's repeated aggressive actions, the State Department has failed to label Nasser an aggressor and refused to suspend aid to his country. That is because, I believe the present all-inclusive, general clause is just that—all too inclusive and too general.

Now, by naming Nasser's United Arab Republic individually, and by inserting this specific antiaggressor section—my amendment, as it amends the gentleman's—will place the burden upon the State Department to prove that Nasser is not an aggressor nation. They must prove that the United Arab Republic is not fomenting strife in the Middle East, or elsewhere if he wishes to earn any aid from us.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unique for Congress to single out nations in the Foreign Assistance Act. No less than 19 nations are mentioned specifically by Congress which are not permitted to receive U.S. aid.

In fact, we have in the past singled out the United Arab Republic itself. I refer you to the amendment this House adopted by voice vote on June 9, on the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], restricting title I sales of food to the United Arab Republic under the Food for Freedom Act. I also refer you to last year's Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, expired as of June 30, which in a fashion very similar to the gentleman's amendment, imposed restrictions on aid to the United Arab Republic.

Secondly, Presidential reports and determinations submitted to the Congress are an accepted procedure to the Foreign Assistance Act. I refer you to sections 512, 620 (l) and (j) among many others.

Mr. Chairman, the phrase "essential to the national interest" is the language accepted in existing limiting legislation. It is used in the restriction on aid to certain other countries. It is used also in both the Food for Freedom Act and the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act to which I just referred.

But that phrase in itself is much too broad, and leaves too many loopholes, which have in some instances been taken advantage of.

That is why I am trying through the language of my amendment to close escape hatches and require the President to submit specific findings to Congress. My amendment will include additional restrictions and closely defined areas for exemptions.

For the reasons cited by the gentleman from New York and by many of us during the general debate on the bill, I would not take the time now to list the numerous indictments against Nasser and why, if we have any self-respect as a nation, we should eliminate the United Arab Republic from our assistance programs.

No one is less entitled to our aid, and no one has made more of a mockery of our program than the Egyptian dictator.

In view of these continuing transgressions on the part of this "Castro of the Nile," I can see no possible justification for the United States furnishing a single dime to the United Arab Republic.

With the adoption of the amendment before the House, and with the inclusion of my amendment, we can finally serve notice on Nasser, and to the State Department, that we no longer tolerate flagrant misuse of our funds—nor do we plan to underwrite aggression in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support this long overdue but crucial suspension of aid to an aggressor nation and to vote for my amendment and then for the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], which prohibits assistance under this act to the United Arab Republic except under clearly defined circumstances. Under the proposed amendments any aid to the United Arab Republic would be prohibited unless the President finds not only that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States but he must also find that such assistance will not encourage aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic. In addition under the proposed amendment the President must report within 30 days after such findings to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Last year I supported and voted for an amendment to the 1965 agriculture appropriations supplemental bill which prohibited the financing of shipments of agricultural products to the United Arab Republic. The other Chamber, in its wisdom, added to this amendment the language which allowed the President to authorize such sales where he determined such sales to be in the national interest of the United States. When the conference report reached the House floor, the Senate version of the ban was approved by the House, by overwhelming voice vote. I supported the Senate version of the ban.

As I stated in the House at that time, February 9, 1965:

> Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to aid to Egypt and other countries dedicated to a course of world aggression remains one of strong opposition. I joined my colleagues when we expressed this feeling as the sense of the Congress last week by voting to cut off shipments of surplus food to the United Arab Republic.
>
> The question before the House yesterday, Monday, February 8, 1965, was not one of reaffirming this position or changing it. Rather, the question was whether the sense of the Congress should be expressed in a manner contrary to the traditional separation of power and responsibility in the sphere of foreign affairs. The amendments added by the other body is one acceptable to me as it was acceptable to a majority of the Members of the House.
>
> I would not want to see the hands of the President tied because of our expression of opposition. It is more fitting to convey our feeling to the Chief Executive without impairing the flexible position required to negotiate with other countries. The other question before the House was whether to tie the hands of our committee going into conference on the bill.
>
> Our feelings have been conveyed in a responsible manner. Let us hope that the United Arab Republic will understand its full meaning and significance.

I have actively participated with my colleague, Congressman FARBSTEIN, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and my colleague, Congressman HALPERN, in the preparation of three amendments.

The language in the proposed amendments before the House today goes even further and strengthens the ban on aid to the United Arab Republic by requiring the President to report his findings within 30 days, and that any such aid to the United Arab Republic is in the national interest and will not be used for aggressive purposes.

The burden will be on the President to justify his action to the Congress while the constitutional power of the President to manage the foreign affairs of the Nation will not be violated.

On the broader question of aid to the United Arab Republic and our military assistance program in general, I would like to express my disappointment in the continuing arms races in various areas of the world. We must not permit our aid to be diverted so as to encourage aggression or subversion. We must continue to support those who represent the hope for peace in the world.

I have supported our economic aid programs in the Near East and in other areas of the world in order to assist the economic development of areas which are unstable and in order to achieve peace and stability throughout the world. I continue to believe that you cannot change the politics of a hungry man.

While we have made strides in assisting the economic development in the Near East through our economic aid program, the people of that area continue to suffer as a result of the arms race, and the aggressive attitudes of the United Arab Republic. Massive shipments of arms by the Soviet Union to the United Arab Republic and to other Arab States have escalated the arms race and as a result of increasing the defense requirements of the nations in the area, further economic progress has been and is being hampered.

Because of the belligerent attitudes and aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic, the proposed amendments now before this Committee are necessary and also because of the increased activities of the Palestine Liberation Front the amendments are time-

ly. By passing these amendments, Congress will have spoken out in clear terms and the executive branch will retain the constitutional responsibility for conducting foreign affairs, while at the same time meeting its obligation to report to Congress the findings we must have to justify further assistance to the United Arab Republic.

I believe the amendments are sound and I am pleased to join with my colleagues from New York in urging their adoption by the Committee of the Whole House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, my able colleague from the Borough of Queens [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in support of the principles contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, my colleague, Mr. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, and for the substitute amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SEYMOUR HALPERN, to H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966.

At this time, I wish to express my opposition to further extension of aid to those countries which have been damaging our Nation's policy interests and materially have been disrupting peace throughout the world. In whatever form it might be, assistance abroad becomes definitely an arm of American foreign policy. We do not wish that newly free states, who are weak and insecure at the present time, to lean too heavily upon enemy forces, as we are a civilized nation and one of our foremost endeavors at this time is to extend our knowledge and surplus commodities to meet human wants. However, on the other hand we do not wish those countries presently receiving our aid to abuse such by diverting its resources to war engagement and making it possible to avoid the cruel internal demands which arise. In this sense, the soundness of American aid, I feel, has already been damaged by countries such as the United Arab Republic.

As an illustration, a few weeks ago, a visitor to this country, Saudi Arabia's King Faisal made a derogatory statement in answer to a question asked of him as to what country he regarded as his worse enemy—the United Arab Republic or Israel when he replied that Egyptians remained the brethren of the Saudis. Jews from outside Israel, he was quoted as saying, had taken over the home of the Palestine Arabs and were therefore guilty of aggression. Is this not a hostile attitude to take after receiving aid from us? I cannot refrain from mentioning here that I believe all of us admire the contributions those of the Jewish faith have given to us here in the United States, as well as throughout the world.

I feel because of the specific section of this bill concerning U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic, a need is necessary for this amendment to delineate precisely our policy toward the United Arab Republic. Therefore, I support wholeheartedly the stand taken by these two distinguished gentlemen from New York, in their respective amendments on this subject.

I wish to commend at this time the outstanding work the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee here in the House of Representatives, has done, as well as the members of said committee, in presenting this important bill to us today.

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

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I should like to a short statement in connection with the remarks made by my distinguished and beloved friend. I know that this bill contains only a very small sum of money for the United Arab Republic, but a contract may be, and probably will be, signed with Mr. Nasser, insofar as the sale of surplus foods under Public Law 480 is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I take exception to remarks of our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I have been pleased to cosponsor the amendment offered by our able colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman FARBSTEIN. I believe that this amendment is fully consistent with the policy embodied in the legislation before us. It is a part of the American tradition that our Government has consciously endeavored to eliminate discrimination and to promote respect for the rights of all our citizens.

We have followed this policy in our domestic affairs and we have made it an integral part of our approach to other nations.

We have advocated and supported all the peoples' right to self-determination.

We have come out openly against policies of discrimination, whether such discrimination is based on race, color, or creed.

And we have included an expression on this point in the statement of policy which is contained in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York simply carries out the principle which has been firmly established in our foreign policy for many years. It is a sound principle and one which gives outward expression to our respect for the dignity of all men.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

I should like to pursue further the statement I started to make earlier.

I started to say, when the time expired, that consideration is being given now to a renewal of a contract with the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

The language of the amendment, and as contained in the other amendments referring to Public Law 480 suggests that no assistance be given unless the President determines that it is essential in the national interest of the United States.

That is all right with me. There is nothing in this bill, however, even if this amendment is adopted—and I understand it has been accepted on both sides—to prevent any development loans from being made to the United Arab Republic if the President finds it is in the national interest.

I want to put all of those who have the authority to make any agreements, insofar as development loans are concerned, with the United Arab Republic and the sale of surplus foods under Public Law 480, that we in this Congress, on both sides, as I said earlier, look with disgust upon the activities of the United Arab Republic.

The statement of the chairman to the effect that we are flag waving is not correct. I believe this is serious business and that mature consideration be given before we make any contract or agreement to aid the United Arab Republic, keeping in mind the feelings of the Congress as expressed in the amendment I just offered which was accepted unanimously as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] for the assistance he has rendered in this and also the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] for her support and the numerous others in the House who echo my sentiments.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Before the United States enters into commitments to supply additional food to Nasser, the officials of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department should take a long, hard look at the record.

It is probably fair to say that during the last several months Nasser's words and acts have been somewhat less objectionable than in previous years.

Nevertheless, the United Arab Republic continues to draw on its very limited resources to build up its military establishment. All of the resources of Egypt are needed to improve the living conditions of the poverty stricken people of that country. They should not be used to accelerate an arms race to the detriment not only of the people of the United Arab Republic but to all of the people of the Near East.

Nasser continues to cultivate the U.S.S.R. His policy apparently continues to be to put pressure on the United States to assist him by threatening to throw in his lot with the Russians.

The Egyptian Army is still in Yemen, and there is no evidence that the withdrawal of these forces is being accelerated.

It seems to me that the United States should be firm with the Government of the United Arab Republic rather than follow a policy of appeasement. If Nasser wants to be friendly and cooperative, let us reciprocate. If he wants to give *aid and comfort* to our enemies and publicize unfriendly statements about the United States and our policies, let him make his own way without our help.

There have been numerous reports of private conversations with officials of the United Arab Republic, who said that beginning last fall Nasser was turning over a new leaf, that he wanted to cooperate with the United States.

In my judgment, the United States should pay more attention to what Nasser does than to what he or his emissaries say. Let us wait until his performance justifies such action before we resume food shipments.

The situation in the Middle East is always in considerable turmoil—the Arab-Israeli conflict; the division in the Arab world; and the constant probing of the Soviets to take advantage of every opening requires constant awareness on the part of our diplomats for shifts in emphasis, programs, and diplomacy while adhering to fundamental principles of U.S. policies in the Middle East.

An interesting discussion on some of the complexities, background, and actions which are continually shifting in the Middle East are set forth in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Philip Geyelin, which I commend to my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1966]

ARAB-WORLD PERIL—FAISAL VISIT POINTS UP WIDENING MIDEAST RIFT ALONG COLD-WAR LINES—SAUDI ARABIAN LEADER SEEKS FIRM U.S. STAND ON UAR; SOVIET ROLE IN AREA GROWS—A NEW RUSSIAN NAVAL BASE?

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The Russians are on the prowl again in the Middle East, and in a manner which raises sharp questions about just how fundamentally the character of the Cold War may have changed.

The popular notions currently have it that Vietnam is the really crucial conflict; that infiltration and subversion and guerrilla wars of liberation are the great danger, with outright Communist take-over as their aim; and that the Russians pose less and less of a threat to Western interests while the Chinese loom more and more as Public Enemy No. 1. Most top U.S. policy-makers find something to be said for all this.

But King Faisal ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud is here in Washington this week to tell President Johnson that his own oil-soaked kingdom of Saudi Arabia and a clutch of other Mideast monarchies are now menaced, actively if indirectly, by a growing Communist threat of Russian origin. As King Faisal sees it, the Soviets are rapidly expanding their bid for influence over the Arab "socialists" running Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Algeria, and actively wooing non-Arab but Moslem Iran. From all the evidence, the king wants more resolute U.S. support for the Arab "conservatives"—notably Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Kuwait—as a counterpoise.

INCREASED ALARM

Without accepting all of this assessment, many U.S. Government experts and private authorities are likewise expressing increased alarm over the latest turn of Mideast events. To some, the current scene is all too reminiscent of the situation a little more than a decade ago when the Russians were lining up their arms deal with Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, nailing down grandiose aid deals such as the one for building Egypt's Aswan Dam, and otherwise plunging deeply into the struggle for influence in the Arab world.

The scale of Soviet activity is more modest now, and the approach is somewhat subtler. "Last time the Russians openly challenged the West, stirred up Cold War tensions, scared the Syrians into union with Egypt, wound up alienating Mr. Nasser and almost wrecked their own cause," recalls one U.S. veteran diplomat. "This time they're moving on little cat's feet instead of bear's paws."

But intelligence reports and other gleanings leave no doubt of quickening Russian interest and activity. In part, the evidence shows a steady increase in the Russian Mideast effort in recent years, including the striking-up of trade relations with even such staunchly anti-Communist nations as Kuwait; the beginnings of a major economic collaboration with traditionally pro-Western Iran (featuring $260 million in Soviet credit to build a steel mill, in exchange for Russian access to Iranian natural gas); a general increase in Russian diplomatic, economic and military missions (at last count, some two-thirds of all Soviet military and technical personnel overseas were in the Mideast); and, according to some analysts, an abnormally high proportion of former intelligence specialists in key positions in Russian embassies in the Arab world (by one count, 5 of the 11 Soviet ambassadors to Arab states are onetime intelligence operatives).

NEW RED ACTIVITY

But there are also signs of a recent spurt in the Russians' activity, timed with Soviet Premier Kosygin's visit to Cairo last month.

Item: Though few results of that visit were revealed, many experts are convinced the Soviet chief nailed down arrangements for Egyptian repair-and-maintenance facilities for Russian warships and some, reportedly including King Faisal, fear that actual naval bases for Russia may ultimately be involved. At the least, this could mean warm-water ports for Soviet naval vessels in a part of the world where the U.S. Sixth Fleet now operates without challenge.

Item: Mr. Kosygin almost certainly used the influence of Russia, as the principal underwriter of Egyptian economic development to encourage Mr. Nasser to carry on with his fruitless, stalemated "war" on behalf of Yemen's republican government. Mr. Nasser's United Arab Republic (the UAR is no longer "united" with anybody since the rupture with Syria) has as many as 70,000 soldiers committed to stamp out the stubborn resistance of the royal Yemeni royalist forces. Russia's real motive, many onlookers believe, is to keep Mr. Nasser actively engaged on the tip of the Arabian Peninsula until the British pull out of Aden, next door to Yemen, leaving that British stronghold and the affiliated South Arabian Federation vulnerable to possible Nasserite inroads a few years from now.

Item: Soviet propaganda lately has been trumpeting, and Soviet diplomacy has been busily promoting, the cause of "Arab socialism" with mixed success. Iraq and Algeria, for example, have so far stood aloof from any tight "Arab socialist" cabal. But Russian efforts to promote improved relations between the UAR and Syria's new, arch-leftist government, which boasts at least one avowed Communist in the cabinet, show more signs of progress. Despite mutual suspicions and hard feelings growing out of the collapse of their short-lived union, both sides have been obediently trying to patch things up, since being urged publicly to do so by the Soviets last month.

By way of increasing the Russian "presence" in Syria, as well as Russian leverage, Moscow has just promised the new Syrian government up to $100 million in credits to finance a start on a new dam on the Euphrates which Soviet propagandists are promoting as "another Aswan."

The aim in all this, as most U.S. experts see it, is not the classic Communist take-over. Only in Syria are local Communists much in evidence. Instead, the immediate objective is to stir dissension in general, and, in particular, to provoke an open, violent quarrel between the so-called Arab nationalists, with their Marxist economic doctrines, and the monarchies, whose allegiance is largely with the Western "imperialists." By sharpening this struggle, the Russians could hope, first, to force the U.S. to take sides openly and decisively with the ancient, "conservative" kingdoms and shiekdoms while the Soviets ride the socialist "wave of the future." The theory, of course, is that the latter would in time turn out to be the winning side.

Ultimately, as this strategy is projected by analysts here, the hope would be to expand Russian influence over the entire Mideast. This could enhance Soviet military power (as with naval bases). More important, it could give Russia heavy influence, if not outright control, over the production and marketing of Mideast oil to consumers in the West. "The Russians don't need Arab oil for its own sake," says one U.S. authority. "But they'd dearly love to dictate the terms under which we get it."

Something else the Soviets might or might not welcome is the effect all this could have on the basic Arab-Israeli dispute which cuts across all other Mideast conflicts. Getting tied inextricably to the Mideast kings and sheiks would be awkward enough for the U.S. But if the Arab "revolutionaries" should wind up as the wave of the future, and sweep over the remaining "conservative" strongholds, the U.S. could wind up in the Mideast as the champion of Israel and little else, with the Soviets in the corner of those pledged to "Palestine liberation" by force. The upshot could be a U.S.-Soviet confrontation on an issue neither wants to fight about.

DREAD OF "POLARIZATION"

Nobody is saying that things actually will turn out this way. But dread of the very "polarization" the Soviets now seem to be promoting, with visible success, has been the major motivation of U.S. policy in the Mideast in recent years. The whole purpose has been to treat each country case-by-case and try to get along with all of them, rather than invite formal anti-Communist alliance only with friendly, staunchly pro-Western Mideast states, as was done in the Eisenhower days.

Against this backdrop the Faisal visit here takes on added significance, for its timing could scarcely have been less opportune. Quite by accident (the visit originally was planned for a year and a half ago), the Saudi leader is arriving at a moment when most of the nasty things that Mr. Nasser and the Soviets are saying about him have at least a ring of truth.

He has just received a batch of U.S. ground-to-air Hawk missiles and British Lightning jets and shortly will have some 1,500 U.S. and British technicians on hand to help him handle this new weaponry. He is loudly propounding a new approach to "Islamic solidarity" which Mr. Nasser is as loudly denouncing as an "imperialist" effort to construct a new kind of anti-Communist Baghdad Pact.

And now, here is King Faisal in Washington, asking for more specific assurances of U.S. support. By some accounts, the king wants the U.S. to cut further aid to the UAR until President Nasser takes his troops out of Yemen. A six-month, $55 million surplus food agreement with the UAR expires at the end of this month, though food shipments under its terms will stretch into the fall. Mr. Nasser urgently needs the food. He is heavily in debt to Russia for arms and is critically short of foreign exchange to buy foodstuffs elsewhere. What he would really like is another long-term food deal similar to a three-year arrangement which the Johnson Administration refused to renew a year ago; the intent was to pressure Mr. Nasser into settling the Yemen conflict and adopting a generally less hostile attitude toward the U.S.

The word is that the king also wants this country to define more precisely the circumstances under which it would come to Saudi Arabia's aid in the event of a UAR attack.

PROMISES COULD BE DANGEROUS

U.S. officials are disinclined to meet either of these demands. For one thing, the Kennedy Administration committed the U.S. in 1963 to help defend the Saudis against aggression. More precise promises could be dangerous simply because the Saudis themselves are involved in helping the Yemeni royalists and the fighting could be carried all too easily across the Saudi-Yemen frontier under circumstances that might make it difficult to tell just who was at fault.

But Mideast "polarization" is the major argument for caution, the policymakers contend. Too close U.S. alignment with Saudi Arabia would only advance the process, as, of course, would an abrupt cut-off of aid to the UAR. Yet President Johnson is in a box. King Faisal's pitch is bound to have powerful appeal in Congress, where sentiment is already strong for cutting off foreign aid to all but the most worthy, pro-Western, anti-Communist recipients.

The upshot is likely to be a compromise when the Saudi king and the U.S. President wind up their conversations today. The U.S. commitment to Saudi defense will probably be reaffirmed, privately if not publicly. The knotty question of aid to Mr. Nasser will be left in limbo. It has no place in any public resume of the Johnson-Faisal huddling. Privately, the king may be given some assurances that U.S. food aid to Mr. Nasser will be doled out on a month-to-month basis, if at all, after the present agreement runs out in an effort to continue the pressure on Mr. Nasser to adopt a more conciliatory tack.

But King Faisal may well be asked to pledge that the Saudis also will be a bit more conciliatory in a fresh effort to solve the Yemen mess. Most officials here contend that King Faisal was as responsible as Mr. Nasser for the collapse of an agreement between the two men last November which was supposed to lead to a settlement in the Yemen. One possible first step: An arrangement by which Saudi Arabia might cooperate in a new plan to provide surplus U.S. food to both sides in the Yemen war. The hope is that such a move might not only help ease famine conditions in the Yemen but perhaps improve the atmosphere for a renewed try at a political settlement.

None of this, however, offers any guarantee of healing the Faisal-Nasser breach or of easing the wider "polarization" threat in the Mideast. The Soviet hold on Mr. Nasser is strong. King Faisal, according to some who know him, may well believe that economic distress within the UAR, coupled with the strains of the Yemen campaign, may well bring Nasser down—and that this is a compelling argument for a continuing hard line.

Meantime, the Soviets can be counted on to use their influence to fuel the wider internecine Arab strife. Whether this effort will match in scope the first big, postwar Russian drive in the Mideast, begun in 1954, is still impossible to say. "But I wouldn't sneer at a man who argued it was 'another 1954'," says one knowledgeable U.S. diplomat. "I'd listen intently."

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] for rendering a fine public service and especially so our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who have accepted this amendment. I would like to point out that this amendment has been agreed to by both sides, and I urge that in the interest of time we move along and vote on it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently urged that this House make perfectly clear our intent that there be no economic assistance or agricultural aid under the Public Law 480 program and now the new food-for-freedom program to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I spoke in favor of the pending bill, stressing the importance of foreign aid as an ally in a dynamic foreign policy and its role in assisting the developing nations to achieve economic independence and self-sustaining growth. I feel strongly that the United States has an obligation to help relieve the economic and social problems of the developing world. At the same time, our economic assistance should not be abused, and the program must be administered in the interest of world peace and stability. Certainly our aid must not be allowed to subsidize aggression.

I have repeatedly urged on the floor of this House that economic aid and Public Law 480 assistance not be granted to the United Arab Republic as long as she continues to threaten Israel and carry on aggression in the Middle East. Congress has written language into the foreign aid bill expressing this as the intent of Congress.

The United Arab Republic, formerly Egypt, has been threatening Israel ever since that democracy gained its independence. The United Arab Republic has invaded Yemen and is currently carrying on aggressive action against that nation. More recently, Nasser has threatened invasion of Saudi Arabia.

In 1963 the Foreign Assistance Act was amended to include section 620 which provided that no assistance was to be provided to any country which the President finds is engaging in, or preparing for, aggressive military efforts directed against any country receiving assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act or any other act.

It is clear from the report, the debate in 1963, and debates in later years on the floor that this so-called aggressor nation clause was directed against the United Arab Republic.

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

When the State Department failed to implement that intent, we again amended Public Law 480 in 1965 to make the prohibition even more specific. It read:

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

Only last month, on June 9, the House adopted my amendment to the new food-for-freedom bill to prevent food sales to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines such sales to be in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, in the face of the expressed will of the Congress, the United Arab Republic has continued to receive economic assistance and agricultural commodities under Public Law 480. Time and again, the State Department has flaunted congressional intent.

Under the pending Foreign Assistance Act Amendments economic assistance will be continued for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968.

Nevertheless, the committee's report expresses the view that:

> Economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution.

This is certainly correct. This language is aimed at Egypt, but the bill itself does not mention that country. This must be spelled out. Therefore, I support the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is ludicrous for this Nation to allow itself to pay for both sides of an armed conflict. We should rather use our aid in an effort to end these conflicts. The most direct way of doing this is to keep American aid from those nations which maintain aggressive policies.

The pending bill also includes a provision which prohibits aid to nations which officially participate in international conferences called to plan activities involving insurrection or subversion against the United States or against countries receiving United States assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the President and the Department of State to heed the will of Congress on this issue.

The past intent of Congress is unequivocal, but it has been frustrated by the administration. Despite the obvious fact that the United Arab Republic has carried on, is carrying on, and plans to continue to carry on aggression against her neighbors, especially the State of Israel, the State Department has continued to send aid to that nation. The State Department is not unaware of what is happening in the Middle East. It has deliberately ignored the Congress in its decisions on Egyptian aid.

Mr. Chairman, we all remember Nasser's statement that the United States

could take its aid and go "jump in a lake." One would think the message was clear enough.

Here is a breakdown of the aid that has gone to Egypt through fiscal year 1965:

Grants	$68,100,000
Loans	103,200,000
Surplus foods	850,700,000
Eximbank loans	47,800,000
Other	11,100,000
Total	1,080,900,000

Mr. Chairman, it is time to end aid to the United Arab Republic. In the past, our assistance has permitted that nation to divert its economy to the production of cotton which has been bartered to Soviet Russia in return for arms—which have then been used for armed attacks in the Near East. This cycle must be halted.

Last month we did begin to halt the process. The House on June 9 voted to adopt my amendment to curb food sales to the United Arab Republic as a part of the new food-for-freedom program. At that time I said that neither our surplus food program nor our economic aid program "should be used to subsidize aggression by nations which receive our aid." The House concurred, and started to close the ring on Nasser. Let us tighten it today with adoption of the pending amendments.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am hapy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendments proposed by my colleagues which would cut off all aid to the United Arab Republic unless the President determined that it was in the interest of our national security to do otherwise.

There should be little doubt in anyone's mind that the United Arab Republic is the greatest threat to peace in the Middle East. In his quest to become the leader of the entire Arab world, Nasser has taken up arms against several of his peace-loving neighbors. Because of Nasser's ambitions, little Israel has had to constantly be on the alert against attack. He has placed 60,000 of his troops in Yemen, a small nation in which a civil war only exists because of Nasser. Nasser supported the Communist inspired "Stanleyville" rebels in the Congo. Also, there are indications that Nasser is training troops to fight with the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

I can think of no reason at all for aiding Nasser: He is a merciless dictator. He has proven himself over the years to be a vile opportunist who has no love for America or what we stand for. He has consistently taken our aid especially food intended for his hungry people and resold it for arms with which to attack his neighbors. He has employed West German scientists in an attempt to develop even more deadly weapons than those which the Russians have so graciously provided him. He has instigated revolutions in many of the nations surrounding him—fortunately with little success. He is hated by most; loved by few—certainly he is not any sort of ally of the United States.

It is difficult to conceive by any stretch of the imagination how aid to such a man will be in the national interest of the United States. By his past performance we all know that all further aid will get us is more denunciations, more burned libraries, and more agression. Therefore, I enthusiastically back the amendments offered by my colleagues to amend this year's Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KREBS].

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, and to compliment both the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] for presenting them to this body.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. I have never voted for any amendment to tie the hands of the President in the conduct of foreign policy, and I believe this amendment will not tie his hands but in effect will strengthen his hands in dealing with the UAR, because the UAR will know that we will insist upon their refraining from aggression.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

I support the measures to eliminate the provision in the foreign aid bill providing several million dollars in aid to Nasser's United Arab Republic.

I voted against this aid because history shows that any aid of any kind, no matter how benificent the project, to a state bent on military aggression strengthens the warmaking power of that state. It releases, for military use, resources which would otherwise have been spent for peaceful purposes.

The facts amply demonstrate that Nasser's present policy is generating throughout the Near East armed conflict, a wastage of manpower and material resources desperately needed in domestic development of all the Mideastern nations, and threatens general conflagration in the entire region.

Nasser's record of aggression is clear and unmistakable.

He has been involved militarily in the internal struggles for control of Yemen.

He is promoting the United Arab Military Command which results in channeling our aid and Arab internal resources into a destructive and ever-escalating Middle East arms race.

He is forcing nations like Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon to add to their weapons stockpiles, and forgo urgently needed internal development programs.

He entered into extensive new commitments with the Soviet Union during his recent visit to Moscow, to purchase ultramodern Soviet arms, jet bombers, tanks, and SAM missiles, which will further escalate the Near East arms race.

He stated four times in 1965, and again this year, that war with Israel is inevitable.

He has attacked our policies in Vietnam.

He encourages Arab refugees to believe that they will destroy Israel and he arms them.

He harasses our British allies in Aden.

He still bars Israeli shipping from the Suez Canal.

I do not believe we should vote funds to nations which, like the United Arab Republic, are engaged or threatening to engage in armed aggression.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. I support both the amendment and the addition.

The minority views to the report—House Report No. 1651—of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, at page 66 states as follows:

> In December 1964, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told the United States to "jump in the lake" because U.S. Officials expressed irritation over the burning of the U.S. Embassy library in Cairo. *The United Arab Republic has been the recipient of $1,080,700,000 of economic assistance, most of it since 1960.*

It is shocking to me that the aggressive actions of the United Arab Republic against its neighbors, such as Israel, that great bastion of democracy in the Middle East, and against the United States itself, should bring forth largesse.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

I firmly believe that economic assistance should be withheld from countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparation for their execution.

The proposed amendment to the foreign aid bill will make the policy of Congress clear concerning the bellicose attitude of General Nasser and the United Arab Republic toward the establishment of peace and stability in the Middle East.

The intent of the amendment proposed by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN] is clear to all of us:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the United Arab Republic unless the President finds and reports within 30 days of such findings to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and further that such assistance will neither directly or indirectly assist in aggressive actions by the United Arab Republic.

Our foreign aid program should be for those countries believing in peace—those which are concerned with the peaceful development of their economies.

Unfortunately the more than $1 billion of aid we have given the United Arab Republic since the commencement of our aid program has done little to promote the peaceful intentions of this country.

Today the United Arab Republic has over 60,000 troops in the country of Yemen actually engaging in a civil war, while refusing to deal with the situation in a peaceful manner. The United Arab Republic has continually goaded the Arab extremists to war against the State of Israel and has led the escalation of the Middle East arms race. The United Arab Republic has for 18 years done everything possible to prevent a reasonable solution to the sad plight of the Arab refugees.

I am afraid that much of the impact of our aid these past years has been to free United Arab Republic funds for the purchase of more and more Soviet arms.

Mr. Chairman, only last month the House adopted an amendment to the food-for-freedom bill to prevent food sales to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sales are in the national interest. The amendment to the foreign aid bill now before us will be consistent with the House's previous action.

In conclusion, may I say that our policy should not only affect the aggressive actions of Nasser and the United Arab Republic, but all nations receiving aid who would use this aid in perpetrating militant acts against their neighbors.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation and my enthusiasm for the support which has come from both sides of the aisle for my amendment. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, since I did not have the opportunity to finish my comments and some further observations based on today's colloquy, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my additional remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Thank you for yielding.

Some years ago I assured my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], that I had enlisted in this war for the duration. I am still in the thick of the battle. I am for the amendment.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we might overkill this amendment, and I suggest we vote.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On Page 17, line 24, strike out "the President determines".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the debate and the comments over the amendment and the amendment to the amendment we have just adopted, and I would like to point out to the Members of the House very early in that discussion the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], pointed out he did not feel the amendment should produce as much energy as the Members were putting into it since it was not being applied to the necessary part of the problem, which was the sale of foodstuffs to the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment applies to that section, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which is the area about which the chairman was concerned.

Now, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that I am not trying to cut anything from the bill. This is not a dollar-cutting amendment. This is a progressive amendment, to block a loophole that exists in the present law.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the Committee will commence reading at page 17, all I do is delete the phrase, "the President determines," and then the language goes on to apply to nations preparing for aggressive military efforts, or participating in activities involving insurrection or subversion, etc., directed against the United States, any country receiving assistance under this act, or any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

However, Mr. Chairman, I leave in the act the next line which states: "until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased."

Mr. Chairman, under the language contained in the bill the problem that will develop, unless my amendment is adopted, is that you will force the President to pick up this hot potato with reference to any nation—for example the United Arab Republic—which is carrying on an aggression.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose, then, of my amendment is to remove the President from the immediate "hotbox" of having to determine that these military efforts are being directed against the United States or countries specified under this section of the act.

Mr. Chairman, what we should do is put the burden on the aggressor country, the country causing the problem in any particular case.

Mr. Chairman, again, I emphasize that my amendment is aimed at the United Arab Republic.

Mr. Chairman, the President, through the State Department, could turn to them and say, "The law that the Congress passed requires me to suspend this aid." Therefore, it is not the President who has this problem. The Congress has made the decision. The President can say that the Congress has given him the flexibility to determine that such military efforts or preparations have ceased, and "your money can then be restored to coverage under this program."

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe my amendment is perfectly compatible with that idea and with that I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we adopt the gentleman's amendment and take out the words, "the President determines," who is going to make that determination?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, through this process we would make the amendment meaningless. I know that this amendment was presented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] who is the chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee and I know the gentleman gave it a great deal of thought and very careful consideration. I am concerned that we may be making the amendment meaningless by removing the words "the President determines."

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the chairman will continue to read the language of the bill, in line 10, page 18, there is another Presidential determination, but that is on the basis of the President determining that the military effort and preparations have ceased.

What I envision is rather than the President having to turn to any aggressor country saying, "I have determined that you are an aggressor, and therefore I am terminating the aid you are receiving under this program," we create the situation where they must convince the President that they have ceased their preparations and their efforts.

This would help the President, since it does not put the immediate and direct burden upon him. It makes the cutoff automatic, and then they must prove lack of aggression to the President.

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

Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman certainly is trying to make a meaningful contribution to this dialog and to this bill, he states that he is removing a loophole but at the same time he is creating a crater.

One of the problems is that if you remove this determination then who shall make the determination? Who shall set the guidelines? This Presidential determination is a very tricky area. I think the Congress has considered this many times when it included the language that presently exists in section 620(i) of the bill as enacted.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, and so that we do not undermine the amendment that has just been adopted as offered by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN and Mr. HALPERN], and in view of other prohibitions that exist, I urge that the Committee vote this down.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment of the gentleman of Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] refers to a section of the bill that is the result of an amendment offered by me and adopted by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, perhaps it will be of value to the Members to point out the purpose of this particular section.

Section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act as presently constituted, prohibits assistance under this or any other act, including sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any countries which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or against any countries receiving assistance from the United States. The addition to this section, included in the legislation now before the House, extends that prohibition to include countries officially participating in any international conference planning activities involving insurrection or subversion directed against the United States or any nation receiving U.S. assistance.

This addition to section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act evolved from concern which I felt regarding the composition of the delegations attending the Tri-Continental Conference hosted by Castro in Havana in January. The Tri-Continental Conference blatantly outlined the new Communist concept of "simultaneous wars" to be waged by several armed "national liberation forces" at the same time.

The Conference established a Solidarity Organization of African, Asian, and Latin American Peoples, which in turn established a Committee on Assistance and Aid to Movements for National Liberation—to be located in Havana—and a Permanent Executive Secretariat of the Solidarity Organization to coordinate armed insurgencies on the three continents, also to be established in Cuba. The second Tri-Continental Conference is scheduled for Cairo in 1968.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have been particularly concerned with the serious implications these developments have for the peace and security of the hemisphere. The Organization of American States expressed its alarm regarding the aggressive intentions of the Tri-Continental Conference in a resolution of condemnation approved February 2 by a vote of 18–0 with only Mexico and Chile abstaining.

The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs held hearings last February on the Havana Conference, and it was learned that delegates from some 82 countries participated in it. During these hearings it was brought out that some of the delegates attending the Conference, while techniaclly not official representatives of their governments, in a number of cases were there with the official approval of those governments. In several instances, the delegates were even members of the cabinet or of the foreign service of countries receiving foreign aid from the United States.

It seemed to me deeply ironic that the United States should be providing assistance to countries whose officials engage in plotting the kind of subversion and insurgency which would render impotent the long-range economic and social progress that are the goals of U.S. foreign assistance.

During the hearings on the Foreign Assistance Act, officials of the Department of State indicated that it was doubtful that present legislation would apply to such conferences. My amendment is designed to extend the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act to cover such circumstances; in short, to discourage such nefarious activities on the part of officials of supposedly friendly nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMSON OF WISCONSIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin: On page 18, immediately after line 15, insert the following:

"(2) Subsection (k) is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) Without the express approval of Congress, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise, or for carrying out any program, with respect to which the aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No provision of this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.'"

And renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to reenact in this law a provision which was first made a part of the law in 1963.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will remember, and probably this Committee will remember, that the aid program was intending in those days to erect a steel mill in India at a cost of about $500 million. After considerable study in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it was determined that some limitation should be placed on the administrative agency as to the amount that they could spend without the prior approval of the Congress.

This provision was in the 1963 act, and in the 1964 act. It expired in September of 1965. But I think it is more essential than ever, although there is no Bokaro Steel Mill on the horizon. The bill we are now considering is a 2-year authorization bill. The committee will not have an opportunity for 2 years to review the proposals that are being made by the administrative agency, and it is conceivable that they have some dreams about some expensive projects which should be the subject of congressional review and approval before a vast amount of money, such as was the case in the Bokaro Steel Mill proposal, is made available, or a commitment is made which might even to a degree be felt to bind the Congress.

I think this bill should have this provision reenacted so that we retain some degree of congressional control over sums of money in excess of $100 million.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Can the gentleman give the House the assurance that this is the same language which was in the 1963 and 1964 act?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Yes; this was drafted by the staff, with the help, I believe, of others who advise me it is the identical language which was in the 1963 and 1964 acts.

Mr. MORGAN. I remember that that language was sponsored at that time by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and was particularly intended to apply to the construction of the steel mill in India. If this is just an additional section having the same effect as the provision of the 1964 and 1965 acts, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I can give the chairman the assurance of the staff who drafted this amendment that this is identical with the language that was contained in the 1963 and 1964 acts, and I believe it would be a fine addition to this proposal that is to run for a period of 2 years. It would retain in the Congress some control over these sums of money.

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. It is my understanding that similar language is in the bill reported out in the other body, and we on this side would be delighted to accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUMSFELD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUMSFELD: On page 15, immediately after line 21, insert the following:

"(3) In subsection (b), strike out "and" at the end of paragraph (6), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection; strike out the period at the end of paragraph (7), as so redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon; and at the end thereof add the following new paragraph:

"'(8) utilize the services of United States private enterprise on a cost plus incentive fee contract basis to provide the necessary skills to develop and operate a specific project or program of assistance in a less developed friendly country or area in any case in which direct private investment is not readily encouraged, and provide for the transfer of equity ownership in such project or program to private investors at the earliest feasible time.'"

And renumber the following paragraph accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to section 601(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This entire sec-

tion deals with the encouragement of free enterprise and private participation in our overall aid effort and contains various recommendations of specific tools to do the job.

My amendment would add to these tools the utilization of cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts with U.S. private firms to develop and operate specific programs of development in emerging nations. Personally, I would prefer tax advantages to organizations undertaking such activities, but such a proposal would not be germane to this bill. However, under such contracts, provision would specifically be made for a transfer of ownership to private investors at the earliest feasible time, as well as transfer of management to citizens of the host nation.

The advantages of this approach are clear. Existing programs of encouragement for private enterprise are not adequate. The investment guarantee program, it has been argued by many, helps only in marginal situations where the business firm already has an interest in making an investment, but is concerned about the risk of the venture. In some situations, the investment would undoubtedly be made even without the benefit of the guarantee.

Often, programs of assistance have been vulnerable to criticism because of mismanagement or inefficiency. This is to be expected when governments try to run business enterprises in areas where they have no knowledge or experience. Jose de Cubas, president of the Westinghouse Electric International Co., has advocated such Government-business partnerships as those authorized in this amendment because "the element of risk could be held to a minimum while the efficiency of individual corporate efforts—and the competitiveness of group efforts—could be maximized."

Through the use of a cost-plus-incentive fee contract system, AID could identify projects of merit, for example a fertilizer plant or food processing business activity, and bring them to the attention of business firms with competence in the area, offer to help finance the venture and get the job done even though under normal criteria investment would not be warranted, due to risk or the difficulty of access. Once the plant or project became operable, early transfer of the equity interest could be planned. The training of local personnel who would be trained to run the business should be structured into the program at an early date.

Mr. Chairman, this concept has received the endorsement of the National Citizens Commission Committee on Technical Cooperation and Investment, which reported to the White House Conference on International Cooperation last December. Its recommendation No. 28 appears in the June 1966, report of Congressman FASCELL to the House on page 43. This approach has also been recommended by the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, in their report of July 1965, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1966, page 15430. Some representatives of AID contend that AID may now have the authority to make this kind of a contractual arrangement. Others seem to disagree. The fact of the matter is that AID is not now making use of this potentially valuable tool of development, as I believe it should.

It is the purpose of my amendment to provide congressional support for the use of the incentive contract as one method of bringing the enormous resources of U.S. private technology and management to bear on the problems of development.

This is what the United States has to offer—management skills, technical knowledge, and the private market system. And this capability exists in private enterprise—not in the U.S. AID Agency. Let us work from our strength.

I hope that the distinguished chairman and the able ranking minority member of the committee will accept this amendment.

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Illinois, and he has assured me that this is not compulsory. As long as there is flexibility in it for the Agency, it is acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the Chairman. Indeed, it is my intention that it be permissive and not mandatory, and that it simply be one of the tools available for AID to use, which they are not now using and which I would like to see them use.

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

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

Mr. ADAIR. I have also had an opportunity to read and study this amendment. I have discussed it with the members on this side. I am quite willing to accept it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Illinois' amendment and also to commend him for introducing this amendment.

The content of the amendment and his remarks are in keeping with comments I have made since my arrival in Congress whenever legislation relating to foreign aid is presented or being discussed. With consistency, I have stressed the overwhelming need for more involvement and commitment on the part of the private sector and a lesser emphasis in the public sector in the economic assistance categories of our foreign assistance programs.

I am pleased to observe the many improvements in the bill that recognize this concept—the trend toward loans and away from grants—the firm restriction against providing aid to Communist countries such as Cuba—the investment guarantee as provided in title III—the section admonishing the President to encourage the recipient country to improve its climate for private investment as a necessary element in economic development and the establishment of an International Private Investment Advisory Council on Foreign Aid.

These are all tremendous improvements and make it very tempting for me to want to vote for the bill. However, with the rapidly changing international situation, I cannot go along with the 2-year authorization proposed removing the annual review by the Congress.

Many of my friends in the Congress and some of my constituents who have visited Vietnam have advised me of the improper administration and mismanagement of the AID programs. Senator GRIFFIN of Michigan gave a very revealing report of the problems on his return from Vietnam. There are many similar reports from other sections of the world. Too often, we have been propping up corrupt governments in countries with the people for whom the aid was intended actually turning against Americans because they feel we are in cahoots with these corrupt leaders. Indonesia and Sukarno has been the most glaring example. When we got tough and cut off aid, the people in the country took the initiative and deposed this political leader in what has proven to be one of the greatest victories over communism of our time. The climate for private investment, I am told, is improving daily.

With the amount of money available in the pipeline, I am convinced the acceptable parts of the program can continue without being jeopardized, thereby permitting a substantial decrease in the required monetary authorization.

The heavy drain on our gold reserves caused by this program is very evident to anyone familiar with the problem. This situation becomes more serious with each passing day. As many of the Members know I have always been an advocate of the "more trade—less aid" philosophy. Careful review of private investment internationally will reveal a favorable impact on our balance of payments where the public sector commitments represent the major drain or deficit factor on our gold reserves. This must be checked and reversed if we are to maintain our competitive position in the field of international trade. That is the principal reason for my raising these objections today calling for a more frugal commitment of funds, hopefully to establish a foreign assistance program that will be mutually beneficial to the people of the recipient country and to the people of the United States. As I said before, we are moving in the right direction but we have not gone far enough, fast enough. Therefore, I will vote for the motion to recommit the bill with the purpose of cutting the authorization from 2 years to 1 year, thus permitting an annual congressional review. We cannot abdicate our responsibility. We, as representatives of our people, owe this review and reporting to our constituents—the American taxpayer. It is their money we are spending.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I note with interest the mellowness of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think hereafter I shall wait until the end of the day to offer my amendments in the hope that they will be accepted.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, ever since the Castro regime seized power in Cuba, I have endeavored with every means at my disposal to bring to bear increasing economic pressure on that regime.

Over the years, we in the Congress have enacted numerous measures to withhold assistance to Cuba, to restrict the availability of free world shipping to the island and to limit the categories of goods that may be available to the Castro regime.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have sponsored and supported various initiatives within the Congress of the United States, designed to achieve these objectives.

In 1961, for example, we enacted the basic provision of section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, denying aid to the present Government of Cuba.

In 1962, we extended section 620(a) to prohibit assistance to countries aiding the Castro regime. We also authorized the imposition of an embargo on trade between the United States and Cuba—a very effective and far-reaching move which I was happy to cosponsor in the House.

In 1963, we went a step further. We placed a prohibition on the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States. We also extended the policy of economic denial by enacting far-reaching provisions designed to inhibit the availability of free world shipping to Cuba.

That same year I offered an amendment which was approved by the House of Representatives to forbid the use of our contributions to international organizations for the provision of technical assistance to the Castro regime.

In 1964, we incorporated the shipping provisions in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act.

In 1965, together with a number of my colleagues I initiated efforts to have the U.S. Delegation to the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization oppose Cuba's attempts to gain admission to that organization.

This year we continued our efforts with a two-pronged attack.

First, I offered an amendment embodied in section 107(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, calling on the President to assure that no part of our contribution to the United Nations development program may be used for projects of technical assistance to Cuba while Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and secondly, I offered a second amendment, embodied in section 301(e)(3), prohibiting assistance to certain countries—including Cuba—which fail to take appropriate steps to prevent ships or aircraft under their registry from transporting equipment, materials or commodities to or from North Vietnam.

Each of the steps which I have just described, together with efforts which we have exerted in other areas, was designed:

To isolate the Communist pariah of the Western Hemisphere from normal economic intercourse with the nations of the free world;

To demonstrate to the peoples of the American Republics that communism has no future in this hemisphere;

To make clear to the people of Cuba, including those who are a part of Castro's present power structure, that the Cuban Castro regime cannot serve their interests;

To reduce the will and the capability of the Castro clique to export subversion and violence to other American states; and,

To increase the cost to the Soviet Union of maintaining a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere.

This progressive application of economic pressure, combined with our other activities, has been effective. It has contributed to the increasing disorganization and bankruptcy of the Communist system imposed on that island.

Mr. Chairman, we must continue in these efforts. I urge that the House overwhelmingly adopt the two amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 which I have just described, adding another brick to the wall of economic isolation and pressure which must in time bring down the Castro regime.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill to amend further the foreign assistance act of 1961 pending action by the other body contains a chapter which provides assistance for population control.

These amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 pending in the other body set a dangerous precedent since they authorize specifically birth control action programs under foreign aid without setting out very necessary safeguards.

At present the Agency for International Development is financing programs of family planning abroad through section 211 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Nowhere in the legislative history of the foreign assistance act is birth control mentioned or provided for.

I have, therefore, branded the present AID programs of birth control as "illegal," and have protested their continued operation.

Apparently because my arguments are well founded, certain Members of the other body who favor birth control introduced two amendments providing for programs during Foreign Relations Committee consideration of the bill. They were adopted and are part of the bill which will be presented to the other body.

While the amendments would have the effect of giving congressional authority to the present birth control programs under AID, it would make the problem worse by not providing the necessary congressional safeguards.

They would in effect give the executive branch a blank check to doing anything it pleased in this area with foreign aid money.

It could finance programs of sterilization and abortion—which would be repugnant to the moral beliefs of the great majority of the American people.

This is not a remote possibility. Right now in India that Government is paying men to be sterilized—about $10 to $20. Further the Indian Health Minister is on record as having said that only abortion would solve India's population problems.

The provisions would allow U.S. funds to be used to bribe men to have themselves sterilized. It would permit our aid money to pay for the murder of children yet unborn.

Can we in Congress, in conscience, give this power to the executive branch? Should not so delicate and sensitive a subject be left in the hands of the elected representatives of the people?

I am not saying that the executive branch will begin widespread support of abortion clinics. In fact, current departmental regulations would not allow it.

But such rules can be changed—without Congress or the public being aware that they have been changed.

Further, there are powerful lobbies at work right now in our country seeking to have abortion and sterilization accepted in Federal programs as legitimate ways of limiting population growth.

The American people will not accept such a socially destructive solution to population growth. But we must not discount the possibility that some public officials—under pressures from Malthusian groups—might without fanfare put the United States firmly behind abortion and sterilization abroad.

For example, the Washington Post of Sunday, March 13, carried a news item about a scientist who proposes a search for two chemicals, the first to sterilize the entire population of a country and a second to reverse the process and allow a couple which had Government permission to have a baby.

The news story quoted Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of the Planned Parenthood-World Population as saying that he had a gloomy foreboding that such a plan might be necessary for some emerging nations which have growing populations.

Clearly U.S. support for such a program would be possible, without congressional approval, under the proposed Senate amendments.

No such provisions were offered or considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee or this committee. I urge, therefore, that the House conferees, when they meet with the conferees of the other body to strongly oppose the Senate provisions.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 301(e)(3) of this bill amends section 620(n) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended. Section 620(n) relates to the prohibition against furnishing assistance to countries which permit ships under its registry to carry cargo to North Vietnam.

I offered the original amendment in committee in 1965 which placed this prohibition in the Foreign Assistance Act. The original language of my amendment as accepted by the committee and finally by the House required that aid be cut off to those countries which had failed to take appropriate steps within 60 days to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting equipment, materials or commodities to or from North Vietnam. I felt at that time that the 60 days was a sufficient time in which to warn these free world countries that they must comply with the law or have further aid terminated.

The Senate had no comparable provision but accepted the House language with a modification. The modification provided that the President "shall consider denying assistance" instead of the inflexible requirement that assistance must be terminated to countries whose ships and aircraft under its registry call on North Vietnam.

The Senate argued that the language of the House bill afforded little negotiating leverage because most of the countries whose ships are still in the North Vietnam trade receive little or no assistance from the United States. The major nation with ships in this trade—the United Kingdom—no longer receives either economic or military assistance from the United States. The United States is making high-level diplomatic representations to obtain free world cooperation in getting ships and planes out of the North Vietnam trade, and a number of vessels have already left the trade because of commercial and safety considerations.

The House accepted the argument that negotiations on this matter would be more effective it there was not a rigid requirement that aid be terminated.

The amendment contained in this bill, Mr. Chairman, removes that flexibility which the House accepted during the conference on the Foreign Assistanct Act of 1965. I offered this amendment in committee because I believed that the full impact of our foreign aid program should be brought to bear wherever and whenever such action could contribute to bringing the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. It was my firm belief that the period of over 1 year which has expired since the amendment was originally adopted is more than sufficient time to have prepared for the termination of aid to the remaining free world countries who still allow their aircraft and ships to carry cargo to North Vietnam.

There has been a very definite improvement in this situation. In calendar year 1965, 256 free world flagships from countries, not all of which received our aid, visited North Vietnamese ports. During the first 3 months of this year, only 36 such vessels have visited North Vietnam. Although there has been a sharp decrease in shipping by free world countries to North Vietnam, I still do not believe that the United States should continue to furnish assistance in any form to any country actively assisting North Vietnam by permitting their ships to transport supplies and materials. It was for this reason that I offered the amendment which removed the discretionary power of the President to terminate assistance to countries trading with North Vietnam.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

(a) Section 624(d), which relates to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) Whenever the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, deems it appropriate in carrying out his duties under this Act, he may from time to time notify the head of any agency primarily responsible for administering any program with respect to which the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, has responsibilities under paragraph (2) of this subsection that all internal audit, end-use inspection, and management inspection reports submitted to the head of such agency or mission in the field in connection with such program from any geographic areas designated by the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall be submitted simultaneously to the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance. The head of each such agency shall cooperate with the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph."

(b) Section 635(h), which relates to general authorities, is amended by inserting "(except development loans)" immediately after "II, V, and VI".

(c) Section 637(a), which relates to administrative expenses, is amended by striking out "the fiscal year 1966 not to exceed $54,240,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968 not to exceed $57,387,000".

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 20, line 7, strike out "each of the fiscal years 1967 and 1968" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the fiscal year 1967".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am about to test the validity of the argument that perhaps it is best to offer amendments late in a debate on a bill of this character. I would trust and even have some expectation this amendment may be accepted. It simply would make necessary an annual authorization for administrative expenses of the foreign aid program.

I recognize this may require a half day of the time of the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1967, but I would assume that this would not be putting an undue burden on that committee.

The Deputy Administrator of AID, William S. Gaud, came to the committee at the end of April and testified with respect to administrative expenses.

He requested some $57,387,000 for the year 1967. He pointed out that there were a variety of reasons why these administrative expenses increased from year to year. He said, for example, that inflation abroad, Federal personnel procedures, and Federal pay raises had resulted in an increase from 1966.

He pointed out further the importance with a 5-year program of having an open-ended authorization for administrative expenses, because, as he put it, it would be impossible to be specific with respect to future years.

I would like to quote what he said on that point:

Mr. GAUD. Ordinarily it is easy for us to predict for the year ahead what we are going to need for administrative expenses or for other programs. For some of these programs, however, it is very difficult for us to predict, and it is true of administrative expenses, precisely what we are going to need 2, 3, 4, 5 years ahead.

I refer to the testimony on page 628 of the hearings.

He mentioned also, in answer to a question by the chairman of our committee, that it would be best to have an open-ended authorization. This testimony is on page 625 of the hearings:

But it is pretty hard to sit here today and calculate with any degree of accuracy what our administrative expenses will be over the next 5 years. That is why it seems to us reasonable to ask you to authorize such funds as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, we did not follow the suggestion of Mr. Gaud. We authorized a specific sum, a sum for fiscal 1968 which is completely arbitrary. No case was made for any amount for 1968.

I would suggest it would be far better, and certainly no violation of anybody's time or responsibility, for our committee to consider next year just what the AID program will need to handle its administrative responsibilities for the fiscal year 1968.

For that reason, I urge consideration of a 1-year authorization for this aspect of the foreign aid program.

If there are no questions, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have been through this now a couple of times—once specifically and once in general.

I believe it was made abundantly clear yesterday the reasons why we have this program on a 2-year basis, and especially the administrative end of it.

Again, it seems to me that the gentleman from New Jersey rather clearly makes a case for a 2-year authorization. I have not seen anything about any of these programs getting any cheaper. We are in inflation. It would seem to me it would be a pretty good thing, if for no other reason, to settle, for the year after next, on the same basis as to administrative cost as is to be provided for the coming fiscal year.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there is a question of morale. In many instances it is a favorite theme for some of us to give the bureaucrats or the administrators of these programs a bad time. To criticize government personnel seemingly reminds us of our own actions in supporting certain legislation and this may be the classic example.

As I said yesterday, on this same principle, we have some able people. We will have people who will be able to do a better job if they can plan over a 2-year period. When they do not know whether they are going to be in this setup for more than 1 year, it seems to me it constitutes a very awkward situation and contributes to a feeling of uneasiness. That does create a lack of high morale in the administration of the program.

It seems to me for many practical reasons, and especially in this regard, it is necessary, and certainly highly desirable, to permit this section to remain intact, along with the other sections.

I would favor retaining the 2-year authorization for this section than any other in the bill. I think the reasons for doing so are practical and substantial.

What would we do? If we are not to have a 2-year authorization for administrative purposes would we have to come in with a part of a foreign aid bill next year, just for personnel or for some other section of the bill? If we are to have a foreign aid bill, we had better come in with a bill such as we are considering now, rather than to fragment this and come in to make a case on a particular section. If there is to be a program I want to see the best one which can be produced. In my opinion it will not be good enough but it certainly should not be worse.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, over the years I have opposed this legislation because I conscientiously do not believe that the military assistance should be handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe that is under the jurisdiction of our committee. But that is a fact of life and it has gone on. I believe it should be separated, but it is not and there is nothing to be gained at this point.

Since I have become chairman of the Committee on Armed Services I have had to travel a lot. Last year I traveled to the Far East, and to Korea. I saw our allies who are the direct beneficiaries of this bill under the military assistance program.

The 19 divisions of Koreans are dependent upon this legislation for their assistance. They have 23,000 men fighting side by side with our boys and they committed another division. The F-5 airplane was built under this program. It is the only new airplane we have in our inventories. There is no other new airplane. Under the McNamara program we are forced to use the F-5 airplane in our armed services, and this military assistance program built that plane.

Mr. Chairman, I also visited Taiwan and saw the need and the dependence which the Nationalist Chinese have for this legislation in order to keep their army, navy, and air force going.

Everybody knows what we are doing in Vietnam. When we had the supplemental appropriation bill before our committee Secretary McNamara told us that he could not separate the MAP money from his own appropriated funds for Vietnam.

I have also visited Thailand and I know the great logistical help that they are giving our military as a result of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I have searched my conscience and knowing this and what these allies are doing for us and knowing that this is the only place I can help them and also being your representative on the Committee on Armed Services, I feel that I must reappraise my position. Therefore, this year, despite the features which may not be pleasing to me, I feel in good conscience I must support this legislation, and this is what I am going to do.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: On page 20, line 8, strike out "$57,387,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$51,648,300".

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this is another constructive amendment. It cuts less from the bill than any other amendment I have introduced when I have been accused of trying to gut this sacred piece of legislation. All we are trying to do with this amendment is to reduce approximately $5.7 million from the administrative expenses. I would like to remind you that 10 years ago this AID Agency, under whatever name it carried at the time, had approximately 11,500 employees. Now, with the direct employees and contract personnel, the figure is approximately 18,000 employees. This is a runaway administrative setup. Since we have rejected the attempt to limit administrative expenses just to 1 year, I think it would be prudent at least to put a limit on the dollar amount of administrative expenses. I do not think $5¾ million would be an amendment that could be described as gutting the bill. I think it is a very healthy restraint on the runaway administrators of this program. The top Administrator, who comes and goes year after year, people like Mr. David Bell, who arrived with great fanfare and who we hope will master their assignments. Just about at the time that we on the committee think he may be able to make some administrative improvements in the program, these people throw up their hands in frustration and take off for institutions such as the Ford Foundation. So, unless we have some practical administrative restraint, I do not know how we will accomplish any savings. The only administrative restraint that I know that bureaucrats acknowledge is a dollar restraint. I think it would be perfectly consistent with the efficiency everyone wants for this program to delete $5¾ million from the administrative expenses of the program. Mr. Chairman, we are at the conclusion of the bill, the only other thing that follows will be a sound motion to recommit. I think we can close on a very diplomatic and progressive note by accepting my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the adoption of my amendment would represent a wonderful conclusion to the very fascinating, although to some of us, frustrating day here in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. For a question, but not for a statement.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many of these employees are now working either as Government employees or as contract employees in South Vietnam?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Too many, for the very simple reason that we are fighting a war in Vietnam and at the very same time we are trying to follow a completely unrealistic aid program where we have not even subjugated the military infiltrators from North Vietnam.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the figures available are with respect to May 30, 1966, and they reveal that there are 2,018 employees in Vietnam.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] that the AID agency has been advertising for civilian employees for employment in Vietnam. They have a number of people who would like to go to Algeria, Cairo, and other glamorous spots, but few for Vietnam.

Mr. JOELSON. Casablanca.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It is a little difficult to administer this program under war conditions, and as the gentleman knows, we are at war in Vietnam.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows and I would say that there is no picnic in Vietnam and those 2,000 people are rendering a dedicated work which will do more to bring about peace than anything else about which I can think.

Mr. DERWINSKI. That is not at all the point. The point is that you are dispensing aid under this program to over 80 nations, without any real administrative control.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment would represent a practical dollar restraint or administrative restraint.

Mr. Chairman, this certainly would be a good way of controlling the runaway bureaucracy.

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

Mr. Chairman, it always pains me to rise in opposition to an amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI]. His

amendments always drip with compassion.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is adopted I would like to point out that it will be gutting the program in driblets of "compassion."

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

However, I believe, while it is a nice little amendment, as the gentleman says, it really in effect does go to the heart of the program. On the one hand all of us here today have been urging that we have greater efficiency in Vietnam.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] had an amendment adopted which will bring about this efficiency. It adds more people. At the same time, the very people who are interested in this economy are now asking us to go ahead and fire a lot of people indiscriminately.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have a more efficient program and at the same time we do not have the personnel with which to carry out the efficiency that we are requiring of them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should keep in mind that this 2-year program that we are adopting really has a built-in cutting device, because this does not take into consideration the fact that there will be things which will come up over which AID has no control such as the small, bit-by-bit pay increase increments and overseas wages and compensation, and the like.

So, I believe that the amount of money about which the gentleman from Illinois is worried is going to be taken care of by extending this program to a 2-year program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I urge the rejection of this amendment. But, nevertheless, if we want efficiency, and that is what all of us want, we should vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1967 authorization request is one of the lowest requests ever presented by the President to carry out the foreign aid program. The minimum request is lower than that of any of the requests in recent years. In fact the request is over $1 billion less than was requested only 3 years ago.

There is other evidence that the program is being tightly administered. Supporting assistance programs have been sharply reduced. Outside of Vietnam these funds have been reduced by more than two-thirds since fiscal year 1961. Programs have been terminated in 20 countries. Furthermore, the number of AID country programs has been reduced from 83 in fiscal year 1963 to a proposed 72 in fiscal year 1967.

This year's request, therefore, clearly indicates that the President intends to maintain an efficient aid program—one that is consistent with U.S. interests, but one that will be a minimum burden on U.S. taxpayers.

A large portion of the economic aid program is for Vietnam. Twenty percent of the economic assistance funds are planned for Vietnam, where they will be used to support vital U.S. objectives. This indicates clearly that programs for all the other countries are being held to a minimal level.

In considering the fiscal year 1967 request, the Foreign Affairs Committee has taken into consideration the executive branch's internal review of its proposal. Last fall, AID's internal review resulted in a reduction of two-thirds of a billion dollars—$660 million—from the original proposals. This indicates that there was a tight review of the program even before the Foreign Affairs Committee examined the request in detail.

Furthermore, in approving the program for 2 years, the Foreign Affairs Committee has provided that there will be almost no increase in the amount of funds authorized. The committee has clearly expressed its position that "those responsible for the administration of economic and military assistance should reexamine their priorities in an effort to accomplish more with less money." This means the program will have to continue to be tightly and efficiently administered.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that the foreign aid program—economic and military aid—continues to be a relatively small portion of this country's immense wealth. Our national wealth continues to grow. Our GNP is estimated to be greater than $700 billion. In fiscal year 1967, the expenditures for the economic and military programs are estimated to be no more than one-half of 1 percent of the GNP—the same level as for the last 2 years. Relatively, therefore, the aid program is becoming a smaller portion of our total resources. It is becoming a smaller burden on the economy and the taxpayer.

The United States today is faced with many crises all over the world. I believe that in some ways the foreign aid program can help us to protect our interests in these turbulent times.

In my campaign, I indicated that the foreign aid program should be closely reviewed by the Congress and all unnecessary funds cut out. I believe the program has been carefully reviewed this year. In approving the request, the Foreign Affairs Committee stressed that the program must be focused on priorities. I believe that approval of this bill, which maintains a minimum program for the next 2 years, will assure us that the program will be focused on priorities, and that it will be, because it must be, administered very tightly.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I have noted with considerable interest and attention the pace and content of these 3 days of debate on the proposed foreign assistance authorization which is now before us. Of particular significance is the fact that so many Members have taken an active role in the debate on this bill. Clearly foreign assistance is a subject touching everyone in the United States, just as every branch of foreign policy has national significance. I can hear in the words of my colleagues the views and concerns of their constituents around the Nation.

There can be no doubt about the wisdom of debating important facets of policy as thoroughly as we are now debating foreign aid. Because foreign aid is a crucial instrument of our foreign policy, I think it is essential that we in Congress have the opportunity to study the program thoroughly every year, so we can insure that the program will be responsive to the thoughts of our constituents and to changes in the international climate. There has been considerable talk around the country of the diminishing role of the Congress in matters of foreign policy. If there is one area where we have assumed a leading role in foreign policy, however, it is foreign aid.

Of course, there is something to be said for eliminating some of the uncertainty that is inherent in an aid program which must be reviewed yearly. But when we offer assistance to an underdeveloped country, we are doing more than just entering into an economic transaction. Based on certain conclusions about the internal policies and problems of the recipient country, we are helping its people to help themselves to attain a better standard of living. At the same time, however, we are seeking to communicate to aided countries the value of the American way of life. This fact is recognized in a wise amendment added to this bill by our Foreign Affairs Committee, and it brings our aid program clearly within the scope of current foreign policy—it leaves something more than a purely economic decision to be made when the question of aiding a particular nation arises. It is this question, involving basic foreign policy, which we in the Congress must answer. Because of the volatile world climate, the answer will not necessarily be the same for a given country every year.

I think we should retain the single-year authorization, whereby Congress can make minor as well as drastic adjustments in foreign aid policy when such changes are justified.

As an example of how foreign aid serves as an instrument of foreign policy, the committee has added an amendment prohibiting assistance to nations which actively assist the North Vietnamese. Thus, we have clearly tied our foreign assistance efforts to our aims in southeast Asia, and rightly so. While we are chided for handling some of our foreign aid on a "strings attached" basis, we must remember that the United States cannot act as an impartial international agency in dispensing money and goods. While the development of all peoples toward a decent level of life falls within the scope of American national interest, there are some instances where our national interest is not served, and we must not hesitate to prohibit the distribution of aid in those instances, particularly where American lives hang in the balance.

Again, I want to commend my colleagues on the thorough and active review we have had of U.S. foreign assistance programs in the past few days. It

is my hope that we can continue to review foreign aid in such detail on a yearly basis, so that we can insure that these programs will serve effectively to aid less fortunate peoples of the world and to promote the basic precept of American foreign policy.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, in past years the issue before us has been whether or not each of us supports foreign aid programs, and by how much. But this year we have added an element that disturbs me. We are asked to authorize a program for 2 years instead of 1.

This is not the first time we have been under pressure to further relinquish our constitutional prerogative of controlling expenditures, and I am sure it will not be the last. But by voting for a 2-year program we will allow a big foot in the door that will eventually lead to the 5-year authorization requested by the administration. In the process, this Congress will further lose its control over the operations of a program that has long been suspect by the American people, and rightfully so, as wasteful in many respects.

It has been argued that the Appropriations Committee will still have to fund these programs on an annual basis, which is true. However, the work of the Appropriations Committee would be hampered in any year when the proper authorizing committee failed to properly review the foreign aid expenditures of the past.

I will be interested in the reaction to this authorization when action is taken by our Committee on Appropriations, since the cost of this package is greatly in excess of even the "bare-bones" amount requested by the administration. I have never seen a foreign aid package yet, "bare-bones" or otherwise, that could not be prudently cut without affecting the purpose or efficiency of the programs. There have been enough failures and instances of wasteful expenditures in the past to indicate that the pruning of appropriations can have a healthy effect on these programs by forcing some degree of planning and efficiency.

It is good to note that this bill includes a provision that prohibits assistance to countries that permit their ships or aircraft to transport equipment, materials, or commodities to or from North Vietnam. It is hoped that this provision will be vigorously enforced and policed.

However, I feel the provision to express the intent of Congress against providing funds for United Nations programs that assist Communist countries such as Cuba does not go far enough. The United States provides 40 percent of those funds, and such moneys should be absolutely prohibited from reaching the Castro regime. One such project was approved for the University of Havana this year in the amount of $2.1 million. To argue that our money is not used for such a project is pure fiction. We are contributing 40 percent of the money used 90 miles off our shores to promote subversion in our hemisphere no matter how you look at it. It should be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, instead of issuing a 2-year blank check with which to continue the foreign aid programs, it would be better if this Congress stepped back and took a long, cold look at the record of these programs. We are currently helping, in one form or another, almost every nation in the world. We continue to hear of further programs that will be submitted to aid foreign countries. Before we commit American tax dollars to the education, health, and welfare of the entire world, we should reexamine the programs already on the books and put them in efficient working order.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, last year, I introduced H.R. 5255, which I recommended either be passed as a separate bill or included in the foreign aid bill. One of the reasons I introduced this bill is because one of the leading universities in the country, Iowa State University, is in the district I represent and conversations that I have had with the president of the university and professors at the university have convinced me that performance and accomplishment at the present time are less than they would be under longer term institutional arrangements. I appreciate the opportunity given me to appear before the committee and the provision added in title II which embodies the provisions of H.R. 5255.

This bill authorized the creation and maintenance of foreign development centers at universities which are engaged in foreign technical assistance projects. At the present time contracts with universities for advice, counsel, and help concerning development projects in a particular country, are usually for a period of not to exceed 3 years. Quite often the university accepting the contract finds it difficult to find competent professional personnel to carry out the contract on such a short-term basis. Therefore, they often recruit a substantial part of their personnel for the contract and since the personnel recruited cannot be offered tenure, it is often difficult to attract the most competent individuals away from some other position which would include tenure and security.

If a university could plan to specialize in the problems for a certain country or area for a period of 10 years, it could not only attract more competent people but could also utilize the experience gained to a much better advantage for the Government. When someone finishes a short-term contract and then moves on to some other area of responsibility without even leaving associates in a continuing program fully exposed to the knowledge and experience he gained, it cannot help but reduce the effectiveness of the program in the less developed countries involved.

At the present time, many university staff members have to secure a leave of absence from their university to take on a foreign assignment; their advancement at the university is retarded; and their experience gained is not utilized after their short-term contract had expired. Under this provision, a university could mobilize a more competent staff for a long-range program and even though some of the personnel left from time to time, there would be continuity and good use made of the experience they gained. The university would also be able to develop longer term programs in the countries involved.

I believe everyone will agree that short-term projects will not do the best job in many of these countries. In most cases the greatest need is for longer term plans involving education and other programs which produce greater results for a dollar spent, but which results are not apparent for several years. These longer term plans could fit in with other university activities and schedules in such a way that the most competent staff members at the university would be willing to take foreign technical assistance assignments within their field of interest. Many such professors who have already attained a high standing in the professional field are not willing to take a part-time assignment concerning the problems of a particular country if they have no reason to believe that the result of their research and study will be used over a period of years.

By directly involving the university and the most competent members of their professional staff in the technical assistance program in a way which is now practically impossible, it would greatly increase the number of professional people engaged in the development activities and broaden the base so that a better balanced program of economic assistance would be recommended.

Mr. Chairman, this provision does not propose a new program in the technical assistance field but merely proposes a way to carry out the existing technical assistance programs so that we could secure better results. This kind of an approach has proven highly successful in the field of agricultural research.

Agricultural universities, including Iowa State University, have performed research work on a continuing basis under existing Federal-State programs. Under this approach they were able to recruit competent staff and have gleaned benefits from all of the research performed through the years. Under this proposal, that successful formula be applied to planning economic assistance programs and I urge that this provision be retained in title II.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing for each of us to ask ourselves before we vote on this bill on final passage is just how much longer can this country endure a foreign aid program? Year after year the American people are assured that our aid contributes toward changing an emerging and backward nation to a self-supporting country with prosperity and freedom.

How can we forget that near the end of the year of 1964, Nasser told the United States to "jump in the lake" because we expressed some rightful irritation over the burning of our Embassy in Cairo? How can we forget that after a comment like Nasser's, his nation since 1960 has received over $1 billion in economic assistance. Remember, that is $1,000 million. Then, recall the spring of 1964 when Sukarno, then President of Indonesia, had the effrontery to tell our Ambassador, face to face, "to hell with your aid." The facts were that Sukarno

maintained himself in power largely because of a little less than a billion dollars he had received from us in economic aid. And yet this ingrate who now, thank goodness, has received his comeuppance had the consummate gall to insult our Ambassador.

Much less than a year ago the now deposed President Nkrumah of Ghana had the audacity to write and release a book blasting our foreign policy and bitterly critical of our assistance program. Yet, this same treacherous chameleon was at the very moment accepting $165 million of our aid to perpetuate himself in office. He nonetheless carried on up to the day of his downfall as the principal organizer of a Red Chinese spy network on the African Continent.

There have been so many insults leveled against us by foreign leaders that if you sat down to tabulate a list for the last 15 years, the total would be over 125.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I ask the question, How much longer can our country stand to engage in a foreign aid program?

The record is clear. There has been failure after failure that has been paid for with our billions of dollars over the past years. If our aid has been so successful, what happened in Uganda, which has received about $20 million in aid, for it to become a dictatorship?

Year after year we have listened to the glowing predictions of what will happen in the future, but again and again we have had to listen to the pitiful excuses for the failures of the preceding year. Each year I have hoped there would be improvement in the administration of the program. But nothing seems to happen in the way of improvement.

Mr. Chairman, although the long record of failures is the one of the best reasons why we should stop the foreign aid program, there are other reasons that should be enumerated, including such things as the drain on our U.S. gold stocks which are a direct result of the aid program.

An additional reason is the fact it is generally recognized that economic assistance never reaches down sufficiently to the people of the aid recipient countries but always seems to benefit only the rich and well-to-do in those countries.

Yet another reason the bill should not be enacted this year is because of the huge unexpended balances in the program which have been referred to as the "pipeline" which now amounts to as much as $9 billion. This large figure is several times the amount authorized this year yet accountability over these pipeline funds has already been lost by the Congress. Why not cut through this bureaucratic redtape to finish the lagging foreign projects already commenced before any new starts? Along the way it might be discovered the projects were no good to begin with and have actually been abandoned.

A telling objection to the further authorization of foreign aid programs is the fact that many of the aid-receiving countries have in the past years taken our aid and proceeded to spend much of this assistance with other countries. This fact can be established by a comparison of the amounts of direct dollar economic aid we have granted these countries along side our trade balance with these countries. In other words compare for each country the amount of aid accorded the list of foreign recipients and compare this with the amount of our exports to each of these nations. From a list of about 25 nations in the Middle East, Africa, and the Far East it can be demonstrated that our dollar aid for these countries exceeds by about 3 to 1 the value of the products we sell to these countries. To state the matter very simply they have taken our money and bought their goods in other countries. These figures should refute conclusively the argument we hear so often that foreign aid money is, after all, spent in this country.

One of the strongest reasons of all why there should be no foreign aid program until there has been a thorough review of the entire operation is the fact that we are furnishing millions of dollars to nations which have accepted our aid and at the same time take aid from the Communist bloc nations.

The very worst offense is by these recipients of our aid who have acted against a peaceful solution in Vietnam. The Agency for International Development has tried to say many times in the past that our assistance to pro-Communist countries prevents them from slipping into the Communist orbit. The old adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating" should pretty well establish the fact that what has happened in these countries is that they have taken our money but are nonetheless today in the Communist orbit.

But the worst evil of all about foreign assistance is that we have furnished aid to some countries who are now actively assisting North Vietnam by permitting their ships to transfer materiel and supplies into North Vietnam ports. It is true that the President of the United States has discretionary power to deny assistance to such countries but they are still shipping and we are still shoveling out money to such countries as the United Kingdom, Japan, Greece, Norway, and the Netherlands.

Since World War II we have spent about $37 billion on military assistance. For a long time we thought this was a small price to pay for keeping our boys off battlefields but within the very recent past we have found that France which has been the largest recipient has turned its back on us in Vietnam. It even supports Peking's admittance into the U.N. and in the last month demanded the closing of all our bases on French soil. Another of our supposedly great friends, the United Kingdom, which has received over $1 billion in military assistance sends her ships into Cuba every week. But worse still, British flagships are hauling supplies into the North Vietnam ports every day. Why is it the jungle-trained British troops in Malaysia cannot be used in Vietnam? Foreign military forces whether French, British, Turkish, or Greek have been equipped with materiel paid for by the American taxpayers. The question which hits us squarely in the face is what value is all this military assistance to us when our American boys are now fighting alone in Vietnam? Over 50 nations have been designated for military aid this year. Only one, South Korea, has sent troops to Vietnam. Australia and New Zealand who have sent troops to Vietnam are receiving no U.S. aid.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the Congress in 1959, although I supported the foreign aid bill that year on final passage I raised for the first time the question of congressional control over the aid program. Before that time I had been an elected official in local government where we had a careful accounting and a review by the authority making the expenditure. But I was astonished to find there was little or no congressional review of the foreign aid expenditure. After finding this to be a fact, I have since opposed this authorization and appropriation year after year because of the maladministration of these programs. Each year many of us have looked in vain for some improvement in the administration of foreign aid programs.

Maybe there is just no way that the foreign aid program can be made to work successfully. The objective apparently had been to make recipient countries our grateful allies and friends. It is argued that once commenced we must continue foreign aid in order to keep these countries as our allies and friends. Look as much as you will, but there is no convincing evidence that any of our aid recipients which have not gone Communist would have done so if they had not received our economic aid. France and Italy have received large amounts of our aid, yet Communist Party membership in these countries has not fallen off. On the other hand, Cuba went communistic in 1959 in spite of 12 prior years of foreign aid from the United States, and in spite of the fact that she had been favored beyond all other countries in sugar imports. Look back at the $11 billion of lend lease to Russia in World War II. Did this endear us to the Russian leaders? Has our aid to Poland, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, or Egypt turned Gomulka, Tito, Sukarno, or Nasser into dependable allies? No. Scores of other nations have received our aid and instead of being our grateful friend, there is good reason to suspect that our aid has often had the very opposite effect.

Some of these countries have even developed the technique of a veiled threat as the recognized and effective way to extort more aid. They make it appear they are in danger of going Communist, in order to receive larger amounts of American aid. But these very same applicants for our aid seem always to find it convenient and even necessary to insult and denounce the United States in order to prove to their own followers that they are independent and not the puppets of American imperialism. It seems to me that the fact that nearly always it is the U.S. Embassies and U.S. information offices that have rocks thrown through their windows and not the embassies of other countries that have never offered aid,

should prove conclusively you cannot buy friends.

No, Mr. Chairman, our country cannot much longer stand or afford a foreign program. The time to stop the program is now. Right now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to explain to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union what the proposed motion to recommit will contain. It will be of two parts. The first part will represent the essence of the so-called Mailliard amendment that we debated yesterday. The amendment would reduce the program from a 2-year authorization to a 1-year authorization, except for development loans and the Alliance for Progress program, which programs would remain at 5-year authorizations.

The second part of the proposed motion to recommit would reduce the authorization for development loans annually from $1 billion to $750 million.

The period of authorization for development loans would remain the same as in the bill before the committee; that is, 5 years.

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

Mr. Chairman, as has been made evident by the explanation of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the motion to recommit contains the essential elements of two amendments already discussed by this body, both of which have been defeated.

The principal one would be to change the program from the present 2-year program, which it now is, back to a 1-year program.

The other would be to make cuts in the Development Loan Fund, which the gentleman has explained.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I would point out that what the gentleman from Florida has said is correct. The motion is essentially the elements of the two amendments. But there is a difference from the development loan program as offered in the amendment that we debated on the floor.

The amendment debated on the floor reduced the amount from $1 billion to $750 million, and reduced the years from 5 years to 3 years. The motion to recommit does not touch the number of years.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for the further clarification, and I now yield to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to point out to the Members of the House, that the first part of the motion to recommit was debated fully on the floor when the Mailliard amendment was considered yesterday. On a teller vote it lost by a vote of 122 to 86.

The second part of the motion to recommit, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] said, is somewhat changed because his original amendment was to reduce the development loan figure from $1 billion to $750 million, and it had a 3-year limitation in it. The 3-year limitation is taken out, but the figure for the Development Loan Fund would be reduced $250 million over a 5-year period by the motion to recommit.

I ask the Members on my side, and all those who realize the importance of the foreign aid program to the security of this country, to vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately preceding the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] at page 17, line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in order to help clarify the question so that Members understand as we vote on the motion to recommit, we are voting to take a 2-year authorization and reduce it to 1 year, or return to the present language.

In other words, if you vote against the motion to recommit you are voting to double the foreign aid program.

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

Mr. Chairman, historically I have not supported an authorization bill for foreign aid. I feel, however, on this occasion, because of the situation and because of our commitments in Vietnam I must reverse my position.

I was very much impressed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services when he gave his reasons for supporting this legislation. I too must say at this time while I intend to support the motion to recommit, if the motion to recommit does not prevail then I shall support the legislation.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington. I too have consistently not supported the foreign aid bill. But for the reasons that he has so eloquently outlined I intend to support the bill this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 906, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ADAIR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ADAIR moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 15750) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On the first page, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after the first section thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 2. LIMITATIONS ON FISCAL YEAR AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act (except sections 202 and 252) authorizes appropriations for furnishing assistance or for administrative expenses under this Act for fiscal year 1968.'"

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$750,000,000".

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 193, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—191

Abbitt	Burton, Utah	Downing
Abernethy	Byrnes, Wis.	Dulski
Adair	Cabell	Duncan, Tenn.
Anderson, Ill.	Cahill	Dwyer
Andrews, George W.	Callaway	Edwards, Ala.
Andrews, Glenn	Carter	Erlenborn
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cederberg	Everett
Arends	Chamberlain	Findley
Ashbrook	Chelf	Fisher
Ashmore	Clancy	Ford, Gerald R.
Ayres	Clausen, Don H.	Fountain
Bates	Clawson, Del	Frelinghuysen
Battin	Cleveland	Fulton, Pa.
Belcher	Collier	Fuqua
Bennett	Colmer	Gathings
Berry	Cooley	Gettys
Betts	Corbett	Giaimo
Bolton	Cramer	Goodell
Bow	Curtin	Gross
Bray	Dague	Grover
Brock	Davis, Ga.	Gubser
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.	Davis, Wis.	Gurney
Broyhill, N.C.	Derwinski	Hagan, Ga.
Broyhill, Va.	Devine	Hagen, Calif.
Buchanan	Dickinson	Haley
	Dole	Halleck
	Dorn	Halpern
	Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho
		Hardy

Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Henderson
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Keith
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Stratton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—193

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Aspinall
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Callan
Cameron
Casey
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Huot
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Price
Purcell
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vivian
Waldie
Watts
Weltner
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—48

Ashley
Baring
Bell
Blatnik
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Carey
Celler
Conable
Conyers
Corman
Cunningham
Curtis
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Farnsley
Fino
Flynt
Hall
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hays
Herlong
King, N.Y.
Landrum
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mills
Morris
O'Brien
O'Neal, Ga.
Powell
Rivers, Alaska
Roush
Schisler
Scott
Senner
Stephens
Toll
Trimble
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Willis
Wright

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Scott for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Matsunaga against.

Mr. Roush for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Rivers of Alaska against.

Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.

Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Senner against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Schisler against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. O'Brien against.

Mr. Harsha for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mills with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Conyers.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 146, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—237

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Selden
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waldie
Watts
Weltner
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—146

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Everett
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Moore
Mosher
O'Konski
Passman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Secrest

Shipley	Taylor	Whalley
Shriver	Thomson, Wis.	White, Tex.
Sikes	Tuck	Whitener
Skubitz	Tuten	Williams
Smith, Calif.	Utt	Wilson, Bob
Smith, N.Y.	Waggonner	Wyatt
Smith, Va.	Walker, N. Mex.	Younger
Stanton	Watkins	
Talcott	Watson	

NOT VOTING—49

Ashley	Flynt	Powell
Baring	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, Alaska
Bell	Hall	Roush
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Schisler
Broomfield	Harsha	Scott
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Senner
Carey	Herlong	Stephens
Celler	King, N.Y.	Toll
Conable	Landrum	Trimble
Conyers	MacGregor	Van Deerlin
Corman	Mailliard	Walker, Miss.
Cunningham	Mathias	White, Idaho
Curtis	Matsunaga	Whitten
Edwards, La.	Mills	Willis
Ellsworth	Morris	Wright
Farnsley	O'Brien	
Fino	O'Neal, Ga.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Roush against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Walker of Mississippi against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Hall against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Harsha against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Schisler with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. O'Brien.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR NATION'S NEW MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE OPENING OF THE WEST AFTER THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE, THE GATEWAY ARCH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of our great country dreams of new and bold ventures have become realities when undertaken by an industrious, imaginative, and enlightened people. Such is the story of our Nation's new monument commemorating the opening of the West after the Louisiana Purchase, the Gateway Arch.

Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the Mexico Evening Ledger on June 30, 1966, and written by Mr. Robert M. White, editor. Mr. White's comments pay just tribute to a feat of which all Americans everywhere can be justifiably proud.

THE MARK OF ST. LOUIS

The Eiffel Tower means Paris.

The Brandenburg Gate means Berlin.

Red Square means Moscow.

Times Square, New York.

The Golden Gate Bridge is San Francisco.

And now the Gateway Arch will mean St. Louis.

The arch is unique, bold, graceful and impressive.

It already is becoming the pride of St. Louis. In time, it will be known throughout the world.

The arch is officially The Gateway Arch commemorating the opening of the west after the Louisiana Purchase.

It is the tallest monument in America—630 feet. As a matter of fact, there are only 16 buildings in the country taller.

It is 75 feet taller than the Washington Monument.

It is 180 feet taller than the Great Pyramid of Cheops.

The foundations of the arch are 60 feet below ground level, the lower 30 feet being in bed rock.

At the ground level each leg is a double steel-walled equilateral triangle with each side measuring 54 feet at the base and 17 feet at the top.

There are 1,076 steps from the visitor center below the ground level to the top; however, a 40-passenger train will ride inside the core of each leg.

The engineering had to be so precise that surveying during erection of the steel sides was done at night when the temperature of each side of the three walls was equal.

There are many other facts and figures about the arch.

But the most interesting facts about it is this:

It's there.

It's there to become the pride of St. Louis. It's there to commemorate the vision of community leaders who said St. Louis needed a symbol. It's there to honor the talent and imagination of its architect Eero Saarinen. It's there proudly proclaiming the courage of the citizen's committee who selected Saarinen's daring proposal * * *.

* * * It's there, like all really great monuments, in towering tribute to man, himself, who always can, if only he will, do the seemingly impossible.

CITIZENS SHOULD BE CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE MONEY MARKETS OF THIS COUNTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, every citizen should be vitally concerned about what is happening in the money markets of this country. The economic and social gains of the past 6 years are in serious jeopardy today because of skyrocketing interest rates and the critical imbalance in the national money supply.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a firm supporter of the new economics, I must hold this administration responsible for the interest rate crisis. Without a cohesive program, this administration is floundering in monetary policy. In effect, the administration is abdicating to William McChesney Martin the responsibilities for economic policy. This is the same Martin who, as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, led us up and down the boom and bust cycles of the fifties.

Today there is a major slump in residential construction and in all the related building industries. Builders predict that by the year's end new starts in housing will drop to 73 percent of the 1965 volume. We are on the verge of a lumber and building industries recession. The savings and loan institutions are badly hurt. The effect can only spread through other segments of the economy.

Only immediate attention and decisive action by the President can avert disastrous economic consequences. Today I am calling on the President to convene an emergency conference with the leaders of the Congress, members of the Federal Reserve Board, and housing and financial leaders to formulate an effective program to bring interest rates back into line, and to reestablish a healthy balance among financial institutions in the money market.

The Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted actions of last December have been completely unsuccessful as brakes on the economy and, as I suggested at that time, have served instead to throw the whole economy out of balance. The 4½-percent discount rate which the Federal Reserve Board is currently charging for loans to member banks is the highest discount rate since 1929. Economists throughout the country are alarmed that the Board has ignored the lesson of the fifties—that peaks of high interest rates are invariably followed by recessions. Almost without exception, the Federal Reserve has not decreased discount rates except as reaction to declining gross national product. Even today, I read with alarm that another hike in the discount rate and further increases in the basic lending rate to commercial banks are anticipated. In the light of our economic history, such an outrageous increase can only lead to complete economic disaster.

The money market today is in chaos. Federal securities are currently trading at an effective rate of 5¼ percent. Commercial banks are responding to the Federal Reserve's lead by continuing their interest rate escalation. On Friday, the

Chase Manhattan Bank of New York moved up its rate on dealer loans backed by Government securities to 6½ percent from 6¼ percent. Loans to brokers backed with non-Government collateral are now commanding a 6-percent rate.

The fierce competition between certificates of deposit of the commercial banks and the commercial paper issues of finance companies quickened when Walter E. Heller & Co. announced a rate jump from 5½ to 5⅝ percent on the short-term commercial paper it sells directly to investors. This action will obviously restrict the ability of commercial bankers to obtain funds for lending.

The tightening money situation is threatening to pressure the commercial banks to raise the "prime" rate even higher than the current 5¾ percent that the banks charge to their most gilt-edged customers. The competition for cash is now intensified by rising yields of sales participation offerings up to 5.75 percent by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Tax-exempt securities are experiencing corresponding interest cost rises.

The Federal Reserve Board worsened the money situation in December by permitting a 5½-percent interest rate on certificates of deposit issued by commercial banks—a rate which by now is commonplace in the banks. Investors are withdrawing their funds from savings and loan institutions to cash in on the attractive interest rates elsewhere.

The net inflow of funds to savings and loans—new savings less withdrawals—for the first 5 months of this year were the smallest since 1951. The May figures, the most recent available, show that withdrawals increased by 38 percent from a year ago. The quarter ending in April showed a loss of $744 million in savings. The Idaho Savings & Loan Association was forced to close its four offices on July 7, even though it was offering 5 percent on regular savings accounts and 5.5 percent on 48-month certificates. A savings and loan association in Oregon, in the district which I represent, reports that it has not made a single new loan commitment since April 20. A year ago this same association was averaging $400,000 a month in loans.

The only remedy that the Federal Reserve Board has offered to correct the maldistribution of money is to raise the reserves that banks must hold against time deposits from 4 percent to 5 percent. The action was quicky denounced as too little, too late by spokesmen for the savings and loans, many of our colleagues in the Congress, and Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon.

The housing industry is dramatically affected by the removal of funds from sources which traditionally lend money for the purchase of homes. The number of new mortgages granted fell 5 percent in April from March, and 9 percent from April 1965.

The Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, John E. Horne, reports that the interest rate on older homes—conventional home mortgages—was up to 6.09 percent in April 1966, compared with 5.89 percent in April 1965. For new homes the rate rise for the corresponding period was from 5.74 percent to 5.99 percent. Such fractional increases are of major significance on a 30-year mortgage. In my Congressional District, FHA mortgages require up to 7 points discount. Conventional mortgages are being limited in many areas to one-third down and 6¾ percent interest.

In May, new housing starts dropped 13 percent from the preceding month to the lowest level in 3½ years. Industry spokesmen are now unanimous in predicting a drop in new housing starts from a 1.5 million-unit level in 1965 to 1.1-million units in 1966, based on decreasing volumes in the first 4 months of this year. Contrast these totals with the 2 million homes a year outlined by the recent White House Commission on Civil Rights as a minimum requirement if we are to make any impact on solving the problem of the urban ghettoes of the Nation.

The decline in the real estate market is immediately affecting the lumber and building trades industries. The economic difficulties which will result if the housing situation continues to deteriorate are readily apparent. On the estimated basis of 2 man-years of labor for the construction of a single house, a decrease of 400,000 in new homes will mean the loss of 800,000 jobs in the labor market. A home construction decrease of this magnitude will cut the lumber market by close to 5 billion board feet.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I represent a State which leads the Nation in lumber production. The interest rate escalation vitally affects the livelihood of many of my constituents. But the impact on the homebuilding and lumber industries will be reflected nationally when home prices soar and financing becomes increasingly difficult. A building industry recession will reach into every congressional district in this country. What good is it for this Congress to pass landmark legislation in the housing area when nothing is done about an economy which is drastically impairing the availability of housing?

Moreover, when the developments described above are considered with other economic factors, the plight of the home building industry and the savings and loan associations becomes the catalyst in a chain reaction. In spite of recent increases in the interest charges on installment loans for consumer goods by leading New York banks, and the much publicized failure in automobile sales, consumer installment credit has continued to escalate to 175.3 percent of its 1957–59 average—compared with 159.2 percent in the first quarter of 1965. The high installment loan rates of the big banks have been obviously ineffectual in stemming the tide of consumer spending. At the same time, manufacturer's inventories continued to rise throughout the spring while orders for goods remained stagnant. Economists are watching with concern corporate expenditures on new plants and equipment which are now 17 percent higher than in 1965's record year.

My increasing anxiety over these economic bellwethers is reflected not only by my prompt response to the Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted action in December, but in correspondence I have directed to President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY. I call the attention of the distinguished Members of this body to the content of these letters as included at the end of my remarks today.

Many of my colleagues in the Congress are discussing the possibility of a tax increase as a method of cooling down the economy. An across-the-board tax hike is neither economically justified nor politically practical at this time. Although the tax cut was a key aspect of the new economics which gave an unprecedented 6 years of economic growth and stability, juggling of our income tax structure will, in my judgment, never be acceptable or desirable as an economic regulatory device. The Members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1962 were almost unanimous in that opinion.

There is no one action that can restore the balance in our economy. An effective program would include actions by the administration, by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Congress, by Government agencies, and by financial institutions. Lowering of discount rates, increasing reserve requirements, and Open Market Committee bond purchases would come under Federal Reserve Board jurisdiction. Stoppage of all "Fannie May" and sales participation offerings should be considered by the Treasury. Immediate repeal of the investment tax credit should be examined. Passage of an excess profits tax, especially in war industries, should be considered, as should restrictions on installment buying and restraint in Federal appropriations. From a wide variety of tools, a concise program of action should be recommended to the President and Congress.

Mark Twain would likely say, "Everybody worries about the economy, but nobody does anything about it." That is my concern. Who is going to take the leadership in restoring sanity to our national monetary policies? Obviously, only the President commands the respect and authority to marshal the forces needed to correct the situation.

I urge the President to take this opportunity to call a conference at which the leaders of the Congress, the members of the Federal Reserve Board, the officials of the Treasury, and other interested Government agencies, and experts from all segments of the housing and financial communities may face up to the money crisis that threatens our Nation and develop a program for its improvement. In his state of the Union message to the Congress last January, the President spoke of "creative federalism" in dealing with the problems of the Nation. What more appropriate time to give substance to these words than now.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a member of the Ways and Means Committee I have strongly

supported the "new economics" of your administration, and in my public statements have been an outspoken advocate of policies to promote sustained growth in the economy. I regret very deeply that I now must strongly differ with the Administration on what I consider to be an abandonment of the principles we have been following.

In my judgment, unless corrective action is taken soon, the tight money policies imposed by the Federal Reserve Board and supported by recent actions of your Administration will destroy the economic gains we have made.

Within the past week, I had an extended conference with Secretary Fowler and Gardner Ackley on this matter. Although they were most cordial and helpful, they did not offer any satisfactory hope that actions would be taken to bring interest rates back into line. Mr. President, the near panic rush throughout the financial community in recent months to hike interest rates has raised a warning of impending consequences that cannot be disregarded. Only a direct action by your office can reverse this disastrous trend.

I submit, Mr. President, that this Administration cannot afford either politically or economically to be swept along, compounding the initial folly of the Federal Reserve Board, by engaging in such high interest policies as 5¾ per cent sales participation offerings and increased Federal loan rates. Every instrument of government should be marshaled to restore the healthy balance of monetary and fiscal policy required for continued prosperity. Through the successes of the past five years, we are on the verge of proving to ourselves and to the world that by enlightened government policies, a private enterprise economy can avoid the boom-and-bust cycles and can accelerate growth to meet the challenges of unemployment, expanding population, and economic opportunity for all. The lack of restraint in the use of monetary policy will surely bring this successful era to an end.

Just as a mixed monetary and fiscal policy has proved successful in generating growth, the same mixture is essential in restraining on overheating economy. High interest rates will not do the job. They are inflationary in themselves. They have not succeeded in slowing investment in plant capacity, not—with the single exception of housing—have they slowed the rising level of personal debt. They have instead contributed significantly to higher costs that are certain to be reflected in the consumer price index.

In the area of fiscal restraints, I recognize that the Administration has made a concerted effort to hold down expenditures and to reduce operating costs to a minimum. In addition, however, I hope that consideration will be given to other fiscal tools that will go directly to the danger points in the economy. Revisions in the Investment Tax Credit may be in order, to make its provisions applicable only to businesses and industries where expansion is vital to national defense or to encourage continued growth in other selective areas that are important to the national interest. Because of the sacrifices in lives and resources being made to fulfill our commitment in Vietnam, it may also be appropriate to consider means of curbing excess profits, particularly among defense-oriented industries. A request for standby authority in these and other areas of taxation might well provide the psychological restraint necessary to bring inflationary pressures under control without hindering a desirable rate of growth.

You, Mr. President, are the only one who can effectively express and implement the basic policies and programs to meet this crisis in our economy. I urge you to do so.

Sincerely,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since my letter to you of June 27, the nation's monetary and financial crisis has worsened. Daily reports of rising interest costs, the drastic decline in housing starts, and other indications of weak spots in the economy give me cause for serious concern about continued economic growth and the attainment of other objectives of your Administration.

The problem is of such magnitude that in my judgment only your personal leadership and influence can bring about a reversal of the interest rate spiral. I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that a conference should be convened among appropriate members of your Cabinet, Congressional leaders, members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, leaders of the housing industry, representatives of private and public financial institutions and other affected interests for the purpose of formulating a concerted program to bring interest rates back into line and to reestablish a balance in the money markets of the nation.

I am enclosing a copy of a statement, prepared for delivery in the House of Representatives, which outlines in greater detail the reasons for my growing concern.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 5, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Vice President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing to you about this matter only because of my grave concern for the political and economic consequences if action is not taken soon to alter the present course of policy.

My apprehension over runaway interest rates and the apparent impotency of the Administration to cope with the current crisis in monetary policy cannot be overemphasized. A recent meeting with Secretary Fowler and Gardner Ackley served to sharpen my concern because it was apparent that the Administration has no positive policy to counter these damaging trends. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I wrote to President Johnson following that meeting.

Mr. Vice President, a continuation of present policies can lead to only one result—a serious recession in the home building industry, the effects of which will be felt first and hardest in the nation's lumber producing areas. The people affected will not be satisfied with a finger of blame put on the Federal Reserve Board. The President and his Administration will be held responsible.

Throughout our public careers, we have both worked to encourage and facilitate home ownership among a larger segment of the American population. To me this personifies one of the most worthy objectives of our free society. Yet, the monetary policies of this Administration threaten to deprive millions of Americans of the privilege of owning their own homes. At the same time, those policies will adversely affect those working in construction, lumber and related industries. To single out this one segment to take the dose of anti-inflationary medicine for the entire economy is inexcusable.

Spokesmen for the Administration are quick to denounce any increase in prices which reflect in the cost of living index—and I am not belittling their cause for concern—but where are the voices of indignation and concern over the 25 per cent hike in prime interest rates in recent months? Where are the positive policies necessary to prevent a disastrous decline in one of the most basic industries in America? Where is the concern over the very real impact that high interest rates, themselves, have on inflated prices?

Because of the high interest rate policies instituted by the Federal Reserve Board and concurred in by this Administration we are on our way to a recession in the lumber industry. There is no reason why such a thing should or must happen, but it will happen unless this Administration moves immediately and forcefully to bring interest rates back to acceptable levels and to institute monetary policies that reflect the real needs of our economy.

Because of the seriousness of this problem, and its broad implications, I hope this matter will receive your personal and urgent attention.

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

A STEADFAST ALLY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Australia is a stanch ally in the battle for liberty in southeast Asia. Australian troops are fighting alongside our men in South Vietnam.

Thus it was hardly unexpected, but certainly welcome, to hear Prime Minister Holt of Australia reaffirm his country's support when he visited President Johnson in Washington last month.

The Dallas Morning News recalls that the Prime Minister promised Australia would stand with us as long as seems necessary to win in Vietnam. The newspaper also notes that strong backing was pledged during the recent SEATO conference in Sydney.

We have fought together in both World Wars, in Korea, and now in Vietnam, the News states in an editorial. And neither should ever lose sight of the other's friendship.

This editorial on a partnership that will surely be preserved is one I would like to see in the RECORD.

[From the Dallas Morning News, July 1, 1966]

A STEADFAST ALLY

Australians have reaffirmed their friendship for Americans. In Washington, Prime Minister Harold Holt promised to stand with our nation "as long as seems necessary to win in Viet Nam." Similar strong backing was pledged during the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization conference in Sydney.

Contrasting sharply with the attitude of such longtime allies as Great Britain, and to an even greater extent France, Australians' support is deeply appreciated. But all of us should recall that this is nothing new.

Aussies and Americans fought together almost half a century ago on World War I battlefields in France. They battled crack Nazi troops across North Africa in the Second World War. In Korea, there were the tough, husky and courageous men from Down Under to withstand communism along with Americans.

In Viet Nam, the U.S.-sized continent with a population only 1 million more than that of

Texas, is supply fighting men in significant numbers, as well as supporting forces.

Dedication to freedom and democracy, as well as clear vision of self-interest, inspires Australians as it does Americans. Australia has seen Oriental foes on her doorstep and knows the need of self-protection. But the descendants of those pioneers who conquered that continent, while our forebearers were pushing westward here, also fight for ideals.

As Australians have not forgotten our aid in the 1940s, Americans, we trust, will never lose sight of their friendship.

THE MILITARY SHOULD LIVE UP TO THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT AND EMPLOY QUALIFIED WOMEN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. 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 gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to congratulate Secretary McNamara and the President on the savings that the Secretary has made in military procurement. As a member of Senator DOUGLAS' Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, which has followed these efforts, I have been quite conversant with the method in which savings have been achieved, and now I would like to point out one other great opportunity for the Secretary of Defense to save money. I would like to suggest that he promote qualified women within the Defense Department in place of bringing at great cost unqualified men to fill positions. Today, I am in receipt of a letter from a woman working at a military base, who points out with names and dates the published requirements for a position. She is now working unassigned as a supervisor, but when she asked for the title and the money that went with it, the military master sergeant in charge of her section said:

> I will not have any * * * feather-merchant women supervisors. We have plenty of qualified 7-level military who will do the supervision.

On one job which she asked for the qualifications were—4 years college; 2 years teaching experience; and 2 years Air Force supply experience. She was told that she was unqualified, although she had two degrees, years of teaching experience, and years as a civil servant. The military brought a man and his family from an area more than a thousand miles away. He had no college, no degree, and no teaching experience. At the end of 1 year he left. They again refused the position to the woman and selected a man with no college, no degree, no teaching, and no Air Force experience. He also was brought with his family—all expenses paid from an area thousands of miles away. The Air Force spent several thousands of dollars hiring and moving these two men and waived all public job requirements.

My correspondent further pointed out:

> I am tired of training my supervisors and tired of not having credit for devotion to duty. Since April 26 of this year I have had four different military supervisors and am forced to cajole them and abide by their whims lest I be classified as uncooperative and they begin to document me for insubordination. I grit my teeth to keep my mouth shut when our master sergeant struts down the office aisle and bellows "these * * * civilians are just like the Air Force missiles—they won't work and you can't fire them."

My correspondent also makes the statement:

> I have nothing in my files to indicate I am an unsatisfactory employee and I feel that part of the Air Force belongs to me and that all of the Communists aren't in foreign countries.

I direct Secretary McNamara's attention to this incredible waste of money, time, and talent, and I further suggest that he reread the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and advise the military that if civil servants can put up with them, they can put up with civilians.

SECURITY AND SECRECY

Mr. BRAY. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major continuing problems we face is balancing the need for secrecy required by our national security with the traditions of public information in a free society.

The problem shows itself in many forms from time to time. During the present fighting in Vietnam, it becomes increasingly critical.

I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Post on July 7, 1966, which was copied from the Los Angeles Times. This story outlines the measures being taken by our forces to minimize the effectiveness of surface-to-air missiles used against our aircraft in Vietnam.

It may well be that much of this information was known to the enemy, yet this article seems to reveal much more information than is wise. My own military experience did not involve the Air Force, but I have talked with a number of officers in the Air Force who share my belief that the facts in this article go beyond what discretion would reveal.

This is not meant to criticize the reporter who wrote the story nor the newspaper which printed it. Obviously it was based on material which was given by military officials. It is they who should have exercised more caution.

It has often seemed to me that the Defense Department goes to excessive lengths to stamp as confidential information which is widely disseminated in the press. Here is an instance in which the Defense Department apparently allowed its interest in publicity to overcome proper caution about a vital security matter.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 7, 1966]

HOW U.S. PLANES EVADE MISSILES

Aerial teamwork, highly secret electronic devices and split-second evasive tactics have combined to virtually nullify the threat of Russian-built surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) against U.S. planes attacking North Vietnam.

Early this year, U.S. officials reported that the Soviet-built SAMs, thanks to new American tactics, had only about 5 per cent effectiveness. That is, only about 1 of every 20 SAMs launched hit a U.S. target. The percentage has dropped even further since then.

Although details of SAM-thwarting equipment and tactics are a closely held secret, they are based on the fact that the SAM-2 missiles provided to North Vietnam are radar-guided beam riders.

Planes specially equipped with electronics countermeasures accompany strike aircraft. Their equipment seeks to detect the beams from ground radar guidance stations when North Vietnamese crews begin to track targets.

Using electronics equipment aboard the planes, the countermeasures' operators seek to confuse the radar beam through transmitting beams of their own.

After the missile is launched, it can make major adjustments in its flight path only during the time that the rocket engine is still burning. After second stage burnout, the SAM travels at about twice the speed of sound along the course set by the burning rocket motor.

In the evasive action, U.S. planes attempt, in effect, to duck under the line-of-sight invisible beam and make such drastic changes in flight course as to make it difficult for radar to remain "locked on."

ADMINISTRATION ANTICS GIVE FARMERS NIGHTMARES

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, an article in this Monday's New York Times was brought to my attention which certainly makes me wonder just what this administration is using for commonsense these days. The article, which I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, tells of a New York investor who is going to set up a company in Rumania to breed and process more than 300,000 hogs a year with the products to be sold in the United States. Seventy-two percent of his financing will come from the American taxpayer through the Export-Import Bank.

Lately those of us from rural areas—Democrats and Republicans alike—have been concerned about the anti-farm attitude of this administration with its hide export controls, cheese import increases and the cutbacks of domestic meat purchases for the military, reductions in school lunch and school milk funds—all designed to push down farm prices.

We are all agreed that we have to do what we can to help underdeveloped countries build a viable agriculture so they may feed their people, but this is an entirely different operation.

This plan to use Export-Import Bank funds to set up a hog feeding and processing operation in a foreign country—and a Communist one at that—to sell

pork products to the American consumer goes even further than anyone could imagine in his wildest nightmare.

It seems strange that at the very same time President Johnson was in Iowa 2 weeks ago telling the farmers that he did not really mean what he was doing to them, his people back in Washington were finalizing this deal to finance the production of 60 million pounds of Communist pork to be sold in U.S. markets in competition with American farmers.

Mr. President, I submit that if the taxpayers' money is going to be used to establish agricultural processing plants, let us do it in this country where our farmers help pay the taxes that support this Nation.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1966]

U.S. INVESTOR MAKES RUMANIA PORK DEAL

BELGRADE, Yugoslavia, July 10.—Milton A. Gordon, a New York investor, has announced here that he has signed an agreement with a Bucharest company for processing Rumanian pork products and selling them in the United States.

Mr. Gordon said last week the arrangement between his company, International Markets, Inc., and Prodexport, the Rumanian trade company, will call for breeding and processing of more than 300,000 pigs a year.

Intercontinental will design a packing plant, probably to be situated near the Danube, and will supply about $8-million worth of modern American-made equipment for the process.

Mr. Gordon added that the output would be worth about $10-million a year for the next decade. He said he would get credits from the Export-Import bank for 72 per cent of the project and financing from American banks for another 12 per cent. The remaining funds are to be provided by Prodexport.

DROPPING OF ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST ANHEUSER-BUSCH

Mr. GOODELL. 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. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, On January 31, 1962, the Department of Justice filed a civil antitrust complaint against the Anheuser-Busch Corp.'s acquisition of a portion of the Rahr Malting Co. Describing Anheuser-Busch as "the largest beer producer in the country," the complaint said:

Rahr will be substantially curtailed as a vital source of supply for independent breweries in competition with Anheuser-Busch; Anheuser will be eliminated as a customer for other malting companies; and Anheuser's advantage over smaller competing breweries may lessen competition.

On May 24, 1966, $10,000 was contributed to the President's Club by eight individuals associated with Anheuser-Busch.

On June 17, 1966, the antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch was dropped on the grounds that "further prosecution of the case was not warranted."

The eight contributors, en bloc, to the President's Club in May 1966 were as follows:

Mr. August A. Busch, Jr. (President)	$2,000
Mrs. August A. Busch, Jr	2,000
Mr. August A. Busch, III (Vice Pres.)	1,000
Mrs. August A. Busch, III	1,000
Mr. Richard Meyer (Exec. Vice Pres.)	1,000
Mrs. Richard Meyer	1,000
Mr. Alfred Fleishman (Public Relations)	1,000
Mrs. Alfred Fleishman	1,000

The reports made by the President's Club to the Clerk of the House of Representatives reveal no contributions by any of these individuals in prior years.

Mr. Speaker, several disquieting reports on the President's Club have been given to the public by reliable journalists. Walter Pincus, writing in the Washington Star of September 24, 1964, said that, in soliciting members for this club, officials of the Democratic National Committee planted the idea "that contributors to the party in power would be able to gain an advantage in their dealings with the Government if they were members of the President's Club."

The columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott made the following report on the President's Club on May 17, 1966:

"The President's Club is still very exclusive although it has been in existence since 1961," says Clifton Carter, Democratic National Committee executive director, in soliciting new members. "Its members are assured of direct relationship with President Johnson."

Carter explains that in addition to being asked to White House social functions, "members who want to talk to the President, the Vice President, or one of their assistants, have only to contact my office. Members will immediately be put in contact with whomever they want to reach."

In his sales pitch, Carter stresses that President Johnson uses the Club's membership list to solicit advice in making appointments and "in developing a consensus on important domestic and foreign issues."

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this information about the President's Club, the sequence of events which I have outlined raises serious ethical questions in the mind of any reasonable person.

Top Justice Department representatives met with me this morning and assured me that the decision in this case was based on the merits alone. I have great respect for the personal integrity of both the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, and the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Donald Turner. I would not believe they would participate in any wrongdoing.

Assuming competent career Justice Department attorneys determined independently that the case against Anheuser-Busch should be dropped, questions outside the Department remain unanswered. What contacts, if any, during this critical period were made by Democratic National Committee personnel with Anheuser-Busch officials? Was reference made in such conversations to the pending antitrust suit? What representations were made to Anheuser-Busch about the antitrust case? Why did top executives of Anheuser-Busch, and their families, suddenly and simultaneously, as manna from above, drop $10,000 into the President's Club? These questions should be speedily and fully answered.

THE ANHEUSER-BUSCH ANTITRUST CASE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell from the news story in the Washington Post this morning on the minority leader's press conference yesterday whether the Anheuser-Busch antitrust case was specifically mentioned by the minority leader in his remarks, or whether, by some fermentation of the news, the reporters just assumed this might be the sort of thing Mr. FORD was referring to. The news story refers only to Anheuser-Busch, however, and so I imagine the finger must have been pointed rather directly at that company.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article be inserted at this point in the RECORD, because I feel that it documents the facts fairly as to the Anheuser-Busch people and destroys the charges implied or rumored or hinted at by the minority leader.

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

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

GIFTS QUASHED TRUST SUITS, GOP IMPLIES

(By George Lardner, Jr., Washington Post staff writer)

House Republican leaders yesterday dropped loud hints of Administration favors for members of the high-priced President's Club.

At a press conference on Capitol Hill, House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD (Mich.) said "some very disturbing rumors (were) floating around Washington about the dismisal of certain anti-trust actions * * * and contributions to the President's Club."

FORD made no charges of wrong-doing. He named no names.

A check of official records showed that three executives of the Anheuser-Busch Co. and their wives paid out $8000 for membership in the President's Club less than a month before the Justice Department dropped an anti-trust suit against the company.

The Justice Department quickly issued a statement saying the antitrust suit was dropped on its merits alone.

The head of the brewery's public relations firm and his wife joined up, too, with contributions of $1000 each, the minimum price of a year's membership.

Records filed with the Clerk of the House showed all $10,000 in contributions came on May 24.

The Justice Department dropped the antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch in Federal District Court in St. Louis on June 17.

"We understand Republican Congressmen are making hay on it," said Alfred Fleish-

man, board chairman of Fleishman-Hillard Inc., the St. Louis public relations firm that handles Anheuser-Busch's account.

He scoffed at the idea that the dismissal had anything to do with the memberships in the President's Club.

"There's one word for it—preposterous," he said. "You win 'em and you lose 'em with antitrust."

Contributing $1000 each to the Club along Fleishman and his wife were A. A. Busch III, the brewery firm's general manager, and his wife, and Richard A. Meyer, executive vice president, and his wife.

A. A. Busch Jr., president and chairman of the board at Anheuser-Busch, and his wife, each contributed $2000.

In a late afternoon statement prompted by Ford's remarks, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach said only two antitrust suits were voluntarily dropped by the Justice Department this year (two other dismissals were forced by bank merger legislation).

"I have no idea whether executives of any of these companies contribute to the Democratic, Republican or any other party," Katzenbach said. "Reviews of the cases after all the evidence had been accumulated indicated that further prosecution was not warranted."

The case dismissed against Anheuser-Busch was a civil suit filed in 1962 over the brewery's acquisition of a malting company plant. It charged that the acquisition of a source of malt for making beer was unlawful under the Clayton Antitrust Act.

The only other case the Justice Department decided to drop was dismissed yesterday. It involved another four-year-old civil suit charging six leading paper manufacturers with conspiring to hold down the prices they paid for pulpwood.

Fleishman said Anheuser-Busch has been on the losing end of antitrust suits, too, despite a long record of contributions to the Democratic Party.

"The Busches as brewers have been Democrats ever since the repeal of Prohibition," he said in a telephone interview. "Johnson's a friend of 30 years' standing. Mr. Busch (Jr.) raised $100,000 at a hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner for Kennedy in 1960."

Yet, Fleishman said, Anheuser-Busch was forced to sell a Miami brewery it "bought five or six years ago" as the result of an antitrust suit by the Justice Department.

"Nobody thought there was any cause and effect then," he said. "This company is too big for any of that type of activity. The courts decide the cases on their merits."

At the White House, Deputy Press Secretary Robert H. Fleming had nothing to say other than that "Ford himself says there are only rumors which he hasn't verified."

At the GOP press conference, Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD (R-Wis.) said the results of a Republican "investigation" of the rumors would be aired on the House floor today by Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL (R-N.Y.).

The session was called to bolster the Republicans' version of an election reform bill calling for candid disclosures of campaign spending and candidates' sources of income.

"We Republicans are serious about campaign reforms," FORD declared. "In this Congress we're only Number Two. But we try harder."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., who is the chairman of Anheuser-Busch and has been an active supporter of the Democratic Party for many, many years, is not the kind of businessman who comes running to Members of Congress for special favors on legislation, or for help in dealing with Government agencies. I told him about a provision of the administration bill on wheat and feed grains last year which would have cost his company millions of dollars in higher rice costs and he then followed up by taking his story to the House Committee on Agriculture in open hearings, where he proved his case. This is not the kind of businessman who is trying to bribe his way into governmental favor. I resent any implications of underhandedness, just as I resent an attempt to connect a contribution to the Democratic Party as automatically being something tainted.

Considering the size and visibility of the Anheuser-Busch firm as the leader of its field in this country, I am sure it operates under the constant scrutiny and surveillance of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and would be about as secure from antitrust action as General Motors or any other giant firm in a particular industry—no more and no less.

If $1,000 or $10,000, or any amount contributed to the Democratic Party could buy immunity for any firm from antitrust action, we would have on our hands a monumental scandal deserving of a congressional investigation. Perhaps, what we should do is to require a report on every business executive who has contributed as much as $1,000 to either party in the past 14 years—through the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations—and to list every governmental action in which his firm has been involved where the contribution could conceivably be regarded as a possible bribe. If the gentleman is suggesting we do it that way, I would be inclined to support him. But if he is basing this whole thing on the Anheuser-Busch case, then I think it is an instance of using honest reporting of political contributions in order to smear a Democrat who has made an aboveboard, fully reported, out-in-the-open contribution. Such tactics do not encourage the aboveboard reporting of political contributions, which is presumably what the minority claims to be calling for.

I understand there are also rumors about the Anheuser-Busch airplane being used to fly Vice President HUMPHREY to the All-Star baseball game. I have the facts on that, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The material referred to is as follows:

The facts are that Mr. Busch is Chairman of the St. Louis Bi-Centennial Corporation celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of St. Louis. The Bi-Centennial was inaugurated by a personal visit from President Lyndon Johnson in St. Louis on February 14, 1964 at the invitation of Mr. Busch. Vice President HUMPHREY was invited to close the St. Louis Bi-Centennial which came to its conclusion upon the tossing out of the first ball of the All-Star game played at the Busch Memorial Stadium in St. Louis on July 12. The Vice President was invited and he accepted the invitation. When the airplane strike took place Mr. Busch offered the use of the Anheuser-Busch plane to transport the Vice President and his party from Washington to St. Louis and return so that he might be sure to be there for the All-Star Game appearance to officially mark the close of the St. Louis Bi-Centennial. Mr. Busch did not know until a day before, when he was informed by the Secret Service, who would accompany the Vice President nor did he recommend or suggest anyone who should make up the Vice Presidential Party. Those are the facts surrounding the visit to St. Louis by the Vice President and his Party.

THE ANHEUSER-BUSCH ANTITRUST CASE

Mr. CURTIS. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious matter. I hope at this time the House of Representatives and indeed the Senate will make a thorough investigation into these charges. I must join my colleague the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] in saying that I have a high regard for the officials of Anheuser-Busch and particularly Mr. Busch. However, there are circumstances here that require for their sake, as well as for the sake of this administration, a real investigation and not one of these perfunctory investigations.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one other thing. I have received calls from people in St. Louis on this. It appears to me that the real problem here is an antitrust suit that was over 4 years old was continued before the courts without the Government prosecuting it and finally the Federal court ordered the Federal Government to come in peremptorily and try this in September. So, as far as the merits of the antitrust suit are concerned, it apparently appears that the Government had a very poor if not a weak case. So it is possibly not a question of bribery as much as sandbagging. I hope that this investigation will look at it from that angle as well in clearing this up.

MURDER OF EIGHT NURSES IN CHICAGO SHOCKS ENTIRE NATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. 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. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation is shocked today at the heinous crime that occurred on the South Side of Chiago when eight nurses were murdered in their dormitory at the Southtown Hospital.

Every resource is being used by Chicago police with the full help of the

county police, the State police, and the FBI, to track down this monstrous killer.

I am reasonably sure that when he is caught, he will prove to be a man with a previous criminal record; a man who has been released from some mental institution or some prison.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this country, in seeing this horrible tragedy which occurred in Chicago today, should give urgent thought to the whole problem of law enforcement. This country desperately needs help, serious help, and I do not think that the Supreme Court, in lowering the rules on the questioning of suspects and apprehending of criminals, is helping us any in this great problem. All of Chicago is shocked by this crime, and I am sure the whole Nation is shocked. I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will give immediate consideration to this growing problem of crime in America. It certainly has shocked the conscience of the whole Nation, and I do not think we should wait any longer in formulating national standards for apprehension and prosecution of those who commit crimes of violence. Too many of our State laws fail to adequately deal with violent crime.

I am certain that the man responsible for the atrocity is one who most probably migrated from some other State into Illinois. But even if he is a native of Illinois, we should realize that with the present mobility of our population, crimes of violence are a national problem which can be effectively attacked with uniform, national standards.

This Nation can no longer turn its other cheek to these mounting crimes of violence. I urge the Congress to take immediate action against this most serious of our national problems.

I should like to include in my remarks today an editorial which appeared this morning in the Chicago Tribune. This editorial was obviously written before the horrible crime occurred, but it is as timely as if it were written after the shocking murder was discovered.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

HANDCUFFED POLICE

Police Supt. O. W. Wilson says that the trend of Supreme court decisions may force law-abiding citizens to live in walled communities while criminals roam the land unmolested. Mr. Wilson related that at the governers' conference in Los Angeles last week he met a home builder who is developing a housing project which will be enclosed by a wall with a locked gate.

"Good people have to lock themselves in homes behind barred doors to protect themselves from assault," the superintendent said. "How much is a citizen willing to give up in life and property for the greater freedom of suspects?"

The court's tendency to load the law and police procedure in favor of the criminal is not new. In 1957 the court gave Andrew Mallory of Washington, D.C., a pass after he had been sentenced to death for rape, holding that the police had interrogated him for an unreasonable period of time before booking him. Mallory was convicted later of the same crime in Philadelphia and was sentenced to a term of up to 23 years.

In 1964 the court ruled that Danny Escobedo of Chicago had been improperly convicted of murder because the police refused his request for a lawyer before he confessed. In the term ending last month, the court extended this doctrine by holding that a suspect is entitled to counsel from the moment he is taken into custody or "otherwise deprived of his freedom in any significant way."

Police, the court said, must warn the suspect from the start that he need not talk. They must tell him that he is entitled to a lawyer before questioning begins. They must warn him that anything he says may be used in evidence against him. Even if he waives a lawyer at the beginning, he may demand one at any time during the interrogation. If he signifies that he does not want counsel, it must be established that he does so "voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently."

Such rules, Supt. Wilson said, "did not apply for the first 175 years of the Constitution." The Supreme court has acknowledged as much. It has held that its new rules will not apply to persons convicted "in conformity with previously announced constitutional standards." That is, it has changed the law overnight.

Mr. Wilson does not exaggerate the plight of the law-abiding citizen. A few hours after he spoke, there was a riot on the near west side in which a policeman was wounded, squad cars were pelted with rocks, store windows were smashed, and looting occurred. The ubiquitous Rev. Martin Luther King promptly showed up and persuaded district and station commanders to release half a dozen prisoners in the interest of abating tension.

The night before a burly hoodlum beat a soldier on an elevated train, repeatedly hammering his head against a window frame, after demanding that the victim hand over his money. A dozen or more passengers cheered the assault, which was brought to an end by a pair of detectives who ran up from another car.

If the Supreme court is trying to reduce urban life to the level of the jungle, it could not have been more successful. The police, not the criminals, are placed under restraint. Phony cries of "police brutality" and the creation of police "review boards" of civilians in New York and other cities compel the most tender concern for the criminal.

The former police commissioner of New York, Michael Murphy, has put the policeman's dilemma in a capsule: "The rank-and-file patrolman is now apprehensive of doing anything because of always being second-guessed. If I were on a beat today, I would share his apprehension."

MULTIPLE SLAYINGS IN CHICAGO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked. The tragedy referred to by my esteemed and distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] occurred in my district. It occurred in the dormitory of one of the better hospitals in Chicago, a hospital with which I am well and most favorably acquainted.

Among the victims was a young woman who had been the classmate and the close friend of the daughter of Mrs. Borrowdale, in charge of my Chicago congressional office.

I have been in constant communication by long-distance telephone. Our entire community is crushed and is still in a daze trying to realize how a homicide of such cruel and brutal dimensions could have come to pass.

Our first reaction is one of deep sympathy with the members of the bereaved families, some of them here and some in the faraway Philippines, from which a number of the slain nurses had come for training here.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in saying that this should stir the entire Nation to renewed efforts to combat crime, including that which unquestionably comes from the malfunctioning of deranged brains.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive, as I gather the details and try to construct the tragedy in my mind, how this could have happened. The orgy of blood, I understand, went on from midnight until perhaps 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, it is a crime of mass murder that has stirred the conscience of our Nation. On every front must the effort be made to remove the likelihood of its repetition anywhere in our beloved country. We must not permit, Mr. Speaker, these young women to have died in vain.

ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICARE PROGRAM IN THE SOUTH IS UNFAIR

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, national attention has finally been focused on the outrageous manner in which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has discriminated against the South in administering the medicare program. The disgraceful situation was brought to light when a Philadelphia, Miss., hospital announced it was being forced to discharge 28 elderly patients because indecisive, procrastinating Washington bureaucrats have failed to act on an application to participate in the medicare program.

Indeed, this case is one of the most glaring examples of bureaucratic bungling that it has been my experience to encounter in 20 years as a Member of this body. But, it is typical of what is happening throughout the South as thousands of elderly persons are being deprived of their rightful benefits as American citizens.

The background of the Philadelphia case illustrates the irresponsible manner in which HEW is handling the medicare program.

On June 16, 1966, an inspection team from the U.S. Public Health Service visited the Neshoba County Hospital. Hospital officials were told that approval would be recommended to Washington. Later, the hospital was told it was not in compliance.

No reasons were given for disapproval nor particulars cited. No recommendations were made as to how the hospital could amend its practices in order to receive approval.

On July 6, another team from PHS inspected the hospital. Again, the inspection team stated that approval would be recommended to Washington.

On July 9, an official of HEW here in Washington assured the hospital administrator on the telephone that approval would be given by 11 a.m. Monday, July 11.

When this promise was not fulfilled, Administrator Lamar G. Salter, called me for help. That afternoon and again the next day I attempted to talk with the Office of Equal Health Opportunities officer at HEW, Mr. Robert Nash. However, Mr. Nash was "on the other line" or in "conference" and I had to be satisfied with talking to his assistant, who passed the buck to another official who told me that the Neshoba County Hospital file would be located and that I would be called first thing Wednesday morning July 13. Mr. Speaker, it is now Thursday afternoon, and I am still awaiting that call.

In the meantime, the PHS dispatched another inspection team to Philadelphia in an apparent effort to pacify an aroused American public which is becoming more and more indignant over these inexcusable bureaucratic delays. No one knows just what this team hopes to discover, since the last inspection was conducted less than a week ago and favorably recommended the hospital for medicare participation.

Secretary Gardner is not confining his discrimination to Neshoba County Hospital. Just this morning I was informed that the Coahoma County Hospital at Clarksdale, Miss., and the North Sunflower County Hospital at Ruleville, Miss., have been victims of the same inexcusable, dilatory tactics of the Washington bureaucrats. In each case, the hospital administrators were informed in June that they had met the qualifications for medicare participation, but approval from Washington is still being withheld. Scores of similar situations exist in the South.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the medicare program are not being made available to eligible recipients on an equal basis throughout the country as Congress, in its enactment, intended. The actions—or inactions, as the case may be—of Federal bureaucracy in administering the program are frustrating the intent of the Congress, and denying needed treatment to great numbers of elderly, indigent citizens.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, and with the hope that Congress may be able to untangle the bureaucratic maze of arbitrary and capricious misadministration that threatens to cripple this program in its infancy, I am introducing a resolution this afternoon to create a select committee of the House to investigate HEW's criteria and methods used in approving hospitals for medicare patients.

Mr. Speaker, I think this a most important matter, and I hope the Committee on Rules will give prompt consideration to this proposal in the interest of the health and welfare of numerous aged American citizens.

USE OF FEDERAL AID FUNDS TO BRING ABOUT FEDERAL CONTROL OF LOCAL PROGRAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission at this time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Bradenton Herald, one of the leading daily newspapers of my State. The author, John T. Hamner, is one of the ablest newspapermen I have ever known. His editorial, "The Obvious Is Admitted," is the finest presentation I have ever read on the subject of the use of Federal aid funds to bring about Federal control of local programs.

I have often reminded my constituents of the fact that Federal control is inherent in Federal aid. Mr. Hamner sets forth very clearly the degree to which this control has developed. He also makes equally clear the fact that these Federal aid dollars come from the same pocketbook the local dollar comes from. I hope that all of my colleagues and all who subscribe to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will read Mr. Hammer's excellent editorial.

For those who are concerned about Federal control in local programs, they can consider Mr. Hamner's conclusion that a "community can decide for itself if the dance is really worth the piper's price."

The editorial follows:

THE OBVIOUS IS ADMITTED

If anyone had any lingering doubts that aim of federal "aid" programs has all along been control of local affairs, that doubt should be removed by the recent declaration of a high federal official with a lot of "aid" money to dispense.

Dr. Tinsley L. Spraggins of the U.S. Office of Education Opportunities put it bluntly: "Money is power, and the government intends to use this power as a lever to pressure school systems both North and South, to eliminate the last vestiges of segregation."

Dr. Tinsley was only admitting what has been obvious for some time, and was speaking only of one particular aspect of federal aid-force intentions. What he says applies generally to the federal programs, and for more purposes than elimination of all traces of segregation—enforced, de facto or volunteer.

The Government gives a community money to help it build a hospital. Then it tells the hospital whom it must admit, where they must be bedded down, what sort of services it may or must offer, what sort of construction it can use.

Then the government gives the hospitals money, via paying patient bills, and begins to tell it what it can charge.

The government gives the schools money, and tells them whom they may and must teach, how the teaching is to be handled, how the program must be run. This swells the programs and the employment rolls and the activities, but does nothing for the real purpose of a school system, which is teaching the regular courses to all students. So the government dangles the bait of still more money to systems hard put for cash, and creates pressures for the schools to invite the government still further into financing—and running—the schools.

The same thing has been going on for years in other areas. The central government gives "matching funds" to states to build highways, and then demands the right to approve or disapprove everything about those highways from where they go to what sort of signs may be placed on private property within sight of them.

It gives "aid" programs to farmers to "guarantee" them equal shares of the proceeds of the market place, and then tells them what they can plant, where they can plant it, and what they must do with it when harvested.

The government has been well pleased with the success of its projects. It has slipped the controls in so smoothly behind the checks that many people didn't suspect they were there. And the politicians have succeeded in having these programs come at the "demand" of the public, which now sees growing proposals to solve problems for people that the people didn't even know they had.

Still, many persist in seeking "federal aid" to pay for projects they sometimes need, more often just think would be nice to have. And thus they give new support to the fallacy that the central government can help states and communities do things.

The federal dollar for building hospitals and expanding school activities comes from the same pocketbook the local dollar comes from. The federal road-building dollar comes from the same gas pump the state dollar comes from.

One community can't stop the trend by passing up the temptations of the Potomac Loreleis. One community can't push the camel back out of the tent.

But one community can decide for itself if the dance is really worth the piper's price. And this one, beginning to show signs of addiction to the federal dollar, needs to be deciding.

CONTROLLING FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the other body is considering legislation to establish a Senate Committee on Intelligence Operations, a watchdog committee to oversee the far-reaching activities of the American intelligence community, and especially those of the Central Intelligence Agency. It is a debate that we should watch carefully, for the problems involved in the oversight of foreign intelligence have often been the subject of our great concern.

I have made my position on the subject quite clear in the past. In each of the Congresses in which I have served, I have introduced legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence to provide meaningful oversight. I have stood in the well of the House on many occasions to stress the need for such congressional supervision. On two occasions, I have testified before the House Rules Committee, urging it to recognize Congress' responsibility to supervise closely our intelligence apparatus.

The legislation which the Senate is considering would establish a permanent standing committee, which would act in this area instead of the present subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and add three members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Functioning only in the Senate, it would not provide the unified oversight that a joint committee could, but it is a very important step in the right direction because of its recognition of the role the intelligence community plays in American foreign affairs.

The current debate marks only the second time that the problem of controlling foreign intelligence has been debated on the floor of either body since the establishment of the CIA in the National Security Act of 1947. The other time was in 1956, when Senator MANSFIELD's resolution to create a joint committee was defeated.

It is regrettable that the current debate comes at a time when a new Director of Central Intelligence has just been appointed, for it is argued that it would be inappropriate to place checks on a man before he can prove himself. To say this is to miss the point, however, for the idea of congressional control of intelligence is a basic one which transcends whoever fills any of the offices involved. The Founding Fathers believed in the abstract ideal of checks-and-balances, regardless of personalities, as a necessity for democratic government. It is that concept which is now at stake.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of controlling intelligence are great, but the dangers are even greater. This point is emphasized in a study recently done by a member of my staff, Mr. Gary Sperling, entitled "Central Intelligence and Its Control." The essay examines the history and current workings of the intelligence community and attempts to evaluate the arguments for and against congressional control. I know that many Members of the House will find it of interest.

The study follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS CONTROL: CURBING SECRET POWER IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(By Gary Sperling, May 1966)

I

This essay is founded upon two assumptions: that the government of the United States must continue to rest upon that most basic principle of the Declaration of Independence, "consent of the governed," and that such consent cannot be meaningful unless the governed are allowed to know to what they are consenting. With the advent of the Cold War, these two assumptions have ceased to characterize properly our American government. Our nation's leaders, motivated by seeming requirements of national security, have increasingly placed large sectors of American policy out of the range of public surveillance. Important information about the workings of our government have been withheld from the people on the theory that potential enemies would also receive the information and use it to advantage. "We have cloaked the operations of the Executive Branch of Government in veils of secrecy unknown to any previous epoch of our history." [1] As a result, the most basic principle of American democracy has become eroded. James Madison, over a century and a half ago, remarked, "It is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to the provisions against dangers, real or pretended, from abroad." [2] Today, his prediction has come true, and in no field more so than in the shadowy, spectacular, and romantic area of foreign intelligence.

At the same time, that governmental secrecy has increased at home, the need for information from abroad has also increased. Almost any area of the world contains either a potential American enemy or a potential crisis spot—and most parts harbor both. The Cold War requires that we monitor all of these, lest the United States be caught unaware of possible danger to it. A missile may strike the United States from a launching site thousands of miles away; every point on the globe is now "strategic". Complex and costly modern weapons systems take years to construct; unknowable future political situations must often be predicted with a high degree of reliability. In addition, there is the difficulty of penetrating the large portion of today's world that lies behind the Iron Curtain; a considerable bureacracy is required to ferret information out of totalitarian states. For these reasons, the tasks of intelligence have been immense, complex, world-wide, and ever-present. Intelligence has become a way of life to every major governmental leader, who must regard it as a necessary tool in national decision-making. The American intelligence community is well aware of its important role; a former Director of Central Intelligence has said, "There has never been a time in history . . . when Intelligence has had as clear an opportunity to get its views over as it has had in this country in recent years. The National Security Act of 1947 . . . has given Intelligence a more influential position in our government than Intelligence enjoys in any other in the world." [3] Certainly, with no immediate easing of the Cold War in sight, with military technology ever developing bigger and better weapons, and especially with America currently involved in a long and costly struggle in Southeast Asia, the prospect is that national security will require even more of our intelligence agencies in the years to come.

Yet this important part of our government remains wrapped, as Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY has put it, "in its cloak of secrecy." [4] The American public and even its elected representatives hear little of intelligence operations—such as the U-2 flights—until after they have either been completed successfully or failed miserably. The most basic information on our intelligence community, such as its total annual budget or approximate figures on the number of people in its employ, are kept strictly "top secret", lest the enemy find and use the data. Often this reaches the height of absurdity; information which is readily available to the rest of the world is kept from the average American citizen. For instance, the National Security Agency, widely known in both the foreign and domestic press as America's "communications intelligence" arm (making and breaking codes, intercepting secret messages, developing techniques for transmitting secret information, etc.), is officially described only as performing "highly specialized technical and coordinating functions relating to the national security." [5] Americans were shocked to learn last year of a CIA agent's offer of a three million dollar bribe to Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore; they were startled to hear recently of the use of Michigan State University as a "cover" for intelligence activities in South Viet Nam. Yet this national outrage does not compare with the international disgrace brought upon the United States by the disclosure of such shady maneuvers as the Bay of Pigs operation.

Its self-imposed ultra-secrecy poses great problems for the intelligence community. Because the public cannot be sure what is and what isn't an American intelligence operation, it tends to suspect shadiness everywhere. "Anywhere in the world, when a minister resigns or a military junta takes over, the handwriting on the wall immediately spells CIA." [6] The frequent unfairness of these charges once caused Allen Dulles, then Director of Central Intelligence, to remark, "I only wish we had accomplished all that the Soviets attribute to us." [7] But Dulles realized the difficulty of his situation: "I am the head of the silent service and cannot advertise my wares . . . public relations must be sacrificed to the security of our operations." [8] John F. Kennedy also stressed this point in commenting to a group of intelligence administrators at the opening of the CIA Headquarters at Langley, Virginia, "Your successes are unheralded; your failures are trumpeted." [9] The present secrecy arrangements do not allow intelligence officials to boast of actions that go well and those that go poorly generally speak for themselves.

If it is risky for the intelligence administrator to present the truth, it is all but impossible for the scholar to obtain it. There is always a body of legitimately secret information about any intelligence operation, and beyond that is the general governmental fear of discussion epitomized by Senator HENRY JACKSON's statement that "details with respect to intelligence should not be discussed" during the 1962 debate over the nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence because it "may be unwittingly giving aid and comfort to the enemy." [10] Only those in charge of any given intelligence action can speak authoritatively of its nature, and these are the very people who would not do so. Harry Howe Ransom, author of a number of books and articles on U.S. intelligence, confesses, "One simply cannot apply the usual rigorous standards of data gathering and documentation to this subject." [11] Yet a certain

[1] Walter Millis, *Arms and Man: A Study in American Military History* (New York: Putnam, 1956), p. 360.

[2] Letter to Thomas Jefferson, May 17, 1798, *The Complete Madison*, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: Harper, 1953), p. 258.

[3] Allen Dulles, Address before the Yale Conference on Human Resources, New Haven, Connecticut, February 3, 1958.

[4] "The CIA Is Getting Out of Hand," *Saturday Evening Post*, January 4, 1964, p. 6.

[5] Office of the Federal Register, *United States Government Organization Manual: 1965–6* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 207. For a lengthy account of the NSA's activities and organization, provided by two former employees who defected to the press and Moscow, see *New York Times*, September 7, 1960, pp. 1 ff.

[6] Sanche de Gramont, *The Secret War* (New York: Putnam, 1962), p. 28.

[7] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 63.

[8] Address before the Advertising Council of San Francisco, California, September 19, 1957.

[9] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 5.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 1, p. 1066. This and other CONGRESSIONAL RECORD references are to the permanent edition, unless otherwise noted.

[11] *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), p. 167.

amount of material is available on this subject and within its restrictions one can analyze some of the dilemmas presented by the existence of a secret intelligence apparatus in a democratic society.

It is clear that today's international situation requires some adaptation of the Founding Fathers' principles. In 1822, Madison wrote, "A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both." [12] Today most citizens would agree that the wide dissemination of information on intelligence methods and results is impractical for them and infeasible for the nation. The subject is both too complex and too fraught with danger for the entire populace to be so informed. However, it must never be considered so sensitive as to be withheld from the people's chosen representatives. Americans must look to a system of careful oversight if the tenuous compromise between defense and democracy is to be reached.

II

While it is common to refer to our intelligence functionaries as *the* CIA, this is only partly true. The Central Intelligence Agency is but one of a large number of executive officers which deal in the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of intelligence. Flanking it are the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence, the Office of Naval Intelligence, Air Force Intelligence, the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a handful of more minor government agencies. Two aspects, however, set the CIA apart. On the one hand, it is the overall coordinating body, with final responsibility for the evaluation and dissemination of intelligence data through all parts of our federal government. On the other hand, though, it is the only one of the agencies listed that is not directly subject to the type of executive oversight Americans have come to expect of their Congress, oversight born of the basic principle of governmental checks and balances. We shall examine this unusual position later on, but for now let us consider the broad organizational outline of the intelligence community.

Perhaps the most closely guarded secret in Washington is the intelligence community's budget. Tucked into Defense Department contingency funds and costly weapons expenditures, its exact amount is known only to a handful of intelligence and Bureau of the Budget officials, as well as the President. In the absence of clear fact, a good deal of speculation has arisen: Hanson Baldwin estimated in 1954 that the total is approximately $2 billion; David Wise and Thomas B. Ross claim it is about $4 billion.[13] Allen Dulles has called figures such as these "several times exaggerated." [14] Yet Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who was one of President Kennedy's chief national security aides, says that the CIA's budget exceeds the State Department's by more than 50 per cent and that *this* amount is but half that of the intelligence expenses of the Defense Department.[15] If we assume that his information is correct (and no better source has as yet become available), the CIA's budget must exceed $600 million and the total allowance for the entire intelligence community must easily top $2 billion, or more than, for instance, the cost of the entire War on Poverty for this year. Similar academic detective work reveals that the intelligence community employs about 25,000 persons, approximately 15,000 of whom work directly for the CIA.[16]

Currently atop this vast bureaucracy is Rear Admiral William F. Raborn (USN retired), the Director of Central Intelligence; his job has been called "second in importance only to the President" by Senator RUSSELL, who as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services is in a unique position to know.[17] He wears two "hats", serving as both chief coordinator of the intelligence community as a whole and as the everyday administrator of its major component. He sits in on National Security Council meetings as chief intelligence advisor. He has the responsibility, under the National Security Act of 1947, to inspect and evaluate the intelligence product of all government security agencies. He has virtually free rein to hire and fire CIA personnel without regard for Civil Service regulations. Perhaps most important, the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 allows him to spend any and all of the CIA's multimillion dollar annual appropriation purely on his personal voucher. As one author has commented, "This is truly an extraordinary power for the head of an Executive agency with thousands of employees and annual expenditures in the hundreds of millions of dollars." [18]

The role of the CIA may be seen by merely noting the names of its four subdivisions: Intelligence, Research, Plans, and Support. The CIA is charged with collecting *intelligence* (80 per cent of this material is gained through *research* among such "open sources" as technical magazines and foreign broadcast monitorings), using this data to draw up reports on the economic, political, social, and military situation in all crisis and potential crisis areas (this includes both long-range projections and daily summaries); providing this information to policy-makers to aid in the formation of *plans* for the national security; and providing such *support* for these operations as many prove necessary. [19]

The National Security Agency, a part of the Defense Department, has primary responsibility for "communications intelligence": the making and breaking of codes, the interception of secret messages of foreign governments, the development of techniques for the secret transmission of information, and the use of electronics for acquiring, communicating, and protecting all forms of information. The NSA Headquarters at Fort Meade, Maryland, contains 1,400,000 square feet of office space and is reputed to have more electric wiring than any other building in the world.[20] Its "domestic" budget is well over $100 million a year.[21]

The Defense Intelligence Agency was established by President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs fiasco; its goal is to unify the intelligence efforts of the Department of Defense by combining many of the formerly separate activities of each of the armed services. These smaller staffs—Army Intelligence (G-2), the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), and Air Force Intelligence (A-2)—still exist and continue to supply particular service intelligence requirements. The DIA is charged with furnishing all Defense Department current operations intelligence, determining all Defense intelligence requirements, and producing all military intelligence estimates for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, United States military commands throughout the world, and the Secretary of Defense. It is, in a sense, a holding company within a higher holding company; the Director both coordinates all military intelligence within the Department of Defense and represents the DIA on the United States Intelligence Board (USIB), the overall coordinating committee of the intelligence community, on which the Director of Central Intelligence serves as Chairman.

The State Department is the oldest American hand in the intelligence field: it has supplied political, economic, and social information on foreign countries to national policy-makers since its establishment in 1789. Since 1947 it has had only the task of collecting this information from nations in the free world; the extra difficulties of extracting similar information from totalitarian nations has made it necessary to shift this chore to the better-equipped CIA.[22] Over the years, there has been considerable conflict between State and the CIA, and today State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research regards itself as *the* research and analysis arm of the Secretary of State's office.[23] Given the central role of State in the formation of foreign policy, this bureau has great potential importance, but the fact that its budget is dwarfed by the other major intelligence producers hinders it as a vital day-to-day factor.

The Atomic Energy Commission has primary responsibility for intelligence relating to atomic energy, including periodic estimates of the atomic-weapons capabilities of the nuclear powers, while the Federal Bureau of Investigation plays a central role in the important task of *counter*espionage. Other government departments and agencies who supply intelligence data in selected areas include the Department of Commerce, the Post Office Department, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, and certain government-affiliated research organizations, such as the Rand Corporation.

In sum, the intelligence community is a loose confederation of agencies from throughout the federal government, bound together on a continuing basis only by the fact that all coordinate their work with the CIA and the USIB and are officially under the President. In a segmented field, where it is the rule that details of operations are divulged only to those with a "need to know" and where it is therefore common to find a man at one desk totally unaware of what the man at the next desk is doing, it may safely be

[12] Letter to W. T. Barry, August 4, 1822, *The Complete Madison*, p. 267.

[13] "Myopia on Intelligence," *New York Times*, June 3, 1954, p. 13. *The Invisible Government* (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 277–8.

[14] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[15] *A Thousand Days* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), p. 427.

[16] See Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story* (New York: Morrow, 1962), pp. 17–27; Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. vi, 82; and David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, p. 232.

[17] U.S. Senate Committee on the Armed Services, *Hearings*, "Nomination of John A. McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence," 87th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, 1962, p. 9.

[18] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 80–83.

[19] I have simplified somewhat here. It is actually the Plans Division that conducts covert operations; the Support Division is merely an administrative arm in charge of such bureaucratic needs as equipment, logistics, etc.

[20] David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, p. 221. See note 5.

[21] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, p. 136.

[22] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 48–50.

[23] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 121–3. Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, p. 137.

said that only the Director of Central Intelligence (and perhaps his highest-ranking assistants) can be aware of all the activities of the intelligence community. Yet it is this very man who differs from the other agency directors in that he is not responsible to the Congress for his budget, his employee policies, or the specific details of the operations he heads. The man to whom the system gives the most power is also the man who needs deal with the least checks upon him.

III

That the intelligence community should have attained such a far-reaching and secure position within our government is in one sense surprising, for the American people came only lately to an appreciation of the value of a coordinated intelligence apparatus. According to its own official history, the United States Army was "slow to recognize the importance of military intelligence and backward in its use in the solution of military problems." [24] Until after World War II, there was little or no official government intelligence activity except in time of combat. For example, when the United States entered World War I in 1917, Army Intelligence consisted of a tiny section buried within a division of the General Staff—with only two officers and two clerks.[25] This was rapidly expanded during the year's involvement in the war, but almost as rapidly dismantled afterwards; symptomatic of official feeling about intelligence is the comment of Henry L. Stimson who, on becoming Secretary of State in 1929, closed down the nation's only cryptographic agency, saying, "Gentlemen do not read each other's mail." [26] During the interwar years, according to George C. Marshall, our foreign intelligence was "little more than what a military attaché could learn at a dinner, more or less, over the coffee cups." [27] Intelligence at this time rarely attracted the most promising officers and usually received meager Congressional appropriations. Many Congressman looked upon a military attaché as an officer being sent upon a luxurious vacation at the expense of, and with no benefit to, the American taxpayer. Yet the neglect of intelligence cannot fully be blamed on such parochialism. More important was the lack of recognition within the State, War, and Navy Departments of the importance, even in peacetime, of coordinated foreign intelligence, and perhaps the most fundamental cause of intelligence neglect was the temper of the times—a period of isolation from world affairs, of America's viewing itself as a moral bastion, and of a military policy of passive defense. For all these reasons, Congress in the 1920's normally appropriated less than $200,000 annually for Army Intelligence and similarly small amounts for other agencies involved in intelligence.[28]

Pearl Harbor ended the apathy. The attack came as an almost complete surprise to American officials; when Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox received the news of the Japanese attack, he exclaimed, "My God, this can't be true. This [message] must mean the Philippines!" [29] Later investigation of the events leading up to the "day of infamy" proved that the information necessary to anticipate the attack was actually available to the Government, but that a lack of proper evaluation and dissemination apparatus had prevented the information from reaching the President and his chief advisors.[30] As in World War I, the response to the recognition of American intelligence inadequacy was a proliferation of temporary agencies; this time, though, there was one improvement: the formation of a Joint Intelligence Committee, a coordinating agency under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was of little help; General William J. Donovan, head of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, has admitted that President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference, lacking accurate intelligence reports, failed to realize that the Japanese were almost defeated and "traded important postwar concessions for Stalin's guarantee of entry into the Pacific war." [31]

The lessons of Pearl and Yalta were not lost upon America's leaders. General Eisenhower called the lack of centralized intelligence "a shocking deficiency that impeded all constructive planning," and President Truman commented, "The war taught us this lesson—that we had to collect intelligence in a manner that would make the information available where it was needed and when it was wanted, in an intelligent and understandable form." [32] Early in 1946, Truman took the first step toward the creation of a coordinated intelligence apparatus, issuing an Executive Order that established the Central Intelligence Group.

The Group operated under an Executive Council—the National Intelligence Authority—composed of the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, as well as a representative of the President. It was primarily a holding company, designed to coordinate the work of existing departments, but it was also authorized to perform services which the NIA determined could best be performed centrally.[33]

A year later, the 80th Congress legitimized the President's creation of centralized intelligence apparatus. The National Security Act—best remembered now for its unification of the military establishment—has been called a "basic charter of civil-military relations and of security policy formation." [34] Its most important creation was the National Security Council, a group of the highest civilian officials responsible for diplomatic and military planning (in 1966, the NSC is composed of President Johnson, Vice-President HUMPHREY, Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Office of Emergency Planning Director Bryant), to generate the basic policy recommendations in all matters affecting the national security. To inform these top-level administrators, the Central Intelligence Agency was formed. Its purposes, as defined by the Act are:

1. *To advise the National Security Council in matters concerning* such intelligence activities of the government departments and agencies as relate to *the national security.*

2. To make recommendations to the National Security Council for the *coordination of* such *intelligence activities.*

3. To *correlate and evaluate* intelligence relating to the national security, *and provide for the* appropriate *dissemination of* such *intelligence* within the government.

4. To perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence activities, such *additional services* of common concern *as* the National Security Council determines *can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.*

5. To perform such *other functions* and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct. (Italic supplied)

This was an "organic" act, in that the functions of the CIA are defined only generally, with more precise direction left to the President and the NSC, but the Congress did make some attempt to limit the new agency. To insure that the CIA could never be converted into a *Gestapo*, the law provided that "the Agency shall have no police, subpoena, law enforcement powers, or internal security functions;" in another section of the measure, the power granted to the Director to inspect the intelligence product of all government security agencies for the purpose of "correlation, evaluation, and dissemination" was restricted in that FBI information may be examined only upon "written request". Furthermore, to emphasize that the CIA was not to supersede most of the existing intelligence bureaus, these departments were directed to continue to "collect, evaluate, correlate and disseminate departmental intelligence." [35]

The clear thrust of the National Security Act was to establish a confederated, and not a centralized, national intelligence appartus. However, this goal was undermined by the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, a measure designed to strengthen CIA administration by giving the Director of Central Intelligence unprecedented powers. Under the new statute, the CIA was exempted from all federal laws that require the disclosure of the "functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency"; the agency was exempted from almost all the major Civil Service regulations; the Bureau of the Budget was directed to make no reports to the Congress on these matters. The Director was given the power to bring one hundred aliens a year into the United States without regard to normal immigration laws. Above all, he was given the staggering power of spending all CIA appropriations "without regard to the provisions of law and regulations relating to the expenditure of government funds . . . the certificate of the Director shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified." [36] These provisions constitute voluntary cession by the Congress of all the traditional controls over the Executive, especially the important control over the expenditure of funds. They are an invitation to unchecked secret power.

Since 1949 the Central Intelligence Agency has grown phenomenally; a conservative guess would be that it now has almost three times as many employees as it had then. For this, five major explanations may be advanced. First of course is the increasing requirement of intelligence. A-bombs have given way to H-bombs, IRBM's to ICBM's, in the Cold War race for bigger and better weapons; the complexities of the latest weapons systems require ever more notice of the need for them. Second, one must cite an increasing feeling that certain aspects of national security are best handled centrally; specific intelligence operations are now so

[24] Department of the Army, *American Military History, 1607–1953* (Washington, 1956), p. 491.

[25] Peyton C. Marsh, *The Nation At War* (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, 1932), p. 226.

[26] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 71.

[27] U.S. Senate Committee on Military Affairs, *Hearings*, "Department of Armed Forces," 79th Congress, 1st Session, Washington, 1945, p. 61.

[28] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 51–3.

[29] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, p. 54.

[30] Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission), *Intelligence Activities*, June, 1955, pp. 29–30.

[31] "Intelligence: Key to Defense," *Life*, September 30, 1946, p. 117.

[32] *Crusade in Europe* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1948), p. 32. *Memoirs* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955), vol. II, p. 56.

[33] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, pp. 74–6.

[34] Walter Millis, Harvey C. Mansfield, and Harold Stein, *Arms and the State* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1958), p. 178.

[35] Public Law 80–253. A further provision of the Act, under which the CIA explains its extreme secrecy, provides that "the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure."

[36] Public Law 81–110.

closely coordinated by the CIA as to make the other agencies involved almost subservient. Such close coordination often raises the general level of efficiency, but there is always the danger implied in Prof. Ransom's comment that "one man's coordination is another man's dictatorship." [37] A third source of growing CIA power over the years has been the policy of rotation within the military services and, to a lesser extent, among the other departments. It has resulted in the CIA's tending to have greater continuity than other agencies in personnel skilled in intelligence evaluation and analysis. "As the experience and competence of CIA personnel increase, so do its power and the relative importance of its role." [38] Despite the fact that Harry Truman said in 1963, "I never had any thought when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations," a fourth cause—one of the most important—of CIA growth must be laid at his feet. The ambitious objective of the 1947 Truman Doctrine ("to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures"), combined with an early lack of precision about the agency's purpose and organization, has caused the CIA to become a secret arm of foreign policy implementation—an arm nobody originally intended and one that has led the United States into disgrace on more than one occasion.[39] That this arm should have ever attained such power is largely the fault of the State Department; its inertia must be cited as a fifth cause of the growth of an agency that has all but replaced State in certain areas of foreign policy. Theodore Sorenson reports that President Kennedy felt that State's tendency to excessive delay obscured determination.[40] Part of the problem is the paucity of State's resources when compared to the CIA's, but even more important is the cession of work from State to the CIA during the Eisenhower years when the Dulles brothers headed these offices. The Hoover Commission found Allen Dulles too much of a work-grabber; Andrew Tully has noted that John Foster relied much more heavily on brother Allen's estimates than he did on the reports from his own ambassadors.[41] Without question, the "CIA problem" is, to a large degree, a "State Department problem."

Perhaps the most noteworthy—and the most frightening—fact is that these explanations seem likely to remain true for some years to come. The demand for intelligence is ever on the rise. The system of military rotation has not been reversed. The present war in Viet Nam illustrates our continuing commitment to the principles of the Truman Doctrine. Unless some outside action is taken, the CIA's secret power is likely to increase even further than it already has.

IV

Americans are presently unable to ascertain whether the CIA is doing a creditable job for two reasons: we are not united in one idea of what "a creditable job" is and, even if we were, we cannot obtain the information necessary to make a sound judgment. The National Security Act defines the duties of the CIA so broadly that there can be many conceptions of what is and isn't within the agency's responsibilities. Paramilitary operations, such as the Bay of Pigs maneuver, provide the best example of this imprecision. During the 1947 hearings, Congressman Fred Busbey of Illinois asked James V. Forrestal, the Secretary of the Navy, about rumors then prevalent that operational activities were being contemplated for the proposed intelligence agency; Forrestal denied them.[42] Sherman Kent's *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy*, which had a generally large influence on early CIA officials, makes a strong case against the CIA's entering into such activities.[43] Yet, as has been amply proven, the CIA has entered and continues to enter the field of international conspiracy. Such efforts are officially justified under clause 5 of the National Security Act, the "other functions" clause, but many people feel that this is stretching the point somewhat; to these people (this writer confesses that he is among them), the thrust of the Act is clearly for intelligence only, and not for military activities of any sort. Some Americans feel that the government ought to refrain from all clandestine and especially illegal operations overseas; they feel that such activities contradict the high moral principles to which this nation has traditionally dedicated itself. On the other hand, other Americans believe—and the government has consistently concurred—that "new times demand new conduct." As one member of this school of thought has forcefully put its case:

"While diplomacy is preferable, and usually more reliable and effective than subversion, the United States cannot realistically abstain from espionage or follow an absolute principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other nations. Cold War is by definition a stage in international politics that is neither war nor peace. In this situation, and short of a reign of international law based upon the consent of the governed, the United States may sometimes have to engage in clandestine activities to protect the national interest. The nation cannot accept the claim, in every situation, that the existing government or regime in every foreign country is the legitimate one. The national interest and the common defense may require intervention, even though this confronts us with legal and moral problems. The United States rarely faces comfortable alternative choices in support of foreign regimes. Often we must accept the lesser evil because circumstances fail to provide an ideal option." [44]

No public referendum can ever be conducted on this question, but it is one well worth more discussion than it has heretofore received. The proposition that our government should not indulge in covert operations includes the notion that the CIA should not do so, but the reverse is not true; Americans must distinguish the question of whether we are to undertake such activities from the question of whether the CIA shall be the leading force in this field. Until we do, there will always be objections to the CIA's work.

Even if we assume the government's position on the morality issue, we may question the CIA on grounds of efficiency: does the agency perform its functions in the best possible manner? Governmental secrecy prevents the layman, and even the scholar and the Congressman, from answering this vital question. There is no way to ascertain just how good the CIA's intelligence reports are or to what extent top officials may rely upon the agency's national estimates, for these are never made public. Most of what is known of these documents is based upon pure speculation, though the few facts available suggest that, like government in general, the CIA is sometimes right and sometimes wrong. It is generally accepted that the agency was over five years off in its estimate of the date the Soviet Union would detonate its first atomic bomb, but, on the other hand, the CIA precisely predicted the date on which the Chinese Communists were to explode their first nuclear device.[45] The agency's failure to predict the Red Chinese invasion of Korea in 1950 or the sudden erection of the Berlin wall in 1961 are balanced by its successes in obtaining a copy of Chairman Khrushchev's "secret speech" in 1961 and the now-famous Berlin wire-tapping incident.[46] Even in covert operations, the CIA has a generally mixed record; it succeeded in overthrowing Iran's Premier Mohammed Mossadegh in 1953 and Guatemala's President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in 1954, but failed miserably in its attempt to dislodge Fidel Castro.[47] Perhaps even more common than these clear cases are those which are partial successes, partial failures. Here the outstanding case is the U-2 incident: reconnaissance flights that, according to Allen Dulles, marked new heights in the scientific collection of intelligence, but the discovery of which torpedoed a summit conference.[48]

For all of the cases mentioned above, there is adequate documentation, but of how many instances are we ignorant? Just since last year, the CIA has been accused of provoking war between India and Pakistan, kidnapping Moroccan agents in Paris, and plotting the overthrow of former Ghanaian President Kwame Nkrumah, among other nefarious acts. While most of these charges are probably unfounded, fostered either by sheer ignorance or Soviet propaganda (one is reminded of the joke, which ran through Washington last summer and has appeared in many forms, about the two Yugoslavs surveying the wreckage after the Skoplje earthquake: one tells the other, "The CIA did it. Pass the word."), yet there is the possibility of their truth. Certainly they have been officially denied, but then so were the U-2 flights and the Guatemalan and Cuban sorties—at the time.

About all the scholar can conclude is that the CIA is neither perfect nor valueless. The official information which has been disclosed presents entries for both sides of the ledger, and it is sure that these facts barely scratch the surface. There is no way for us to tally up a final score for the CIA's efficiency.

All the while, there is a very distinct threat that the CIA, in performing its functions as best it can, may lead the United States into new and unwanted foreign policy situations. The CIA may at times make its own foreign policy; though this has been hotly denied by every CIA Director, the 1963 disclosure that the agency had been secretly aiding South Vietnamese Special Forces in their raids of Buddhist pagodas—raids that the U.S. Government officially condemned—seemingly presents such a case.[49] Even if it carries out only official State Department and National Security Council policy, though, the CIA's tactics may lead the nation into trouble.

---

[37] Harry Howe Ransom, *Central Intelligence and National Security*, p. 84.

[38] *Central Intelligence and National Security*, p. 84.

[39] Harry Howe Ransom, "Containing Central Intelligence," *New Republic*, December 11, 1965, p. 12.

[40] Harry Howe Ransom, "Containing Central Intelligence," p. 14.

[41] *Intelligence Activities*, p. 14. *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 259.

[42] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, *Hearings*, "National Security Act of 1947," 80th Congress, 1st Session, Washington, 1947, pp. 120–1.

[43] (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949), pp. 94ff.

[44] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, pp. 194–5.

[45] Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 267. *New York Times*, April 25, 1966, p. 20.

[46] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, pp. 140–58. Millis, Mansfield, & Stein, *Arms anc the State*, p. 284. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 128–30. Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, pp. 1–7.

[47] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 224. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 6–96.

[48] Allen Dulles, The Craft of Intelligence, p. 67.

[49] *Washington Post*, September 10, 1963, p. 16.

The U-2 flights provide an example of how the United States may be forced to make hurried and contradictory statements because of the CIA's efforts; the bumbling hypocrisy which American presented to the world in the spring of 1960 left us in international disgrace. Perhaps the best example of how the U.S. may be forced to undo itself is provided by the New York Times' recent account of the 1962 plot to doctor Cuban sugar:

"On Aug. 22, 1962, the S.S. *Streatham Hill*, a British freighter under Soviet lease, crept into the harbor of San Juan, Puerto Rico, for repairs. Bound for a Soviet port with 80,000 bags of Cuban sugar, she had damaged her propeller on a reef.

"The ship was put in drydock, and 14,135 sacks were off-loaded to facilitate repairs. Because of the United States embargo on Cuban imports, the sugar was put under bond in a customs warehouse. Sometime during the lay-up, agents of the Central Intelligence Agency entered the customs shed and contaminated the off-loaded sugar with a harmless but unpalatable substance.

"Later, a White House official, running through some intelligence reports, came upon a paper indicating the sabotage. He investigated, had his suspicions confirmed and informed President Kennedy, much to the annoyance of the CIA command.

"The President was not merely annoyed; he was furious, because the operation had taken place on American territory, because it would, if discovered, provide the Soviet Union with a propaganda field day, and because it could set a terrible precedent for chemical sabotage in the undeclared "back-alley" struggle that rages constantly between the West and the Communist countries.

"Mr. Kennedy directed that the doctored sugar not leave Puerto Rico. This was more easily ordered than done, and it finally required the combined efforts of the CIA the Justice Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department, customs agents and harbor authorities to dis-intrigue the intrigue.

"The Soviet Union never got its 14,135 sacks of sugar; whether it was compensated for them has not been disclosed.

"It would be unfair to conclude that this was a typical CIA operation. On the other hand, it cannot be dismissed as merely the unwise invention of some agent who let his anti-Communist fervor get out of control.

"There is good reason to believe that a high-level political decision had been taken to sabotage, where feasible, the Cuban economy. The sugar project, harum-scarum as it was, developed from a general policy determination in the Plans Division of the CIA, and the general policy, if not the specific plot, presumably had the approval of the interagency, sub-Cabinet group responsible for reviewing all operations that have political consequences." [50]

Here, then, is an example of the CIA's carrying out an approved plan which could easily have disgraced this nation and opened up a whole new field of war. It would not have been a blunder or a mishap, as in the Powers flight, that brought the United States to this unhappy position, but the efficient tactical maneuvering of the CIA. This is not divergent foreign policy, but poor implementation, implementation that required the combined forces of many dissimilar government agencies for its correction. Still this incident presents as great a danger as the CIA's setting its own foreign policy would.

V

The general argument is now clear: left to itself, the CIA is the most dangerous agency in the United States Government. It may determine foreign policy, either knowingly or (if we accept disclaimers such as Congressman BRAY's statement on the floor of the House last month: "The CIA does what the President tells it to do. It is not autonomous; it does not chart its own course.") accidentally, through its capacity to develop and pursue an operation free from everyday guidance or restriction from the more political parts of the government.[51] It is, in one sense, its own ruler, for the only information the National Security Council or other high-level administrators have regarding the CIA's efficiency comes from the CIA itself. Its resources, both in number of employees and funds available, give it a strong advantage over competing departments, such as State, in displaying and selling its wares in the governmental market-place. Finally, its necessary secrecy—and secrecy often beyond what is necessary—shield it from many of the traditional American forms of governmental control.

Extraordinary measures are needed to check this powerful agency, but in the past these measures have not been forthcoming. Despite the fact that the CIA has been surveyed by no less than six *ad hoc* bodies, five different parts of the Executive Branch, and four Congressional subcommittees, little that is meaningful has been accomplished. The *ad hoc* investigations have been too sporadic, the Executive groups too limited, the Congressional subcommittees too eager to be discreet.

None of the first three *ad hoc* investigations was very thorough. The first of them, a task force of the First Hoover Commission headed by Ferdinand Eberstadt, reported in 1949 on national security organization in general and gave only passing mention to the still-new CIA. It did, however, find the agency "sound in principle, but . . . not now properly organized," and recommended that "vigorous efforts be made to improve the internal structure of the Central Intelligence Agency and the quality of its product." [52] Another special survey, conducted by a three-man panel headed by Allen Dulles (then a lawyer in private practice), reported to the President and the National Security Council in 1951; its findings were never opened to the public. It may be presumed that the alleged CIA failure to predict the Communist Chinese invasion of Korea was a central point of consideration for the group; their report is said to have found "much cause for dissatisfaction." [53] That their recommendations were probably accepted in large degree is evidenced by the fact that, shortly after the report was circulated, Dulles was made Deputy Director of the CIA. A third survey—this time of general CIA organization and performance—was made in 1954 by a four-man group, chaired by Lieutenant General James H. Doolittle; it came at a time when Senator Joseph McCarthy was threatening to investigate the "Communists'" in the intelligence community and probably was meant to head off what would have been a disastrous fishing expedition (the hearings were never held). Like the Dulles panel, Doolittle's group made only a private report, but it simultaneously issued, through the White House, a very brief public statement praising the CIA for "a creditable job" (though it also felt that there were "important areas in which the CIA organization, administration, and operations can and should be improved.") [54]

Far more detailed than any of these investigations, indeed the most thorough governmental study of the intelligence community yet produced, was the work of the five-man task force of the Second Hoover Commission, led by General Mark W. Clark. Originally only instructed to study and make recommendations about the CIA, it enlarged its subject to a comprehensive review of all foreign intelligence activities. It submitted two reports: one for the public; the other—including recommendations covering many overseas operations—for the President only (even the full Commission was not allowed to pass upon it).[55] Among its findings: that Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence by this time, had "in his enthusiasm . . . taken upon himself too many . . . duties and responsibilities on the operational side of the CIA's activities;" that "certain administrative flaws have developed in the CIA, which must be corrected to give proper emphasis and direction to its basic responsibilities;" that "the American people can and should give their full confidence and support to the intelligence program," though this presents "a corollary demand for clarification of misunderstandings which have arisen in the public mind, largely as a result of the misapplication of secrecy." To correct these conditions, the task force recommended "a small, permanent, bipartisan commission, composed of members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost national respect and confidence . . .;" modeled after the Hoover Commission itself, this new body would make periodic reports on the "organization, functions, policies, and results" of the intelligence community to the President and Congress; it would "be empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use." [56] The full Commission did not fully accept this recommendation, feeling, no doubt from its own experience, that "while mixed Congressional and citizens committees for temporary service are useful and helpful to undertake specific problems and to investigate and make recommendations, such committees, if permanent, present difficulties." It did, however, accept the need for a CIA "watchdog" by suggesting that "the President appoint a committee of experienced private citizens, who shall have the responsibility to examine and report to him periodically on the work of Government foreign intelligence activities," as well as that "the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy." The Commission believed "the two committees, one Presidential and the other Congressional, could collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security." [57]

Following the Bay of Pigs fiasco, President Kennedy asked a former Army Chief of Staff, General Maxwell D. Taylor, to make a special study of the Cuban failure and of America's capabilities for paramilitary operations. Assisting Taylor were ROBERT KENNEDY, Dulles, and Chief of Naval Operations Arleigh Burke.[58] Their report was never published, but it was no doubt directed to the President's feeling that the CIA was one of the "soft spots" in his administration; following their study, Kennedy tightened up Executive review procedures over the CIA and transferred primary responsibility for any future

[50] *New York Times*, April 28, 1966, pp. 1, 28.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 23, 1966, p. 6587.

[52] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570*, "Joint Committee on Central Intelligence Agency," 84th Congress, 2nd Session, Washington, February 23, 1956, pp. 6–7.

[53] Warren Unna, "CIA: Who Watches the Watchman?" *Harper's*, April, 1959, p. 51.

[54] *New York Times*, October 20, 1954, p. 1.

[55] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities*, pp. 17–20.

[56] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities*, p. 14.

[57] Hoover Commission, *Intelligence Activities*, pp. 1–2.

[58] Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive The Cold War?*, pp. 184–5.

paramilitary operations from the CIA to the Pentagon.[59] It may also be assumed that the shake-up in the CIA administration in the late months of 1961 resulted in large part from the Bay of Pigs failure and the Taylor recommendations. A further study of the CIA was made in 1964 by a special Presidential task force composed of Federick E. Nolting, former Ambassador to South Viet Nam, Major General John M. Reynolds, a vice-director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and John A. Bross, a deputy to the CIA Director. It may also have been a response to an alleged intelligence abuse—the Buddhist pagoda incident—and could well have been the most enlightened study of the six, since all three members of the investigating panel were directly involved in the compilation and use of foreign intelligence, but its findings have never been released by President Johnson.[60]

The major faults of the six *ad hoc* groups are clear: they have been too sporadic, occurring only once every three years or so, and lacking continuous information; and they have been far too secretive to settle the strong fears of many Americans. Their recommendations have been all too often ignored, and thus have had only small impact upon the CIA. Furthermore, they are almost totally useless as a check on the everyday activities of the intelligence community. The offices of the Executive Branch which oversee the CIA offer far more hope of effective control than these periodic studies. They are regularized and better funded. Yet these have not been fully effective either.

Though the CIA was established to inform the National Security Council, the Council is not a prime check upon it. Many CIA activities are considered so mundane (even though they may have disastrous consequences) that the NSC may never learn about them. Basic oversight comes rather through the Special Group, also known as the 54–12 Group (from the number of President Eisenhower's directive establishing the panel).[61] General guidelines set down by the NSC theoretically control CIA operations, but it is the 54–12 Group that controls the rules' everyday application. The Group's current membership includes Admiral Raborn, U. Alexis Johnson (Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs), Cyrus R. Vance (Deputy Secretary of Defense), and William D. Moyers and Walter W. Rostow (Presidential assistants with special responsibilities for national security). Meeting once a week, they concentrate almost exclusively on operations, attempting to head off actions that might prove politically embarrassing to the United States.[62] But it does not clear most of the routine intelligence-gathering activities of the CIA, nor does it maintain continuing supervision over those operations it does approve. It is confined to basic decisions, leaving everyday affairs to the agents "in the field". As the Cuban sugar sabotage plot almost proved, this is not close enough surveillance to insure against national disgrace. Moreover, the Group is currently especially handicapped by the fact that a majority of its members are still relatively inexperienced in national security intelligence affairs.

Another controlling body, more aimed at improving general CIA efficiency than approving specific operations, is the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. This group succeeded the Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities in 1961. Its predecessor, which had been set up by President Eisenhower in 1956 to implement the Hoover Commission's first recommendation, had never gained the President's close attention and had lapsed well before 1961; one explanation was that President Eisenhower was "too busy to be bothered by it."[63] The FIAB has been more successful, no doubt due to the fact that its present Chairman, Clark Clifford, is one of President Johnson's closest confidants. But the FIAB has a basic problem (which was even worse for the Board of Consultants): meeting only once a month or so, it often finds itself exercising only *ex post facto* control. And, like the Special Group, it does nothing to inform the Congress and the people of its findings with regard to the CIA's general competence.

A third check is the Bureau of the Budget, which considers the CIA's budget in some detail before it is hidden in the Defense Department appropriation request that is finally sent to the Congress. Allen Dulles has stressed that the CIA always stands ready to account for every dollar it spends.[64] But this control is merely budgetary, which is to say that it makes no substantive judgments. The Bureau of the Budget, sworn not to interpose policy judgments in its decisions, can merely weigh a proposed operation against the total amount of funds available for this and other projects; it cannot make crucial political judgments.

The State Department and United States Ambassadors also exercise some control. The *New York Times* reports that the Ambassadors are now kept well-informed of CIA activities in their area, quoting Thomas Mann, Under Secretary of State: "I am sure that the policy is made here [at State] and that nothing is done without our consent;" it notes that Secretary Rusk feels "quite certain the CIA is doing nothing affecting national policy that he does not know about." But Rusk goes on to contradict Mann in adding that he is sure he is "the only one in the State Department informed about some of the things being done."[65] Such control is obviously not nearly as thorough as is needed; it is still quite conceivable that a CIA agent in some foreign land and the U.S. Ambassador to that nation are working in directly opposite directions.

A new hope in the area of executive oversight is the recently-formed Senior Interdepartmental Group. Charged with "responsibility to the full extent permitted by law for the overall direction, coordination, and supervision of interdepartmental activities of the United States Government overseas (less exempted military activities)," SIG includes Under Secretary of State George Ball (who will serve as "executive chairman"), Cyrus Vance, Admiral Raborn, USIA chief Leonard Marks, JCS Chairman Earle Wheeler, AID administrator David Bell, and Bill Moyers—an unusually powerful and qualified contingent. While it is clear that this panel will have far more to do than control the CIA, it is just as obvious that SIG will enhance the State Department's ability to perform that task. As one high-ranking Foreign Service officer observed, "If State really gets hold of this thing, it could be the biggest shift in years."[66] Given the traditional State Department inertia, though (see page 20), only time will disclose the true significance of the Senior Interdepartmental Group.

If executive oversight has not been complete enough, congressional oversight has been far, far worse. As one political commentator puts it, "The CIA has always had near sacred-cow-status on Capitol Hill."[67] The most shocking aspect of the situation is that it is the Congress' own fault; the wall between it and the CIA is self-imposed. By defining the CIA's duties in the National Security Act in the broadest possible terms, it left the actual limitation of the new agency not in its own hands, but in those of the NSC. The CIA Act of 1949 went even further, as we have seen; all the standard procedures inherent in Congress' traditional "power of the purse" were voluntarily waived. The conclusion that a majority of the Congress then felt many aspects of intelligence to be "too hot to handle" is obvious, but worse than this is the fact that this extraordinary sense of discretion (accorded to no other governmental area) still persists.

Congressional control is vested in four subcommittees on the Central Intelligence Agency—one each from the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations. These groups meet infrequently and do not accomplish much at those meetings they do hold. In 1963 the House Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA met five times, with the other subcommittees holding about the same number of sessions; this, sparse as it is, is a sharp rise over the years just before the Bay of Pigs fiasco, of which Congressman Walter Norblad of Oregon once noted, "We met annually—one time a year, for a period of two hours in which we accomplished nothing."[68] The basic fault is not a lack of meetings, though, but a reluctance to act; were the latter not the case, the former would not be either. Senator SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, who serves on two of the subcommittees (he is the senior minority member of both Senate bodies), provides the best example of this problem. He has repeatedly asserted that the CIA is willing to produce information for his groups: "Whenever a suggestion was made as to whether there was anything more we should be told, or any information we might need, we always received it. . . . We could do more than we have done if we felt it were necessary to do so."[69] Yet, he has just as consistently voiced strong feeling that the subcommittee should not do too much: "The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have . . . it is not a question of reluctance on the part of the CIA to speak to us. Instead it is a question of our reluctance. . . ."[70]

The sessions these subcommittees hold are all closed, but there is sufficient evidence that the groups function less for investigation than for shielding the CIA from its critics. After the U–2 disclosures, WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, one of the most influential members of the Senate, complained, "I had been hearing testimony presented before the Committee on Appropriations by the Central Intelligence Agency for 13 years. Never during that time were we told what the money was to be used for. It was a deep, dark secret. . . . I asked a number of members of our Defense [Appropriations] Subcommittee if they knew that the Central Intelligence Agency owned and operated planes, and they said they did not . . . it embarrassed me to know that the CIA had planes. . . ."[71] Senator Henry C.

---

[59] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days*, p. 290. Harry Howe Ransom, "Containing Central Intelligence," p. 13. David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisible Government*, pp. 202–4.

[60] Paul W. Blackstock, *The Strategy of Subversion* (Chicago, Quadrangle, 1964), p. 275.

[61] David Wise and Thomas B. Ross, *The Invisibile Government*, p. 278.

[62] *New York Times*, April 28, 1966, p. 28.

[63] Andrew Tully, *CIA: The Inside Story*, p. 13.

[64] *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 259, 261.

[65] *New York Times*, April 28, 1966, p. 28.

[66] *Newsweek*, March 14, 1966, p. 27.

[67] Mary McGrory, "The CIA Chief," *New York Post*, March 25, 1966, p. 46.

[68] Paul W. Blackstock, *The Strategy of Subversion*, p. 274.

[69] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 1, pp. 1067, 1070.

[70] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5924. For convenience and efficiency, the two Senate subcommittees often meet as one.

[71] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 8, p. 9780.

Dworshak's account of his experiences with congressional control of the CIA is more sarcastic:

"A year ago I was assigned to membership on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. For a long time I had had certain misgivings and uncertainty with respect to the operations of the CIA. I was very eager to find out something about the CIA, because it is a very vital and important agency in the executive department of the Government.

"When the director of the CIA appeared before the Senate appropriations subcommittee, I was so naive as to think that, as a member of the committee, and as a member of the Senate, I might be entitled to some information.

"I ventured to ask certain questions of the director. I was told very emphatically, 'This information is classified.' Information as to the number of personnel is classified, whether there are 1,000, 10,000, or 20,000 employees and officials working for CIA. Oh, Mr. President, that is highly classified information!

"Then when I directed questions to the director about the amount of money required to operate the CIA. I was again told, quite forthrightly, 'This is classified information.' Hush hush! Members of the Appropriations Committee must be willing to assume that the CIA, as a part of our Defense Establishment, is operating efficiently. We are told that it should not be our concern to inquire whether we are obtaining full value for the several millions of dollars which are appropriated annually for the CIA." [72]

Their excessive discretion, and the plain fact that they are often completely ignorant of important covert operations—before *and* after—keep the present subcommittees from functioning as effective curbs upon the CIA.

It was the recognition of these faults that led MIKE MANSFIELD, now the majority leader but then a Senate freshman, to introduce legislation in the 83rd Congress to set up a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. The bill did not get out of committee in that Congress, but in 1956, the Committee on Rules and Administration (prompted by both the reasoned recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the wild charges of Senator McCarthy) favorably reported the bill by an 8–1 vote to the full Senate. The ensuing discussion was the only time either House, as a whole, has considered the possibility of stronger methods of congressional control over the intelligence community.

The measure was not merely MANSFIELD's idea; he had, by this time, been joined by 34 cosponsors. The bill provided for a twelve-man joint committee, six from each House. Initial membership was limited to those Senators and Representatives already serving on one of the existing four subcommittees dealing with the Central Intelligence Agency. These members would select their own chairman and staff and have full cognizance and supervision over matters relating to the CIA, with power to advise, inquire, and report. Staff and other committee expenses for its first year were set at $250,000 by the Rules Committee.[73]

The general points made in floor debate on the bill will be considered in the next section of this essay, a discussion of the proposal's merits and demerits; it will suffice here to say that MANSFIELD, then just breaking into "The Club", soon found himself up against almost all the notables in what Senator CLARK has since referred to as "the Senate Establishment".[74] Just before the final vote, MANSFIELD commented, "I am beginning to feel a little like David facing Goliath, although I fear the results will not be the same"; in retrospect, he summed up the political situation by saying, "What you had was a brash freshman going up against the high brass. I got a good education." [75] Among "the high brass", all both politically influential and deeply committed to the existing system of control, were Senator Barkley (a former Vice-President and NSC member), HAYDEN, RUSSELL, SYMINGTON, and SALTONSTALL. To these men the two most crucial objections to the resolution were its "fully informed" clause and its provision for a committee staff.[76] Allen Dulles had been especially vehement about the latter point, feeling he would be making "unauthorized disclosures" by discussing CIA matters before such a staff; selected legislators were all right, for they carry the mandate of the electorate, but, to Dulles, professional staff members were quite another matter.[77] The final vote on the bill, 27–59, reflects the pressure of the Establishment; every member of the two Senate CIA Subcommittees (with the exception of Senator Chavez of New Mexico, who was absent), the only Senators eligible to serve on the proposed joint committee, voted against it.[78] Even ten cosponsors of the resolution switched.[79] Perhaps it is worth noting that Senator John F. Kennedy voted for the bill; Senator Lyndon B. Johnson voted against it.[80]

Since 1956, every Congress has seen at least a score of similar resolutions, but none have emerged from committee. The House Rules Committee held two days of hearings on CIA oversight on March 1 and 2, 1960, but later voted to shelve all seventeen resolutions on the subject.[81] Periodic reports of CIA abuses have aroused cries for renewed consideration of such measures, but no committee has as yet responded. In the present Congress, there are over two dozen resolutions on the subject, but none should be accorded more than a very slight chance of ever passing either House.

VI

Its one complete airing in the Senate, plus a large number of articles in the press, have provided a considerable background of debate for the proposal to establish some kind of strong Joint Committee on Intelligence. The major points in this heated discussion may be briefly summarized.

The major argument of those who see a need for such a committee is based upon Lord Acton's statement that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." While a certain need for secrecy is recognized, it is held that excessive secrecy invites abuse. There is no way at present for the Congress meaningfully to determine whether the CIA is doing a creditable job. "It is difficult to legislate intelligently if there is a dearth of the information upon which Congress must rely. . . ." [82] Free from the reins of Congress, the CIA is able to mount operations, such as the Bay of Pigs effort, which would face very difficult chances of ever being approved by the Congress. As Congressman ROGERS of Florida has put it, ". . . we have trusted a Government agency to make all but war without the consent of Congress." [83] There are those who would argue that even limited wars are not impossible for the CIA under present arrangements.

A second important argument in favor of a strong "watchdog" committee is that the half-dozen investigations of the CIA, which functioned largely in a manner similar to that of a weak Congressional Special Committee, have not provided adequate investigation, even in combination with the other existing control bodies. Each of the six surveys has found inadequacies in the CIA, but their recommendations for correction have usually been kept secret; the inadequacies were usually still there when the next investigation took place. Perhaps, it is argued, this is because the Congress didn't have a chance to exert some prodding political pressure. "It is not enough that CIA be responsible alone to the White House or the National Security Council," the Senate Rules Committee concluded. "Such responsibility should be shared with Congress in a more complete manned." [84]

Another argument, first put forth by Senator MANSFIELD in the Senate floor debate, is that the development of the CIA under essentially only Executive control, if that represented an "arrogation of power on the part of the Executive and a diminution to that extent of the equality between the executive and the legislative." Both MANSFIELD, and Senator MORSE of Oregon expressed strong fears that, through its control of secret information vital to foreign policymaking, the CIA abetted the Executive's increasing domination over this field, to the exclusion of Congress.[85]

To illustrate their feeling that a "watchdog" committee would be a proper and efficient control over the CIA, many propose the analogy to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Regular Congressional supervision in the field of atomic energy has existed through this committee since 1946.[86] It acts upon matters just as sensitive as foreign intelligence and has had no major difficulties in ironing out jurisdictional lines with the other standing committees. Above all, it has functioned well:

"The work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been of benefit to the country at large. It has maintained congressional liaison with, and congressional control of, much of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has provided a forum where information can be solicited and exchanged to the mutual satisfaction of all parties. It has given to Congress, for its guidance and assistance, a trained staff especially concerned with atomic energy matters. It has, at the same time, provided the Atomic Energy Commission with a legislative group familiar with its problems and alert to its particular needs and objectives.

"The members of the Atomic Energy Committee have the full confidence of the other Members of Congress. Their legislative actions are based on the knowledge that trusted Members of both Houses are fully cognizant of developments in atomic energy. They do not have to depend upon the unilateral judgment of the executive branch as to what Members of Congress ought or ought not to know." [87]

The Senate Rules Committee not only praised JCAE, but concluded, "What is true

---

[72] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6056.

[73] S. Con. Res. 2, 84th Congress.

[74] *The Senate Establishment* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1963).

[75] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6051.

[76] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, pp. 5922–5939, 6047–6063, 6065–6068.

[77] Warren Unna, "CIA: Who Watches the Watchman," pp. 52–3.

[78] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6068.

[79] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 261.

[80] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6068.

[81] *Congressional Quarterly*, March 10, 1961, p. 389. Harry Howe Ransom, *Can American Democracy Survive the Cold War?* p. 179.

[82] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570*, 84th Congress, p. 20.

[83] Cited in Fred J. Cook, "The CIA," *The Nation*, June 24, 1961, p. 569.

[84] *Report No. 1570*, p. 19.

[85] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5927.

[86] Harold P. Green and Alan Rosenthal, *Government of the Atom* (New York: Atherton, 1963), pp. 2–5.

[87] Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570*, p. 18.

of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can be true of a new joint committee organized to oversee the Central Intelligence Agency.[88]

A fifth argument is that a strong "watchdog" committee would provide new public and Congressional confidence in the now much-maligned agency. It could prove useful in denying the various unfounded international rumors of nefarious CIA activities, denials that mean little from the present clearly-biased subcommittees; it could also assist in safeguarding the agency from such domestic demagogues as former Senator McCarthy. In addition, it could help to safely publicize, without disclosure of vital information, the strength of our intelligence agencies, publicity which Allen Dulles has conceded would be one of the most effective deterrents to a potential enemy's appetite for attack.[89]

Sixth, it is argued that a "watchdog" committee might prove of definite value in exposing and counteracting possible prejudice that may slip in to the CIA's factual judgments, prejudice that Dulles has called the intelligence field's "most serious occupational hazard."[90]

In sum, the proponents of a strong joint committee argue that, in an era of increasing reliance upon foreign intelligence, there is a wide area in which the Congress could help to improve the intelligence product and safeguard American democracy. Congressional avoidance of this area is considered to be nothing less than an evasion of constitutional responsibility.

Opponents of a strong joint committee are, by and large, more vehement than those in favor of such a committee, for while the latter generally see the proposal as necessary to halt an indirect threat to American democracy, many of the former see the idea as an immediate surrender of American security. To these men, the extent of present CIA secrecy is vital, lest important national secrets be disclosed to America's enemies. They quote from George Washington: "The necessity of procuring good Intelligence is apparent and need not be further urged. All that remains for me to add, is, that . . . the whole matter [be kept]as secret as possible. For upon Secrecy, Success depends in most Enterprises of this kind, and for want of it, they are generally defeated, however well planned and promising a favorable issue;" and from James Forrestal: "There is, of course, the Central Intelligence Agency, on which, I am sure you will agree, if one is to secure improvements, one must undertake to secure them without fanfare."[91] There are clearly solid reasons for their position. Sources of certain types of data would immediately "dry up" if disclosed. Underground actions must by definition be kept secret if they are to succeed. Referring again to Allen Dulles: "Any investigation, whether by a congressional committee or any other body, which results in a disclosure of our secret activities and operations or uncovers our personnel would help a potential enemy just as if the enemy were able to infiltrate their agents right into our shop."[92] This is a problem not merely for the United States, but also for our allies, many of whom contribute to and make use of our intelligence services.

Most of those who hold the present secrecy arrangements vital also feel that the existing control apparatus is adequate. They point out that the public is represented by a small group of its most experienced Congressmen and that the entire intelligence system functions, in theory at least, under responsible Presidential leadership. The willingness of the CIA to cooperate with the present subcommittees is cited; "no information has been denied and all desired information has been candidly supplied."[93] The large number of *ad hoc* investigations is held to be equivalent to what any joint committee could safely do without impinging on the efficiency of the CIA. As Senator HAYDEN said in his lone dissent to the Senate Rules Committee report, "The greatest service we can do . . . is to facilitate the important work of the Agency and to let it get its job done without being watchdogged to death."[94]

Third, it is argued that the functions of the CIA are essentially executive in character, since the agency serves the President, the National Security Council, and other departments in a staff capacity. Senator JACKSON has said that, given this relationship, he cannot understand the contention that there is no constitutional control.[95] If we are to have a joint committee for the CIA, must we have a similar joint committee for the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and other executive agencies? Should the FBI be overseen by a new joint committee? Furthermore, a Joint Committee on Intelligence might raise a constitutional issue on the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches. Senator HAYDEN felt that, since the CIA officially undertakes activities only in accordance with National Security Council directives, any Congressional action which seeks to interfere with or pry into this relationship "would tend to impinge upon the constitutional authority and responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs."[96]

Those who oppose a "watchdog" committee do not accept the analogy to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. During the Senate debate, Senator SALTONSTALL especially emphasized the motion that the JCAE deals with a much larger operation, having possible effect on the domestic economy. The JCAE overlooks a field in which the Government is basically involved in manufacturing; it is closely involved in detailed legislative considerations. Intelligence, however, is vastly different from the field of atomic energy; a Joint Committee on Intelligence would have little or no legislation to consider.[97] Also, there is disagreement over whether the JCAE is doing an appropriate job. There is strong feeling, both in the Congress and among scholars, that it has, in some respects, taken over many tasks which should be performed by the AEC. "The JCAE," it is said, "is . . . not merely a legislative mechanism, but also a coparticipant in executive decision-making."[98] Such extension of power might not only raise serious constitutional questions, but prove disastrous to the intelligence apparatus.

A fifth argument is that the proposed committee might someday give an overly powerful forum to an irresponsible demagogue or even a mere ideologue, of which there are many in the Congress. Such a person could not only endanger the intelligence system roadblock to vital operations. Intelligence with actual or threatened disclosures, but might also prove a potent behind-the-scenes is held to be far too important to be hindered by politicians searching for political capital.

Finally, it is said, somewhat threateningly, that the present committee chairmen would oppose such a committee on the grounds that it might impede them in their own jurisdictions. The loss of control over military intelligence would hardly sit well with RICHARD RUSSELL.

Summing up for the opposition, then, one might cite Senator HAYDEN's comment, "How it would be possible to keep the American people fully informed and at the same time keep our Communist enemies in the dark, it is difficult to imagine. There must be secrets. There are men all over the world who are engaged in the service of the CIA. Are we to tell the dictators in Moscow how much money we are spending in employing these men and where they are empolyed?"[99] Certainly not; indeed, says Senator RUSSELL, rather than disclose vital secrets of the CIA, "It would be better to abolish it out of hand."[100]

VII

Once again the Central Intelligence Agency is prominently in the news. The recent disclosure that Michigan State University served as the "cover" for CIA agents in South Viet Nam during a multimillion dollar technical assistance program the university conducted for Ngo Dinh Diem's regime has spread fear among many Americans that the CIA is far more pervasive than had been previously suspected. All of those universities now receiving some CIA aid are currently suspect. At almost the same time, it has become known that an Estonian refugee, Juri Raus, who is being sued for slander in a Federal District Court in Baltimore, is basing his defense on the fact that the alleged slander was committed in the course of his duties as a CIA agent. Raus is claiming immunity from the suit on the ground that he had acted as an official agent of the Federal Government. Here again, the CIA appears in an unusually dim light.

Partially as a response to these incidents, the *New York Times* has published a 25,000-word study of the Central Intelligence Agency, compiled by a staff of writers and researchers, and based not only upon much of the data cited here, but as reports from foreign correspondents and interviews with high government officials as well.[101] It concludes that "while the institutional *forms* of political control appear effective and sufficient, it is really the *will* of the political officials who must exert control that is important and that has most often been lacking . . . the control question, while real and of the utmost importance, is one of 'not measures but men'. The forms of control mean nothing if there is no will to control, and if there is a will to control, then the form of it is more or less irrelevant."[102] This conclusion seems reasonable: certainly the Congressional subcommittees could be stronger bodies if their members chose to make them so, and both the 54–12 Group and the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board could do more by meeting more often and demanding greater information from the CIA. But it is easy to misinterpret this

---

[88] *Report No. 1570*, p. 18.

[89] *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 51.

[90] *The Craft of Intelligence*, p. 51.

[91] Allen Dulles, *The Craft of Intelligence*, pp. 7–8. Letter to Hanson Baldwin, *The Forrestal Diaries*, ed. Walter Millis (New York: Viking, 1951), p. 449.

[92] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[93] Individual views of Senator HAYDEN, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Report No. 1570*, p. 24.

[94] *Report No. 1570*, p. 25.

[95] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 1, p. 1066.

[96] *Report No. 1570*, p. 27.

[97] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 5936.

[98] Harold P. Green and Alan Rosenthal, *Government of the Atom*, p. 268.

[99] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6058.

[100] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6049.

[101] *New York Times*, April 25–9, 1966, pp. 1ff each day.

[102] *New York Times*, April 25, 1966, p. 20; April 28, 1966, p. 28.

fact. The *Times'* survey finds little to criticize in the Executive Branch control bodies, proposes that the Director of Central Intelligence be the key figure in any system of control, and suggests that control can be attained only peripherally through congressional supervision—in short, the basic control structure should be within the Executive Branch. These recommendations echo Allen Dulles' comment that in the field of intelligence "you have to take certain things on faith. You have to look to the man who is directing the organization and the results he achieves. If you haven't someone who can be trusted, or who doesn't get results, you'd better throw him out and get somebody else." [103] It is this reliance upon the executive—to the almost complete exclusion of the legislative—that must be examined.

A good deal of secrecy cannot be denied the CIA, for it is certainly true that some secrecy is indispensable to much of its work. None of the responsible proponents of a "watchdog" committee has suggested, for instance, that the agency divulge the names of all its employees. What is being sought is not a completely open intelligence apparatus, but merely one that will be prevented from entering the Alice-in-Wonderland world that excessive secrecy can cause. Complete oversight may be impossible, but strong liaison is not, and this liaison does not now exist. The shock in Congress following the U-2 and Bay of Pigs disclosures indicates that many of the most important CIA operations are completely hidden from Capitol Hill. Yet the executive cannot be merely self-controlled; the Founding Fathers recognized this over 175 years ago and deliberately set up a governmental system filled with checks and balances.

To say that the CIA's activities are essentially executive in character is to say little; the Departments of State, Commerce, Interior, etc.—all clearly executive—are closely checked by Congressional committees. Even the FBI, a favorite example of "watchdog" opponents, is supervised; as a part of the Justice Department, it is monitored by the two Committees on the Judiciary. All that those who stress the CIA's executive nature are really saying is that, since it is executive, the CIA should be singled out for *separate* treatment by a *joint* committee. Look at the JCAE, it is said; it has abrogated executive power. But arguing against a "watchdog" committee in this way misses the point of the analogy. The JCAE was set up by the Congress because of a widespread feeling that the particular problems of the field of atomic energy could best be handled in this manner. Most proponents of strong Congressional supervision of the CIA feel that intelligence too could best be handled jointly, but would be almost as happy to have separate "watchdog" committees in each House. Unity is proposed only to save the CIA from redundant testimony and to help prevent harmful security disclosures. When the analogy to the JCAE is made, it is done so merely to prove that a "watchdog" apparatus *can keep a secret*, and resist being overrun by cheap politicians in search of demogogic fodder, while effectively curbing hidden power.

The joint committee format has its weaknesses. No matter how it is constituted, it will not be able to conduct wide-ranging *public* investigation of the CIA; some discretion will always be necessary. Furthermore, if the Mansfield method of starting such a committee with present CIA subcommittee members is used, the new committee will suffer from the same biases as the old ones. These are relatively unimportant, though, when balanced against the prospect of Congress effectively fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities. Let us put an end to arguments that the joint committee proposal is unsafe. It is certainly no more unsafe than the present subcommittees and, more generally, it must always be remembered that democratic government will always involve personnel risks. On the other hand, a joint committee has the added advantage of easily lending itself to the addition of Congressmen and Senators from the Foreign Affairs (Relations) and Government Operations Committees, many of whom would bring useful insights to Congressional surveillance of the intelligence community. Far more than the present segmented system of four subcommittees, a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence presents the possibility of intelligent oversight with the fewest possible security leaks.

A "watchdog" committee would not be a panacea though, and this writer believes further action is needed. The Senior Interdepartmental Group offers new hope of greater executive surveillance of the field of intelligence, but its wide range of duties will probably prevent it from realizing this hope. A stronger possibility for better oversight would be presented by reconstituting the 54-12 Group in such a way as to include Congressional representation; this panel might then serve as an additional "watchdog". Even more crucial is the need for an informal national discussion of what we should expect from our intelligence apparatus. "Those who believe that the United States Government on occasion resorts to force when it shouldn't," Richard Bissell, former CIA Deputy Director, once correctly noted, "should . . . direct their views to the question of national policy. . . ." [104] Many of the abuses attributed to the CIA might never have occurred had the United States not let its intelligence apparatus develop so haphazardly. Intelligence is an ugly business, but today it must be accepted, and the sooner we do so—and decide how we are going to carry it out—the better. If the American people are against covert operations, for instance, let them rise up and say so—and not let the Government assume their feelings on the matter.

There is no easy solution to the problems of controlling central intelligence, but some delicate compromise must be sought. No issue is more basic than whether we can preserve rule by "consent of the governed" in today's troubled world. No challenge is greater than the combination of adequate intelligence machinery with the principles of popular government. It is imperative that we meet the challenge, or American democracy will either be rapidly destroyed or slowly whittled away.

[103] *U.S. News and World Report*, March 19, 1954, p. 67.

[104] *New York Times*, April 29, 1966, p. 18.

PROGRESS REPORT ON NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO SAVE THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include three editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago I announced the formation of a National Committee To Save the U.S. Capitol. The purpose of the committee was to mobilize public opposition to the proposals of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. George Stewart, to extend the historic west front of the Capitol. Mr. Stewart's project would not only cost $34 million at a time when we are being asked to forego every possible unnecessary expenditure, but it would also destroy and cover up for all time the last remaining face of the historic original U.S. Capitol Building.

Since that time the response to this appeal has been most encouraging. Some 10 Members of the Senate and 20 Members of the House have accepted honorary cochairmenships on this committee. Legislation has been introduced in both Houses of Congress to block the Architect's move, at least until the whole matter can be more fully and publicly discussed and the best possible engineering and architectural advice can be submitted to the Congress.

In addition, the response from the people back home, the grassroots sentiment, has been tremendous. These are not just the architectural purists. These are the people who do not believe Congress ought to spend $34 million when we are faced with overwhelming military expenditures in Vietnam.

These are the people who do not believe Congress needs 119 "hideaway" offices in the U.S. Capitol only a couple of years after we spent $125 million to build a new House office building, including a modern electric subway to speed Members back and forth between the Capitol and their offices.

These are the people back home who believe our most treasured national shrine should be preserved, not defaced and destroyed, especially on the basis of a plan that was put forward by a man who is not an architect, and a plan that was developed in secrecy without any public review or debate.

I am confident the views of the people back home will be heard in this Congress and will block the unnecessary and most deplorable extension project.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include thoughtful editorial comments from three outstanding upstate New York newspapers, the Syracuse Herald-Journal of June 29, 1966, the Binghamton Evening Press of June 28, 1966, and the Freeman's Journal of Cooperstown, N.Y., of June 29, 1966, one of the oldest and most distinguished weekly newspapers in the Nation:

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-Journal, June 29, 1966]

THE CAPITOL PROFANERS

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON is issuing a call to join him in "fighting city hall". He wants our support in the form of protest letters to our Washington representatives to halt a proposed $34 million extension of the U.S. Capitol.

After thinking it over, we are angry enough to back up STRATTON's call with one of our own.

Our Capitol at Washington, in the words of Allen Nevins, is the "best loved and most revered building" of our nation, and no one yet has publicly attempted to justify the idea of this extension on a basis of need or of money.

This grandiose proposal by a handful of men (J. George Stewart, the congressional architect, and the Commission on the Extension of the Capitol) would destroy the western front of the building with its handsome classic walls and cascading staircases. In their place would be another restaurant, two movie theaters and 109 new "hideaway" congressional offices, STRATTON reports.

Whether the exterior walls are or are not safe is a matter for competent engineers. If they are unsafe, they can be rebuilt and replaced without alteration of the original design. The British restored their House of Commons after Nazi bombing, and they insisted that it be restored, not modernized or modified.

Let's not let a few men in Washington tell us that our Capitol building (and it certainly belongs to all of us) must be defaced . . . This is our shrine of democracy . . . We want it to remain as it is.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, June 28, 1966]

THE NOISY WESTERN FRONT

The humble but honest Virginia sandstone of the West Front of the U.S. Capitol is crumbling after 166 years. A face of the nation, so to speak, needs repair.

Something called the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has decided on a major face-lifting—replacement of the sandstone with marble and extensions of the West Front 88 feet to accommodate another Capitol restaurant, two theaters, some offices, some conference rooms and a tourist center.

The estimated cost is $34,000,000, but in the light of experience with Congressional construction of recent years, the figure cannot be taken seriously. The hideous Rayburn Building, for example, started out with a $20,000,000 estimate and ended up at somewhere around five times that.

The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has five members, Capitol "architect" J. George Stewart, House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Vice-President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and House Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. Stewart's title has quotes around it because he is not really an architect. The commission has the power to alter the Capitol without asking further Congressional approval and the decision on the West Front was made at a meeting which neither Mr. FORD nor Mr. HUMPHREY attended.

Since then the cries of outrage have risen. Some of the most outspoken comment has come from Democratic Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON of Amsterdam. Mr. STRATTON attacks the project as too costly, and a needless defacement of the "last remaining section of the original building." He also argues that most of the things that would be provided in the expanded building are not needed.

Mr. STRATTON is in good company. The National Capital Fine Arts Commission and the American Institute of Architects take about the same view. Such varied editorial voices as those of the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Times and the Washington Post have thundered in protest.

At the risk of being a copycat, we'd like to get on the bandwagon.

There is something essentially wrong with a five-man commission having the complete say about what is to be done with a national monument of a democracy. There also is something wrong about the office of Architect of the Capitol not being headed by an architect. There also is something wrong about Congressional buildings being the only public structures in the capital that do not have to be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission for approval.

Representative STRATTON is organizing a National Committee of One Million to Save the U.S. Capitol. That's all right, but we'd suggest that he might look into sponsoring a bill to recognize the Capitol architect's office to make sure that Congressional minions no longer can build unsupervised, unchecked and unreviewed.

[From the Freeman's Journal, June 29, 1966]

ARCHITECTURAL CAUTION

Swirling controversy once again surrounds proposed changes in the architecture of the United States Capitol. Reconstruction of the East Front of the imposing structure was completed in 1961, despite a storm of architectural controversy. Now the Vice-President and the distinguished legislators who serve on the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol have approved a proposal to enlarge, resurface, and redesign the West Front.

That the West Front is in a state of structural deterioration and even in danger of collapse is a fact. Something must be done and without delay. The question, however, is what?

William Walton, chairman of the Federal Fine Arts Commission, leveled a heavy barrage of criticism at the proposal for extending the West Front. He charged that the plan would be "a national tragedy" and that it would "vandalize" and "vulgarize" a great historic monument.

Some senators and congressmen have added their criticism. Our own Rep. SAMUEL S. STRATTON announced formation of a National Committee of One Million to Save the United States Capitol.

Few will contest the charm, grace, and inspirational quality of the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, or the Supreme Court, to cite but a few of the structures which help to make Washington one of the strikingly beautiful cities of the world.

Some recent additions to Washington architecture, however, have been, in the judgment of many critics, ponderous, dull, monotonous, vulgar. A not-so-shining example is the new Sam Rayburn House Office Building, for which the present Capitol architect bears responsibility.

We assume that Congress will want to withhold its approval for changes in one of the world's most prominent and historic buildings until it has given careful consideration to the views of distinguished members of the architectural profession.

U.S. LAWN TENNIS ASSOCIATION UNFAIR TO PERTH AMBOY TENNIS TOURNAMENT

Mr. PATTEN. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Lawn Tennis Association has monopolistically ruled that the people of Perth Amboy, N.J., will not be able to hold their annual tournament at the regular time this year. The association's new 100-mile rule will not sanction a tournament within 100 miles of a USLTA at Forest Hills, Long Island. I intend to discuss this with the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce because I do not believe that any group in New York should have the power to prevent a tournament in New Jersey.

I resent their new rule, Mr. Speaker, because I resent the association telling us in New Jersey that we cannot hold our small tournament because it will conflict with their Forest Hills championship. From my personal experience, I know that the attendance at our tournament is almost entirely local, and that it does not hurt the Forest Hills attendance at all. Some people from Perth Amboy do go to Forest Hills and I know, in fact, that our small tournament helps to increase interest in the larger championship.

Moreover, in making this arbitrary 100 mile decree, the USLTA is acting like a monopoly and a trust. For, even though the antitrust laws do not apply to tennis, the association here is certainly violating the spirit of the antitrust laws and is acting truly small and provincial.

For nearly 30 years, Mr. Speaker, the people of Perth Amboy have been holding a small local tennis tournament in the beginning of September. The tournament, though small and drawing at most 1,000 people for its 2 days of matches, has several important purposes. All the receipts from the tournament go to worthwhile charities in the area, the Deborah Fund, the Elks Crippled Kids Fund, and the Mount Carmel Nurses Fund. In addition, the tournament enhances community spirit, while at the same time it builds up a local interest in tennis itself.

For nearly 30 years, this small tournament for the people of Perth Amboy ran along smoothly and was allowed to proceed in its own small way. Occasionally, since the more famous Forest Hills tournament was drawing to a close at the same time that our tournament was being played, we were fortunate enough to get a big-name star.

This year, however, there will be no big-name star at our tournament. There will, in fact, be no tournament at all.

We, who are so angry over Russia's canceling our annual track meet for her own selfish political reasons, should not allow a big organization like the USLTA to refuse to sanction Perth Amboy's annual tournament for its own selfish purposes. At the height of the tennis season, during the Labor Day Week, the association, at the expense of all nearby local tournaments, is attempting to secure for itself a monopoly of all the big-name players. The association fails to see, Mr. Speaker, that they will lose no revenue if they sanction Perth Amboy's tournament. They will only allow, if they do sanction it, a small tournament—held for charity—to continue for its 29th year. However, if it should not sanction the tournament, it will lose a great many friends, a good deal of respect, and a large amount of good will.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to put the distinguished majority leader on notice that next week, or very soon thereafter, I am going to be inquiring about when this session of the Congress may be expected to adjourn, because I have things to do as a few other Members have.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's last campaign proves conclusively that he does not need to spend any time campaigning in his district.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID HAS FAILED

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being asked by the Democrat administration to authorize the Federal Government to take billions of the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers to finance many questionable projects under a hodgepodge program known as mutual assistance. Despite the lofty purposes of foreign aid I am afraid the net result over the past 17 years has been to finance the mutual efforts of foreign countries in ganging up on the United States, abusing the American people, and in collaborating with our enemies. Foreign aid has failed in its objectives. It has not weakened or stopped communism. It has bought no friendship or loyalty for the United States in its efforts to prevent any country from going Communist when the Communists wanted to take over. It has depleted our gold reserve to the point where this Nation could face actual bankruptcy. It has helped to strengthen the economies of Communist countries so that Red dictators have been able to tighten their control over enslaved populations. It has made it possible for countries receiving our aid to carry on a profitable trade with North Vietnam at the very time Americans are being slaughtered by this Communist enemy.

The continued drain on our gold supply caused by the reckless use of foreign aid could well bankrupt the United States and force the devaluation of the dollar to make our money worthless. This is certainly of paramount importance to the American people. At the rate gold is being withdrawn from this country, the dollar will soon be without support. We have already replaced our silver coins with copper. Our paper dollar may soon be worth little more than the cost of the paper it is printed on.

Last year the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit was $1.3 billion. U.S. gold reserves at this time amount to $13.8 billion and foreign countries hold dollars, which are claims against our gold, of at least twice that amount. By law approximately $9 billion is required to back up the paper money which is in circulation today. So it is plain to see how dangerous the situation is and yet the administration takes no steps to halt the pressure on our gold reserves by cutting back on the greatest source of the pressure, foreign aid.

In short, what little good has ever been accomplished by foreign aid has been completely overcome by the harm it has done and is continuing to do to this country.

I am opposed to the present bill, H.R. 15750, for the reasons I have just outlined. My opposition is further increased by the provisions of this foreign aid bill by which Congress gives up more of its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch. We are asked to give the President extended authority to spend the peoples' money on these overseas programs without checking with Congress. It is a betrayal of our oath of office to relinquish a responsibility demanded of us under the Constitution, to manage the spending of Federal funds. We have no authority to give the President the power to spend these funds without an annual accounting to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is enough money in the pipeline to finance existing foreign aid programs for at least a year. I do not think we should authorize any more money for foreign aid until we have been able to make a thorough restudy of where and how the money is being spent, with the view of eliminating those programs which are not accomplishing the purposes for which Congress authorized the money and to eliminate entirely all funds going to Communist countries or to programs of the United Nations which in turn channel them to Communist countries.

The American people, with good reason, do not trust the Johnson administration to be truthful about the foreign aid program any more than it has been honest about the Vietnam war and the Great Society programs at home. It is therefore our responsibility to the people we represent to be honest with them in matters in which they have a vital concern. We can best be honest by calling a halt to new foreign aid programs until we have uncovered the whole truth about what has been accomplished up to this time. I will vote against this bill.

DR. PAUL A. MILLER

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's nomination of Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, as Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare drew mixed emotions from my fellow West Virginians.

Most West Virginians, I feel, are proud that the President has seen fit to name a man who was educated in West Virginia and who has been devoted to the future of the State of West Virginia, to one of the most vital and important Federal positions in the Nation. At the same time, there was a feeling of disappointment that Dr. Miller is leaving his job at West Virginia University.

The Weirton Daily Times sums this feeling up better than I. Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD together with my foregoing remarks the editorial of the distinguished editor of the Times, Paul Glover:

[From the Weirton (W. Va.) Daily Times, July 9, 1966]

WE HATE TO LOSE DR. MILLER

Hancock County residents are elated that Dr. Paul A. Miller has been appointed to a high post in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, but are sorry to lose him as head of West Virginia University.

Dr. Miller has been recognized as one of the most able and distinguished men in higher education in the country.

We all in Hancock County have a close attachment to him because this is his native county. Although born in East Liverpool, his family moved to a home near Chester when he was still a boy. He attended Wells High School in Newell and was graduated at the top of his class there in 1935.

His mother, Mrs. Harry A. Miller, still resides in Chester. A brother, Bernie, lives across the river in East Liverpool.

Dr. Miller attended Bethany College for one year, then transferred to West Virginia University where he received an AB degree in 1939. He received his master's degree at Michigan State. He taught at Michigan State University for a number of years before returning to his WVU alma mater four years ago.

In accepting the government position, Dr. Miller succeeds Francis Keppel who resigned. The post pays $27,000 a year.

Dr. Miller has been receiving an annual salary of $30,000, plus an estimated $10,000 in fringe benefits at WVU. He has been the highest paid public official in the state.

Dr. Miller has been well liked throughout the state for his aggressive administration. He also was popular with the student body and the faculty.

When the City of Weirton held an appreciation dinner for Thomas E. Millsop earlier in the year, it was Dr. Miller who was invited to make the principal address. Dr. Miller is known personally by scores of residents of Hancock and Brooke counties and his departure from the West Virginia scene will be a great personal loss to them.

However, the whole state wishes Dr. Miller success in his new and more responsible field on the national level. In his new position he will have an opportunity to use his talents and energies in the whole field of education and in a most strategic and important situation and also at an important time in American educational history.

BRIDGEPORT, W. VA., 150 YEARS OLD

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege this evening of joining the residents of Bridgeport, W. Va., in the celebration of its 150th birthday.

Bridgeport is unique and rare in that one of its native sons, the late-famed wildcatter Michael L. Benedum gave proof to the community that he had never forgotten his West Virginia birthplace. Today, thanks to the philanthropy of Mr. Benedum, Bridgeport proudly boasts a civic and recreation center and swimming pool and a beautiful church as lasting remembrances of a man for his hometown. I might add that Mr. Benedum, a multimillionaire who lived in Pittsburgh, Pa., at the time of his death contributes hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to colleges and universities in West Virginia through the Claude W. Benedum Foundation.

The Clarksburg, W. Va., Sunday Exponent-Telegram has an interesting account on the history of Bridgeport and its plans for the week-long sesquicentenial celebration in its July 10 edition.

Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks in the RECORD:

BRIDGEPORT PLANS SESQUICENTENNIAL EVENTS THIS WEEK

Bridgeport is 150 years old, first chartered in 1816, and to celebrate this event, the week of July 11 through July 16, has been set aside.

Bridgeport was first settled before the war between Great Britain and the American Colonies, when a fort was built on the waters of Simpson Creek and was then known as Bridgefort.

Some of the first settlers at that time were Andrew Davidson, Joseph Wilkinson, James Anderson, John Powers, and Joseph Johnson. Bridgeport, rich in heritage as part of a new developing nation, has grown into one of West Virginia's finest residential and business towns.

A full week of events have been planned to entertain the many visitors expected.

The annual Fireman's Fair will be in progress nightly throughout the week starting at 7 p.m. The fair this year is to be bigger and better, providing fun and thrills for young and old alike.

At 6 p.m. July 14 at the Bridgeport Civic Center, the Sesquicentennial opening ceremonies will be held presided over by Mayor Walter Hathaway, who will welcome all visitors and introduce guests of national and local importance.

At this time the new addition to Bridgeport's water system will be dedicated with addresses by government officials of national prominence. Music for this program will be furnished by the Bridgeport High School Band.

Immediately following this ceremony at 7:30 p.m. will be the official Sesquicentennial Parade, which will follow a route east on Philadelphia Avenue to Center Street, then south on Center Street to Main Street, then West on Main Street to Virginia Avenue.

The parade will be made up of many exciting floats, bands, marching units, fire department vehicles from throughout north central West Virginia, clowns, old automobiles and the candidates vieing for Sesquecentennial Queen. This parade promises to be one of the most elaborate seen in this area.

Following the parade the public is invited to attend a reception to be held in the dining room of the Civic Center to greet the many honored guests. Refreshments will be served.

During the days of July 14, 15 and 16 there will be an industrial exhibit, open for all to view, in the main auditorium of the Civic Center. On display will be exhibits and products of all the local industries. At the same time, the public is invited to tour the Civic Center building and grounds and view the library, West Virginia Room and the Benedum Room.

On the Civic Center grounds will be found mobile trailers housing displays of West Virginia wildlife from the Department of Natural Resources and the "Telmobile" presented by the C. & P. Telephone Company of West Virginia.

All of these displays and exhibits will be open to the public during the hours of 1 p.m. to 8 p.m. each of these days.

At 7 p.m. July 15 a band concert will be presented on the lawn of the Civic Center. Following this event, at 10 p.m. on the stage at the fair grounds, the crowning of the Sesquicentennial Queen will take place. At 10 a.m. July 16 a tribute to "The Great Wildcatter," Michael Late Benedum, in the form of a Birthday Memorial will be held at the Chapel Building at the Bridgeport Cemetery.

Paul G. Benedum, of Pittsburgh, nephew and business associate of the late Michael L. Benedum, will be present to relate some of his memories of this great man. In the early evening of this day, it is hoped there will be a "Fly-Over" of several C-119 transports of the Air National Guard.

To bring the Sesquicentennial Celebration to a close, members of the Company E, 7th West Virginia Infantry (Civil War) of Morgantown, will visit the Bridgeport Civic Center, where at 8 p.m. the 38-star Union Flag will be raised, while an authentic Civil War cannon and muskets will be fired. These men will be dressed in uniforms of the Civil War period and will provide a fitting close to this wonderous event.

In conjunction with Bridgeport's Sesquicentennial Celebration, guided bus tours will be provided by local real estate and building firms.

It was announced by James W. Frush, that at 1 p.m. Saturday, July 16 and continuing through until 5 p.m. free bus tours will depart from in front of the Bridgeport Civic Center. These tours will be available to all visitors and will follow routes that will allow the passengers to view both the old and the new expanding Bridgeport.

Guides provided from the membership of the Bridgeport Women's Club will be aboard each bus to explain the community and its development as this tour continues.

Frush stated, "All Bridgeport citizens are justly proud of their town and hopes that all visitors to the Sesquicentennial Celebration will take advantage of this opportunity to see first hand all that Bridgeport has to offer."

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1966 OPINION POLL REPORT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become my tradition in the "Fabulous Fourth" Congressional District to send a questionnaire to each registered voter to test the prevailing opinion on great national issues.

In March, I mailed my third annual questionnaire to over 100,000 constituents. The questionnaires sent in the previous 2 years brought complimentary responses and requests for more of the same. The enthusiastic response this year proves that people do care about their government.

As in the past, there was no politics in the questionnaire. It was sent to all registered voters regardless of party. The results were independently compiled and verified.

Our "Fabulous Fourth" District is progressive, successful, and well educated. Its opinion is important.

My reaction to the answers is that the American people are angry and frustrated. Never has opinion been so clearly set forth and been so one-sided on many issues.

There is a general determination to stop communism in southeast Asia and to back the President's commitments there.

The answers to questions Nos. 6, 7, and 8 show the low public opinion of typical so-called Great Society programs.

These results show the temper of the people. They are particularly significant because they represent the combined thinking of a cross-section of the Fourth Congressional District of New York—the "Fabulous Fourth"—a leading part of the New America, the suburbs.

I am still in the process of individually answering the thousands of comments I received but, the results having been tabulated, I am setting them forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress.

Once again my thanks and congratulations to those who participated and made this questionnaire a success. I am addressing these results to "Postal Patron" to reach each home in the hope of encouraging all citizens to register and vote this year.

If I am reelected, the large participation has assured that there will be a fourth annual questionnaire in the "Fabulous Fourth" District next year.

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	Undecided
FOREIGN POLICY			
In your opinion—			
1. Is it vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover?	70.6	19.2	10.2
2. If the Communists will not talk truce, should North Vietnam be hit harder?	76.0	14.2	9.8
3. Should the Congress support the President's decision to fight in southeast Asia?	70.4	17.8	11.8
4. Do you favor participation of Red China in the United Nations?	29.7	59.1	11.2
HOMEFRONT POLICY			
5. Do you favor my proposal to allow parents a tax credit for tuition payments?	81.1	14.8	4.1
6. If the war in Vietnam continues, should taxes be raised to finance an expansion of Great Society programs?	12.8	80.7	6.5
7. Do you think the war on poverty has been successful in improving the conditions of poor people?	7.6	71.7	20.7
8. Do you favor Federal rent subsidies to pay one-fourth of the rent for lower income families?	10.0	83.2	6.8
9. Do you favor a reduction in spending to produce a balanced Federal budget?	80.7	12.4	6.9
GENERAL			
10. Do you believe that the Government gives the people enough reliable information on what it is doing?	22.5	67.3	10.2
11. Have you felt the effects of an increase in the cost of living over the course of the past year?	91.2	6.7	2.1
12. Is the Congress dominated too much by the President?	60.4	25.6	14.0
13. Do you favor Federal legislation regulating packaging to protect consumers? (See Consumers Lobby)	75.5	7.8	16.7

CANCELLATION OF HEARINGS ON ELECTION REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent need for reform in the field of political finance, I am deeply disappointed at the sudden and unexplained cancellation of hearings on this subject which were scheduled to begin before the Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee. Less than an hour and a half before the time set for the opening of hearings today, committee members and witnesses were notified of the cancellation.

It is hard to understand this show of reluctance to come to grips with issues so important to the institutions of popular government. Several bills have been introduced looking toward reforms which leaders of both parties have stated are long overdue. The problems to which these bills address themselves require early attention by the Congress. Recent revelations of the activities of the President's club give added reason for speedy action.

Mr. Speaker, all who are interested in the integrity of the election process will be grieved that Congress is dragging its feet on the matter of election reform. I trust that the canceled hearings will be rescheduled as soon as possible and that a serious and penetrating study of the subject will be undertaken without further delay.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER ADDRESSES OHIO ASSOCIATIONS ON FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 8, 1966, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Public Works and probably the most knowledgeable Member of this distinguished body on Federal water pollution control legislation, addressed a joint conference on water quality in Columbus, Ohio.

The conference was held jointly by seven major statewide associations concerned with water pollution control in the Buckeye State. These groups are highly interested in developing a comprehensive water pollution abatement program in the State which will become the one to be put into effect under the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965. The seven organizations which held the conference are the Ohio Manufacturers' Association, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio Municipal League, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the Ohio Reclamation Association, the Ohio Petroleum Council, and the Ohio Coal Conference, Inc. The conference was attended by over 500 concerned citizens of the State representing State and local governments, private industry, farmers associations, nonprofit and civic organizations, and just concerned Ohioans.

Mr. CRAMER's remarks are highly perceptive of and indeed relevant to the Federal water pollution control programs.

Mr. Speaker, Ohio has been one of the leading States of the Union in controlling water pollution through State and local government cooperation with specially created water pollution control entities. The Ohio River Water Sanitation Commission—ORSANCO—has long been regarded as an outstanding example of a river commission being able to clean up a major river without reliance upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include Mr. CRAMER's remarks before the water quality conference, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress and all Americans who are concerned about water pollution control legislation:

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS IN WATER QUALITY CONTROL

(Remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Member of Congress, before the Water Quality Conference jointly sponsored by the Ohio Manufacturers' Association, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio Municipal League, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the Ohio Reclamation Association, the Ohio Petroleum Council, and the Ohio Coal Conference, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, July 8, 1966.)

Ladies and gentlemen, during the past decade, our Nation has become increasingly aware of the many water supply and water purity problems confronting it.

Wide rivers have dwindled to streams, and lakes have been reduced to ponds. Streams and lakes which were once the pride of fishermen, swimmers, and other recreation and sports enthusiasts, in many instances, have now become open sewers. Some municipalities are without sufficient pure water to even meet the consumption demands of their residents. Some industries are without enough water to produce their products and to use in the operation of their machinery. Ships barely have enough channel depth to make it through some of the Nation's most important waterways.

Our Nation has an acute water resources problem. It has been characterized by some as a "water famine." There is just not enough water of adequate quality at all the places where it is needed for municipal, industrial, commercial, and irrigation purposes. It is so polluted, in many cases, that taxpayers and industries must pay ever-increasing taxes and spend ever-increasing sums of money to meet the needs of purification.

In my opinion, there are few problems confronting this Nation today with the magnitude and seriousness of maintaining sufficient pure water. The need for adequate, good quality water for all the Nation's uses is paramount, for water pollution menaces public health, destroys fish and wildlife, adversely affects manufacturing processes, reduces property values, raises taxes, and destroys natural beauty.

The increase in the amount and nature of pollution can be best illustrated by citing a few statistics. At the turn of the century, the total of municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses of water in the United States was about 40 billion gallons per day. By midcentury total water use had risen to about 203 billion gallons per day; and by 1965, it had risen to about 367 billion gallons per day. By 1980, only 14 years from now, the average daily use of water is estimated to be an astounding 597 billion gallons.

Municipal wastes increased from an equivalent of the sewage discharge of 24 million persons in 1900 to a total equivalent of the sewage discharge of 75 million persons in 1960. The comparable increase in industrial waste discharged was the equivalent of 15 million persons in 1900 to 150 million persons in 1960. The increase of the two combined is roughly sixfold in sixty years. Municipal wastes increased threefold between 1900 to 1960, but industrial wastes increased tenfold.

As recently as 1960, 25 percent of municipal wastes were being dumped into waterways as raw sewage. Another 31 percent was receiving only primary treatment, that is, the removal of only those solids which would settle. The very nature of the control problem has also changed, for water is being polluted today by materials unknown a few decades ago.

THE WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

Ladies and gentlemen, the problem of water pollution is indeed a substantial one. Congress has proclaimed that it cannot be ignored. It must not be ignored. But just because it is a national problem, we need not rely completely upon the Federal government to correct it.

I think that it has been amply demonstrated over the past decade that only by concerted action on Federal, State, and local levels of government to claim the water which falls on our land, and to implement effective water pollution control abatement, can we guarantee the citizens of this Nation that there wil be an adequate supply of water of needed quality in the future. The answer lies in the effective use and reuse of water, and that cannot be achieved without sincere cooperation between government and industry, from the Nation's Capital to every County Courthouse, and from monstrously large industries to small plants.

When one realizes that by the year 2000 we will have a water supply need of 1,000 billion gallons daily, I repeat—1,000 billion gallons daily, and that there are only 650 billion gallons now available daily, then it becomes strikingly apparent that this will necessitate water reuse. Ohioans must be fully aware of the necessity for water reuse, inasmuch as water from the Ohio River is used 3.7 times as the river winds its 1,000 mile course. A program to provide sufficient clean water is the only way to meet these demands.

One of the most essential elements in water pollution control is the maintenance of water quality. Its many intricacies have been the subject of heated debate both in and out of the Congress for many years. It will continue to be the one overriding issue in water pollution control legislation for some years to come.

What are the current laws regarding water quality criteria, regulations, standards, and control? What about enforcement of such standards? How will the States and local governments be affected? What can concerned citizens and industries do? These are but a few of the questions with which I wish to concern myself today as I discuss water quality control and enforcement with you. Before we examine the details of the Water Quality Act of 1965, a desire for an understanding of some provisions of which has prompted this meeting today, it might be wise to first briefly examine the historical development of the Federal water pollution control program in general and water quality in particular.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1948

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, sponsored by Senators Robert Taft and Alben Barkley, represented a significant breakthrough in terms of national recognition of the problem. The theme of the legislation was that pollution was primarily a health problem best dealt with at a local level.

THE 1956 CONTROL ACT—FIRST GRANTS

Congress took a longer legislative step in 1956 with the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, better known as Public Law 660. The major innovation of the 1956 legislation was the provision for grants-in-aid to help local communities build sewage treatment works. Although the enforcement provisions of the 1956 Act allowed the Federal government to pursue with more authority the pollutors of interstate waters, they were regarded by most as being modest. However, this section did mark the entering wedge of what some considered to be the most vital part of an effective water pollution control program, namely, Federal sanctions.

I know that all of you probably recall the provisions of the 1956 Act respective to water quality control, but let me refresh your memories briefly. Under the provisions of the 1956 Act, when the Surgeon General had "reason to believe" pollution of interstate waters was occurring, he could call a conference of officials either in the State or States of origin or in the State or States being affected. After the conference, the Surgeon General could recommend remedial action; and if no such action occurred within six months after the Surgeon General's recommendations were made, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could call a public hearing in the State or States of pollution origin. Remedial action could be called for by the Secretary after the hearings and the pollutor given six months to effect such action. At the end of that time, if no action had been taken, the Secretary, upon request from the offending State could request the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit against the offender.

FEDERAL VERSUS LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In hearings before the House Committee on Public Works in 1959, the Secretary of HEW, Arthur S. Flemming, appearing as the principal Administration witness, took the position that the Federal government should pursue the enforcement provisions of the 1956 Act and should engage in the research and other activities embodied in the program. As you know, legislation in the 86th Congress, 1959–60, was vetoed by President Eisenhower because of his objections to the substantial expansion of the Federal grants-in-aid program of the 1956 Act which was called for in the legislation. In his veto message, President Eisenhower stressed that water pollution was primarily a local responsibility and that the budget could not be balanced by continually expanding Federal programs, i.e., the grant provisions of the Act. The veto was sustained, despite the substantial Democratic majority in the Congress that year.

THE 1961 AMENDMENTS

In 1961 Congress enacted legislation which amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase authorizations for appropriations for construction of waste treatment works, to encourage joint projects, to raise the dollar ceiling limitation for a single project, and to set a dollar ceiling limitation on joint projects. The Secretary of HEW, rather than the Surgeon General, was given responsibility for the program.

Ten Republican Members of the House Committee on Public Works filed a strong minority report on the reported bill registering our approval of many of its provisions.

The main discord between the House version and the Senate version of the legislation which resulted in the 1961 Act lay in the enforcement provisions. What happened, of course, is well known. The Senate conferees rejected the House provision giving the Secretary of HEW the power to issue orders for abatement, and the Conference substitute provided that if pollution were not abated within the specified time in the notice following the public hearing, the Secretary of HEW could ask the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit to secure abatement in cases of interstate pollution. In the case of intrastate pollution, he could ask for a suit only with the written consent of the State involved.

The 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act were the culmination of the developments toward amending the 1956 Act which had begun as early as 1958.

The Congress realized, however, that it would take a greater effort at all levels of government, and on the part of industry, agriculture, conservationists, civic and voluntary organizations, and individual citizens to come to grips with the monumental problems of water pollution. It is imperative, however, that the State and local governments and non-governmental entities take the lead in abating water pollution. This is the only effective means by which we can prevent encroachments by the Federal government into the prerogatives of the State and local governments in controlling water pollution.

With the thought in mind that additional water pollution control legislation was needed on a national level, many bills were introduced last year to strengthen the Federal water pollution control program.

The bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution control Act which was eventually acted upon by both Houses of Congress was S. 4, introduced by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine, and known as the "Water Quality Act of 1965." This bill passed the Senate in an extremely strong form, and, as a matter of fact, Republicans and Democrats alike expressed similar views, especially with regard to the section on water quality standards applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof.

Let me say from the outset, I do believe that the Water Quality Act of 1965 as finally drafted on a bipartisan basis is, by and large, a constructive and effective piece of legislation. Briefly, it provided for the creation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, through which the Secretary of HEW was to administer the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended. It created the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of HEW to assist the Secretary in supervising and directing the head of the new Administration as well as the administration of all other departmental functions involving water pollution. It authorized research and development grants to demonstrate new or improved methods to eradicate the problems of water pollution caused by overflow of storm sewers or combined storm and sanitary sewers. The 1965 Act provided for a substantial enlargement of the grant program for construction of sewage treatment works, and it doubled the dollar ceiling limitation on grants for construction of waste treatment works for an individual project or a joint project.

Under the 1965 Act, authorizations for appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 were increased from $100 to $150 million, of which $100 million is to be allocated to the States under the formula of the existing law, based on population and income, and all amounts appropriated in excess of $100 million are to be allocated on the basis of population alone. Project grants above the dollar ceiling limitations may be made from the latter allotment if

the State matches the full Federal contribution made to all projects from this increase in annual allotment. The law further permits the Secretary of the Interior to increase the basic grant by an additional ten percent of the amount of the grant if the project conforms to the comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area. But when the Senate passed bill lay before the House Committee on Public Works for consideration, all was not so well.

REORGANIZATION INTO INTERIOR

Although last year's Act, as all other legislation pertaining to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, continued the program through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President's Reorganization Plan Number Two of 1966, which transferred the program to the Secretary of the Interior, effective as of May 10, 1966, necessitates our discussion today on the basis of the Federal water pollution control program being administered by the Secretary of the Interior. I will make all references to last year's Act and the law, as amended, in that context.

WATER STANDARDS

The provisions of last year's Act which were the most controversial when the legislation was before the Congress was the section which would have given the Secretary authority to prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to all interstate waters and portions thereof and to promulgate standards pursuant thereto. It is the requirements of the language which finally evolved from this section which has prompted this meeting today. The provision, as passed by the Senate, would have given the Secretary complete power to control the use of waters of practically every stream in the Nation from the Ohio River to your neighborhood creek, which to a very large and realistic extent would, in fact, have given the Secretary control over the use of the lands adjacent to all such streams. The effect of this provision would have been to establish the Secretary as a nationwide "zoning Czar" over waters and adjacent lands.

Members of the House Committee on Public Works were strongly opposed to such a far-reaching provision. The Committee voted to strike this controversial and unwise provision. The Committee inserted in lieu of the Senate version a provision that each State in order to receive funds under the Act must have filed within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act (October 2, 1965) a letter of intent with the Secretary that the State would establish water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters on or before June 30, 1967. I think that all of you would agree that the House version was a much more reasonable one than either the Senate's or the one which eventually became law. The legislation, as reported by the House Committee, was sent to the Floor of the House where it was passed without a single "nay" vote.

Obviously, as I have pointed out, standards of water quality are desirable, but efforts should be made first to obtain the establishment of such standards or criteria by the State and local governments which are most familiar with all aspects of the matter in a given locality, including the economic impact of the standards to be established and enforced. Authorizing the Secretary to promulgate and enforce standards, to the exclusion of the States, would obviously discourage the State and local governments from developing their own plans and standards for water quality. It was the desire and the need to bring the States into the field of water pollution control that other provisions were included in the bill.

This desire to have the States adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof within such States and a plan to implement and enforce such criteria is the very reason that you are gathered here today.

Inasmuch as there was disagreement between the House and the Senate, the bill was submitted to a Conference to have the disagreements worked out. What came out of this Conference was the legislative language which became public law. The water quality standard provision reported by the Conference was the best compromise that could be obtained.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

I want to discuss the 1965 Act as it pertains to water quality standards in more detail, inasmuch as it is the principal purpose of your meeting and because it is complex legislation.

The new law provides that if the Governor of a State or a State water pollution control agency files within one year after the date of enactment of the Act a letter of intent that such a State, after public hearings, will before June 30, 1967, adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof within such State and a plan to implement and enforce such criteria and if the Secretary determines that such criteria and plan are consistent with the provisions of the Act, then such criteria and plan will thereafter be the water quality standards applicable to those interstate waters and portions thereof. If State control is to be preserved here in the Buckeye State, the criteria and a plan must be submitted by Ohio by June 30, 1967, and to be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

The 1965 Act provides further, however, that if a State does not file a letter of intent to establish water quality standards under the provisions which I have just discussed, or if the Secretary or Governor of any affected State wants a revision of the standards, then the Secretary may, after having had a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities, and affected industries, prepare and publish regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof. The Secretary may promulgate standards six months after the date he publishes his regulations, unless within that period the State has adopted water quality standards which the Secretary finds to be consistent with the protection of the public health and welfare, the enhancement of water quality, and the general purposes of the Act or unless a petition for a public hearing had been filed under other provisions of the Act.

If the Governor of any State affected by the standards, petitions the Secretary for a hearing at any time after the regulations have been published and prior to thirty days after standards have been promulgated, the Secretary is required to call a public hearing. This public hearing is to be held in or near one or more of the places where the standards will take effect and is to be before a hearing board consisting of at least five persons. The members of the hearing board are to be appointed by the Secretary; however, each affected State may select one member and the Department of Commerce and other affected agencies may each select one member. There is a further restriction that at least a majority of the hearing board must be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of the Interior. House Conferees in their committee report stated that they expected the Secretary to appoint at least one public member of each hearing board who will be from the area to be directly affected by the standards. The House Conferees also intend that the Secretary in appointing hearing boards will insure a proper balance between all effected parties.

HOUSE CONFEREES INSIST ON STATES RIGHTS

Notice of the public hearing is to be published in the Federal Register and is to be given to the State water pollution agencies, interstate agencies, and municipalities involved at least 30 days before the hearing. After the evidence has been presented and on the basis thereof the hearing board is required to make findings as to whether the Secretary's standards should be approved or modified, and to transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the hearing board approves the standards as published or promulgated, they take effect when the Secretary receives the hearing board's recommendations. If modifications are recommended, the Secretary is required to promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards in accordance with the recommendations, and these revised regulations will take effect immediately upon their promulgation.

The Act provides that the discharge of matter into interstate waters or portions thereof which reduce their quality below the applicable standard, whether the matter is discharged directly into the waters or reaches the waters after discharging into tributaries thereof, is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of the Act. However, before abatement is initiated, the Secretary is required to notify the violators and other interested parties of the violation of the standards and at least 180 days must elapse so that there may be voluntary compliance. The House Conferees stated in the Conference Report on the legislation that during such period the Secretary should afford an opportunity for an informal hearing before himself or such hearing officer or board as he may appoint relative to the alleged violation of standards, upon the request of any affected State, alleged violator, or other interested party, so that if possible there can be voluntary agreement reached during this period, thus eliminating the necessity for suit.

In any suit brought to secure abatement of pollution the court is required to receive in evidence a transcript of the conference and hearing, the recommendations of the conference and the hearing board, the recommendation and standards promulgated by the Secretary, and such additional evidence including that related to the alleged violation of the standards as the court deems necessary to a complete review of the standards as well as a determination of all other issues relating to the alleged violation. The court is given jurisdiction to enter whatever judgment and orders the public interest and equities of the case may require after having given due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of complying with the applicable standards. The existing enforcement procedures in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act consisting of three stages, conference, public hearings, and court action, will continue to be applicable for enforcing the abatement of pollution which endangers the health or welfare of persons.

The Act requires standards of water quality established pursuant to the Act to be such as to protect the public health or welfare, enhance water quality and generally to serve the purpose of the Act. In establishing such standards the Secretary, hearing board, or State, as the case may be, is required to take into consideration their use and value for water supply, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreation, agriculture, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

In connection with such procedures the Act prohibits any witnesses or other person from being required to divulge in connection with any hearing any trade secrets or secret processes. This was insisted upon by the Minority.

As you can readily see, the 1965 Act is the most far-reaching proposal concerning water quality standards which has ever been enacted by the Congress of the United States.

HOW 1965 ACT IS WORKING

How is the program working? I have been informed by the new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, now under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, that some 36 States, including the District of Columbia, have already filed with the Secretary a letter stating their intent to adopt water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters and portions thereof within their respective State and to adopt a plan to implement and enforce such criteria. This is an encouraging number of States, indeed, inasmuch as the remaining 15 States still have until October 2 of this year to file such a letter of intent. I understand that your State of Ohio was one of the first five States in the Nation to submit such a letter of intent, which is indeed commendable.

It is further my understanding that the majority of the responses received from the various States have been from the Governors themselves, rather than the State water pollution control agency, which may be an encouraging indication of the concern of the States over developing their own criteria and programs to control water pollution. Strong, but realistic, State programs will invalidate any claims by the Federal government that the States are not doing their share in controlling water pollution.

In May of this year, the Secretary of the Interior issued guidelines for establishing water quality standards for interstate waters under the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965. The guidelines were issued to assist the States in the development of the required water quality criteria and the plan for the implementation and enforcement thereof,and to delineate factors which will be considered in the Secretary's determination of whether the criteria and plan are consistent with the purposes of the Act. In addition to the guidelines in the Act, some twelve policy guidelines are given in the Secretary's release.

Unfortunately, there is not time here today to discuss the policy guidelines issued by the Secretary, but I am sure that they will be covered in other sessions of your conference.

Obviously, the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1965 must be complied with. What we all must do is to make sure that the interests of all affected individuals, governing bodies, and industries are accurately represented and given a fair airing. If we enact satisfactory programs on State levels, there will be no need to resort to Federal regulations and standards.

NEW PROPOSALS FOR LEGISLATION

There are proposals before the Congress which, if enacted, would contribute more substantially to the abatement of water pollution from industrial sources than the present or proposed procedures of the Executive Branch. The application of Federal regulations is a negative response to a positive need. Proposals to encourage industry to prevent water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes are preferable, in my opinion, to continuing escalation of Federal expenditure and Federal regulation.

On March 15th of this year, I introduced a bill, H.R. 13616, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide such a tax incentive to industry for the construction of waste treatment works. Under the provisions of my bill, every person, at his election, would be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis of any treatment work over a period of five years. In this context, treatment work means any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing process, including the necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances. I understand that the concept embodied in my bill of accelerated depreciation of capital assets would probably be much more palatable to the Committee on Ways and Means than to consider such expenditures, which in fact are capital expenditures, as ordinary expenses that could be fully deducted in the year incurred or spread over a number of years at the option of the taxpayer, as many bills before that Committee would do.

I think proposals, like mine, are a much more constructive way to prevent industrial pollution of our waters without being detrimental to the industries themselves than any, if not most, of the proposals which have come from the Administration.

One thing remains abundantly clear. The Johnson Administration and the Secretary of the Interior are striving to exercise complete control over the waters of the Nation. What we must do is to see that the States adopt satisfactory programs and implement and enforce those programs to prevent further encroachments by the Federal government.

Already, there are many bills before the Congress to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to set up new Federal water pollution control programs. Many of these bills call for even stronger standards and Federal authority to control pollution. I feel that it is unwise at this time to change the existing law as it pertains to water quality standards, if such changes would result in more Federal control. I suggest that it is very unwise for anyone to suggest amending the existing water quality standard provisions of the Act when the regulation under present law will not go into effect until June 30, 1967.

Next week, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House Committee on Public Works begins public hearings on pending legislation to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to establish other Federal water pollution control programs. There are no less than forty bills on water pollution control pending before the Committee for consideration this Session. I sincerely hope that any legislation enacted this year will be realistic, and I for one will work for palatable legislation.

Your meeting here today is indeed praiseworthy. It is encouraging to see representatives of various interests meeting to learn about the water pollution control program and how it affects them, directly and indirectly. I hope your efforts are successful, and I hope that the State of Ohio is permitted to establish its own water quality standards and to carry out its own clean water program.

FOREIGN AID REASSESSMENT

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote "No on H.R. 15750 unless it is amended to limit its extension to 1 year and the amount authorized is also reduced. We have continued this program of foreign aid over a period of years in an inefficient manner. It has not won friends for us nor have the funds been effectively utilized. Last year there was much sentiment in the other body to eliminate the present program and not reinaugurate another until a complete reassessment of its value had been made. It is my judgment that this should be done.

A DOCTOR WRITES HIS PATIENTS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter which two fine doctors wrote to their patients regarding the advent of medicare and its coverage. They very succinctly pointed out what it would do and what it would not do. There is a great misunderstanding regarding medicare and many liberal spokesmen make it appear that the new and costly program will wipe disease off the face of the map by virtual push button control.

Dr. James Joseph Hughes and Thomas Michael Hughes very ably put the whole matter in its proper perspective in the following letter:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *July 1, 1966.*

To all our patients:

Now that medicare is law we feel that you should know exactly where we stand. We are not sure as to what kind of law it is—lawyers tell us that it is 1,000 pages long; we do know that the government has issued two books of instructions and these are frightening. We need to remember that the law was supposedly enacted to subsidize those over 65 (at present) and not to control the professional service.

Our policy has always been to provide the best medical service possible to all our patients. This policy will not be changed by medicare.

What does this mean to you if you are over 65 or have someone in your family who is?

1. You will need no "medicare card" to see either doctor; you have not needed this in the past. Your only "eligibility requirement" is that you need our service; this has been the only "eligibility requirement" in the past and the only limits on our practice have been the limits of time and space.

2. We will continue to bill you as we have in the past. We will look to you for payment of fees, as we have done in the past; we will not use nor accept assignments under "Part B" because then our obligation would no longer be to you but to a third party, the government or the insurance carrier.

3. We will furnish you, and you alone, with the necessary medical information so that you can seek reimbursement from whatever source you choose; this is lawful. This information will be on our own forms, rather than on any government or insurance company forms; the forms we plan to use are furnished by the Ohio State Medical Association. This is done to limit the paper work, "the red tape"; it is done in order to prevent the paper work from taking over the physician's time. We feel that the physician's time should be devoted to patient service rather than to paper service.

4. If you are eligible for medicare and need hospitalization we will continue the current practice of signing your hospital chart, thus indicating that you need to be in the hospital.

In summary, we will continue to provide professional medical service rather than political medical service—we are not trained in the latter. And it is for that reason that we will continue to provide medical service, as we can, to you; and that we will continue to look to you for our fees. You can then look to anyone you choose for reimbursement—the law provides for this!

We need to remember that the only compulsory feature of medicare is the obligation to pay the taxes—an obligation on all taxpayers!

JAMES JOSEPH HUGHES, M.D.
THOMAS MICHAEL HUGHES, M.D.

UNUSUAL "ARMY" OF INTERLOCKING CORPORATIONS ENGAGES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing in the RECORD the fourth and fifth in a series of six articles which have been published in recent editions of the St. Petersburg Times. These articles bring to light further irregularities in the administration of the war on poverty on the west coast of Florida. Part 1 appeared in the RECORD of July 12 at page 15362 and part 2 appeared in the RECORD of July 13 at page 15484.

SOME MIGRANT MONEY USED FOR UNEXPECTED BILLS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Times staff writers Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the way war-on-poverty funds are being spent by organizations commanded by Dr. Thomas P. Hardeman. So far they have been denied inspection of records of programs supported wholly by public funds and denied knowledge of the true ownership of land leased by these organizations with public funds. Today they write about some curious expenditures in the VISTA program.)

(Fourth of a series by Bette Orsini and Jack Nease)

Some of the more than $600,000 in federal funds spent by the Community Action Fund (CAF) to help migrant farm workers in the past 12 months has been used for unexpected purposes.

Some $20,000 to $25,000 of the money was used, for example, to rent automobiles for Volunteers In Service To America (VISTA) assigned to work with the migrants.

Thomas P. Hardeman, CAF president, says he was told last year that the money would be reimbursed by the VISTA office in Washington.

Now, he says, VISTA officials will not repay CAF for the expense and it will have to be absorbed by the migrant program.

The VISTA car rentals are included in the $51,956 in travel expenses reported by CAF in a recent tabulation. Nowhere in CAF records made available to The Times are the volunteer car rentals listed separately.

The $20,000 to $25,000 estimate was made by a bookkeeper for CAF.

Some volunteers apparently traveled quite a bit during ther work with Florida farm workers.

One rental car assigned to a VISTA was driven 9,126 miles between Aug. 9 and Dec. 1, 1965. The bill came to $1,392.

Another volunteer's rental car was driven 6,664 miles during the same period, and another volunteer drove a rental car 2,148 miles in a 16-day period.

CAF paid both daily fees and mileage charges for the cars. The practice was stopped this month, one official said.

Hardeman refused to name the official in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) who approved the car rentals.

Several other expense items in the migrant program, and a related Community Service Foundation (CSF) VISTA training program, aren't what they seem at first glance.

CSF records, for example show payments to Bob Fellows, a former Tampa newsman, as a $75-a-day "consultant."

Hardeman said Fellows was really paid for taking pictures.

Fellows was paid $300 on Aug. 10, 1965, for four days of "consulting" and $375 Aug. 31, for five days.

Hardeman and a Tampa attorney affiliated with the migrant program have been paid as consultants to the program also, although total amounts received by them are relatively small.

CSF records show Hardeman received a $50 check Sept. 16 as a consulting fee for work done June 13, 1965.

Howard Garrett, a Tampa attorney who is secretary-treasurer of CAF and chairman of the board of the newly-formed Migrant Legal Services Inc. (MLS), has received at least $660 from the Hardeman groups.

Early in the program Garrett was paid $100 for two days consultation and $32 for two days per diem from CSF migrant funds. Both checks are dated July 2, 1965. Another $25 was paid to prepare a lease.

Later, when the migrant program was shifted to CAF, Garrett's law firm was paid a $175 consulting fee Nov. 3, 1965, and $281.25 for "consultant service" April 21, 1965.

Garrett has also been paid as a $50-a-day lecturer in the CSF VISTA training program, but records for this program past Oct. 1, 1965, are secret.

So are records showing the full amount of rent paid the H.A.S. Corporation, which lists Garrett as president, for rent of the VISTA training camp south of Bradenton. Garrett has said the real owners of the camp don't want their identity known.

Jack Mansfield, who later joined the CSF staff and is president of MLS, also received consulting fees early in the program. He was paid $200 for two days consultation and $129.44 for plane fare and per diem July 6.

Mansfield also was paid $242.66 from migrant funds March 10. There was no explanation of the payment on the check.

Mansfield's current salary comes from the CSF payroll, which handles the VISTA program, but he received a check for $462 on March 18, 1966, from the CAF payroll account.

The migrant funds, which totaled $623,568 from June 1965, through mid-May 1966, was checked by a federal auditor for the first time last week. His findings have not been made public.

Periodic auditing of the CAF funds has been done by Clearwater CPA Mildred C. DeJane, who received varying amounts for this service. She also received $100 a week to audit the CSF VISTA books.

CAF also employes a bookkeeper, Walt Neiger, to post accounts but Neiger appears to have little to do with actual accounting of the funds.

Real control of the federal funds handled by CSF and CAF is in the hands of Mrs. Hazel Ramsey, a long-time employe of CSF.

Only Mrs. Ramsey signs payroll checks for the two programs. Checks for other expenditures in the migrant program require both her signature and that of Hardeman, but in many cases Hardeman's signature is put on with a rubber stamp.

According to available records, Mrs. Ramsey was being paid $137.50 a week last July, received a $300 bonus early in August, and in late August began receiving $187.50 a week.

When reporters first asked to see the VISTA training fiscal records, Hardeman said Mrs. Ramsey had taken them home to work on during her vacation.

Five days later, but before Mrs. Ramsey returned to work, Hardeman and Mansfield produced the records after having gone through them in another section of the CAF office suite.

Reporters discovered the record-sifting process when they went to ask questions about another subject.

Many purchases for the migrant program were made from rather large petty cash funds maintained in each of the five regions.

One regional director received $1,798 in petty cash funds during a five-month period. Some regions attempted to keep petty cash balances of $250 and $300.

The OEO has since ordered CAF to reduce petty cash balances to $50.

SOME CAF-CSF FUNDS AMAZINGLY GYMNASTIC

(Fifth of a series by Bette Orsini and Jack Nease)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Times Staff writer Jack Nease and Bette Orsini today continue their inquiry into the fiscal affairs of a $2.36-million complex of anti-poverty operations run by Thomas P. Hardeman. So far the reporters have been denied access to records of programs supported wholly by public funds and denied knowledge of the true ownership of land leased by three organizations with public funds. Today they write about some interesting gymnastics with poverty funds.)

Poverty funds sometimes go through some interesting gymnastics in the $2.36-million Community Action Fund-Community Service Foundation complex operated by Thomas P. Hardeman.

Reporters asking to see fiscal records of a $626,410 CAF migrant Program arm of the complex were given some—but not all—of the accounts to examine.

Tracing one transaction to its source turned up a separate CAF "administrative account." It contained some interesting notations.

The migrant program accountant is not permitted access to the account and says he "doesn't ask questions."

"They don't tell me—and I don't want to know," he volunteered.

The account was just getting started when reporters began looking at the records.

It appeared to have been set up primarily to handle an expense not permitted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Walt Neiger, the accountant, said some of the money went for down payment on a mobile home in a transaction "under no condition allowable by OEO."

The account was opened March 24 with a $200 deposit. The first check was for $200 a week later to George Coble and John Adonis. The records contain an April 15 note signed by Coble and William H. Johnson promising to pay the CAF administrative account $438 "in replacement of a loan."

Another prime purpose for the account according to Neiger's information was to have a depository to receive a $514.91 "profit" the Community Action Fund realized on a separate $4,900.38 contract with the federal government to run a VISTA training conference in St. Petersburgh last December.

The OEO paid poverty funds to CAF at the rate of $15.41 per day per volunteer for three days for 106 VISTA volunteers.

Conference records indicate a consistent total of 95 volunteers attending each of the three days' series of workshops. Some drew an attendance as low as half a dozen VISTA's. Newspaper accounts in the conference file list an attendance of 101.

At any rate the federal government paid for 106 and the $514.91 leaped from the CAF account to the closely guarded CAF "administrative account."

It was deposited by Hardeman and provided the capital for a series of loans, advances and other expenses.

In another interesting gymnastic, payments to one employe who had been receiving his checks from the CAF migrant account suddenly switched to the CAF administrative account.

Asked about the switchup Neiger said it involved a personnel problem he couldn't talk about and referred questioners to Hardeman. A Hardeman spokesman said the employe "did some work" for the administrative section.

The payment was for $137.50 to Billy Weeks, a former migrant center regional director taken off the payroll.

The check notation said the money was for "mileage."

Administrative account records showed "mileage" for 1,375 miles of travel by Weeks in 20 days "building community good-will and understanding." A notation said "trip authorized by Thomas P. Hardeman."

Seven weeks later Weeks was paid $200 from the account with a check marked "con. fees."

The files contain a May 19 letter from Weeks saying he received "the check for VISTA instruction" but didn't get paid for his last week's work.

The contents of the letter are interesting.

Weeks wrote, "I have never received a check for my last weeks (sic) work. This was the week you asked me to go to the state office on Friday. I understand you were to pay me with the $230.00 I raised from friends for that week. This was put in the Community Service Foundation (Migrant Program) Special Fund."

Among the first deposits in the account were one for $200 and one for $30. It was these funds though that went to cover the disallowable OEO expense on buying the trailer.

It is impossible to determine the amount of one loan made out of the account. A mixup of deposit and payment computations leaves the loan amount in question.

None of the CAF officials asked could supply figures to put the account back into balance—and hadn't noticed it was out of balance.

The VISTA conference payments produced more puzzlers.

The only record of how the $4,900 in poverty funds was spent was a nearly illegible handwritten report on a torn half piece of note paper. It listed printing and stationery figures, $200 for consultants, $300 for mileage, left a blank for per diem and noted a hotel bill of $3,904.77.

Another notation gave a breakdown of the consultant fees and noted expenditure of $514.91 marked "CAF." This amount later was deposited by Hardeman to his CAF administrative account.

The files contained no statement supporting the $3,904.77 hotel bill to the Princess Martha when first checked by reporters and CAF officials.

The next day CAF officials told reporters they found the bill "right after you left" and produced it from the files which had not contained it the day before.

There was a breakdown on all but three "miscellaneous" items for about $100 each. There is still no information available on the miscellaneous $300.

Next: 21 Attorneys.

THE PLAN TO DEFILE ONE OF NATURE'S GREAT MASTERPIECES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in order that every Member of Congress may know the complete implications of H.R. 4671, the central Arizona project which includes provisions for intruding upon the monumental beauty of the Grand Canyon through construction of two unnecessary hydroelectric dams, I shall continue to place in the RECORD various statements, news articles and editorials, and other pertinent material.

Today I ask unanimous consent for inclusion of an analysis by Luther Carter from the June 17 issue of Science, a publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The article is accompanied by a set of photographs which of course cannot appear in the RECORD. Two of the photos are described by the following caption:

Bridge Canyon dam, a 736-foot high concrete-arch structure shown by an artist on the photograph above, would nearly fill the Grand Canyon's inner gorge. Marble Canyon dam, as indicated by the line in the photograph at upper left, would stand 310 feet high—its top nearly 400 feet below the rim of the inner gorge.

Mr. Speaker, for anyone who may wish to study these photos showing the deleterious effects of the proposed dams on majestic Grand Canyon, I shall be happy to obtain copies.

In addition to the destruction of a natural birthright, the dams would cost U.S. taxpayers only a million dollars short of three-quarters of a billion dollars, an expenditure defying sound economic reasoning particularly in a time when the Nation can least afford extravagance. Since the only reason for the dams would be to produce electricity and since the power could be generated more economically in steamplants, the proposal is all the more distasteful.

The Science article follows:

GRAND CANYON: COLORADO DAMS DEBATED

The Grand Canyon, carved by the Colorado River over a leisurely 9 million years, is indisputably one of nature's great masterpieces. The politicians of the Pacific Southwest, in something of a hurry, have been at work on a masterpiece of their own—a multibillion-dollar water project which, while offensive to some tastes, is drawn to a scale impressive by human standards.

Besides two dams in the Grand Canyon, which are the project's most celebrated feature to date, it would include the Central Arizona Project, consisting principally of a large aqueduct running hundreds of miles across Arizona, from Lake Havasu on the Colorado to Phoenix and Tucson; a number of reclamation and water supply projects in other Colorado basin states; and—ultimately the project's keystone—an aqueduct system to bring to the Colorado millions of acre-feet of water from some other river basin, probably the Columbia. The project's initial cost is estimated at $1.6 billion; its ultimate cost is not known, but it would run into additional billions.

Legislation to initiate the project is now before the Interior Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. The bill, H.R. 4671, will, if ever enacted, be a remarkable achievement of basin diplomacy to which Representative MORRIS K. UDALL of Arizona, the Metternich of the Colorado, will have contributed much.

The proposal represents an intricate, delicate meshing and balancing of the interests of the Upper Colorado Basin states—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—with those of the Lower Basin states—Arizona, Nevada, and California. Moreover, it harmonizes the interests of Arizona and California, whose relations with respect to use of the Colorado have been marked by much disharmony. It retains certain elements, such as the canyon dams and the concept of water importation, of the Pacific Southwest Water Plan submitted to Congress in 1964 by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, the congressman's brother.

The feeling of honest compromise inspired by H.R. 4671 within the Colorado basin is not the feeling the bill has always produced outside the basin. Its provisions for a water importation study have generated fears in the Northwest that the Columbia's now abundant waters may be seriously diminished by demands from the Southwest, a region whose political power has been growing as rapidly as its thirst.

Nationally, conservationist groups have become alarmed by the proposal to build the canyon dams. The conservationists, led chiefly by the Sierra Club, have had some success in contributing to the atmosphere of doubt and criticism that seems to have enveloped H.R. 4671. Indeed, the opposition appears strong enough to make passage of the bill without major alterations doubtful—yet any important change in the measure could cause the compromise among the basin states to fall apart.

The intricacies of Southwest water politics, fully revealed in H.R. 4671, are best explained by the history of the region's policies regarding use of the Colorado. The "Law of the River," as developed through two interstate compacts, several acts of Congress, a treaty with Mexico, and court decisions, apportions the Colorado's water among the various basin states and Mexico. The apportionments are based on an assumed annual flow of 17.5 million acre-feet a year—7.5 million for the Upper Basin, 7.5 million for the Lower Basin, and 1.5 million for Mexico.

However, from 1906 to 1965 the rivers total yearly flow averaged only 15 million acre-feet, with annual flows ranging from the record high of 24 million in 1917 to the record low of 5.6 million in 1934. Thus far, the deficit has existed solely on paper because only California has in fact been withdrawing its legal quota. California, entitled to 4.4 million acre-feet, has been withdrawing 5.1 million by dipping into the unused share of other states.

As other basin states begin withdrawing their full allowances, through future reclamation and water supply projects, the need to conserve and augment the Colorado's flow will become critical. Estimates as to when the critical movement will arrive vary, but it is believed to be not more than a generation away.

The purpose of H.R. 4671 is to "make the river whole" by increasing total water available as well as to authorize for immediate construction, the Central Arizona Project (CAP) and five reclamation projects in Colorado and New Mexico. The canyon dams and the importation of water from outside the basin are both viewed by the bill's sponsors as essential to their long-range objectives. The dams would serve no water storage function, but, once having paid for themselves from the sale of the electricity that they would generate, they would be expected to contribute to a new Lower Basin Development Fund. This fund, which would also receive the proceeds from water sales and part of the power revenues from Hoover dam

and other existing dams on the Lower Colorado, would be used to reimburse the federal treasury for about 90 percent of the $525 million to be spent on CAP and for part of the much larger sums to be spent on the aqueducts, pumping stations, and other works needed to import water to the Lower Colorado.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to study various possibilities for augmenting the Colorado basin's water supply. These include water salvage and conservation, weather modification, and desalinization of sea water; but, in the sponsors' judgment, the most promising possibility is water importation.

The study would contemplate importing, initially, up to 6.5 million acre-feet of water a year (including 2 million acre-feet to the Upper Basin), which would make up the deficit under present quotas and provide for additional needs that arise. Another 2 million acre-feet might be withdrawn from the exporting basin (or basins), but diverted to water users along the route to the Colorado. The bill was amended last week to have the study cover west Texas, which is not part of the Colorado basin but is potently represented in Congress. The deadline for completion of the importation plan, together with the supporting feasibility studies and cost estimates, would be 31 December 1970.

Arizona's need for CAP, deemed urgent because of the steady loss of existing farm land as ground-water supplies decline and pumping becomes uneconomic, is the great driving force behind H.R. 4671. Representative UDALL concedes that CAP might be financed without the canyon dams, but he contends that the dams, dubbed "cash registers" for the Development Fund, are needed to help finance the importation system and other Lower Basin projects of the future.

In any event, if either the provision for the dams or that for the importation study were struck from the bill, the Arizona delegation might find that its basin allies, who were expected to support the provision for CAP, had vanished, like Indians into the wilderness. In fact, even with the revenue-producing dams and the importation study provided for in the bill, Arizona has had to make a major concession in order to obtain California's support for CAP. Arizona has agreed to give California's quota of 4.4 million acre-feet priority over its own quota of 2.8 million acre-feet, which the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed in 1963 after 12 years of litigation.

The five Upper Basin reclamation projects—three of them too marginal to get Bureau of the Budget approval—have been included in H.R. 4671 as part of the price Representative UDALL has had to pay for the state of Colorado's support for CAP. UDALL is not hostile to reclamation in the Upper Basin, but inclusion of the five projects, which would be built at a total cost of $361.4 million, does not make his bill more attractive politically. Colorado can speak softly on such matters and still be heard. One of her citizens, Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, is chairman of the House Interior Committee.

The foregoing sketch of basin politics does not do full justice to the complexities of the subject but is to be taken as a primer from which one may safely conclude that Colorado water policy is not arrived at by pure reason. Plans made for one part of the basin must take into account the desires and interests, legitimate and otherwise, of every other part of the basin.

Moreover, water project development in the West is characterized by a high degree of institutional rigidity. The policies of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, and the laws which govern those policies, are such that decisions on water projects are made within a rather narrow range of choice. The Bureau's contribution to the development of the West, as in the Salt River Project which has made modern Phoenix possible, cannot be gainsaid. But the Bureau cannot be expected to render objective judgments when faced, say, with a choice between recommending the construction of power dams in the Grand Canyon and recommending the construction of steam plants fired by the Southwest's abundant coal or by nuclear fuel.

The Bureau never has built thermal plants. It is not eager to start a fight with the private utility industry by proposing to build some. In fact, Secretary Udall has been making peace with the utilities by finally reaching agreements, after long controversy, for the sharing of cost-saving interregional transmission networks.

Traditionally, the Bureau has looked, with the blessing of Congress, to hydroelectric plants as the revenue-producing units for its "basin account," a device sometimes used to encourage acceptance of water projects which would have trouble standing on their own. Representative ASPINALL and many of his colleagues on the Interior Committee, which is dominated by Westerners, have, or think they have, a vested interest in continuing to have things done in the traditional manner.

To no one's surprise, when the Pacific Southwest Water Plan was proposed in 1964, the Bureau of Reclamation recommended the construction of the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams.

Although H.R. 4671 would authorize both dam projects, the Johnson administration has recommended the construction now of only one—the $238.6-million Marble Canyon dam. This dam is planned for a site 12.5 miles north of Grand Canyon National Park but still within the area known to geologists as the Grand Canyon.

The Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the administration, has said that a decision on Bridge Canyon dam, which would cost an estimated $511.3 million, should be deferred. The Bureau has recommended the establishment of a national water commission and indicated that this commission should study the dam's effect on Grand Canyon National Monument and National Park, along with the dam's relation to regional water needs and the various alternatives for meeting those needs.

Bridge Canyon dam would be in the Grand Canyon's lower reaches, well below the monument and the park, but its 93-mile-long reservoir would extend through the entire length of the monument and through 13 miles of that part of the canyon's inner gorge which forms the park's northwest boundary. Rising to a height of 736 feet, the dam would have a generating capacity of 1.5 million kilowatts, compared to the 600,000-kilowatt capacity of the 310-foot Marble Canyon dam. Having better than twice the other dam's potential for production of power and revenue, the Bridge Canyon dam is the one the Bureau of Reclamation and the sponsors of H.R. 4671 really want.

The Bureau is, to say the least, doing nothing to discourage an idea, which has been circulating among the bill's sponsors, that a deal should be struck with the conservationists. The proposition would be (i) to abandon the proposal to build Marble Canyon dam and to have the National Park's boundaries extended northward to take in Marble Canyon, and (ii) to build Bridge Canyon dam with the agreement that this dam would be the last Grand Canyon dam ever to be built. But there is virtually no chance that the conservation groups—certainly not the Sierra Club—will concede that Bridge Canyon dam should be built. They can be expected to continue denouncing the Bridge Canyon proposal as contrary to the Grand Canyon National Park Act. The act would permit dams and reservoirs necessary for reclamation projects to be built in the park, but only when such construction is consistent with the park's primary purpose of preserving the canyon's scenery, wildlife, and "natural and historic objects."

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, the Interior Committee's ranking Republican member and a caustic critic of the Bureau of Reclamation, has introduced a bill drafted by the Sierra Club that would enlarge the part to take in the entire Grand Canyon from Lee Ferry at the beginning of Marble Canyon to Grand Wash Cliffs at the head of Lake Mead. The bill would prohibit construction of any dams in the park.

Ironically, the Sierra Club and the Bureau of Reclamation both revere, as a spiritual antecedent, John Wesley Powell, the one-armed Union Army veteran and geologist whose Grand Canyon expedition of 1869, by small boat, was one of history's great adventures.

"We are three-quarters of a mile in the depths of the earth," wrote Powell in his journal, "and the great river shrinks into insignificance, as it dashes its angry waves against the walls and cliffs, that rise to the world above; they are but puny ripples, and we are but pigmies, running up and down the sands, or lost among the boulders. We have an unknown distance yet to run; an unknown river to explore. What falls there are, we know not; what rocks beset the channel, we know not; what walls rise over the river, we know not. Ah, well! we may conjecture many things. The men talk as cheerfully as ever; jests are bandied about freely this morning; but to me the cheer is somber and the jests are ghastly."

Powell's journal provides a classic account of a journey down a "wild river"—a term much used by conservationists, including the Secretary of the Interior. According to Georgie White, a white-water adventurer who has gone down rivers in Alaska, Canada, and Central America as well as in the Southwest, the Colorado, on its 280-mile course through the Grand Canyon, is the wildest river of them all. The only point of contact with the outside world is at Phantom Ranch, the Park Service camp on Bright Angel Creek for hikers and mule riders who take the Kaibab or Bright Angel trail to descend into the canyon from the South Rim.

The Sierra Club wants to preserve the free-flowing river—all of it, not just the 116 miles that would be left between the foot of Marble Canyon dam and the upper end of the reservoir behind Bridge Canyon dam. The club wants the inner gorge left undisturbed, preserving a unique geological record and the river which helped to write it. The club is outraged that spots such as Vasey's Paradise, a place of mosses, ferns, and flowering plants below a fountain that gushes from the side of Marble Canyon, would be drowned by the water rising behind Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon dams.

The National Park Service, in a 1963 report, also criticized the Bridge Canyon dam proposal. Edwin D. McKee, now with the U.S. Geological Survey, was quoted as saying, in a paper prepared in 1942 when he was a Park Service naturalist, that the Bridge Canyon project, which was already being considered, would obscure important geologic features. The greatest losses, McKee said, would be in and to the west of Toroweap Valley, in the National Monument, where the rising waters would conceal features illustrating local volcanism and the early stages of canyon cutting, as well as remnants of lavas that flowed down the river channel and sediments showing that, in two places, lakes had formed behind lava dams.

The Park Service observed that the upper reaches of the reservoir would lie between Havasu Creek and Kanab Creek, an area deemed by some to be among the most scenic in the National Park. Silt and debris would accumulate in this section of the park, the report predicted.

A DIPLOMATIC SILENCE

Strangely, however, the report said the Marble Canyon dam would have little effect on the National Park. This judgment conflicts with the view held by Park Service men now serving at Grand Canyon. It is fair to say that for the National Park Service, an Interior Department agency, to give no quarter in criticizing proposals favored, or likely to be favored, by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the House Interior Committee would not be playing the game in the most prudent bureaucratic manner.

Bureau of Reclamation officials insist that the objections to construction of the two dams that have been raised by the Sierra Club and its allies in the Park Service and elsewhere have been wildly pessimistic. For example, the Bureau discounts predictions that construction of Marble Canyon dam and of Coconino dam, which would be built on the Little Colorado River to keep Bridge Canyon reservoir from silting up, would leave the Colorado a tame river—too tame, even during spring runoffs, to flush out the boulders and other debris that wash into the river from side canyons to form natural dams and rapids.

The Bureau also contends that releases of water for power generation during hours of peak demand would keep the channel scoured and the river flowing freely. Siltation below Kanab Creek, where the Bridge Canyon reservoir would begin, would be minimal because the Coconino dam, together with Marble Canyon dam and the de-silting dam on the Paria River, would turn the now silt-laden Colorado into trout water, the Bureau says.

The Bureau regards conservationists of the Sierra Club type as people who are possibly sincere, but impractical and not a little selfish. Why, otherwise, would they oppose dam projects which, besides serving as "cash registers," would open up the inner canyon to tens of thousands of sightseers who would take boat trips on the reservoirs? Many of the conservationists, for their part, look on the reclamationists as Philistines who would gladly count in "fishermen man-days" to improve a project's cost-benefit ratio but who sneer whenever anyone mentioned natural beauty.

The Sierra Club says that the dams, besides being a desecration, would not be the best means of producing revenues for the Lower Basin Development Fund. One club study uses the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures as a basis for concluding that the Central Arizona Project could be paid for without any new revenue-earning facilities at all—just by using the future earnings of Hoover and other existing dams.

One expert witness to testify for the Sierra Club at recent House hearings on H.R. 4671 was Alan P. Carlin, a Rand Corporation economist. He said that neither Marble Canyon nor Bridge Canyon dam, despite the admitted flexibility of hydroelectric power in serving peak demands, would be as efficient as a nuclear plant, or a nuclear plant combined with a pumped storage plant, which would use the same water repeatedly by pumping it from a lower to an upper storage basin and running it through the turbines at hours of peak demand. Not only would these plants be cheaper to build than the power dams but transmission costs would be lower, Carlin said. They would be built, not in the bowels of the earth, but in or near urban areas of high power demand.

Representative UDALL and the Bureau of Reclamation have, of course, contested Carlin's findings. But UDALL himself has said that the most significant problem raised by proposals to build nuclear or coal-fired generating plants as an alternative to the dams is not economic but political.

UDALL has contended, moreover, that, if the federal government doesn't build the dams, they will be built by non-federal interests. License applications by the Arizona Power Authority and the City of Los Angeles are now pending before the Federal Power Commission, which 2 years ago was directed by Congress not to grant licenses for the two sites before 31 December 1966. Even with the expiration of the licensing moratorium, however, the commission may find itself under restraints. Last December a U.S. Court of Appeals told FPC it would have to reconsider its decision to permit construction of a pumped storage plant at Storm King Mountain on the Hudson River. The preservation of natural beauty should be a basic concern in comparing the desirability of the proposed plant with possible alternatives, the court indicated.

Because the water importation study is essential to the compromise on H.R. 4671, resistance by the Northwest to the bill's provision for such a study may prove as great an obstacle to passage as the conservationists' opposition to the Grand Canyon dams. This study is not easily reconciled with the study which the proposed National Water Commission would undertake. A bill to create the commission, submitted by the administration and sponsored by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, and 48 other senators, was passed by the Senate on 9 June.

The commission, to be made up of seven private citizens, would have 5 years to study water resource policy problems in a national perspective. Its mandate, as defined in the Interior Committee's report, would be to consider alternative solutions to water problems "without prior commitment to any interest group, region, or agency of government."

COOLNESS IN THE COMMITTEE

The commission bill has struck few sparks of enthusiasm in the House Interior Committee, where its fate now rests. Supporters of H.R. 4671 are understandably reluctant to trust such a commission to come up with a water importation plan for the Colorado basin. Yet, unless they can agree to do so, the reclamation states will be seriously divided on the bill, for there is little chance that Senator Jackson and the Northwest ever will agree to the importation study. It is now proposed that the study be placed under the aegis of the new interagency Water Resources Council, which Secretary Udall chairs, but this supposedly mollifying gesture isn't likely to soften the opposition. Indeed, JACKSON has rejected even a proposal to have the national commission give priority consideration to the Southwest's water needs.

For Secretary Udall, who must feel some anguish at the criticism he has received from his friends in the conservation movement over the dam proposals, the National Water Commission might well prove a blessing. The commission, if it ever receives House approval and is set up, could search for ways to loosen the regional and institutional rigidities that now bind water resource development planning. It is a large task, but the commission might even discover a solution to the Southwest's water problems that would keep dams out of the Grand Canyon and allow Colorado basin politicians to keep their heads above water.—LUTHER J. CARTER

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on the final rollcall vote, No. 165, on H.R. 15750, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, I was in the Chamber and did not hear my name. Had I heard my name called, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER. The statement will be in the RECORD.

ATLANTIC STUDIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I invited the attention of this body to a program of studies on the Atlantic Community being conducted by the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community. The committee consists of:

Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana.

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Republican, of Michigan.

Representative DON CLAUSEN, Republican, of California.

Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Representative ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas.

Representative HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Representative JAMES D. MARTIN, Republican, of Alabama.

Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON, Republican, of Maryland.

Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota.

Representative OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York.

Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, chairman.

In this program, essays on Atlantic Community topics have been prepared by foreign policy experts and referred to Congressmen for comment.

Today I wish to draw your attention to a statement prepared for our committee by Dr. Hendrik Brugmans, rector of the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium. In the midfifties, Dr. Brugmans collaborated with Dr. Strausz-Hupe of the University of Pennsylvania to lay the groundwork for what is now the Atlantic Institute, a private international research organization directed by a group of prominent persons from many of the Atlantic nations. Dr. Brugman's statement is of particular interest at this time in view of the recent visit of the President of France to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Brugmans believes that President de Gaulle has brought home to the Europeans generally that they can now stand on their own feet and should now be more independent of the United States. Noting that real life is springing up again in east-central Europe, Mr. Brugmans further recommends that East-West relations be examined afresh, perhaps with an economic and cultural Marshall plan for Eastern Europe.

The full text of Dr. Brugman's statement follows:

ATLANTIC POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE

I

Less than ten years ago, there was much talk about an "Atlantic Community" to be established. Today, this phrase has lost a great deal of its significance, and is used with considerable care.

This has two reasons.

On the one hand, the rise of the European Common Market has given a new, specific meaning to the word "Community", which

stands now, in practice, for a group of nations in a process of supranational integration.

On the other hand, President de Gaulle (whatever his style and wording) has brought home to the Europeans at large, that they can stand now on their own feet and should therefore be more independent of the United States. In fact, he has given them a sense of dignity, which is not going to disappear when he will have left the political scene. Whatever the future holds in stock, there will be no "restoration" in that respect.

Henceforward, we can talk about "partnership", but not of "community" in the strict sense which the term has acquired recently. Consequently, we should give some thought to the future structure of our Western world, so much the more so as N.A.T.O. has to be renewed three years from here. Structures are always the reflection of a balance of forces, of aspirations, hopes and interests, convergent or conflicting. Let us therefore ask ourselves how the situation is now, what our aims and targets are, and how we are to achieve them. Two main factors have changed international relations since 1949: first, *the Russian threat has substantially diminished*. On the one hand, Khrushchev's successors have hardly been able to consolidate their power, and inner opposition is a force to reckon with. On the other, the U.S.S.R. is at loggerheads with Red China, which means that it has a huge Eastern frontier to protect; consequently, it is unlikely that it will embark in military (or even political) adventures in the West; although the future remains unpredictable per definition, it seems probable that the two "crises" which Russia opened around Berlin, will not be followed by a third one; even the infamous "wall" might work here as an element of international stability. In any case, we have moved far away from the days when Monsieur Spaak voiced the feelings of most Europeans, in his unforgotten U.N. speech: "Nous avons peur". Today, Europeans are no longer "afraid" and this deprives us of an integrating force.

Secondly, as already indicated, the "economic miracle" they see around them, gives the Europeans a feeling of self-confidence which is new. True, this "miracle" was made possible by the Marshall-plan, but this was twenty years ago. Today, Europe no longer automatically looks to Washington for help, guidance and advice; only some smaller countries are still willing to leave world-politics to the U.S., but that is part of their neutralist past rather than of their Atlantic conviction. Although not yet powerful enough to match American economic dynamism, Europe already asks itself how it might achieve a position of equal partnership with America, not only in words but in reality. It has come to resent the constant flow of its scientists to the U.S. and the growing American "infiltration" on our industrial market, especially in its technologically most progressive sectors.

These facts will remain overwhelmingly important, with or without President de Gaulle. The "status quo ante" will not return, and in these circumstances, America should not take it for granted that Europe should "normally" be an unconditional ally. The alliance, desirable though it still is, should be redefined, both in political and frontier-guards, with the whole weight of N.A.T.O. is no longer axiomatic: it has become a matter of debate. New arguments are required.

Finally, we have to state that the feeling of greater self-confidence and the longing for greater independence of the U.S. cannot simply be described as "Europeans," as we did earlier. It is to a large extent more "national" than consciously continental. Here too de Gaulle is a symbol and a symptom rather than an accident.

If we are to counter the threat of resurgent Nationalism in Europe—and Nationalism is today a factor of Western disintegration—we should do so with intellectual and emotional weapons, different from those we could use 12 years ago. If the Atlantic world is to be organized, it should be done through concrete proposals and inspiring concepts, which correspond to our present needs.

II

In the military field, the great new fact is of course the apparition of two national "striking forces" in Europe, one of which at least, the French, can hardly be expected to be neatly integrated into any Atlantic whole. What should our policy be there, in a field which has to be considered as more and more "hot"? The "bomb" is becoming an obsession in people's minds and, as disarmament negotiations seem to become a senseless routine-business for experts, public opinion looks out for a statesmanlike perspective.

Is it enough to protest against "proliferation?" Certainly not. As things develop now, it seems reasonable to foresee that, in about ten or fifteen years, a certain number of medium-sized nations will have built up their nuclear defence. This may well seem deplorable to a country like the U.S., which enjoyed atomic monopoly until 1949, but there is every probability that super-weapons will become less expensive and therefore move into the range of national aspirations everywhere, be it for real military reasons or simply for prestige. Moreover, a moral condemnation of such a desire, when it comes from a nation which has thrown the bombs on Japan, does hardly sound convincing to newcomers, to "have-not's" and "have recently's". In other words, if the claim for non-proliferation is to have any appeal at all, American proposals should not only suggest that others stop building atom-bombs. They should also show what America intends to do with her own, short of which she will be accused of hypocrisy. In this respect, let us remember the action made to discredit the test-ban treaty of Moscow. Making the atomic club a closed shop will not do.

Before coming to our suggestions, let us make one remark first.

It seems wrong to be entirely hypnotized by the problem of who is going to pull the atomic "trigger." Of course, the final decision will always be taken by a very small team, if not by one man alone. This is true, whatever our Atlantic structures. But those who will have the fateful responsibility of "pushing the button or not," are not or should not be isolated from the community in the name of which and for the protection of which they act. They should know what their people or peoples would be prepared to consider as an acceptable "casus belli." In other words, the problem does not really lie with the "moment supreme", but with the political, popular consensus to be achieved beforehand. All concerned must be convinced that, whatever happens, they have been able to raise their voices and participate effectively in the decision-making process. When President Kennedy made his historic speech during the Cuba-crisis, he of course did not consult his 50 States. But the 50 States recognized him as their legitimate President.

Unfortunately, the Europeans have no reason as yet to consider the man in the White House as "their" President. They may like or dislike him, but he is not their elected chief, however much his decisions bind them in actual fact. This dichotomy now creates feelings of frustration, as one never knows whether the American leader who speaks and acts, does so as a national or an Atlantic Statesman. Many Europeans remarked with great concern that the Cuba-speech contained several mentions of "this hemisphere", but no reference to the defense of the free world. None the less, the final decision might have meant atomic war—also for Europe.

Here lies an institutional problem of paramount importance, the issue being between hegemony and partnership. How can the latter be organised?

In our opinion, only by the creation of an Atlantic body, with both military and political competences, fully equipped to prepare and finally make the fundamental decisions in the field of world-politics, including the decision to apply force, even nuclear force. In other words: I would propose an *Atlantic Council for World-Affairs*, to which the U.S. and the States of Europe should surrender part of their political and military sovereignty. In fact, it seems useless to complain that the allies are lukewarm in their support of American actions, for example in Vietnam. How could they be more enthusiastic, as they have never been consulted beforehand, even less participated in the debate that prepared the intervention? The Vietnam-war is not theirs and they cannot be expected to act as a "claque", applauding what they never were able to discuss. In practice, the Americans see themselves today in the same position as the French twelve years ago: they ask for support, but did not offer a share in the policy-making process.

The first and most important function of such an Atlantic Council would be to preserve peace in freedom, and set up a machinery for arbitration and peaceful change. As it would have the whole nuclear potential of the Western world at its disposal, it would take up the basic idea of the Baruch plan: supranational government "with teeth", its competence being however strictly limited to the function of a "world-police". For the time being, its geographic area would of course be limited to the States around the Atlantic, but it is no longer entirely utopian to envisage that maybe one day the Soviet Union would join the institution. No doubt that such proposals are radical, even revolutionary ones. But two factors should not be forgotten:

First, the present "balance of terror" (however preferable to no balance at all) can hardly be expected to remain the last word of international relations; sooner or later, fresh thinking should be done and new proposals made, in order to promote less provisional solutions;

Secondly, it seems difficult to underestimate the widespread pacifist feeling all over the world, including the U.S. itself. In the "battle of minds" which is going on, we should not be afraid of being "utopian" for a while; plans which seem utterly unpracticable when they are launched, may well be considered wise sooner than foreseen.

III

Of course, such an "Atlantic Council" (whatever its institutional form and competences: Federal or Confederal) will be extremely difficult to be set up—even if the U.S. would be willing—as long as Europe is weak and disrupted by Nationalism. If there is to be a real "partnership on equal footing," this cannot be achieved between one organised Continent on the side and a loose group of quarreling States on the other. In a certain sense, President de Gaulle was right when he suggested in 1958 that N.A.T.O. should be reorganised and ruled henceforward by a "condominium" of the "Big Three." Of course, President Eisenhower was also right when he declined the offer, answering that this would reduce the other allies to a state of second class mutes. None the less, it is only too obvious that no international organisation can work when composed by a multiplicity of countries, each of them being very different from the others, in size, power and political orientation. In fact, the situa-

tion today is, that there is no political leadership in N.A.T.O. at all, whereas the emergency-bonds of 1949 become weaker and weaker.

In this situation of deadlock and sterility, which was the cause of Monsieur Spaak's resignation as Secretary General, the suggestion of an Atlantic Council as mentioned above would have the notable advantage to make things move again. In fact, it would kill two birds with one stone and function as a sort of *"political Marshall-plan."* Real participation in world-politics, i.e., real participation in decision-making, should be made conditional of European integration. In fact this would not mean an offer "with strings," but the sober statement that the proposed Council could only work in practice insofar as Europe would be prepared to speak with one voice and act with one will. Moreover, there is nothing against "strings," provided they are woven intelligently.

So far, European Federalism is the only new political idea put forward on the Eastbanks of the Atlantic Ocean. But it has been shown continuously that the old self-conscious nations of Europe are not willing to give up part of their political sovereignty and independence. Everybody pays lip-service to the desirability of coming closer together, but each time the basic question arose, the governments backed out. That was the case in 1949 with the Council of Europe, in 1954 with the Defence Community (which included political integration) and recently, when the problem of majority-rule was put forward. Probably, the European States will not have the courage of setting up a workable Federation, as long as there is no "bait." The "political Marshall-plan" mentioned above, would provide such a "bait."

Do the Europeans accept to be prosperous but non-existent in world-affairs? Do they wish to unite economically and become a sort of "greater Holland", or a neutral Switzerland? If so, there is no problem and consequently no solution. But if we are right in thinking that the relatively great success of Gaullism, also outside France, is due to a feeling of political frustration to which the Europeans are subject—then, an offer of this kind would have an explosive effect, and be of lasting historic value. It would mean that the American Administration would be ready to open its world-political dossiers and share the responsibility for their handling with the Europeans . . ., provided they care to unite politically. In still other words, European unity would be the precondition of Atlantic integration, and, at the same time, the perspective of real Atlantic partnership would give an indispensible new impetus to European union.

Maybe such an Atlantic co-operation in nuclear and political world-affairs should be complemented by a new edition of the European Defense Community as far as "classical" weapons are concerned. In fact, why should not the Europeans rather than the Americans be responsible for the defense of their own sector, now that it probably will not be "hot", at least for the time being? "Partnership" also means that each partner is strong enough to meet the other without inferiority-complexes: it therefore seems advisable to let the Europeans be their own frontier-guards, while the whole weight of Atlantic nuclear defense behind them.

IV

Finally, it would be wrong to leave the East-Central European peoples out of consideration here. The times of Stalinism are over, in spite of occasional setbacks. True, the Communist governments in power beyond the Iron Curtain would probably prefer to be at the same time more independent of Moscow and less dependent on their own resurgent public opinion. In any case, real life is springing up again in these countries, which so many men of little faith deemed already lost for ever. In his latest book, "Europa Grossmacht oder Schlachtfeld", Dr. Otto Habsburg (as he calls himself now) makes this point strongly and rightly. In fact, "Mitteleuropa", the community of nations described by Professor Oscar Halecki in his "Borderlands of Western Civilization", is becoming a world-political factor again. It has already ceased to be a group of passive "satellites".

This means that we can no longer be content with shedding some tears on the graves of their freedom. New opportunities arise, but this forces us to do some new thinking. Things are on the move, whatever we do, but we should have a line of action of our own. Violent revolution seems to be out of the question: the non-intervention from the West in 1956 (and, earlier, in the German rising of 1953) has brought home to the peoples of the European East that they have to count only on themselves ("farà da se"). However, we can try to help and support them in a political non-warlike way.

Up to now, the re-orientation of those nations has mainly been directed to gaullist France. Striving for greater national independence (if not for inner liberalization), Rumania contacted Paris. In Poland, where the movement against totalitarian rule is more powerful, the government tried to win the backing of President de Gaulle, and profit by the traditional friendship between the two countries. This seems only too normal. Of course, the peoples East of the Curtain know that America is by far the strongest partner in the West, and that was the political meaning of the triumphal welcome they gave to men like Richard Nixon and Robert Kennedy. But at the same time, they consider natural to renew their bonds with their fellow-Europeans in the West, rather than expect everything from the far-away American "imperialists".

Consequently, it seems desirable that the whole problem of East-West relations should be examined afresh, first of all in the economic sphere. Here too, there should be a "bait" for opening up the doors: *an economic and cultural "Marshall-plan" for Eastern Europe,* of the type suggested by Professor Brzezinski in his book, "Alternative to Partition". A plan, financed by Americans and West-Europeans together, but administered by them and the Eastern governments concerned.

Here too, "conditions" should be put forward.

On the one hand, "liberalization" should be "rewarded", and political backwardness "penalized": in fact, there is no reason to believe that Western help would automatically result in greater freedom. But the "strings" imposed in order to promote it would no doubt be popular in Eastern public opinion.

On the other hand, multilateral co-operation between the beneficiaries should be made conditional, like in 1947 for the West. We are well aware of the fact that this second condition seems to contradict the ideas which have sometimes been predominant so far. In fact, it was thought in the recent past, that any kind of Nationalism in the Curtain-countries served our purposes, as it meant disintegration of the Eastern bloc.

Such a policy, however, seems to be short-sighted. The days of Nationalism are over, and it would be all too easy for the Kremlin to argue that the West, again, is "reactionary", as it tries to foster out-dated "sovereign rights". And this would be right!

We therefore should stress that, although national identity of all peoples should be maintained, the modern world is looking out for larger, plurinational concentrations, not for chauvinistic separatism. Here the example of the Common Market can be used as a possible model, as well as the attempts to create an Economic Community in Latin America. Thus, East-Central Europe could give another version of the universal trend towards Regionalism, and America should give it her full support. It was good to promote the independence of the former satellites vis-a-vis Soviet imperialism, but it will be better to support a lasting co-operation between the Sates concerned. A "buffer-region" beween Western Europe and the U.S.S.R. would be a factor of détente, as it would give Russia the certitude that her Western borders are safe.

How are political perspectives likely to develop? It is difficult to say, but probably the East-Central countries will discover a concrete similarity in their situation, so that it is not utopian to foresee that a kind of more collectivist edition of E.E.C. might be created, probably in co-operation with, but not subservient to the U.S.S.R.

Will the Soviet Union participate herself in such a program? That is perhaps not impossible. But even if she stays out, she would have the greatest difficulties in stopping her former "satellites" who want to take the risk. In any case, even if such an offer from the West would be rejected, both by the U.S.S.R. and the "Borderland"-countries, it would have an impact on public opinion and give a shock. Inside and outside the Communist Parties, there would be lively discussion on the subject. How in fact could they refuse altogether, confronted as they are with huge economic problems?

A new American-European plan of help and co-operation would mean that we would again be an active factor there. But much will depend on the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

Finally, any policy towards the East should give an answer to *the German question.* Those Germans are wrong who think that their problem of national "re-unification" can be solved apart from the European problem as a whole. For the moment, the Soviet-controlled part of Germany is still the key of the situation, and the U.S.S.R. will certainly not give it up before a reasonable alternative will be offered. On the other hand, any form of national re-unification of Germany would be highly impopular in countries like Poland and Czechoslovakia—for understandable reasons.

It therefore should be made crystal-clear to all East-European powers, including the U.S.S.R., and to public opinion, that any German "revisionist" move as concerns the Oder-Neisse frontier or the Sudetenland, would strongly be opposed and drastically checked by Washington. The Germans have to choose: either a "New Deal" East of the Iron Curtain, including re-unification of the Federal Republic with the present "German Democratic Republic", or a continued strife over Eastern frontiers. They cannot count on Western support both for a re-unification-policy *and* a "revision" as envisaged in the agitation of the "Landsmannschaften".

In other words: pacification and democratization, should include the formal recognition of the Oder-Neisse borderline, by Bonn. It is wrong to keep as a "trump-card", what in reality is a pre-condition for the game to be started. Presently, the influence of the U.S. in the Federal Republic is very considerable. The U.S. should use it to make our German friends understand that the Eastern borderlines of Germany as a whole, are there to stay.

H. BRUGMANS,
Rector College of Europe.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our committee is indebted to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] for making a study of Dr. Brugmans' statement. The gentleman is a member of the Joint Economic Committee and an expert in international monetary matters.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly an important paper, and a

clear and carefully thought out statement.

It is true, as Brugmans said, that the Europeans can now stand on their own feet and should therefore be more independent of the United States. It is also true that Europeans have an enhanced sense of dignity; but I seriously doubt that it is President de Gaulle who has "given" this to the Europeans.

Undoubtedly, as Brugmans suggested, the time is ripening for the reopening of dialog between East and West over the question of the division of Europe and the division of Germany. Certainly it is true that the immediacy of a military threat from Russia toward Western Europe has diminished; certainly it is true that the days of Stalinism and even of Khrushchev are gone. Certainly it is true that Europe has a new sense of dignity and a surging sense of strength.

If, however, these impulses are to be maintained and not destroyed, then it is most inappropriate to speak or think in terms of following De Gaulle, who would fragment Western Europe, or of emphasizing European unity at the expense of Atlantic community. An East-West dialog can lead to peace, opportunity, and security, only when the West is unified, not fragmented.

I hope that nothing in Brugmans' paper would be taken in any other way.

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see where our British friends are continuing to allow their ships to supply North Vietnam and Prime Minister Wilson piously has said England will not sell arms to the United States because England disapproves of the U.S. bombing of North Vietnamese petroleum dumps and other military targets.

That is England's privilege. I do not want America to purchase arms from Great Britain anyway. The United States should have its own munitions industry. Our national security demands that we do not depend on anyone for arms.

I do object, however, to the holier-than-thou attitude of John Bull. What is the difference between arms and naval vessels? Why is not the United Kingdom consistent? After all, England's Ministry of Defense on behalf of a British shipyard has just underbid our American yards on some naval survey ships.

If the low-wage foreigners want to stand on principle, let them say, which is true, naval vessels even noncombatant ones, are a form of munitions. These new ships will have a role, indirectly at least, in resisting Communist aggression. Therefore, in all conscience, the British should abstain and not contract to build American naval vessels in British shipyards.

Meanwhile, I hope the House Committee on Armed Services will hold hearings on my bill to require all naval vessels to be constructed in American shipyards.

Mr. Speaker, no great world power with any sense would ever depend upon foreign nations to supply it with weapons or facilities or ships of war. Two naval survey ships might not seem important and not too serious were it not for a precedent. Once the United States establishes a new policy, the damage will have been done.

Congress should kill this Trojan horse program now—once and for all. Congress should insist that the Defense Department place its order in American yards.

Thereby, our pious foreign friends will be made to feel truly righteous. Let us help our English cousins abide in the paths of the righteous.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Food for Freedom Act of 1966 came up for discussion a number of times today during the debate on the foreign aid bill. While it is not a subject of direct concern in the foreign aid bill, an amendment adopted to the food-for-freedom bill should be of concern to all of us. On June 9, 1966, the House adopted an amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. PIKE] which would permit fish concentrate to be exported under Public Law 480 without prior approval from the Food and Drug Administration.

Public Law 480 presently provides that fish concentrate may be moved under the authority of that act only upon approval from the Food and Drug Administration. I objected to the amendment and the concern I expressed at that time has only increased. Let me quote what I said on this matter during the floor debate on the Pike amendment:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. When fishery products were included, they did not include fish concentrate because that had not been approved by the Food and Drug Administration.
>
> I do not believe it would be wise for us to pawn off on people of other countries food we do not permit to be sold to the people in our country. I do not believe we ought to sell fish concentrate to people of other countries until the Food and Drug Administration determines it is acceptable for human use.
>
> What the amendment would do is, by legislative intent, to say that fish concentrate, which includes all parts of the fish, could be sold under the Public Law 480 program. What would happen if it should be found that these fish products for some people in other countries caused some diseases or even death, and the Food and Drug Administration had not approved it? That would surely redound to the discredit of the United States.
>
> We in the United States demand that every food product which is sold for human consumption have the approval of the Food and Drug Administration. Until fish concentrate can get that approval, I believe the language ought to remain in the Act. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment. I believe it would be terribly unwise for the Congress to remove the language. This is not insignificant; it is extremely important. An interest in the fishing industry is not enough. We have the same problems with respect to other industries. Other commodities are subjected to certain economic difficulties because they cannot sell their product for a period of time. Cranberries had that difficulty a little while ago.
>
> Unless we are certain the product is healthful, that it will not create harm, we have denied to the industry the opportunity to sell it in this country. I rise in opposition to the amendment which would permit the dumping of fish concentrate on unsuspecting people in developing countries when the Food and Drug Administration still feels it is unfit for human consumption.

The significant part of my objection was based on the unknown effects of fish concentrate on other peoples of the world. I have recently come across an article appearing in a recent issue of the New Zealand Dairy Exporter containing some sobering implications in the drive to produce new fish protein concentrates and ship them to developing nations.

The author of the article is Sir Ernest Marsden, fellow of the Royal Society, Britain's oldest scientific society, and elder statesman of science in New Zealand. I believe his observations command more than passing note. Before I read the pertinent sections of the article, however, let me point out that early in the article Sir Marsden reports that Japanese studies of stomach cancer conducted by the National Cancer Center at Tokyo under Dr. T. Hirayama find:

> A positive correlation, of borderline significance, was indicated between the endemicity of stomach cancer in Japan and the local custom of taking certain highly salted foods, such as certain fish products, and possibly salted beans.

In the article Sir Ernest Marsden goes on to explain:

> In regard to the indication that certain salted fish products were conducive to higher incidence of stomach cancer, that is, apart from the larger influence of milk consumption habits, it is to be noted that small plankton scavenge radioactive substances from sea water and become very radioactive, chiefly from acquired polonium. I have found this to be a world-wide phenomenon. Plankton in turn pass on the polonium activity to bivalve shell fish such as mussels, cockles, pipis, etc. and also to certain small fish and thence to larger predatory fish where it moves mainly to the offal with little to the white flesh.

This indicates to me that the assumption that anything from the sea is pure for human consumption is surely false. Fish concentrate contains all the fish including the entrails and this, of course, means the offal as well.

The effect of this fish diet on certain people was included in Sir Ernest Marsden's article of which again I quote:

> The effect of this on the Maoris and Polynesians who consume large quantities of shell fish, etc., has already been pointed out by the author and incidentally also it is to be noted that the Maori incidence of stomach cancer, etc., is very high compared with that of Europeans.
>
> It would be of great interest to examine the radioactivity of the salted fish product referred to by Dr. Hirayama, as a significant portion of the diet of Japanese. Previous to my suggestions, Dr. Hirayama was inclined to ascribe the stomach cancer effect to the excess salt, which is perhaps not unreasonable. However, it may well be that a correlation may be found with the radio-

activity of the fish product in question, rather than with the quantity of salt consumed.

Similar reasoning may be applied to the case of Baltic fishermen who have an incidence of gastro-intestinal cancer four times that of the inland population who do not eat large quantities of smoked fish products; likewise there is a high incidence of gastric cancer in Iceland. Hitherto, these effects have generally been considered as due to possible carcinogenic compounds in the smoke, etc., but may it not be that it is the particular kind of fish product which is more important and the amount consumed?

It would appear to me that approval by this Congress of fish protein concentrate without Food and Drug Administration approval is a hazardous move. Untold damage could be done to our international relations should we be found guilty of pushing off on unfortunate peoples a food which possibly has a cancerous cloud over it. The little help that amendment might give to the fishing industry is nothing compared to the propaganda opportunities for people unfriendly to the United States, unless we make food available to other nations only when it is safe enough for our own peoples to eat.

SPIRIT OF VALLEY FORGE LIVES ON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Valley Forge lives on. It is a rare thing in this day and age to find people who are committed to the principles which make this Republic what it is. A front-page story carried in the New Concord, Ohio, Enterprise indicated a spirit that should be heart-warming to those who become cynical and think that our youth are beatniks carrying placards of protest and throwing beer cans at Fort Lauderdale. The truth of the matter is that most of our youth are doing a good job of living up to the American heritage in finding work in the summer, participating in scouting, 4-H activities and, yes, serving their country in its military commitments.

Lance Cpl. Harold Edward Boetcher, New Concord marine, lost his life in Vietnam in the service of his country. No eloquence could possibly assuage for the loss to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold A. Boetcher of Route 1, New Concord. Words cannot fill the void which must be in their lives.

Yet all Americans can gain inspiration for these troubled times in the statement of Corporal Boetcher's father at this time of tragic loss of life. He explained that his son "was most proud to be a marine and fought for what he believed. That was, according to Harold, he would rather fight Communists over there than he would over here."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the Boetchers but they must be great Americans. Their son would be just as proud of them as they must be of his convictions and the honor he was true to in the Nation's hour of need.

The article follows:

[From the New Concord (Ohio) Enterprise, June 23, 1966]

NEW CONCORD MARINE PAYS HIGHEST SACRIFICE IN VIETNAM AREA

Mr. and Mrs. Harold A. Boetcher of New Concord, Route 1, have been notified of the death of their son Lance Corporal Harold Edward Boetcher. His death, according to authorities, occurred Monday June 20, at Chui Lai, South Viet Nam. The Boetchers reside one half mile west of New Concord and just north of U.S. 40. They are formerly from California where their son enlisted in the Marine Corps. The body will be brought to the Mock Funeral Home in New Concord for services and burial.

Two Marine Corps members from Columbus delivered the first message of their son's death to the Boetchers. Then a telegram was delivered, which had been sent to Cambridge

Cpl. Boetcher, who was a member of D battery, Second Battalion, 11th Marine Division, was sent to South Viet Nam in mid-February. He had been in the Marine Corps since enlisting July 6, 1962, after six months in the National Guard.

Born in Mitpitas, Calif., July 26, 1946, he attended elementary school in Muskingum County but was graduated from high school in the California community before entering the service. The family returned to Muskingum County two years ago.

Surviving Cpl. Boetcher in addition to his parents are two brothers, James Boetcher of Mount Sterling and Norris Boetcher of New Concord Route 1 and a sister, Nancy Boetcher of the home.

Corporal Boetcher's father explained that his son "was most proud to be a marine and he fought for what he believed. That was, according to Harold, he would rather fight Communism over there than he would over here."

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY CASH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide a substantial increase in social security cash benefits and other needed improvements in the social security program.

Today over 88 percent of the people age 65 and over are getting social security benefits or—for a relatively small proportion—benefits provided by some other governmental retirement program. Yet the great majority of our old people are poor. In fact, they constitute between one-fifth and one-fourth of all the poor in the Nation.

The reason why old people are generally poverty-striken is that they must depend largely on social security benefits to meet their needs and these benefits are inadequate. Even at the upper levels, the benefits are barely sufficient to provide subsistence in most parts of the country. The average social security benefit at the close of 1965 was $82—$984 a year—for a retired worker who has no wife entitled to wife's benefits and $142—$1,704 a year—for a retired couple. According to a recent survey of social security beneficiaries about half of the aged social security beneficiaries—46 percent of the beneficiary couples and 60 percent of the nonmarried beneficiaries—had less than $12.50 a month in regular retirement income over and beyond their social security benefits.

Poverty and its attendant social evils can be eliminated for those able to work by improving job opportunities, by providing opportunities for them to obtain training in skills that will fit them for available jobs, and by providing a prosperous and expanding economic climate. But improving job opportunities cannot eliminate poverty for the great majority of people who are on the social security rolls. Work is not a practical possibility for them. The economic well-being of the old people, disabled workers, and widows and orphans that constitute this large group—more than one out of every 10 Americans—depends largely on the extent to which their social security benefits are adequate.

Thus it seems to me evident that a very substantial increase in social security benefits is needed if the program is to play a truly effective role in relieving and preventing poverty. Under my bill, all social security beneficiaries will be provided a substantial increase—50 percent on the average—in cash benefits beginning for January 1967. For aged workers, benefits will increase from a minimum of $44 to a minimum of $55, and the maximum eventually payable under the law, now $168, will increase to $407. The maximum monthly amount payable to a family will be increased from the present $368 to $610. A retired worker now getting the average benefit of $82 a month will get $118 a month, and the average benefit for an elderly couple will be increased from $142 a month to $231 a month. Thus the increase in benefits provided by my bill will represent a really significant step forward in our efforts to alleviate the problem of poverty among the retired aged.

But this is only one aspect of what my bill will do. Social security today is not just a mechanism for preventing poverty. With the broad coverage the program now has, practically everybody who works for a living—the average earner and the above-average earner, the urban businessman, the farmer, the professional self-employed, and the supervisor and manager—counts on social security benefits as a source of income for himself and his family in retirement, in the case of disability, or when death occurs. More than 9 out of 10 Americans look to the social security program to replace their usual work income if that income is cut off by one of these occurrences. And, in my bill to improve the overall protection afforded under social security, I have not overlooked the above-average earner.

There has been a substantial deterioration in social security protection, in relation to earnings levels, over the years. This deterioration is due to the failure to keep up to date the amount of earnings that is subject to social security taxes and that counts toward benefits—the contribution and benefit base. There have been several increases in the base since 1935, but all of them have consistently lagged behind the rise in earnings levels. For example, the increase in the

base to $6,600 under the 1965 amendments will, by 1967, only restore the situation that existed in 1951 with respect to the proportion of workers with all their earnings counted; it does not come anywhere near restoring the situation that existed in the early years of the program, under the $3,000 base. The result is that more and more workers have earnings above the creditable amount and therefore have insurance protection related to only a part of their earnings.

The $3,000 earnings base established by the 1935 Social Security Act had the effect of covering the total earnings of all but the most highly paid people. In 1938, about 97 percent of all workers and 94 percent of regularly employed men had all of their earnings covered by the $3,000 base. By providing an increase in the earnings base in two steps, to $12,000 beginning in 1967 and to $15,000 beginning in 1969, we will recapture all of the ground that has been lost since the beginning of the program. Setting the earnings base at these higher levels will, together with the average 50-percent increase in benefits, enable the program to offer, for workers at average and above-average earnings levels as well as for low-paid workers, social security benefits that compare reasonably with their accustomed levels of living.

In addition to improving the adequacy of social security benefits now, my bill also makes provision for keeping these benefits up to date once people start getting their benefits. Perhaps one of the most difficult problems facing people who are forced to live on a fixed pension is that economic conditions several years after the benefit is first paid are almost certain to be very much different from those prevailing when they retired. Even when benefits are reasonably adequate at the time they are awarded, they are likely to be nowhere nearly adequate some years later.

Thus far, this problem as it applies to our social security system has been attacked by making ad hoc changes in the system. In contrast, there are important advantages to having the adjustments made automatically as economic conditions warrant. One of the most important advantages is the feeling of security and the resultant peace of mind that will be afforded beneficiaries; they will know that their benefits will not fall behind as price levels change. By providing for the automatic adjustment of benefits to changes in the Consumer Price Index, my bill guarantees a beneficiary that his benefit will buy as much 10, 20, or 30 years after he came on the rolls as it bought at the time when he first came on the rolls. Both the civil service retirement and the military retirement systems now have provisions to automatically adjust benefits to increases in the cost of living. Such a provision for the social security system is overdue.

My bill also provides for automatic adjustments of the contribution and benefit base to increases in earnings levels. This continuing adjustment, in conjunction with the two-step increase in the base to $12,000 and to $15,000 that is provided in my bill, will assure that the social security program will continue to provide benefits that are reasonably related to the standards of living of the working population as a whole.

My bill includes still another provision that will have a significant effect on the amount of benefits payable. Under the present program a worker's retirement benefit is based on his average monthly earnings over a period of years measured up to the year he reaches age 65, if a man, and up to age 62, if a woman. Shortening by 3 years the period over which a man's average monthly earnings are figured, thereby making it the same as for women, will have a significant effect on the amount of the benefits payable to male earners and their families. For example, a man whose earnings were first covered in 1956, who had maximum creditable earnings in each year from then through 1966, and who attains age 62 and applies for reduced benefits in January 1967 would have his average monthly earnings computed over 14 years; his average monthly earnings—including 3 years of no earnings—would be $314 and his reduced old-age benefit, according to the benefit table in present law, would be $92.50; if all that my bill provided was an average 50 percent increase, his benefit would be increased to $146.60. Under my bill, his benefits will be computed over his 11 best years; his average monthly earnings will be $400 and his reduced old-age benefit, after taking account of the 50 percent increase, will be $168.70.

My bill also will provide important and urgently needed improvements in the protection afforded disabled people under the social security program. A major improvement in the protection of the disabled that will be made by my bill is the extension of health insurance protection under social security to people who are getting disability benefits. People who suffer severe disability are exposed to the same sharp drop in income and at least as great an increase in the cost of health care as retired workers, and the disabled worker may be less well prepared for the financial shock than is the retired worker. In addition, he often has great difficulty in getting health insurance coverage—perhaps even more difficulty than the aged person has. Thus the considerations that prompted us to provide health insurance for the aged under social security last year apply with equal force to the disabled.

The other improvements in the social security protection for the disabled which my bill will meet have to do with the conditions for payment of disability benefits.

Under present law, the older worker who incurs a physical handicap that prevents him from continuing in his usual occupation must, unless he is blind, be denied social security benefits, unless he is disabled to the extent that he cannot perform any substantial gainful work. My bill will fill this serious gap in the disability protection of many older workers by extending to all disabled workers age 60 through 64 a modified definition of disability similar to the definition that is now applicable to older blind workers. Benefits will be payable under this provision to older workers aged 60 through 64 who are unable because of their disabilities to perform work requiring skills and abilities comparable to those required in their previous usual occupations, but no benefits will be paid for any month in which an older worker meeting this special definition actually performs substantial gainful work.

My bill will also extend to all young workers who become totally disabled the same protection that is available under present law only to young workers who are disabled by blindness. Under present law, a disabled worker must, unless he is blind, have about 5 years of covered work during the 10-year period before he becomes disabled. This requirement is difficult, if not impossible, to meet if the worker has been in the labor force for a relatively short time. Under my bill, a worker who becomes totally disabled before age 31 will, regardless of the nature of his disability, be insured for disability benefits if he has covered work in half the period elapsing after age 21 and up to the time of his disability, with a minimum of about 1½ years of covered work.

My bill will also provide benefits for totally disabled widows, in cases where the widow became disabled before her husband's death or, in the case of a young widow, before her entitlement to benefits on the basis of having a child in her care ends, or within 7 years after either of these events. This is a period during which the widow may not have had sufficient opportunity to work so that she could become insured for disability protection on the basis of her own earnings. And, I want to point out that since these widows would be paid disability benefits, they would qualify for health insurance protection under the provision in the bill for extending health insurance protection to all people getting disability benefits. I think that disabled widows need to have this protection.

Finally, my bill will fill serious gaps in the survivor, disability, and retirement protection of large numbers of Federal employees and their families. In the many cases where workers have Federal service under the civil service or foreign service retirement systems but are not protected under one of those systems at the time they retire, become disabled, or die, my bill will provide social security protection by transferring credit for Federal employment to social security. The transfer-of-credit provisions in my bill are similar to a recommendation of the 1965 Advisory Council on Social Security, to a plan which was supported in a 1965 joint report of the Social Security Administration and the Civil Service Commission to the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to one of the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Federal staff retirement systems. It is a less expensive approach than one involving direct social security coverage because, unlike a coverage plan, which would generally involve payment of benefits under both social security and the staff retirement system, it will not go beyond the objective of filling gaps in protection. Also, the transfer-of-credits approach requires no reduction of benefit amounts payable under the staff-

retirement systems, and thus avoids an important objection that has been raised by organizations of Federal employees against coverage under social security.

To finance these major improvements in the social security program, I am proposing, in addition to the 2-step increase in the contribution and benefit base to $15,000, a provision for a payment from the general revenues of the Treasury to the social security trust funds and some adjustment in the contribution rates for the program.

The payment from general revenues, which will begin at one-half of 1 percent of taxable earnings in 1967 and increase gradually thereafter, until it reaches 5 percent of taxable payrolls is, I believe, a most important and most necessary step. Under the present method of financing social security, people who start working today are going to pay more than they otherwise would have to in order to make up for the fact that in the early years of social security full benefits were paid to people who worked only a short time under the program and who contributed relatively little toward the cost of their benefits. Only about two-thirds of the employer and employee contributions paid with respect to young workers entering the labor force now and in the future will be used for benefits for those workers; the remaining third will go toward meeting the cost of paying reasonably adequate benefits in the early years of social security.

Under my bill, the payment from general revenues will be graded in so that eventually the general funds will bear about a third of the cost of the program—the cost of establishing, in the early years of social security, a reasonably adequate program for those who were at that time already approaching retirement. The whole of our population has benefited, directly or indirectly, from the fact that social security did pay full-rate benefits to those who were already nearing retirement when the program began or when their jobs were first covered by social security. And it is time, I believe, that we recognize the obligation of the Nation as a whole to help finance these benefits. It is therefore most appropriate to introduce into our social security system a provision for meeting a substantial part of the cost of the program from the general revenues of the Treasury.

Under my bill, it will be possible to make a very small downward adjustment in the contribution rates for hospital insurance program and still keep that program on a sound financial basis. My bill provides for this downward adjustment. On the other hand, the tax rates to finance the cash benefits part of the social security program for employees and employers will rise from the ultimate 4.85 rate now scheduled in the law to 5 percent each, beginning 1968. No change is needed, and none is made, in the rates paid by self-employed people under the cash benefits part of the program.

My bill thus provides important and urgently needed benefit improvements for the 21 million people now on the social security rolls and improves the benefit protection for those who will come on the rolls in the future, and provision is made for adequate financing of all of these improvements.

POCKETS OF POVERTY WITHIN OUR LARGE CITIES DEMAND EMERGENCY ACTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 16252, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1963. The purpose of my bill is to remove the arbitrary distinction between needy cities and needy areas, or pockets of poverty within our cities.

My own city of Cleveland provides a case in point for the need of such an amendment. Of the estimated 10 million people who inhabit the poverty areas in 34 major cities in the United States, 234,000 reside in Cleveland. Many of the people living in these pockets of poverty are in the lowest income brackets, lack the education and skills needed to qualify for gainful employment in today's highly competitive labor market. Others, while employed, lack either the education or technical training to improve their economic conditions. The poor of our large cities are at a particular disadvantage in their quest for a decent life. Our large cities are beset with a multitude of human problems while the local sources of public revenues to meet those problems are inadequate. In these circumstances the Federal Government must act.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 provides for assistance to cities in severe economic distress. It does not provide for neighborhoods or areas within cities which are in severe economic distress. The result is that the great urban slums, where such assistance is most desperately needed, present conditions which call for immediate remedy.

My bill is consistent with the basic intent of the law. It will make the pockets of poverty within our large cities eligible for Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of the City of Cleveland adopted an emergency resolution calling upon Congress to take action to meet this problem. I include in my remarks a copy of the resolution:

RESOLUTION No. 1511-66

(By Mayor Locher and Messrs. Armstrong, Banko, Bell, Bilinski, Blaha, Brooks, Carr, Carter, Cimperman, Dacek, Duggan, Forbes, Garofoli, Gilliam, Harmody, Leo Jackson, Morris Jackson, Katalinas, Kellogg, Kruczyk, Latkovic, Matt, Mrs. McCaffery, Messrs. Pilch, Russell, Sanislo, Sinkiewicz, Smith, Stanton, Stringer, Turk, White, Zone)

An emergency resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Economic Development Administration Act to provide assistance to areas of poverty within central cities

Whereas, it has been clearly established that although employment may be high in a metropolitan area as a whole, persistent pockets of poverty exist at the same time within the central cities of this Nation; and

Whereas, the population of these poverty areas in thirty-four major cities totals nearly ten million, of which 234,000 are in the City of Cleveland; and

Whereas, technological change and the movement of industry out of the central cities has greatly diminished job availability in these areas; and

Whereas, the people living in these pockets of poverty are in the lowest income bracket and lack the education and skills needed to qualify for gainful employment in today's labor market; and

Whereas, this lack of economic opportunity and the resultant undesirable living conditions are causes of severe social unrest; and

Whereas, the economic stability of the entire area requires that these pockets of poverty be eliminated and that it is in the interest of the United States that meaningful employment be found for this poverty stricken segment of our society; and

Whereas, it is clear that massive measures requiring Federal assistance must be taken if these areas of poverty are to be eliminated; and

Whereas, this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

Section 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to provide assistance from the Economic Development Administration Act in areas where it is determined that low family income due to persistent high unemployment cause pockets of poverty within the central cities.

Section 2. That such legislation should include provisions for both loans and grants to increase jobs and also to increase job potential for the citizens in these areas of poverty.

Section 3. That the Clerk of Council be and she hereby is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG and Representatives MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, CHARLES A. VANIK, FRANCES P. BOLTON, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, and ROBERT E. SWEENEY.

Section 4. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to Council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted June 20, 1966

JAMES V. STANTON,
President of Council.
MERCEDES COTNER,
Clerk of Council.

Approved by Mayor Ralph S. Locher, June 23, 1966.

Effective June 23, 1966

I, Mercedes Cotner, Clerk of Council of the City of Cleveland, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 1511-66, adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland, June 20, 1966.

Witness my hand and seal at Cleveland, Ohio, this First day of July, 1966.

MERCEDES COTNER,
Clerk of Council of the City of Cleveland.

FINANCIAL POSITION REVEALED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, because I feel that officials occupying posts of trust and candidates for these posts should reveal their financial positions, I hereby make public my assets, liabilities, and income.

My investments consist of a 112-acre farm with two houses in Maryland, west of Aberdeen, which I acquired in 1965 for $118,000, and the purchase of which I announced at that time; my home in Ruxton, worth about $45,000, which I have owned for 20 years; eight shares of IBM stock worth about $2,800; paid-up annuities worth $32,345.79, accumulated during a 25-year tenure as a professor; and $6,736.83 credit in my congressional retirement plan.

My liabilities are an $80,000 mortgage on the farm and a $25,500 mortgage on my home.

In 1965, my personal income was $29,463.67 and $360 from articles and speeches. The gross rental income from my farm during 7 months of ownership in 1965 was $2,445.

Mr. Speaker, if I buy or sell any substantial item of property in the future, I shall follow the policy of announcing the transaction immediately.

VIETNAM: THE CONSTRUCTION WAR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with all of the news of the war in Vietnam we rarely hear of the constructive actions being taken by Americans in that country. It is a pleasure, therefore, to commend to the attention of our colleagues the June 1966 edition of a publication called Construction Equipment and Materials.

This edition is devoted to the story of the building of harbors, airfields and other modern facilities which, when we leave, will be permanent assets for the Vietnamese people.

The people of the construction industry are to be commended for their bravery and patriotism in conducting "The Construction War" under the most difficult conditions of warfare.

The article follows:

VIETNAM: THE CONSTRUCTION WAR

(The war in Vietnam is like the closed-canopy jungle which covers this land. From afar, you see a profusion of greenery, but not the trunks and limbs that support it. So too, newspapers and TV dramatically portray the role of the jet bomber and the helicopter. But they neglect the building of new harbors, airfields, cantonments, and POL facilities—which are the backbone of the U.S. military. To obtain for CEM readers a definite blueprint of the role of construction in this conflict, we visited many military bases, photographed scores of construction projects, and interviewed admirals, catskinners, and project managers. The salient facts are these: The United States armed forces are the most powerful, technologically advanced combat units in the world. But the dispersion of enemy forces, adverse terrain and climate, and total lack of modern facilities makes Vietnam a poor place in which to wage a mechanized war. Therefore, the U.S. must first build the elements vital to modern warfare. We must reconstruct the environment, so that we can assist the Republic of Vietnam in winning its battle against the terrorist activities of Viet Cong. It is within this frame of reference, that we describe for you "The Construction War".—MIKE SPRONCK, publisher.)

WHAT YOU NEED TO RUN A $1-MILLION-A-DAY JOB

Putting a private contractor to work in a war zone is unique. So are the size and scope of construction in Vietnam. Contracts cover dredging, pile driving, excavating and grading, paving, erection of thousands of buildings, pipelining—you name it—on hundreds of projects at some 40 different locations.

The volume of the work is enormous. Current plans call for completion of over $1 million worth of work every day!

The problems of logistics are tremendous. In Vietnam you start with nothing, so you ship in everything: Like 100,000,000 board feet of lumber from U.S. West Coast mills; some 10,000 prefab buildings (most from mobilization reserve stock in the U.S.); about 50,000 tons of cement a month from Taiwan.

WORK ESCALATES WITH WAR

Construction in South Vietnam started out rather placidly. In 1962, Raymond International and Morrison-Knudsen accepted a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract for some airfield work under our military assistance program. The total program was about $15,000,000.

In fiscal '63 and '64 there were modest increases. Then, as the war escalated, construction did, too. By the spring of '65 the contract volume had grown to $100,000,000. Current funding is over $400,000,000. And RMK became RMK-BRJ as Brown and Root and J. A. Jones Construction Co. were brought into the joint venture.

Of course, this meant a complete reevaluation of the program through '65 to accelerate the rate of work in place. The $1.7 million WIP per month in December 1964 was now unsatisfactory. The contracting authority (U.S. Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks for all military construction in the Pacific Theater) decided to step up the pace to a $4.5 million WIP per month by July 1965. But by May '65 BuDocks realized that they needed $7.5 million WIP per month by September. And so it kept rocketing up: in July '65, $13 million for December; in August, $25 million for March '66; and in December '65, a $40 million rate for work-in-place per month to be achieved by October '66.

To reach this goal, RMK-BRJ and BuDocks would have to crank out a mammoth work force.

TRAIN VIETNAMESE ON JOB

The manpower target is 67,000. Of these, there will be 4,500 U.S. personnel (mostly supers and foremen), 7,500 third country nationals (most from the Philippines and Korea), and 55,000 Vietnamese.

By early spring, the contractor had more than half of his requirement on the payroll. And it looks like he'll have no trouble getting the rest.

Despite the dangers inherent in the Vietnam operations (attacks by V.C., tropical diseases, unskilled equipment operators), very few men have resigned.

WORKERS CHICKEN OUT, VOTED TO NO. 10 HALL OF FAME

Construction crews are a tough breed. You don't hang on the side of a cliff socking a jackhammer into a rock outcrop unless you've got a lot of guts. And it takes almost as much muscle and nerve to boss a gang of 'em.

If the construction stiffs in Vietnam are any exception, it's that they are tougher than most.

Dodging some green Vietnamese operator who's having trouble downshifting a 10-speed transmission is just one of the hazards. There's also the annoyance of tropical monsoons (11 inches of rain in one day), a variety of bizarre diseases (like the plague), and an occasional V.C. sniper popping up out of his spider hole. But over 2000 American construction men are sticking it out, giving our GI's the construction backbone they need to win the war.

The few that quit usually give hometown reporters exaggerated descriptions of the dangers. Like the one who complained in his local newspaper of "fear and filth." He claimed he and his roommate stood alternate guard in their room at night. (Kind of foolish within a fortified camp of 20,000 U.S. soldiers). He couldn't seem to get used to the lizards (the 4-inch kind that eat insects) that were all over the place, either.

RMK-BRJ voted him charter member of their newly formed "No. 10 Hall of Fame." (The Vietnamese kudo for everyone they like is No. 1).

A fundamental part of the personnel program is training. For all practical purposes the Vietnamese have no technical community—equipment operators, truck drivers, survey crews, draftsmen, and the like. There is even an extreme shortage of competent carpenters, bricklayers, pipefitters, etc. So the contractor is directing a technical training program—with dual benefits. The Vietnamese learn fast and soon become proficient at simple skills—carpentry, masonry, cement finishing—and adequate for the immediate needs in equipment operations. Over a period of time this training *and experience* will help South Vietnam achieve industrial capability.

MILLION-DOLLAR SPREAD

The huge volume of work and tight time schedules call for maximum mechanization. To get it, the contractor will use over $100 million worth of American-made construction machinery. About $40 million is currently at work; and $67 million is already on order. One Navy officer quipped: "This is the world's largest job being performed with equipment *on order*."

At the beginning of the construction build-up it was easy to draw rigs from mobilization reserves. Now the timelag is five to eight months—even with priorities.

If you're finding it hard to get the equipment you want—when you want it—the reason is obvious. We've got a booming civilian economy. On top of that we need over $100,000,000 worth of equipment for military construction in Vietnam. The drastically abbreviated roster that follows gives a fairly good idea of what that involves: 142 motorized scrapers; 306 crawler tractors; 56 wheel tractors; 12 soil stabilizers; 117 motor graders; 158 air compressors; 11 asphalt plants; 9 concrete plants; 125 power shovels; 14 dredges; 550 dump trucks; 14 pile driver-hammers; 30 asphalt pavers; 118 transit-mix trucks.

PARTS WEAR FAST

Parts purchase and distribution to the sites that need them are a serious problem.

Wear rates on machinery are ravenous in Vietnam. RMK-BRJ equipment specialists face: green operators; weather that alternates between 11-in. per day tropical down-

pours and 110-deg dry spells; fine sand and dust everywhere; a high-gear 20-hr-per-day 7-days-per-week schedule.

As a result, tracks last less than 1000 hr on many jobs. Radiator cores at Cam Ranh last 250 hr. They are then pulled off, repaired, and turned around once. But at the end of 500 hr they are completely "sandblasted" out. Brake seals during the monsoon season require replacement as often as every other day.

To meet the need for a greater-than-normal supply of repair parts, the contractor orders extras right with his new machine purchases. Another complication arises when stevedores on the West Coast fail to send along bills of lading with parts shipments. Sorting $150,000 worth of parts on the wharves of Saigon proves an added burden for busy equipment specialists.

CONTRACTOR TAPS WORLD MARKET

The construction programs in Vietnam demands vast quantities of materials—$12½ million worth each month.

A major need is cement. (Vietnam has only a few mills and these are heavily overtaxed meeting the needs of the local economy. As a result, the local price has inflated 400% in just a few months.) Current shipments, bought by low bid from Taiwan, are running 50,000 metric tons per month. Price is below West Coast figures; with further saving in shipping cost.

For timber, U.S. lumber mills quoted prices below those of Asian firms, including the Philippines. Right now RMK-BRJ has over 100 million bd-ft on order.

The need for structural steel is limited; mostly pre-engineered buildings. Reinforced steel, sheet piles, and other steel items have been bought in the Asian market—mainly Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong.

VC CLOSES RAIL AND ROADS

Distributing the equipment and materials in-country is as difficult a problem as getting it there.

There is only one major port—Saigon. (Cam Ranh and DaNang are now being developed as secondary ports.) There is *no* overland transportation. Most roads are inadequate for U.S.-size loads. The V.C. can ambush any convoy. The single railroad is already interdicted at some 80 points. Result: a logistical logjam. All shipping must be by air (expensive) or by water (slow).

But despite the obstacles, a dedicated group of men—military and civilian—are getting the job done. More than this, they are performing remarkably well. With few exceptions; the hundreds of projects that springboard our military effort are on or ahead of schedule.

HOW TO CONTROL A CONTRACT THAT HAS NO BLUEPRINT—SO YOU THINK YOU HAVE PROBLEMS

There isn't a contractor who has had more than one job, who hasn't asked himself how he ever got into his crazy business.

It takes guts, imagination, and money. The work is hard, the days are long, and the profit low. And if you read the failure records, you know it's as easy to get out of as in.

But next time you (or your men) feel the going getting tough, read over this description of the RMK-BRJ project in Vietnam.

Total volume: nearly $1½ billion.

Rate of completion required: over $1 million a day.

Design: half have blueprints and specs—which naturally change with the scope and direction of the war—and the remainder is "eyeballed" in under oral directions of the resident engineers for the military commanders.

Location: forty or more separate sites, all 10,000 mi from home.

Transportation: no usable roads or rail lines between headquarters and the projects.

Weather: tropical heat all year long, with monsoon rains half the time.

Terrain: swampy river deltas in the South, barren sand-dune wastelands along the coast, 10,000-ft mountains in the North, and tropical jungles in between.

Special problems: sniper and mortar fire by V.C. terrorists.

Put any yardstick you want on the contract construction in Vietnam. You'll agree it's the biggest, most difficult project ever undertaken by private contractors.

The joint venture of Raymond International and Morrison-Knudsen easily met the $3-to-$5-million-a-year demands of MAC-V (Military Assistance Command-Vietnam) in the early 1960's.

But by 1965 the job was too big ($500 million a year), even for these giants, so they added the capabilities of Brown & Root and J. A. Jones, a pair of equally famous international contractors. As Project Manager Bert Perkins explains it, "We needed tremendous resources in proven management capability to undertake a project of this scope in the short time span required."

To extend its organizational skills even further, RMK-BRJ is subcontracting some 20 items of work.

DOUBLE KEY-MAN OUTPUT

The main difficulty in undertaking a project so urgent is that you must move ahead without blueprints.

This is where experience pays. The Vietnam Builders, as the joint-venturers call themselves, have it. Most of their supervisors have a generation's job know-how to draw on.

Bert Perkins has developed a novel way to multiply the output of his key men.

"Stole the idea from the Navy," he says. "Works like this. Each key man has a smart young engineering aide. (The Navy calls 'em Blue Darts.) I have a couple of them and a Special Assistant with no fixed assignment. This gives all top managers an extra set of eyes and hands and feet. The aide goes with the key man all the time, gets to know the jobs, the background, how the boss thinks, and what he's interested in. When something comes along where the boss can't be two places at once, the aide goes instead."

Even so, most of the RMK-BRJ top men work 12 to 15 hr a day, 7 days a week. Bert himself spends five days in the field, troubleshooting problems on his 40 or so projects.

EVERYONE NEEDS EVERYTHING NOW

Adding to the management problems is the fact that there are many "customers" for the contractor's services. This is a military program in a war zone. Vietnam Builders are at the disposal of scores of "customers." Each corps and base commander, each branch of service, both U.S. and Vietnamese, has *separate* and *immediate* needs. (And these change—with the fortunes of war and shifts in military strategy.)

It's the job of RMK-BRJ management to see that all these needs are met—and through proper channels.

This creates the second major problem: time. Between the request for construction by a specific CO and the actual crank up of project forces must come the approval, clearance, and OK for funding by a host of military staffs and committees. (And occasionally congressional approval.)

Of course, the CO always needs the facilities "yesterday." Since the time-lag due to distance is six months, Bert Perkins and his staff often have to use some top-level diplomacy in explaining why they can't go right to work or meet everyone's needs.

MANAGEMENT THINKS AHEAD

To counter the adverse affects of shipping delay, the Viet Builders management staff has improvised a system of "advance thinking." It works like this.

A CO at one of the military bases tells OICC (Officer in Charge of Construction, U.S. Navy BuDocks, the military contracting authority for all of Vietnam) that he needs a particular facility. While the request is flowing through normal military and civilian channels, OICC talks to RMK-BRJ. They sit down right there and then and mentally build the project. Materials, equipment, labor, shipping time, cost. They develop rough layouts; get U.S.-based procurement officers busy on searching sources, availability, price. Like master chess players, they are thinking six, ten, twenty moves ahead.

This reduces the reaction time considerably. When Viet Builders get the official OK, its staff can pick up phones, assign job numbers, and go. (Of course, they just tear up the work sheets on the 3 out of 5 jobs that are finally authorized.)

Bert Perkins compliments U.S. suppliers. "They've leaned over backwards for us. They know the job we've got to do here, so they help. Even though we don't have priorities as such, they rush our stuff. It keeps the time span to six months—otherwise it would be years."

Some kudos are also due the contractors. The job syphons off their top management, men they could use in the booming U.S. economy to make profits they'll never earn on a complex, overseas operation like this. M-K president Jack Bonny, though, considers Vietnam a moral commitment.

WHERE TO GET MANAGERS FOR TOMORROW'S JOBS

Contractors are constantly searching for good managers—men to run their jobs and to help run their business. Yesterday, they got them from the crafts. Today, they draw them from engineering schools. Tomorrow's manager may be pulled from the ranks of professional business-school graduates. (Naturally, all are green to start and need on-the-job development.)

Bert Perkins, Project Manager for Vietnam Builders, shows the quality man you can get when you reach out into new fields for executive development. His college specialty was time-and-motion studies and management methods. After he had selected construction as a career, he picked up his civil engineering at night school and from correspondence courses. Like most of today's construction bosses, Perkins worked up through the ranks: timekeeper, expediter, equipment operator, foreman, superintendent.

"Contractors are learning to value scientific management methods," Bert declares. "Contractors today use PERT, computers, and enlightened personnel practices. They draw ideas from the many industries they serve: petroleum, chemistry, railroading, metalworking.

"The managers of tomorrow get their field experience on the job during the day; we expect them to do their home work at night reading articles or studying the administration of a business.

"No manager is going to be successful without both—job-site know-how and modern business administration."

WHY ONE CONTRACTOR?

Laymen often ask why the U.S. government doesn't put a hundred contractors on the Vietnam work. They don't understand the absolute need for tight, coordinated construction control.

The problem in Vietnam is one of logistics. There's a critical shortage of equipment, materials, transportation and communications.

More contractors would only increase the pressure on supply sources (not increase the number of machines or pounds of nails). And prices would be bound to rise. Nor would more contractors increase the available shipping tonnage—or dock space. And

dozens of contractors would only complicate the problem of establishing and using radio networks and air lines.

Of course, the Vietnam Builders draw on the professional services of other American contractors, as key men are released from current jobs. RMK–BRJ provides some two-thirds of the management and supervisory staffs from its own personnel (many finishing up contracts in the States) and expands from this core.

Since there is no national phone system the contractor has had to establish a radio network. (Even Saigon is served by eight *separate* phone companies. "It's easier and quicker to drive across town," says Lt. Pickart, OICC Project Coordinator.)

Cable communications to the U.S. is almost as bad. So, routinely, a key man will hop in a plane to Manila or Tokyo and phone in a pocketful of messages, instructions, and requests.

RMK–BRJ also has its own air transport network, under a lease arrangement with Continental Airlines and Air Viet-Nam. They have a fleet of four DC–3s, three Dorniers, and eight Beech Barons with more planes to come.

A WAY OF LIFE

Mr. CEM asked Bert Perkins about the incentives for supers and foremen on overseas jobs like this. "Not much," Bert replied. "The pay rate is the same for many top jobs like mine. The main financial break is that up to $20,000 is tax free.

"There is just a certain breed of men geared to overseas work. They know it, and they like it. It's a way of life for them.

"Of course, some men figure it's a chance to move up. Maybe a good equipment operator gets to be a grading foreman, or a skilled carpenter gets a crack at forming super."

SUCCESS IS HARD WORK

The ability of the Vietnam Builders to successfully direct and control a project of this scope is based on not one, but many things. Long days and hard work, for sure. But also scientific management. They've built a transportation net and communications system from scratch. They preplan every job—including proposals. They have a computerized PERT system for management control in effect.

As a result, the U.S. Armed Forces will get the launch pad they need to fight and win a mechanized war as fast as it can be built.

VIET CREWS BUILD HARDSTANDS

One of the oldest quarries in Vietnam—and about the busiest (two 11-hr shifts, 7 days a week)—is at Bien Hoa. A battery of new wagon drills and compressors sinks holes on a 5x5-grid 22-ft deep. The nearby crushing set-up converts shot basaltic rock to four finished sizes (1½, ¾, No. 4, and fines) at about 300-tph rate. The trio of 15-kw generators provide power for belts and lights. All-Vietnamese crew turns out good looking concrete hardstand at Bien Hoa Airfield, using a 34–E paver and three-roll power screed. Don't worry about that big labor force. Pay is 25 piasters (18 cents) per hour. Built-up 14-in. forms move by fork lift. The four-compartment dry-batch trucks get agg and cement from drive-thru batchers near the crushing plant.

TERRAIN AND TACTICS DICTATE NEW METHODS

The kind of war you wage determines your construction requirements. That is why construction in Vietnam is unlike that of World War II or the Korean War.

There are sharp distinctions. There's no blackout of military sites at night. Quite the contrary, you brightly light the perimeter and much of the camp to prevent infiltration. You don't disperse your facilities, you concentrate them. (The problem is not aerial or artillery attack, it's the dollar cost of buying land in an allied country.)

Even latrine construction has changed. With concentrations of men in camp areas and up to 10 in. of monsoon rain in a single day, you don't dig a big hole in the ground and set some prairie schooners over it. You use above-ground 55-gal steel drums as removable containers and burn the waste outside the camp.

The Vietnam conflict is unique in another way. Private U.S. contractors are doing most of the military construction.

When you are fighting a war, nobody wastes a lot of time keeping track of who does what. So it is a little difficult to sort out the exact roles of the various construction forces in Vietnam.

CEM estimates that the private contractor is doing about 60% of the work. Military construction battalions—Corps of Engineers, Seabees, and the new Air Force Prime Beef and Red Horses teams—are doing the rest.

On some jobs, nearly everybody pitches in. Like the POL depot at Phan Rang. The Navy supplied all materials for the foundations—forming lumber, rebars, and the concrete. The Air Force shipped in the plates for the steel tanks and all hardware for assembly. Army work forces constructed the foundation and erected the tanks.

Usually, the who does what depends on the hazards and the urgency involved. Military forces take on the dangerous and immediate tasks. Or as one GI expressed it: "the quick and the dirty." The contractor is given responsibility for the bigger tasks and those of a more permanent nature (like building a permanent wharf for ocean-going ships).

Corps of Engineers troops in Vietnam number some 10,000 men. They perform a wide variety of tasks: Small but important jobs, like filling in bomb craters on roads; big jobs, like installing the twin prefabricated DeLong piers at Cam Ranh Bay.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS CREATES GI LIFELINE

To provide combat support: U.S. frontline forces need roads and bridges built, cleared, or repaired. The Army, Air Force, and Marines need helipads and runways. There's demolition work to be done and fire-streams to be cleared around camps.

To insure logistical support: Troops need a constant supply of ammunition, food and petroleum products to keep fighting. It's the Corps job to restore or create the facilities for these—deep harbors, docks, airports, POL tanks, roads, warehouses, storage areas, munition dumps and depots.

To improve the environment: To increase the U.S. soldier's fighting efficiency and morale, the Corps eliminates or reduces the hazards of climate, geography, and pests. This means building barracks, mess halls, hospitals, latrines; developing water supply (and maybe refrigeration) facilities; destroying breeding areas of mosquitos, rats, snakes, and other pests.

Now waging a war in an underdeveloped, rugged, tropical land, the U.S. Army places an even greater reliance upon the lifeline which the Corps provides for its combat forces.

The Corps construction battalions must therefore have tremendous flexibility. The equipment roster of each is standardized to fit average situations: enough machines in as wide a variety as possible to permit all types of construction, but no one type of equipment in any great supply.

This presents problems when special needs arise. Case in point: the tremendous demand for rock in Vietnam. Corps battalions had to put in an order for a dozen more crushers.

Troopers experienced in World War II note some other differences in construction procedures. Military strategy in Vietnam calls for concentration of forces rather than dispersion.

One soldier said: "It's kind of like the old Wild West days here. The 'Indians' are liable to come storming out of the hills at any time so you keep your wagons in tight."

This simplifies some problems of construction. The distribution system for water, power, telecommunications, etc. is easier to install. Lines are shorter.

But it aggravates other problems. Drainage (of monsoon downpours) is more difficult in a confined area. There's a greater than average demand for power, too. With temperatures running over 100 deg during the day, refrigerators require huge quantities of electric power. At night, extensive floodlighting is required—for round-the-clock construction work and for perimeter security protection against sneak attack by the VC.

An unusual aspect of the War in Vietnam is the large amount of civic work performed by U.S. servicemen during their off-duty hours. Corps of Engineers and Seabee troops, particularly, are helping Vietnamese citizens in the construction of local public works. They build schools, repair and strengthen bridges, dig fresh water wells, repair electric generator sets, undertake a wide variety of tasks that help the Vietnamese upgrade and improve their public services.

This work is perhaps as vital to our winning the war, as are our military operations. Through the civic action programs the Vietnamese people see our sincere desire to assist them in creating a richer, better life. It is in sharp contrast to the terroristic and destructive activities of the Viet Cong.

The Vietnamese also recognize the economic value to their country of much U.S. military construction. An outstanding example is Cam Ranh Bay. The piers, docks, warehouses, roads, cantonments, POL facilities, and two airfields will constitute the finest, most modern air and seaport in all of South Vietnam; perhaps the best in all of Southeast Asia. This is the legacy of the construction war.

STABILIZING "THE WORLD'S LARGEST SAND TRAP"

Bob Hope called Cam Ranh the world's largest sand trap. He's right. But that's only half of it. The sand is the world's worst for building: the particles are *all* fine, round, and of equal size. They flow and move like billions of ball bearings. But Cam Ranh is also site of the world's largest natural harbor. So the U.S. Armed Forces selected it for one of our principal bases in Vietnam. On a strip of beach facing the South China Sea the joint venture contractor is building revetments for an ammunition dump. In this first-stage construction, they build up the 12-ft-high walls with motorized scrapers, then shape and back slope them with a dozer. The sand must be thoroughly wet to hold even a shallow slope. Slopes are then sprayed with a MC No. 0 asphalt and the interior "floor" is given a 4-to-6-in. double bituminous surface treatment. (As you can see some of the blow sand has already moved in on the "finished" work.) Nearby, a big fleet of 24-yd twin-engine pans are carving a deep cut through a 250-ft-high sand hill. (Heavily-laden ammo trucks need shallow grades: 4% max.). No mass diagrams or grade stakes here. RMK–BRJ excavating super just cuts, fills, wastes, and borrows, as seasoned judgment tells him.

SEABEES HARD-SURFACE SMALL BOAT LANDING

Northernmost link in a chain of new harbors for South Vietnam is this one at Da Nang. Here Seabee forces are putting the finishing touches on a small boat landing. The twin LST ramps, pair of double LCU/LCM ramps, and truck-loading bays between, are hard-surfaced by a double bituminous paving. As the hydraulic dredge completes backfilling each sheet piled bay, trucks haul in ¾-minus top stone. A grader levels the lift to about 6 in. A crawler-

drawn road mixer, borrowed from the 7th Marine Engineer Battalion, then applies and mixes bituminous coating. After the mixer makes a second (transverse) pass, a 35-ton rubber-tired roller finishes the surface.

TRIM FORCES FOR FAST, SMALL-SCALE WORK

The commanding officer or exec of a military construction battalion faces most of the problems of a contractor. He looks at the Army, Navy, and Air Force as his customers. They set the specifications and, indirectly, pay for the men, machines, and materials he needs to do the job.

Of course, there's no profit involved. Nonetheless, the military officers are held accountable for their construction services. Because of the unusual nature of building in a war zone, money can't be the criterion of organization, efficiency, and economy; power usage is.

Here's how is works. Each project, or part of one, is assigned a certain number of man-days. For example: erecting a 40x100-ft. preengineered steel building, 550 man-days. This is based on careful record-keeping on scores of jobs, stateside and overseas.

So an officer of a construction battalion records the time his group takes. Say they complete the job in 475 man-days. Their efficiency rating would be 116% (550 × 100 ÷ 475). If they required 600 man-days, it would be only 91%

These military construction managers also rate themselves on percentage of *active* labor or the number of men they actually have available for work. Unlike most of their civilian counterparts, they must provide their own quarters, mess, transportation, materiel, etc. That's all overhead which, though vital, doesn't produce.

The job-site force of a typical Seabee battalion today, runs only 45% of the total complement of officers and men. This is a big drop from the rating for MCB's during World War II. There are many reasons (some of which will probably be reviewed in light of our Vietnam experiences) why this is so.

The basic problem is that Seabee forces were sharply cut back after WWII. This left a hard core designed only for short-term, small-scale tasks. Current MCB complement is about 400 men—half that of WWII.

The equipment allowance, too, is half that of 25 years ago—230 machines compared with more than 500.

Besides, the young, eager, hardworking Seabee in today's conflict just doesn't have the job know-how of the WWII pros. For the most part, those men were craftsmen, operators, and mechanics who traded a hard hat for a helmet. They needed no on-the-job training.

The picture is getting brighter, though. For one thing, BuDocks is increasing the number and size of Seabee battalions. To reach an active labor ratio of 65 to 70% considered desirable, battalion size will have to almost double, since "overhead" tends to be fixed. (From the standpoint of U.S. contractors, this will build up a pool of skilled labor, as was the case in WWII.) In addition, troop commanders can hire Vietnamese laborers for some work—which helps the local economy.

Perhaps just as important, is the fact that the private U.S. joint venture can expand and contract work forces far more easily—and economically—to meet the requirements of the war. (Pay of a Vietnamese laborer is about 6000 piastres a month—$50 at the official rate of exchange—and, of course, he is completely self-supporting. By contrast, a Seabee gets a basic pay of $100 on the average, not including the direct costs of food, quarters, clothing, health and recreative facilities etc.)

Under these most adverse conditions then, we find a skillful blending of military and civilian forces to win the construction war.

CONVEYOR AGG PLANT FOR CONCRETE

Seabees in Vietnam are living up to their tradition of being a can do organization. At Chu Lai, MCB-4 needed a dry-batch concrete plant. None was available, so Seabees put two double-hopper aggregate batches together to do the job. The one on the left conveys 1½-in. crushed stone and sand to a ready-mix truck. The one on the right adds cement. The saw-tooth knife edge tears open cement bags; the canvas cover prevents wind-blown losses. With one man using a clamshell to load sand and stone and four men feeding bagged cement, the plant turns out 120 yards a day.

INSTANT BUILDING—GOOD AND NOT SO GOOD

In a land that offers both torrential rains and choking dust storms "instant buildings" are a haven for parts storage and work crews. The single-wall nylon units go up fast. You spread the canopy over level ground, erect the air lock, and turn on the blower. The only drawback: the lock limits vehicle entry. The double-wall structure—a series of sausage-shaped arches are laced together—is designed to be self-supporting. One problem: water leaks in. Others: columns at each end restrict entry; tie down stakes extend beyond the base; and a fan is still needed. But as one G.I. said: "It's better than working under a bush."

PM MEANS PRIMITIVE MAINTENANCE

"Over here you don't have the niceties you get used to in the States," said the Seabee equipment specialist, in what may be the understatement of the year. He's got one of the toughest maintenance jobs anywhere, keeping some 300 machines—everything from 1-yd power shovels to pickup trucks—working in defiance of conditions that would wear down many a stateside master mechanic.

In the first place, the fleet takes a constant pounding. It's running 20 hours a day, 7 days a week (all work is on a crash schedule). Most of the operators are young and inexperienced. Terrain and weather are absolutely rotten—hot, bone-dry dust half the year; heat, mud, and rain the other half. Sand chewing away at the metal all the time, rain seeping into seals at least half the time.

It's no wonder that rigs are virtually driven into the ground; they don't get sidelined for repairs until they practically drop in their tracks.

Repair facilities include one 30x75 ft. frame structure with a tin roof. That's the automotive repair "shop." Heavy rigs get parked outside a big circus-style tent.

Don't dirt and water get into the machines when they're torn down? You bet; and you find them there still when the rigs are buttoned up.

Then there's the problem of parts. Every equipment super faces slow delivery. Over here, though, the wait can be as long as 6 months; so Seabee machinists make as many parts as they can.

In the face of these problems, it's a tribute to American skill and ingenuity that equipment availability is as high as it has been. Right now, with 50 machines sidelined, availability is running about 85%.

ENGINEER TROOPS LAY INSTANT RUNWAYS

Air mobile warfare depends upon the ability of an army to launch division size attacks by air *and to support them by air*. In an underdeveloped country you must first build the airfields. Corps of Engineer and Seabee) troops are doing just that—at amazing speeds. The secret: AM-2 aluminum landing mats—a space-age improvement over the pierced steel blanks of WW II vintage.

Aluminum alloy sheets top and bottom are stiffened by a honeycomb of aluminum foil between. A simple interlock and their light weight (150 lb. per 2x2 ft. panel) make placement quick and easy. A standard motor grader dresses the subgrade and a 6-in. sand base. Soldiers, with some Viet workers, unfurl rolls of reinforced plastic membrane over the base. It extends 5 ft. into the runway shoulder to carry away runoff. An 8- to 14-man crew will place over 5000 sq. ft. per hour. Troops have thereby created operational fields (3500-ft. runways with Jato take-off and arrestor-gear landings) in 27 days, and "completed" bases (10,000-ft. runways and support facilities) in 90 days.

PEACE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there should no longer be a scintilla of doubt in anyone's mind that every American wants peace. First and foremost in the quest for peace is the President of the United States.

The President speaks for us in firm and unmistakable terms when he says we never wanted this war in Vietnam. We want no war there or anywhere else and that we will leave no stone unturned to attain peace there and everywhere else for all time.

He has made it abundantly clear that we are ready to negotiate for peace at anytime, at any place, with anyone and without any conditions. That means we will negotiate for peace with combatants, with non-combatants, with Communists and with non-Communists. As a matter of fact, any and every avenue, heretofore used or not, will be taken advantage of even if there is only a glimmer of hope that it will lead to peace.

At the same time this must not be taken as any wavering on our part to keep our commitments to the world and to continue to fight for freedom and liberty everywhere.

President Johnson's most recent statement cannot be misunderstood. He said:

> We want an honorable peace . . . In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it.

Those who are demanding dialog should understand that dialog means conversation between two or more people, not talking to oneself. Unfortunately, Hanoi and Peking and Moscow have refused to participate in any dialog that may lead to peace.

The very able and distinguished John Steinbeck, American Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winner and great contemporary author, sums up the entire situation beautifully in his recent letter, as follows:

> MY DEAR FRIEND GENYA: I have just now read those parts of your poem printed in the New York Times. I have no way of knowing how good the translation is, but I am pleased and flattered by your devotion.
>
> In your poem, you ask me to speak out against the war in Vietnam. You know well how I detest all war, but for this one I have

a particular and personal hatred. I am against this Chinese-inspired war. I don't know a single American who is for it. But, my beloved friend, you asked me to denounce half a war, our half. I appeal to you to join me in denouncing the whole war.

Surely you don't believe that our "pilots fly to bomb children," that we send bombs and heavy equipment against innocent civilians? This is not East Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, nor Tibet in 1959.

You know as well as I do, Genya, that we are bombing oil storage, transport and the heavy and sophisticated weapons they carry to kill our sons. And where that oil and those weapons come from, you probably know better than I. They are marked in pictograph and Cyrilic characters.

I hope you also know that if those weapons were not being sent, we would not be in Vietnam at all. If this were a disagreement between Vietnamese people, we surely would not be there, but it is not, and since I have never found you to be naive you must be aware that it is not.

This war is the work of Chairman Mao, designed and generaled by him in absentia, advised by Peking and cynically supplied with brutal weapons by foreigners who set it up. Let us denounce this also, my friend, but even more, let us together undertake a program more effective than denunciation.

I beg you to use your very considerable influence on your people, your government, and on those who look to the Soviet Union for direction, to stop sending the murderous merchandise through North Vietnam to be used against the South.

For my part, I will devote every resource I have to persuade my government to withdraw troops and weapons from the South, leaving only money and help for rebuilding. And, do you know, Genya, if you could accomplish your part, my part would follow immediately and automatically.

But even this is not necessary to stop the war. If you could persuade North Vietnam to agree in good faith to negotiate, the bombing would stop instantly. The guns would fall silent and our dear sons could come home. It is as simple as that, my friend, as simple as that, I promise you. I hope to see you and your lovely wife Galya soon.

With all respect and affection,

JOHN STEINBECK.

All of this means in the simplest language that we will stop fighting when the aggressor stops fighting. We will negotiate for peace while he is fighting or will deescalate and negotiate for peace during the course of the deescalation, or we will stop altogether and negotiate for peace during the cessation of hostilities.

We will bring this war to an end at the earliest possible moment but we will not bring it to an end by leaving the South Vietnamese to be slaughtered by the Communist aggressors.

We cannot, we must not, we will not permit the enslavement of people by aggressors anywhere.

CULVER PROPOSES DIRECT RETURN OF FEDERAL REVENUES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, as I have met with local officials in the Second District of Iowa, I have become increasingly convinced that new and more effective means must be found to assist State and local governments in meeting their rapidly expanding financial obligations without necessitating further increases in already burdensome property taxes.

I am therefore introducing legislation today to provide States and their subdivisions a share of Federal tax revenues without establishing a specific purpose for which the funds may be used.

If we are to maintain a viable, creative federal system, it is essential that the tasks of government be performed at that level—local, State, or National—where needs can most effectively and economically be met. But I am concerned that unless we do establish a meaningful revenue-sharing plan, the Federal Government will have to assume more and more functions which could be better performed at the local level, simply because the States will not have the necessary resources.

My proposal would return a percentage of the gross national product directly to the States, divided according to population, who in turn would distribute the funds within the State to all levels of government in proportion to the taxes levied by State and local government units. In 1968, the States would receive a share of one-half of 1 percent of the GNP, with the amount increasing each year until it reaches a level of 2 percent of the GNP by 1978, where it would level off for annual distribution.

On the basis of most recent GNP and population figures, this means that a total of nearly $3,400 million would be distributed to the States in 1968, with Iowa receiving $38,948,000 on the basis of 1965 population figures.

All levels of government would receive advance word on the amount they would receive each year so that they could plan how to spend the money most effectively. There would be no Federal control over the funds appropriated.

In such a way, State and local governments can be encouraged to develop their own unique solutions to problems in a way that will insure the greatest possible freedom of action at the local level.

Oftentimes Federal grant-in-aid programs for specific purposes result in States instituting or expanding programs not always needed by the States, simply because they do not want to pass up any Federal funds that are available to them.

Implementation of my proposal would help eliminate such waste, would minimize the Federal requirements and administrative details presently involved in obtaining financial assistance, and would reduce the vast confusion of dealing with a multiplicity of Federal agencies.

In returning these funds to the States to meet their ever-increasing revenue problems, we will simultaneously be returning power to the States to meet the responsibilities which best fall to them and to their subdivisions. And in so doing, we will be promoting the type of creative and cooperative federalism which is crucial to the continued growth and development of our Nation.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO EMPOWER THE CONGRESS TO REGULATE THE DISTRIBUTION OF PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the world in which we live requires ever-increased consciousness if man is to progress as he should. It means the utmost development of our mental capabilities thus the best possible educational development of our citizens.

As we all known, the educational process is not confined to the walls of our educational institutions. Much of our education is acquired outside the halls of our schools and a good portion of this is in the form of the various reading matter that we come in contact with.

In view of this, it is greatly disturbing to see any pornographic literature reach our citizens let alone the sea of filth that is cast before their eyes today. This pornography can only serve to distract and mislead them and deprive them of those intellectual and moral pursuits that enrich all of society as well as themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I think that as the chosen representatives of the people we have an obligation to do whatever we can to foster the educational and moral development of our citizens and protect them as best we can from those things that can only hinder this development.

Therefore, I am introducing today a joint resolution proposing that the U.S. Constitution be amended to permit Congress to regulate and control the distribution of pornographic material.

There must be a stop put to this deluge of filth that our citizens are subjected to. Drastic measures are needed and they are needed now.

Our citizens are contributing $1 billion a year toward the further development of this atrocious business. Yes, this business grosses $1 billion a year and every dollar that it receives serves to further its growth. Unless we take legislative action to control and curtail the distribution of pornographic literature, this destructive business will continue to grow and further contribute toward the moral decay of our society.

What is most disturbing about this business is that its attention is largely directed toward our youth; toward those who are most impressionable and those who will one day be the leaders of our society—for better or worse.

And what most provokes me is the fact that our mail system is being used as a means of reaching these youths—in their homes. It has been estimated that 1 million children a year are receiving pornographic literature in the family

mailbox, and a study conducted in 1958 revealed that the traffic in mail-order pornography is doubling every 5 years.

Why must we allow this to happen? Why must we stand still in dazed appall while the distributors and publishers of pornographic literature gnaw away at the moral fibers of our society?

I am told that the Post Office receives some 70,000 complaints a year about obscenity in the mails and I wonder just how many more thousands of citizens receive obscene literature in the mail and fail to register a complaint?

What is to become of our society if we allow this obscenity to continue unchecked?

Action is needed. It is needed now and it is for this reason that I rise, Mr. Speaker, and ask the assistance of my colleagues in rectifying this deplorable and destructive situation by enacting effectual legislation now.

BOBBY STEPHENS DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Longview Morning Journal on June 18, 1966 concerning a longtime close friend of mine, Col. Robert L. Stephens. Also I include an article about Bobby Stephens Day.

I have known this very outstanding young man from the time he was a small boy. He always has been religious and a man of he highest character in all respects. His many talents and attainments warrant the signal honor he has received. Certainly he deserves the recognition he has been given.

The material follows:

BOBBY STEPHENS DAY

(By Carl L. Estes)

Any community is at its best when recognizing and honoring its citizens who have served their country faithfully and with distinction to themselves and the nation. So it is with Gilmer which places itself in the public spotlight Saturday by officially celebrating Bobby Stephens Day.

All East Texas is proud of Col. Robert L. Stephens, the celebrated and highly decorated "Silver Fox" of the U.S. Air Force who on May Day last year piloted a YF-12A jet interceptor at more than three times the speed of sound and brought the world's air speed record back to the United States from Russia.

For setting two new world flight records—a straight course speed record of 2,070.101 miles per hour, and an absolute sustained altitude record of 80,257.86 feet—Colonel Stephens and four of his test flight crew officers were decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross, awarded by Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. John P. McConnell in a Pentagon ceremony in Washington.

Gilmer is literally booming with pride, for Colonel Stephens is a native of the Upshur County capital. He is the son of Mrs. Manie Stephens of Gilmer and the late Vernon J. Stephens. A veteran Air Force test pilot at 44, he is prematurely gray—the basis for his honored unofficial title of "Silver Fox" by which he is recognized among his Air Force friends and admirers.

Colonel Stephens and his co-pilot also were awarded the Flying Tiger Pilot Award for the world record-breaking flight, and received the 1965 Thompson Trophy Award. The MacKay Trophy for 1965, awarded by the National Aeronautic Association for the most meritorious flight of the year, will be presented to Colonel Stephens and his flight crew at Edwards Air Base on July 23 by General McConnell, Air Force chief of staff.

Gilmer and East Texas people are proud that Colonel Stephens' picture hangs in the Air Force Hall of Fame at Edwards Air Base, Calif., where he is officially known as Director of the Air Force Flight Test Center YF-12 test force.

The intrepid Gilmer colonel has been a test pilot longer than any other man in the Air Force today. He was the first military man to be elected a "fellow" in the international Society of Experimental Test Pilots.

He is a Legion of Merit Medal winner for his work a few years ago as director of testing of the famed F-104 fighter plane. As a test pilot and aeronautical engineer for 17 of his 22 years in uniform, he has been at Edwards Air Base a number of times over the past 12 years and now heads a group of more than 100 military and civilian test pilots, engineers, technicians and others engaged in flight testing the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) aircraft.

Colonel Stephens is a graduate of Gilmer High School, a graduate of Texas A&M University with an aeronautical degree, and holds a master's degree in aeronautics from Princeton University. He and his wife Joy have three lovely daughters, Lila, Linda and Lisa. His family will be with him for this happy occasion.

We here in Longview and throughout East Texas join in spirit with the proud people of Gilmer in honoring Colonel Stephens this Saturday. In all the activities of the day, we all shall be happy to have back home again, a distinguished citizen and one of the Air Force's finest, Col. Robert L. Stephens.

SPECIAL DAY IN HOMETOWN HONORS PILOT

GILMER.—As his home city put finishing touches on plans for Bobby Stephens Day scheduled today, the National Aeronautics Association revealed that Air Force Col. Robert L. Stephens and his record-setting pilots are to receive still further honors.

The MacKay Trophy, given for the most meritorious flight of the year, will go to the pilots and crew of the YF-12A jet interceptor in July 23 ceremonies at Edwards Air Force Base in California. It will be presented by Gen. John P. McConnell, U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, Washington, D.C.

Veteran test pilot Stephens, known as "Bobby" to his hundreds of friends and admirers throughout East Texas, broke world speed and altitude records on May 1, 1965, when he and his co-pilot, Lt. Col. Daniel Andre, flew the YF-12A to 80,257.8 feet at a world speed of 2,070.1 miles per hour. This broke the previous record held by Russia—and on the Soviet Union's May Day at that.

On the same day, four other test pilots under Colonel Stephens' command, set nine world speed and altitude records in the same aircraft.

The MacKay Trophy will be awarded in the name of all the men who flew and set the nine world speed and altitude records.

Because of his distinguished career, the colonel and his family are being paid special honors all day Saturday in the town of his birth.

Festivities, under direction of Jack (Spot) Baird of Gilmer and Longview, and the Upshur County Chamber of Commerce, get under way at 9 a.m. Saturday at Kinel's Cafe where friends are invited to drop by for coffee and visit the colonel before he goes to the Strand Theater at 10 a.m. to show actual films of the record-breaking flight. He will narrate the film, and answer questions from his audience. Primarily an event for school children of Gilmer and all East Texas, the film will be shown again if interest warrants, Baird said.

At noon, an all-service club luncheon at Gilmer Country Club will spotlight Colonel Stephens and his family. This includes his mother, Mrs. Marie Stephens of Gilmer, his wife, Joy, and three daughters, Lila Lee, Linda Lou and Lisa; his mother-in-law, Mrs. Jewel Fuller of Baytown; and his two sisters, Verna Helen and Lila Blanche.

Gilmer Rotary, Lions and Kiwanis Clubs will combine their meetings for the luncheon, which will see such special guests as State Reps. George Hinson and John Allen, State Sen. Jack Strong, Cong. Lindley Beckworth and Ray Roberts.

Texas A&M University will send a representative from its engineering school, from which Colonel Stephens was graduated, and a San Antonio member of the famed Flying Tigers, also is expected.

The 745th Air Force Band from Barksdale Air Force Base will play at the luncheon as well as in concert from a bandstand on the city square beginning around 2 p.m.

Colonel Stephens will be presented from the bandstand at 2:30 p.m. and will speak briefly.

On display on the city square will be survival equipment from the 2nd Combat Support Group from Barksdale.

Colonel Stephens and his family also will be paid tribute by the Gilmer High School Class of 1946 which is holding its 20th class reunion Friday through Sunday.

"AN INSPIRED TRADITION," ADDRESS TO HARVARD UNIVERSITY ALUMNI BY W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, U.S. AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, JUNE 1966

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the Foreign Assistance Act today, I think it appropriate to call attention to the excellent address delivered by a distinguished American and outstanding public servant, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at Large, on the subject of economic aid to other countries.

Ambassador Harriman's address was delivered to alumni of Harvard University during commencement exercises there last month.

On this occasion Ambassador Harriman was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Ambassador Harriman's address and a list of the degrees follows:

AN INSPIRED TRADITION

(Address to the alumni by W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador at Large)

In one way or another this University seems to have taught its graduates that there are more important things in life than purely personal gain. It has held out and ideal of public service and established a record of public achievement. Its graduates work for the community, the nation, and

now the world—who knows how many governments, beside our own, are infiltrated, dominated, influenced by Harvard men?

FDR AND JFK EXEMPLIFY HARVARD TRADITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE

No men in our time have better exemplified this tradition of public service than Franklin D. Roosevelt, Class of 1904, and John F. Kennedy, Class of 1940. It has been my good fortune to have served them both.

Both these Harvard Presidents were distinguished, among other things by their precise and vivid understanding of history. They understood that change in the world was inexorable, that the velocity of history has never been greater, and that our nation can keep abreast of history only as it presses ever forward to new deals and new frontiers.

They knew also that the changes were not only in man's machines and his institutions but, even more, in his aspirations, in his faith, and values. They understood that the towering fact of the 20th century has been the awakening around the planet of the masses of humanity, so long the victims of misery, exploitation, and oblivion.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

President Roosevelt used to speak of "the forgotten man." It is time, in our own country, we have begun to remember the forgotten man: the unemployed and the impoverished; the sick and the aged; the man whose color consigned him to second-class citizenship; and the man whose lack of education denied him opportunity.

As President Kennedy said: "For one true measure of a nation is its success in fulfilling the promise of a better life for each of its members. Let this be the measure of our nation."

In the more than thirty years since I first went to work for Franklin Roosevelt in the National Recovery Administration—the old NRA—our country has made steady progress in widening the promise of American life. Today we see President Johnson's determination to make all American citizens full members of the national community—to strike down the barriers which hold men and women back for reasons beyond their own control—is carrying this effort to its fulfillment in the goals of the Great Society.

In so acting in our own country today, we are recovering the sense of public purpose—we are reclaiming our moral heritage.

OUR TASK IS TO BUILD A WORLD SOCIETY

Yet, even as we make progress at home, we find ourselves confronted by the same problems on a vastly larger scale in the world outside.

In the thirties Franklin Roosevelt told us that the nation as a whole could not move ahead so long as one of its parts lagged behind in poverty and underdevelopment. In the sixties John F. Kennedy told us that the world could not move ahead safely and successfully if one part lived in affluence and the rest in squalor.

The great task—the overriding challenge—for mankind in the rest of the 20th century is to do in the world what we began to do a generation ago here in the United States: to help build a world society where everyone can start to hope for a better life, if not for himself at least for his children, or their children.

We cannot survive as an island of safety and prosperity, aloof from poverty, wretchedness and strife elsewhere on this small planet. We must offer a helping hand to those who ask our aid to fulfill their hopes for a better life, in freedom from outside interference.

At this same gathering nineteen years ago, General Marshall pointed to the needs of a war-torn Europe, and proposed a great cooperative plan for European recovery. This, combined with the North Atlantic Treaty, made possible the revival of the genius and vitality of Western Europe. Now Western Europe is more vigorous and dynamic than ever. Some of us may feel sometimes there is a man who is too dynamic—but let us not forget that diversity was what we wanted to achieve.

NATO TODAY

Today we are reviewing the relationship within the North Atlantic Community and the role of NATO which has served us so well in the past. In looking ahead, we find a wide measure of unity of purpose among fourteen of the fifteen allies. It is agreed that our integrated strength continues not only to give essential security but greater opportunity for progress. In the political field this unity can contribute to breaking down the unnatural barriers of the Iron Curtain—to fulfill the strong urge of the peoples of both East and West. It can provide, as well, combined economic resources needed to assist the developing countries of the world in attacking the fundamental problems confronting them.

THE PLIGHT OF THE UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

Nineteen years ago the acute problem compelling our concern was a stricken Europe. Today it is the plight of the underdeveloped countries. Many of these countries have only recently attained their independence.

I vividly recall on more than one occasion President Roosevelt pressing Prime Minister Churchill during the war to grant India independence. This advice, I might add, was not at the time fully appreciated. Roosevelt's influence and the example of our country's actions in the Philippines have contributed to the rapid emergence of fifty-seven new nations from colonial status. Fifty-seven in all obtained their independence since the end of the war.

President Kennedy stated our position in the United Nations in unequivocal words: "My country intends to be a participant, not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals."

These fifty-seven newly independent nations are now facing the staggering problems of self-government combined with the need for rapid economic development which their peoples are demanding. These are formidable tasks and outside help is needed to deal with them.

In recent years we have undertaken to give a helping hand both through our support of international organizations as well as through bilateral assistance. Much constructive work has been accomplished, but the dimensions of the problem are greater than the means provided to meet it.

THE INCREASING GAP BETWEEN RICHER AND POORER NATIONS

Unhappily the gap between the poorer countries and the richer is increasing, and we don't need a computer to realize that appalling fact. Countries which have about half the population of the free world have an average per capita gross national product of $100 or less, compared to ours of over $3,000.

The president of the World Bank, George Woods—a product of Boston—recently pointed out that by the turn of the century at present growth rates the poorer countries will increase their per capita annual income by no more than $50 while we will add $1,500. Similar comparisons are applicable to the other industrialized nations. Mr. Woods, therefore, calls for a sharp increase in the flow of capital to the developing nations—at least those who ask for it—and on better terms, together with greater consideration for the acute problems created by the instability in terms of trade.

A former World Bank president, Eugene Black, is taking the lead in formulating plans for the coöperative developments of Southeast Asia and the new Asian Development Bank.

It may be reassuring to some to realize that these two men are not academic braintrusters but hardheaded, successful bankers with whom I used to work during the years I was involved in international banking.

Clearly, both moral obligation and political necessity require us to do our share to help the awakening peoples to move as rationally and quickly as they can into the 20th century. Unfortunately, I detect a new mood in some quarters today . . . a retreat from the idea of larger responsibility, a desire to return to our own concerns, almost a neo-isolationism. One can understand the causes of this mood because the burdens have been heavy, the problems intractable, the results slow. Yet we cannot let frustration become the ruler of our judgment, or fatigue the arbiter of our policy.

FOREIGN AID IS ESSENTIAL

I feel that something like this is happening today when men who have previously fought for foreign aid programs now regard them with indifference or reject them with indignation. For foreign assistance is one essential way in which we can meet our responsibilities to the developing world and thereby protect our national interest.

No doubt these aid programs have had their defects and failures though they have never been better directed than they are by a Harvard man today. Certainly they have not wrought magic or passed miracles, although as we look back at it the Marshall Plan in fact came very close to being a miracle. Yet they are the means by which we can join in partnership with brave and patriotic men in other lands, working for the modernization of their countries. To cast off this hope of a constructive relationship would be a blow not only against our national security, but against our moral identity.

Economic aid, I have said, is one indisputable way by which we can associate ourselves with those seeking national and social fulfillment.

THE INFLUENCE OF OUR DEMOCRATIC IDEALS

There is one other way, even more profound, and that is the influence of our own democratic ideals. Our leadership in the world does not rest ultimately on our material wealth or on our military power. It rests—in any enduring or significant way—on the extent to which our society and our policies embody aspirations which touch the minds and hearts of the rest of mankind.

I was in Moscow when Franklin Roosevelt died—and I will never forget the shock and sorrow of the Russian people, women weeping in the streets, the sense of desolation. Roosevelt represented a hope of peace and friendship with the United States, even in Stalin's Russia.

And no member of the Class of 1966 will ever forget when and where he heard about the death of John F. Kennedy.

Yet yours was not a private grief. Shock and grief encircled the world. Today, in the hovels and shanties in Latin America, Africa, Asia, I am told, photographs of President Kennedy, torn from newspapers still hang, recalling the faith forgotten men everywhere had in his purpose and his leadership. Even behind the Iron Curtain, I still hear people feeling and speaking of his loss.

THE CALL TO ACTION

This, I would like to think, is the Harvard heritage, the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. It is a challenge to self-satisfaction and complacency. It is a summons to generosity and magnanimity. It is a call to action—bold action, gallant action. It carries us beyond the narrow confines of our personal lives and private concerns, into a realm of higher and deeper fulfillment. It reminds us that we live in the most extraordinary century in history—and that, as

another Harvard man, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said: "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

This is the meaning of the lives of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. They shared the actions and passions of their times. They knew there was nothing to fear but fear itself. They asked not what humanity could do for them, but what they could do for humanity. As Harvard men, you inherit an inspiring tradition.

Let us recall the words of John F. Kennedy . . . The last public message he ever wrote, on the morning of his death, closed with these words to the American people: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

HONORARY DEGREES, 1966

William Averell Harriman, Doctor of Laws: Quick and generous to serve the public good, he has bountifully expended his high talents in his country's cause. (Mr. Harriman, dipolmat and former Governor of New York, is currently United States Ambassador at Large.)

John William Gardner, Doctor of Laws: An informed and articulate champion of education, a concerned and perceptive agent of the social ends of government. (Mr. Gardner is the United States Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and President on leave from the Carnegie Corporation and Foundation.)

Charles Allerton Coolidge, Doctor of Laws: An upright and discerning servant of college, community and country; for thirty years this institution has relied on his courage and strength. (Mr. Coolidge, a Boston lawyer, was for thirty years a member of the Corporation and for eleven Senior Fellow.)

Howard Wesley Johnson, Doctor of Laws: We welcome to our company a vigorous new champion of education on the Charles. (Mr. Johnson is the President-elect of Massachusetts Institute of Techonology.)

Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, Doctor of Laws: A brave and gracious international officer who ably furthers world order by monetary means. (Mr. Schweitzer is Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund.)

Robert Lowell, Doctor of Letters: With anguished heart this powerful poet compassionately confronts the tragic complexities of human existence. (Mr. Lowell is often Visiting Professor of English at Harvard.)

Manfred Eigen, Doctor of Science: This marvelously innovative chemist has learned to time with accuracy the nearly instantaneous reactions of the molecular world. (Dr. Eigen is the Director of the Max Planck Institute at Göttingen.)

David Washburn Bailey, Doctor of Humane Letters: Scholar-scribe devoted to precision, preceding and propriety; long-time generous and helpful officer of this university. (Mr. Bailey is the former Secretary to the Corporation and the Overseers.)

Martha Graham, Doctor of Arts: She speaks to us of grandeur, tragedy and beauty through transient movements of the human form. (Miss Graham is a dancer, choreographer and teacher.)

Alexander Calder, Doctor of Arts: Earthbound, ethereal, standing or moving, the fresh forms of this joyous artist enhance our visual environment. (Mr. Calder, an artist of varied talent, is the creator of mobiles and stabiles.)

John Hasbrouck Van Vleck, Doctor of Science: Harvard honors a brilliant expositor of the electrical behavior of matter, her servant as beloved teacher and creative dean. (Mr. Van Vleck is Hollis Professor and former Dean of Engineering and Applied Physics at Harvard.)

Mark Van Doren, Doctor of Letters: Poet, critic, humane and admired teacher, he interprets with wit and understanding the best in literature and life. (Mr. Van Doren is Professor Emeritus of English at Columbia University.)

John Rock, Doctor of Laws: To thousands of grateful patients he has given the joy of children; to millions of families the potentialities of a happier life. (Dr. Rock is Clinical Professor of Gynecology, Emeritus, at Harvard and head of the Rock Reproductive Clinic.)

Saul Lieberman, Doctor of Letters: A rabbi modest, quiet, strong, whose patient learning illumines treasured ancient texts for modern man. (Rabbi Lieberman is Professor of Palestinian Literature and Institutions and Dean of the Graduate Department and of the Rabbinical School of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.)

Paul Codman Cabot, Doctor of Laws: A business leader astute, direct, high-principled; few of her sons have so well served this university. (Mr. Cabot was Treasurer of Harvard.)

MORE EFFORT NEEDED ON HARNESSING H-POWER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I note with great interest a small article in today's Washington Post entitled "AEC Asks More Effort To Harness H-Power." I am including the article with these remarks and hope that all of my colleagues will read it.

Most Members of Congress, by reason of their position, have had a greater opportunity to appreciate the impact of nuclear science on all phases of our society than have most citizens. Outstanding congressional leaders, such as our highly respected colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], have played a key role in bringing this country to the position of eminence in the nuclear field which it now enjoys. However, the accomplishments made to date are but a shadow of what lies ahead if we are successful in making a scientific breakthrough in harnessing the power of the hydrogen fusion reaction.

It is this reaction—the combining of elemental hydrogen atoms into more complex molecules—which is truly one of the fundamental sources of energy in the universe. This is the reaction which produces a major part of the energy of the sun and other stars—the source fundamentally responsible for life itself, as it exists on earth today.

A generation ago the taming of this reaction was inconceivable. Today it is conceivable, but its accomplishment is considered to lie in some remote future. A glance at the history of nuclear science, however, shows how fast these projections can change. Fifty years ago an atomic fission reaction was inconceivable. In 1939—just 27 years ago—as a student of physics at the University of California at Los Angeles, I listened to the great Dr. Fermi describe his first simple experiments with uranium fission, still far from the stage of a sustained chain reaction.

The war telescoped development in this field, as we all know, leading to the atomic bomb. In 1947 I was able to take graduate work in the design of nuclear piles for atomic powerplants—still then visualized as a more or less remote possibility for power production because of economic factors. Today, however, we see that possibly 50 percent of the newly planned electrical powerplant capacity of this Nation will be nuclear power. Such is the speed of scientific progress.

It is safe to predict that progress in controlling the hydrogen fusion reaction will, similarly, exceed our expectations. The results of that progress will represent a quantum jump in man's ability to cope with his environment. Energy, the use of which is the measuring rod of technological advance, will be available on an unlimited basis and at costs which may approximate zero, except for local distribution to the consumer.

So, I commend the Atomic Energy Commission for making the step described by this news article which follows. I have confidence that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will act favorably and quickly, and that the Members of the Congress will respond with vision and leadership to support the programs requested.

[From the Washington Post, July 14, 1966]

AEC ASKS MORE EFFORT TO HARNESS H-POWER

The Atomic Energy Commission asked Congress yesterday to okay a "significant strengthening" of the Nation's effort to harness the hydrogen bomb reaction to produce electricity.

The AEC did so in reporting to the Senate-House Atomic Committee that the U.S. effort—once the world's most vigorous—is "losing its momentum" while the Soviet Union and certain other countries are forging forward vigorously.

Saying this is largely due to an essentially static budget, now runing at about $21 million annually—the AEC called for:

A 15 percent annual increase in normal operating funds over the next five years.

Construction of several large new devices—to carry out a "new generation" of experiments in the field—at a cost of up to $4 million a year at least three years.

The recommendations fell somewhat short of those recommended by a private panel of non-AEC scientists which had called for an up to three-fold increase in the range and pace of the program over the next five years.

SOVIET OCCUPATION OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago today the armed forces of the Soviet Union began the occupation of the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, thus ending the existence of these countries as free and independent nations.

That invasion and occupation and the imposition of the Soviet regime was a flagrant act of aggression and continues as such today.

The Soviets have deported to their country more than a half million people from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, regardless of the fact that the U.S.S.R. joined the Genocide Convention.

In addition to these deportations the Soviet Union is forcibly resettling young people from these countries in Soviet Russia, thus obliterating their national identity by Russification, atheism, and Communist indoctrination.

The U.S.S.R. does not have any legal basis for the occupation of these countries but is trying to justify its domination by fraud and usurpation of the will of the people. The United States has never recognized the seizure and occupation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and has upheld and restated this position in a recent official publication of the Department of State—"Treaties in Force."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the oppressed people of these once-independent nations will be able once again to gain their freedom—a freedom they so richly deserve.

NEED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURES TO SETTLE DISPUTES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the current strike by the International Association of Machinists against five major airlines underscores the urgent need for the establishment of procedures to settle such disputes which paralyze our Nation's transportation and damage the economy.

It no longer suffices for Congressmen to wring their hands and extend their sympathies to the hundreds of thousands of people who have been seriously inconvenienced by this strike. It accomplishes little to assign culpability to the union or the airline companies. This will not reclaim the profits lost by the airlines or put lost paychecks back into the pockets of airline employees.

Trans World Airlines, one of the affected companies, is headquartered in my congressional district and has been forced to furlough 5,700 employees in the Kansas City area, a disastrous blow to the economy of that area. This involves the dilution of TWA's $3,600,000 monthly payroll in the Kansas City area.

I have received a telegram from Mayor Ilus W. Davis of Kansas City, who states:

The International Association of Machinists strike against the five major airlines is substantially affecting the business and economy of the Greater Kansas City area. I know that you are concerned about this national emergency and I hope that you, in your legislative role and collectively with your colleagues, will take every possible action to bring this national crisis to an early and successful conclusion. In a separate communication, I have advised the President of the United States of my interest in this matter for I am convinced that this should be a concern of all levels and divisions of government. I want you to know that this office stands willing to be of assistance in resolving this serious labor dispute.

What is needed immediately is an end to the strike, followed by establishment of procedures to guarantee that such strikes, so injurious to the national interest, do not reoccur.

INFLATIONARY PRESSURES CONSIDERABLY EASED—HOMEBUILDING INDUSTRY THREATENED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all cautiously pleased by recent economic reports, particularly those which indicate that the inflationary pressures which we were experiencing earlier this year have been considerably eased.

The economy of the Nation appears to remain very sound while the Nation's standard of living continues to increase.

However, in the effort to curb inflationary pressures there has emerged a clear and dangerous situation threatening one of the most important industries in our economy, homebuilding, and ultimately endangering the physical and financial well-being of millions of Americans.

This is a most important industry. It contributes 1 of every 18 dollars which make up our annual gross national product. It employs directly hundreds of thousands of persons and indirectly provided jobs for millions more.

But if current expectations of the homebuilders themselves are realized, this Nation faces a serious cutback in our efforts to provide homes for a rapidly growing population.

The situation is so serious that Mr. Larry Blackmon, president of the National Association of Home Builders, has termed it a potential "disaster."

The source of the problem is, of course, the "tight money" market created by those who shape our national monetary policies which has resulted in the current interest rate war and threatens to reduce the availability of mortgage financing to a point where only the higher income group can afford the expense of homebuying.

The effort to curb inflation through monetary practices affecting interest rates has set off strong and unhealthy currents in our money market. The immediate result has been a shortage of loan funds available for the financing of new home construction.

The thrift institutions, such as the savings and loan firms, have been caught in the middle of the current rate war. As a result, the thrift institutions, a primary source of the Nation's home financing, are now at a great disadvantage in securing funds at reasonable cost.

Thus, those buyers who can afford mortgage money in the current market are going to pay more for it while prospective buyers of a few months ago find they have been squeezed out of the market.

The cost of money rises and as it does the cost of housing rises, pricing additional prospective buyers out of the market, decreasing demand, forcing construction layoffs and cutbacks in construction.

This is not a hypothetical chain of events. It is underway at this very moment. In a recent survey of its members, the National Association of Home Builders indicated that 80 percent responding builders plan to cut back their operations by some 35 percent. A projection of this throughout the entire homebuilding industry would indicate a reduction in starts over the next year to 1,250,000. The association states that at least 1,600,000 new units are needed annually just to keep abreast of current requirements.

Admittedly, these are industry figures based on projection. However, the need for adequate and proper housing, a need which has been long recognized by the Federal Government, cannot be met or even approached if this situation is permitted to continue.

The money market in the country today is badly out of balance in some areas. Unfortunately, it appears that only congressional action will alleviate the situation and prevent a possible serious recession in the homebuilding industry.

We all wish to prevent inflation and ease inflationary pressures. But it is neither fair nor wise to permit one industry to bear the major portion of the load in carrying out anti-inflationary programs and policies.

There are several recommendations currently before the Banking and Currency Committee which could provide relief. These include proposals to authorize and instruct the Federal Reserve Board to purchase obligations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal National Mortgage Association. In addition, the committee has reported bills to increase the present authority of FNMA to borrow money to finance its secondary market operations, operations which have been seriously curtailed in recent weeks.

And finally, it would be my suggestion that the committee give consideration to a bold new program for providing adequate private sector financing through existing or additional Federal agencies over the next 10 to 20 years to insure that the situation which the home buying public and homebuilding industry faces today does not recur in the future.

Our population is growing at too great a rate, our current demands too large, our future responsibilities to formidable to risk major setbacks in homebuilding. In fact, today anything less than expansion in this field is detrimental to our national goal of better and more adequate housing for the American people.

But this is for the future. Immediate action is needed now to remedy an existing situation. There is legislation of controversy before the House regarding occupancy. However, if we do not act because others will not, the question of housing occupancy will become irrelevant in the face of lack of housing availability.

Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter which needs immediate attention. The health of an industry which is one of the economic mainstays of this Nation and interests of millions of present and prospective homeowners is at stake.

PROPOSED REIMBURSEMENT OF MEDICARE PATIENTS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would permit reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital to receive treatment from a therapist.

The present law permits a therapist to be reimbursed for his travel to extended care facilities or into a patient's home, but does not permit reimbursement to the individual patient. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this provision in the law prevents medicare recipients from receiving all the care they might otherwise get. A great deal of time is spent by therapists in traveling from place to place which might otherwise be spent treating patients.

I am very happy to join with my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], in correcting this provision in the law. I know that a great many senior citizens in the State of New Jersey would receive better treatment resulting from the more efficient use of the time of therapists.

I urge all Members to join with us in support of this corrective legislation.

ROBERT L. BENNETT, COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, TO BE HONORED AS "INDIAN OF THE YEAR"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, July 16, special ceremonies will be held at the annual Indian Exposition at Anadarko, Okla., honoring Robert L. Bennett, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, as "Indian of the Year."

This award was begun 15 years ago by the 15 western Oklahoma tribes which sponsor the exposition. Its first recipient, in 1951, was the great All-American athlete, Jim Thorpe.

In recent years, the award has gone to such outstanding Indians as famed Ballerina Maria Tallchief, Evangelist Oral Roberts, and, last year, to Mrs. LaDonna Harris, wife of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the long-neglected needs of the American Indian are finally beginning to gain wide recognition, we are indeed fortunate to have a man such as Commissioner Bennett to oversee the progress which is being made in improving the living standards of this great segment of American citizens.

As the first Indian to serve as Commissioner in almost a century, Bob Bennett has, in the short span of 2½ months in office, brought new life to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. He has established lofty, but realistic, goals to move Indians now living on Government reservations into the mainstream of American life.

As he stated in his recent report to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

> As long as the Bureau has the responsibility for Indian people on or near reservations, it will do everything possible to see that disadvantaged Indian people benefit from this commitment. The application of the various government programs to Indian reservations should hasten the day when Indian people will become self-sufficient citizens of our American society.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Commissioner Bennett on this fine honor to be accorded him, and to express my hope, and belief, that his remarkable achievements—past, present, and future—will serve as a great source of inspiration not only to his fellow Indians, but to all the citizens of this Nation.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, there is today a mounting problem in the elective process. Because of the rising costs of campaign financing, many candidates for offices high and low, find it difficult to avoid encumbrances and obligations. The solution lies in the participation of more Americans in the political process. Elections should be financed primarily by people whose only interest is in good government. Therefore, I am introducing a bill to provide a tax deduction of up to $100 for political contributions to all political campaigns. This bill will broaden the base of political participation by encouraging men and women of meager and moderate resources to support candidates of their choice. It will encourage truly democratic government—of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this measure will be beneficial to the American political process, and I join with other Members who have submitted similar proposals.

CHANGES NEEDED IN TARIFF LAW TO BRING VALUATION PROVISIONS ON ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS INTO LINE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 to permit valuation of receiving tubes under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

This is emergency legislation for the benefit of American manufacturers of television, radio, and other consumer electronic products. It is also for the benefit of the American consumer because it will prevent exorbitant increases in the cost of imported components and will forestall price increases for consumer electronic products.

There is today a great demand for radio and television tubes, caused primarily by the sudden acceptance of color television. This color boom already is straining the capacity of the U.S. firms which which produce these products. The firms are turning to foreign sources, particularly Japan, to help meet the demand.

However, a recent Customs Court decision has raised the threat of a drastic increase in the cost of importing receiving tubes. The problem stems from an archaic method of import valuation under section 402a of the Tariff Act of 1930. It establishes foreign value as the basis of appraisement of imported goods.

The appraised value of imported receiving tubes under this valuation method ranges from 200 to 600 percent of the actual price to the importer in some instances.

The present tariff, if not corrected, will result in a sharp increase in the cost of receiving tubes, which must eventually be reflected in the price of many finished products.

This problem gets out of the nickel-and-dime category when one reflects that the sales of consumer electronic products in the United States will reach $3.7 million this year.

The Customs Simplification Act of 1956 has established a more reasonable valuation provision, making export value the primary basis of dutiable value. However, receiving tubes are one of the items still subject to the old method of valuation under section 402a.

It appears that legislation is the only effective solution to the problem, so I am proposing the removal of receiving tubes from appraisment under section 402a and bringing them under section 402.

The legislation I propose is emergency legislation, designed specifically to include only receiving tubes and to be in force for only 3 years, the predicted peak years of the demand for such products.

Such legislation, I believe, will prevent an exorbitant increase in the cost of imported components. It will have no harmful effect on domestic manufacture since the domestic receiving tube business is so strong that manufacturers are selling all the tubes they can make.

SHIELD IN ASIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no equivocation in the Atlanta Constitution's support of the decision to bomb the oil depots in North Vietnam.

I have in hand three editorials from the Constitution which appraise various aspects of extending the air war.

Communist infiltration of the South was bound to force strikes against the petroleum supplies, the newspaper says. It finds a demonstration of President Johnson's praiseworthy restraint in the fact he held off the attacks until now. And it says that to have moved earlier would have disproved our contention that we wish no higher level of conflict than we are compelled to take.

The Constitution enumerates successes achieved by the President's foreign policy and it quotes Australian Prime Minister Holt's backing of our stand in southeast Asia.

The Prime Minister said while in Washington:

> But for the power and resolution of the United States, no country in Asia could feel itself secure from the threat of Communist aggression.

Hanoi could stop the fighting, if only it were willing to talk peace.

Under unanimous consent I place each of these editorials at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, June 30, 1966]

ESCALATION BY WHOM?

For more than a year American warplanes carefully flew around the oil dumps at Hanoi and Haiphong while urging the Hanoi government to negotiate an end to the war, not force its continuance.

The Communist government declined to join in stopping the war. American planes still skirted the oil dumps in hopes the Communists would hold down their invasion of South Viet Nam to levels that would not necessitate strikes on their oil supply.

Instead the North Vietnamese scaled their invasion upward. Secretary of Defense McNamara reports that their greatly increased infiltration is relying more and more on trucks and power junks to haul in much heavier arms and equipment for use against U.S. and South Vietnamese troops.

That Communist escalation was bound to force a U.S. strike eventually against the oil supply at Hanoi and Haiphong. It was a demonstration of President Johnson's restraint and patience that he waited so long.

For the Soviet Union then to attribute "criminal escalation" to the United States is not so much outrageous as it is silly.

British Prime Minister Harold Wilson could afford to disassociate his government from the U.S. "extension of bombing to such areas" since British soldiers are not the ones being hurt by the Communist escalation, and he has his troubles with a noisy left wing.

But in reiterating stout British support for the American assistance to South Viet Nam, Wilson stated the case very well: "The opportunity for bringing all the fighting in Viet Nam to an end is open to Hanoi and the onus for continuing it rests there also."

By not only continuing but escalating the war, Hanoi required the American counterblow that it has now received. President Johnson's restraint is praiseworthy. But so is his determination not to falter in giving American and South Vietnamese troops that support which they so clearly require to offset the North Vietnamese escalation.

The United States has offered North Viet Nam peace. The North Vietnamese have chosen instead to test American power. They have no grounds for claiming mistreatment when they feel it.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 1, 1966]

THE ONLY SHIELD IN ASIA

While many in Washington regretted and damned the President's decision to bomb around Hanoi and Haiphong, the Australian prime minister visited the American capital and had a blunt word on the subject.

Prime Minister Harold Holt said he was "nauseated" by the readiness of some people to attribute imperialism to the United States, and benevolence and humanitarianism to her Communist adversaries.

"But for the power and resolution of the United States," said Holt, "no country in Asia could feel itself secure from the threat of Communist aggression."

That is quite simply the fact. Japan is the only Asian nation that has the potential of power to counterweigh Chinese Communist aggression, direct or by proxy. And Japan has no appreciable armed force. Rather she has rested secure under the protective wing of American power while rebuilding her booming economy, as Europe did.

The day may hopefully come when reconstructed Asian nations can cease to fear and start to treat with a tamer Communist neighbor from a base of strength of their own. This is now happening in a Europe which 20 years ago was under immediate threat of Soviet seizure.

Until that day comes in Asia, though, Prime Minister Holt is right. No Asian country can be secure if the United States withdraws its shield now. There is no other.

So, just as the United States stood at Berlin, she stood in Korea and the Formosa Straits. Bush communism was resisted in the Philippines and Malaya, as it had been in Turkey and Greece. All the while the work of development, from Pakistan and India to Taiwan and Korea, has absorbed the unstinting effort of the United States.

To wish for a more perfect U.S. legal position in South Viet Nam (and it is considerably less embarrassing than the position of Hanoi, which has invaded South Viet Nam with three divisions, not vice versa) cannot, alter the fact of U.S. policy which has kept world peace for two decades.

That policy is in Asia what it was in Europe—to shield the weak from Communist seizure while helping them develop, and then be free to shape their own destiny. Wherever communism has pressed outward, it has struck the unbending American shield. It has met it now in Viet Nam and President Johnson is explaining patiently to Hanoi and home-folks alike that it simply is not going to bend there either.

Since the U.S. determination became clear in Viet Nam, Pakistan has quietly replaced her pro-Chinese foreign minister; Chinese violation of India's border has quieted; India and Pakistan have stopped fighting, with Russia as the peacemaker; Russia's coexistence exponents have been further repelled by Red China's warlike wing; war no longer threatens between Malaysia and Indonesia; Indonesia has withdrawn from the Chinese orbit; dissension within China itself points to purges, and the South Vietnamese are now and will remain free to choose their own destiny.

Incidental reverberations have set back Chinese intrusions in Africa and Latin America. In the briefly busy cockpit of the Caribbean, the Dominican Republic has chosen its own way and the Soviets have learned nuclear prudence in Cuba.

President Johnson's policy has been harshly debated. But it has had its successes.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 2, 1966]

THE INGREDIENTS FOR PEACE

A room. A table. People willing to talk.

That combination is the way to peace in Viet Nam, President Johnson has told the world. The alternative is an even higher price for North Viet Nam.

The President has delivered the same message, again and again: America has no desire to impose military solutions. But it has the might and the obligation as the free world's greatest power to guarantee that aggression will be more expensive for the aggressors than value of any gains they seek.

American involvement in Viet Nam was originally minor. It has grown, rationally, step by step, because Hanoi and the Viet Cong kept believing there would be a stopping point, a weakening of will, a weariness.

Because they guessed wrong, they have now paid an awesome price. The Communist war machine has been dealt a stunning blow in the loss of a great portion of North Viet Nam's petroleum reserves. The deputy commander of the U.S. 7th Air Force calls it the "most significant, most important strike of the war."

The carefully ordered escalation has been widely misunderstood at home, too. There are many who have counseled for two or three years the action taken only last week. Have they been proven right?

No. For to have made an all-out military drive then would have given lie to a basic American policy. It would have disproved our contention that we wish no higher level of conflict than we are forced to take.

And such abrupt action, taken without careful warning and gradual escalation, could so have confused Russia and China about our intentions that they might have panicked into general war. Both nations are denouncing us now, but there is little sign either will do anything new in the face of the Hanoi-Haiphong bombings. They know the new action was predictable.

Hanoi must realize it too, by now. And the North Vietnamese must know we hold even more punch in reserve. They can end the bombings now, without the loss of an inch of their own territory.

All it takes is "a room and a table and people willing to talk respectfully."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA-U.S.S.R. TRACK MEET CANCELLATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has announced that it will not send its national track and field team to the United States this month to participate in the scheduled Los Angeles meet which was to have been a continuation of the cultural exchange athletic program began in Moscow in 1958. The reason given for this decision, a mere 2 weeks before the meet was to have taken place, was that members of the Soviet track, squad chose not to come to Los Angeles to show their displeasure over the recent bombings of North Vietnamese military targets.

However, a study of past performances of both the Russian track squads and Russian propaganda use of those cultural exchange athletic meets indicates to me that it was not the activities of American airplanes which precipitated this decision, but rather the activities of American track and field stars, such as young Jim Ryun and Bob Seagren, and our squad of women athletes, considered the most promising in years.

I have always deplored the use of athletics as a propaganda weapon, but despite the manner in which the Soviets have made use of these dual track meets since 1958, we have—and rightly, I feel—continued to participate in good faith. We have done so despite a wide disparity in the conceptions of amateur athletics held by the U.S.S.R. and ourselves, and have held our own in these meets.

It has been well documented that in the Soviet Union, top athletes in every sport are carefully screened and those chosen to represent that nation plucked from the national crop and carefully tended in special training camps where their sole "employment" is to train and practice their specialties. It is likewise well known that in our country, an amateur athlete must train for his specialty while earning his living, and many of our top athletes have withdrawn from Olympic and other national competitions due to their inability to maintain their employment while preparing for competition.

Despite this, we have traditionally fielded excellent teams in every sport popular in this country and some sports which are not generally popular here.

When the first United States of America-U.S.S.R. track meet was held in Moscow in 1958 it was agreed that the competition would consist of two separate meets—a men's and a women's competition. They were to be scored separately, by pre-meet mutual agreement. When the dust had cleared in Lenin Stadium, the scoreboard showed that the American men had outscored the Soviet men by 126 to 109 and the Russian women had won their meet by a 63 to 44 tally. As far as we were concerned, that was it—the American men and the Russian women had won their respective meets.

But this did not satisfy the propaganda-minded Soviets, and their reports of the weekend's activities proclaimed that the Russians had won the international competition by a 172 to 170 triumph through the simple expedient of adding the men's and women's scores together.

Despite this violation of the cultural exchange agreement, we fielded a squad on Philadelphia's Franklin Field in 1959. There the U.S. men's team again outscored the Soviets by 127 to 108 and the U.S.S.R. women outdistanced the American women by 67 to 40. This time, not content with merely repeating their 1958 claim to have won the combined men's and women's meet, the Soviet propaganda mills claimed that the overall 175 to 167 score indicated they were widening their "superiority gap" and told their Radio Moscow audiences in Asia and Africa that this "victory" was symbolic of their increasing mastery of all facets of the competition between East and West.

And they went a step further. America's men had excelled in the field events and short running races while the Soviet long-distance runners left no doubt of their superiority. Russian women outshone America's female athletes in nearly all phases of the competitions. This, the Russians claimed, was proof that Americans may excel where speed over a short haul is essential, but when it comes to "stick-to-it-iveness," the Soviets have the stamina and determination to win out. The symbolism was obvious. Moreover, they said, American women, pampered and idealized, were no match for their Russian counterparts, who forsake frills in favor of hard work and physical discomfort, they declared.

In no uncertain terms, Russia has served notice on the world for two decades that she will catch up with and overtake the United States in production of industrial and agricultural items, cultural activities, and athletic prowess. In no uncertain terms, the Soviet leaders announced their convictions that communism would overtake capitalism all over the globe. The way they have gone about it in the field of athletics gives Americans who will take the trouble to examine it, a good example of how their determination is implemented.

Mr. Speaker, Russia entered the postwar era without any formalized national athletic program. Individual Soviet athletes scored occasional victories in distance running. Russian soccer teams advanced in semifinal rounds in Olympic competitions. U.S.S.R.'s skaters ranked among the best in winter Olympic games. After Stalin's death, however, the new Soviet leaders attacked their physical fitness problem with two thoughts in mind—the obvious need for a healthy, strong, spirited citizenry to accomplish the tremendous tasks the Government set for them and, second, the propaganda value of athletic superiority.

So the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a program called "Guidance of the Sports Movement in the Country," the motto of which was "Sports for All."

Today, Russia has nearly 200,000 sports organizations with a total membership of more than 20 million. New stadia, such as Moscow's 110,000-seat Lenin Stadium, have been built and athletic grounds have been established at factories, industrial settlements, parks and even in hotels, apartment houses and collective farms. The emphasis on physical fitness and competitive athletics in Russian schools has been noted by Americans during their travels in the Soviet Union for the past 8 years.

An example of the manner in which the Russians operate in athletics can be found in the sport of basketball, virtually unknown in the Soviet Union until 1948. As the sport gained in international favor and was added to the roster of Olympic events the Russians determined to become tops in this American-originated sport. Their observers came here, studied the game, and returned to Russia where they evolved a program for development of basketball players. They recruited a team and practiced without fanfare until they felt they were ready. Then, with a 7 foot 3 inch tall center, they showed up at the 1956 Olympic Games at Melbourne, boasting that they would defeat the United States at its own game. They have not yet made good their boast, but they are still trying.

Ice hockey was approached by the Soviets with the same determination, and they developed a world's championship team in 5 years. And on a tour of Canada in 1959, their "amateur" national team lost their first game in an unaccustomed indoor rink, but then they gained a tie and won the next six straight games over the best of Canada's amateur hockey teams.

Statistically, it would seem more probable to find 50 top competitors from among 225 million Russians than from among 190 million Americans. It is easier still when each of the 225 million is forced to keep his body in tip-top shape. And it is ridiculously easy when the Government need only tap the outstanding prospects and assign them "jobs" which consist exclusively of developing their athletic talents.

Last summer, in Russia, the Soviet's male athletes registered some excellent performances and defeated the American men's team for the first time, and, as usual, the Soviet women outscored the American girls. The Russians were unrestrained in their glee as they trumpeted this victory to the world.

But this year, things promised to be different. The performances registered during the qualifying meets for places on the 1966 American squad, both men's and women's, were outstanding, and apparently these performances were not lost on the Russians. Their track coach, Gabriel Korobov, had been preparing the ground for a massive Soviet defeat for several weeks prior to the announcement of the meet's cancellation. He told Russians of the smog in Los Angeles, carefully noting that Americans were "smog insulated." It seems that he eventually found the ultimate "out"—cancellation of the meet.

Mr. Speaker, this seems an even more probable explanation when one realizes that, while the Russian track team will not compete against the Americans because of our involvement in the Vietnamese fighting, the Soviet chess team—which will have no problems with either smog, Ryun, Seagren, or other American stars—will go through with its scheduled

cultural exchange "meet" against an American chess team.

The cancellation of this track and field meet is deplorable, no matter what its reasons, Mr. Speaker. Americans have always felt that healthy athletic competition should be completely divorced from political considerations. I feel, however, that as long as the Soviets feel otherwise, it is far preferable that they show their displeasure over the North Vietnamese bombings by canceling a track meet than by following the pattern they favored a few years ago—creating an incident in Berlin.

CONGRESSMAN MORRISON REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following communication is a report which I am sending to some of my constituents entitled, "Your Congressman JIMMY MORRISON Reports From Washintgon."

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing this letter to give you a report on my accomplishments in your behalf during the last 24 years that I have had—thanks to you—the wonderful privilege and honor of representing the 6th District in the Congress of the United States.

I am also writing you this letter to ask your vote and support on Saturday, August 13th for my re-election to Congress for my 13th term.

A mayor of one of our cities put it this way when asked of his opinion of JIMMY MORRISON:

"In the first place you can't argue with success, and no man has been more successful in Louisiana politics than JIMMY MORRISON. There is, of course, a reason for this success, and I believe it is his hard work and dedication. No man tries harder or works harder to please his constituents. He is kind, good hearted, and generous, but overshadowing all of this the greatest attribute of all is the fact that JIMMY is the same fellow on all occasions and at all times. Unlike some politicians, he is the same after election as he is before, the same between elections, and just about the same year in and year out. I can say one thing, I never called on him but that he didn't put forth a great and extra effort to help me. He doesn't just help elected officials like myself, but he helps everyone of his constituents who calls on him regardless of their walk in life."

Quite naturally, I take the mayor's remarks as a compliment and I assure you that I shall continue to work for you, and do the best possible job for you as your Congressman.

As your representative, I have always devoted my full time to the countless problems of our District. The many decisions that I have made over the years have been uniformly based on what you people wished me to do for our District, State and Nation.

Without trying to be boastful, I think you will agree with me that the following projects and actions were tremendous aid and benefit to our District and State.

1. I was co-author of the Bill providing for $357,000 to dredge a 40 foot channel in the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to New Orleans. This has greatly contributed to the great industrial expansion in Baton Rouge and surrounding areas which has added additional wealth and thousands of jobs. This 40 foot channel provides the Port of Baton Rouge with deep enough water for any type of ocean-going vessel. Some of our industries required that this be done before expanding, and some of our new industries required this before building a plant in the Baton Rouge area.

2. The Indian Village-Port Allen cutoff project which I helped start in 1943 and which was completed a few years ago at a cost of $26,869,000 gave Baton Rouge and Port Allen the opportunity of obtaining the wonderful port facility which has meant so much to the area. With this new lock and intercoastal waterway large barges save 126 miles going and coming from the Mississippi River to Texas ports.

3. I worked hard to prevent the capital gains formula from being changed on pulpwood and timberland—greatly aiding this important industry. After Hurricane Betsy left over $10,000,000 worth of timber on the ground, I got the Interstate Commerce Commission to give special low freight rates so that this timber could be hauled by rail to larger mills in neighboring states, thus keeping it from rotting.

4. I have been successful in getting millions of dollars in Federal Funds for the construction of post offices throughout the District. I worked hard for the allocation of $5,000,000 in funds to build the beautiful, new Post Office and Federal building now under construction in Baton Rouge. When the approval of this building was announced, it gave a tremendous boost to the economic redevelopment of downtown Baton Rouge. This is just one example of the effect which new Federal buildings can have on the development and pride of a community.

In addition to this the following communities have received approval for new or expanded postal facilities in the past four years alone: Bogalusa, $324,923.24; Hammond, $393,378.03; Madisonville, $12,000; Slidell, $115,000; Baton Rouge (Istrouma Station), $79,000; Tangipahoa, $12,000; White Castle, $77,000; Baton Rouge (Foster Drive Station), $34,000; Baton Rouge (University Station), $104,000; Abita Springs, $14,000; New Roads, $88,000; St. Francisville, $66,000; Livingston, $20,000; Pearl River, $40,000; Springfield, $17,000; St. Gabriel, $90,000; Mount Hermon, $17,000; Covington, $156,000. Port Allen has a beautiful post office and a new one at Holden is to be constructed. Pearl River's post office has been completed and bids will be taken in a few weeks for Plaquemine's post office.

5. Below is a list of some of the Federal funds I have worked so hard to get for these local projects:

Sewer Facilities, Gonzales	$132,000
Sewer Facilities, New Roads	165,000
Sewer Facilities, etc., Hammond	970,000
Sewer Facilities, Ponchatoula	410,000
Sewer Facilities, Darrow	132,000
Gas System, Varnado	120,000
Water System, Tangipahoa	78,000
Dredging Bayou Bonfuca, Slidell (this helped the Southern Shipbuilding Co., which has one of the largest payrolls in Slidell)	138,000
Sewer Facilities, water, etc., Denham Springs	980,000
Drainage, Amite-Comite Rivers, Baton Rouge	4,000,000
Interceptor Sewer, Port Allen	15,870
Water System, Sun	86,600
Two Water Systems, Amite	92,700
Do	83,570
Drainage for Ward Creek Project, Baton Rouge	1,600,000

These are but a few of the projects, as I have been successful in obtaining additional Federal fund allotments for various towns and cities in the Sixth District. When you classify these Federal dollars in jobs, thousands of new jobs were created.

6. I have always been a strong supporter of the Federal highway system, and have worked hard to see that the Sixth District gets even more than its share of funds allocated for the new interstate highway system. In 1965 alone, $26,224,470 was authorized for construction of the system in the 6th District, and 4,150 jobs were created to date; $176,581,633 have been authorized in the District covering work on 132.5 miles of interstate highway and 156 bridges. When the entire system is completed, more than 237 miles of interstate highways will be located in the 6th District at a cost of $342,281,000. This is 40 percent, or almost half, of the entire interstate highway system of the whole State which is located in our Sixth District. I am proud of the fact that I was instrumental in securing approval of the construction of Interstate Highway No. 12 from Slidell, through Hammond to Baton Rouge—the so-called Military Highway—which had at one time been eliminated from the plans by the Bureau of Public Roads.

7. For hospitals at Baton Rouge, Hammond, Ponchatoula, Mandeville, Slidell, Covington, Franklinton, Livingston Parish, Independence, Jackson, Zachary, St. Helena Parish, Bogalusa, Ascension Parish, Pointe Coupee Parish and others, I have secured over $26,000,000. I am doing my best to get more Federal funds. Just recently, I obtained $475,000 for Slidell and $475,000 for Covington hospitals.

8. Devil Swamp Barge Canal in Baton Rouge received over $3,000,000 in Federal funds which will prove to be a great asset in the future.

9. I have worked hard to get over $30,000,000 in Federal funds for L.S.U., Southeastern, and Southern University. Recently L.S.U. received a $3,700,000 grant from the National Science Foundation to use in expanding its excellent science program. Southeastern College in Hammond also recently received $400,000 for construction on its Hammond campus. Southern University at Scotlandville has received several million dollars in the past years.

10. To give you an idea of how hard I have worked to get more federal funds for my district, I might point out the difference in what the people of Louisiana paid out in federal taxes a year or so ago and what Louisiana received in federal funds:

Recent amounts *paid* in all federal taxes by all citizens of Louisiana in one year amounted to $827,640,000.

Recent amount *received* in federal funds in that year, given to Louisiana and its people—$1,741,722,000.

Therefore, Louisiana received almost a billion dollars more in federal funds than Louisiana paid in federal taxes. Think of what a billion dollars a year does for Louisiana's economy in the way of thousands of jobs and added prosperity.

11. I have always worked hard to bring new industry into the Sixth District, and few districts in the United States have had as many new industries located in their respective borders, as has the Sixth District of Louisiana. But I have also done everything possible to cooperate with existing industries by offering my full cooperation at all times. For example, the following have received federal loans with my assistance during the past 2 years alone: Kentwood Brick Co., $531,312; Vulcan Foundry of Denham Springs, $98,000; T. K. Valve, $273,999 for its plant at Hammond; Wilson Steel of Denham Springs, $100,000; Grant-Lehr Corp. of Denham Springs, $125,000; East Ascension Telephone Co., $1,400,000 and many others.

Again all of these federal funds mean new payrolls, with more people put to work.

12. Recently, through my efforts in cooperation with the rest of Louisiana's Congressional Delegation, $2,500,000 was given by the Federal government to L.S.U., Tulane, Loyola and three other South Universities to locate a research center at Covington, Louisiana, which in all probability will develop into a 10 to 20 million dollar institution.

13. Fourteen states made a terrific bid to have the Saturn Project located in their area. I can point with pride that I played a major part in locating this project at Michoud and Slidell, and the operation promises to become the largest industry in the state.

14. I have at all times offered my full cooperation to all civic and governmental agencies in the Sixth District and the state to provide for old age and welfare cases, unfortunate people, sick people, and people who were unable to take care of themselves. During my 24 years in Congress, the Federal Government has assisted Louisiana and citizens of the 6th District with well over $1 billion in welfare and old age pension funds which have been matched by the state.

Think of what this has done for our economy, like our crossroad country stores, small merchants and business in general.

15. I have handled the personal problems of thousands of constituents who called on me concerning matters affecting veterans, farmers, working men and women, day laborers, elderly people, businessmen, and all those with problems who had occasion to call on me in the last 24 years. On each and every one of them, over 50,000 in number, I have done my best and put forth my best effort to assist them.

16. I have done everything possible in the last 24 years to cooperate with and assist the oil and gas industry in the Sixth District and the State of Louisiana. This important segment of our industry has added much wealth to our economy.

17. I have been a staunch backer and have put forth all possible assistance to aid the strawberry farmers, vegetable and truck farmers, tung oil growers, dairy farmers, cotton farmers, small truck farmers, chicken and egg producers, rice farmers, sugar cane farmers, beef cattle producers, and all the other farmers in our Congressional District. That is why my membership on the powerful House Agriculture Committee is so important. I am a high ranking member on this Committee and am Chairman of the Family Farms Subcommittee.

18. I have devoted an enormous amount of time to veterans' problems and have supported all beneficial veterans' legislation in the past 24 years. I was a co-sponsor of the Cold War G.I. Bill, which recently became law and will help thousands of our deserving veterans. I was the author of legislation providing free air mail privileges to soldiers in Vietnam as well as air transportation at surface rates of letters and small packages to and from our soldiers in Vietnam. I was also co-sponsor of a Bill providing for mail airlift of regular mail to and from servicemen all over the world.

19. I am sure you recall the many times I took the Floor of the House to denounce Communism and urge my fellow Members to do everything possible to make this nation strong both within and without. I have worked for and supported all of our defense appropriations, and I feel that our only salvation to continue to be a free and great nation is to keep our country strong, both economically and militarily.

20. I have always voted independently on all bills coming before Congress, always trying to vote as the majority of my constituents wished or wanted me to vote.

My friends, it is difficult to impress upon you how important *seniority* and *experience* are in Congress. No truer words were ever spoken than, "there is no substitute for experience." As far as seniority is concerned, there is no greater valuable asset on Capitol Hill. I rank 31st in seniority out of the 435 Member House of Representatives. In other words, 404 Members stand *behind* me in seniority and only 30 Members stand ahead of me. For any of my opponents to even match this record of 24 years of seniority and experience, they would have to run, not in this August 13th election, but in the year 1990.

With this seniority you have given me and the experience I have gained, I can continue to do the job you want done. When you look at this record, I certainly hope that you will go to the polls on Saturday, August 13th and cast your vote for my *re-election*. Remember, please *vote No. 8*, and if you can, try to get some of your relatives and friends to do likewise.

I will be most grateful.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. "JIMMY" MORRISON,
Incumbent.

EYE RESEARCH NEEDED

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the great and growing responsibilities of the Congress to take appropriate action in matters concerning the Nation's health and to support the continuous pursuit of scientific efforts to control diseases which deprive our citizens of a useful existence. The evidence that we are carrying out this function effectively is all around us. The advance of medical science is so rapid, however, that we must be constantly alert that we do not neglect new challenges and new opportunities in health research as they are presented to us by the scientific community. Nor should we neglect glaring needs that are called to our attention.

In recent months it has been brought sharply to our attention that the field of eye research is suffering acutely from such neglect. We have evidence also that, largely as a result of the support given to our medical institutions by the Federal Government, this field of eye research today is our major hope for the conquest of blinding eye diseases. We know that more than half of our citizens suffer from some visual malfunctions. We have been made aware that 3½ million Americans have serious, permanent, noncorrectable eye defects and that blindness is perhaps the major disabling condition in our country. Yet I am told by experts in the field of ophthalmology that more than 80 percent of all blindness is the result of diseases whose causes are unknown to science.

Many of us in both the House and the Senate have become aware, Mr. Speaker, that it is imperative to the future of ophthalmic research in the United States , and it is imperative to the health of our people, that there be created within the National Institutes of Health a separate and autonomous National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of eye research. On January 27, 1966, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, introduced a bill—H.R. 12373—to create such an institute and identical legislation has since been introduced by numerous other Members of this legislative body. In the other Chamber, similar legislation has been introduced by Senator FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah, and, most recently, by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. The bill introduced by Senator HILL enjoys the cosponsorship of 50 Senators.

The significance of this legislation was stated eloquently by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in a recent address before a group of eminent ophthalmic scientists and I think the substance of Congressman ROONEY's speech is worthy of the attention of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of Congressman FRED B. ROONEY's address before the National Committee for Research in Ophthalmology and Blindness, of Chicago, Ill., on June 25, 1966.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRED B. ROONEY, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH IN OPHTHALMOLOGY AND BLINDNESS IN CHICAGO, ILL., ON JUNE 25, 1966

I am very grateful for the opportunity to speak before you today. I welcome the opportunity to share with you, as a layman, some of my personal thoughts regarding a health problem in which I have an intense interest.

And I hope to be able to discuss with you also, as a Representative in the U.S. Congress, what I feel are important elements in the movement to create a National Eye Institute, and to inform you as to the present status of legislation to establish such an autonomous unit within the National Institutes of Health.

It is important, I believe, that we who are representatives of the people in the Congress keep in close contact with you who are the leaders in the eternal search for better health. Government's involvement in health research depends almost totally upon the experience, the knowledge and the advice which is brought to it by the scientific community. When government does become involved, it is essential that we communicate frankly and cooperatively in seeking objectives which will best serve the American people.

It is not possible for us in the Congress to act upon needs and opportunities in medical research unless our attention is drawn to these problems by the nation's physicians and scientists—or by a knowledgeable segment of the public.

Congress today is taking increasing interest in the problems of vision and visual research. The beginning of this interest dates back ten years to the founding of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, under the National Institutes of Health.

Since that time we have seen an intensification of the eye research effort in the nation's medical schools. New work has been started. New ideas have germinated. New enthusiasm has developed among young ophthalmic scientists. And we, your representatives in Congress, have been congratulating ourselves that things were moving along at a lively rate toward the conquest of blinding diseases.

Then, last year, a report was published which provided us with a totally new insight into what was happening, and was not happening, in eye research. The report, "Ophthalmic Research: U.S.A.," was the result of an intensive survey. It was initiated and

financed by Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc. and conducted by Dr. Thomas D. Duane, my good friend and neighbor in Pennsylvania.

Dr. Duane's report opened the eyes of many legislators to the fact that the government's investment in eye research had created a rebirth of interest and activity in the search for knowledge of the eye and the problems of visual loss. As Dr. Duane put it, we had created an infant of great vitality and with magnificent potential, but we were neglecting to provide that infant with proper nourishment. At the time of the survey less than $9 million per year was being invested in eye research by all sources of support, both government and private.

The interest of the Congress was further awakened last year by the results of a public opinion survey, sponsored jointly by the Gallup Organization and Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., which indicated that the American people feared blindness more than all other physical afflictions with the single exception of cancer.

These surveys, and the additional insight provided by expert scientific testimony before our House and Senate committees, have highlighted some facts which were never before brought to the attention of your legislators. I am sure the public was not aware of them either.

In the first place, we have been impressed by the opportunities that are present today in ophthalmic research. Many of us have no idea of the enormity of the problem. We do not know the scope of modern eye research and the many pathways that offer hope for the alleviation of visual disabilities that have been tolerated since the beginning of time. I am sure most of us did not realize that the advance of science in a whole host of disciplines has made it possible to attack the conditions which cause blindness from many newly-discovered fronts. We began to see for the first time that a full-scale research effort held hope for success in the eventual eradication of the causes of blinding diseases.

The second area of impact on us—and I must tell you that it has come as a shock to most of us—is the way we are neglecting these opportunities. I am sure that the Congress and the public have believed that eye research was moving along at the same velocity at which other scientific research is progressing.

We have found to our surprise that eye research has been proceeding traditionally as a part-time calling. For years it has existed in our medical institutes under the wing of departments of surgery. We were happy to learn that since Dr. Duane's report there has been a massive movement in our medical schools to give ophthalmology the departmental status it deserves. We are less happy with the realization that in the National Institutes of Health ophthalmology continues to play a minor role among a vast assortment of neurological interests. To my knowledge, ophthalmology does not exist as a division of a department of neurology in any of the nation's medical schools.

When we compare the need with the opportunity, the support we are presently giving to eye research seems inadequate. As legislators entrusted with the judicious use of public funds, we have become keenly aware that blindness is costing the nation tremendous sums of money each year. It is poor economy to provide for anything less than a total research effort in the field of vision, therefore. Dr. Jules C. Stein, Chairman of Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., recently said in testimony before a House Committee, and I quote: "It is time we stopped being content to pat ourselves on the back for all the good things we do for people after they are blind, and start moving vigorously into research that will wipe out blinding diseases at their source."

I assure you that many members of Congress now share this view. We have come to realize that eye research has not kept the pace in a period of magnificent progress toward better health. It is not my intent to place the blame for this situation. It is a universal attitude that visual loss is a fact of life. From physicians themselves we have often heard that loss of sight is an inevitable part of the aging process, that loss of visual acuity is unimportant if it is correctable through the use of glasses, and that we have done enough when we have encouraged frequent eye examinations so that conditions may be diagnosed and treated. They cite improvements in surgical techniques as ultimate advances. Yet I doubt that there are any here who are convinced that surgery and treatment are the ultimate goals to be sought in research, or that the eradication of conditions such as glaucoma and retinal diseases should stand in the wings, awaiting the advance of neurological science.

It seems to me that the public, including the Congress, has been preoccupied with "ultimate" blindness and care of the blind in the mistaken belief that such activity is contributing to the prevention of blinding disease. This emphasis on the plight of the totally or legally blind has tended to minimize the true and terrible extent of the problems of vision that exist among the American people today.

The Congress has become acutely conscious of the need to assess accurately the extent of these problems. It has acted quickly and positively on the recommendation of the RPB survey that the objectives of those engaged in gathering statistics be fully supported, and funds have been appropriated for these purposes.

However, we are aware also that there is deepening professional concern as to whether the statistics that are now being gathered have any application to the problems of today, other than to enumerate some segment of the population which is almost totally blind. There is growing concern as to whether or not these statistics are truly meaningful, or if they are indeed relevant to the problem of visual afflictions which affect our population.

If we are to deal realistically with the problems of vision that plague millions of our people, we must know to what extent disabling conditions such as glaucoma, cataract and retinal diseases have reached into our population. We have need for an assessment of typical segments of our population in terms of their visual acuity, whether or not they are totally blind. These questions cannot be answered through our present system of fact-finding, nor does it seem that a sufficient effort is being made to find the answers. It is said that one and one-half million Americans are blind in one eye—and I am at a loss to find any source to authenticate that figure. To be blind in one eye imposes a tremendous burden on an individual and in many cases would indicate serious jeopardy to vision. Yet, if the other eye is healthy, not one of these people would be reported under our present system of gathering information. It is as though we had decided to measure the extent of crippling in the nation by counting only the number of quadriplegics.

We are well aware of the difficulties involved in gathering detailed statistics on diseases and conditions that are not reportable to departments of health. Yet the Congress is becoming increasingly convinced that the problem of visual loss is far greater in its impact on the American people than is presently being represented to them today.

If you gentlemen are to be provided with adequate resources from both governmental and private sources of research support, then you and I and all of us who are interested in moving vigorously forward in eye research must lose no occasion to change these outmoded public concepts. The public is not aware that important research projects in eye research are being postponed or abandoned because approved applications for N.I.H. grants have not been funded. Nor is the public aware of the impact on the entire field of investigative ophthalmology when valid grant applications cannot be financed. The effect is not only to inhibit the activities of established investigators, but to discourage promising young people from embarking on careers in eye research. It is totally unrealistic, economically naive and scientifically unsound to train people, and then deny them the opportunities for research support that exist in most other areas of medical research.

I think you will understand then why an increasing number of Representatives and Senators are beginning to see the vital need for a separate Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health. I have been impressed by the many scientific reasons for the creation of such an Institute advanced by the many eminent researchers whose advice has been sought on the subject. I will leave it to you gentlemen to discuss the scientific arguments that have been presented. I have heard it said that all the arguments in favor of the separate institute are largely economic and political, while the arguments against it are primarily scientific. This does not coincide with the persuasive case for a separate institute developed by numerous ophthalmic scientists who have had my ear.

Speaking as a layman, it is only necessary to look at the record to be convinced that the only way to move ophthalmic research into the stream of scientific progress, the only way to get the answers to ophthalmic questions, the only way to gather information, to set realistic goals, and to carry out realistic action in ophthalmic research, is to put the vast and complex field of ophthalmology under the leadership and direction of ophthalmologists.

To the statement that the arguments for a separate institute are economic and political, I would answer as a layman that we have only to observe the extent of the blindness problem and to examine the effect of neglect on eye research, to conclude that the present status of ophthalmic research and training in the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is and will continue to be totally inadequate to the scientific needs of our time and of the future.

I am personally convinced, as are many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, that the NINDB is carrying out its commitment to visual research with the greatest integrity and the best of good will. However, we cannot expect that those oriented to the broad field of neurology will look upon the problems of ophthalmology with the same intensity of interest and enthusiasm that we find among you who have been trained, have practiced and are continuously involved in investigation of every facet of the visual process. It is a matter of great significance to me that in its presentation of testimony before Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY'S subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, that the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness outlined its present and projected activities in what amounted to 72 pages of fine type in the printed record of those hearings. In all this material, that which related specifically to programs in visual research amounted to approximtely three pages—some three percent of the text—and none of it indicated the scope of planning, the intensity of activity or the depth of scientific interest that we believe are now essential if the progress of eye research is to move off dead center.

If solid ophthalmic research projects are being held up, if the development of new ideas is being discouraged, if we are failing to take full advantage of promising oppor-

tunities, and if scientific research is suffering because the present Institute is oriented in other directions, then I submit that these are indeed *scientific* arguments for a separate Eye Institute.

It is for such reasons that on January 27 of this year I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to create within the National Institutes of Health a separate National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders. Since the introduction of that bill, 27 of my colleagues in the House have indicated their enthusiastic support by introducing identical legislation on the floor.

As for the other chamber, Senator FRANK E. MOSS of Utah was the first to introduce the Eye Institute bill in the Senate on April 15. I think you will be delighted to learn that we now have the full support of Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama who, as you are well aware, is the key figure in the Senate in matters related to the nation's health and welfare. Senator HILL himself introduced a similar bill on the Senate floor just ten day ago.

Senator HILL's proposal includes provisions for specific clinical research. Such research was merely implied in the wording of the bill I introduced in the House.

It is, however, completely in keeping with the intent and purpose of my bill and I see no reason, whatever, why the two versions could not be combined for a stronger drive in the fight against blindness.

We are confronted by one major problem in both the House and the Senate, however, and this is the sheer volume of health legislation proposed during the present session of the Congress.

There have been nearly 400 separate bills directed to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee relating to matters touching on public health. You can readily see that such a volume presents problems for Committee members and for the staffs of the Sub-committees.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I am pleased with the fact that the Eye Institute bill has been introduced by four of my colleagues. I have had indications of support from other members of the committee as well.

The situation is only slightly less complex in the Senate. A large number of public health proposals are now pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, as one would expect.

The fact that Senator HILL has sponsored the measure will insure its fullest consideration, of course. But the Senator has always been scrupulously fairminded in his approach to priorities for legislation, I believe. The prospect for early hearings in either house in this session is not as bright as we might hope, therefore.

It is interesting to note, however, that in the two days immediately following Senator HILL's introduction of the bill, he was joined by 34 co-sponsors. This indicates wide interest in the Senate, also.

In seeking passage of this legislation, you must bear in mind that we must depend upon you who are recognized authorities in ophthalmology and those sciences which are closely associated with ophthalmology. You should by this time be active in convincing influential people, including your own Representatives and Senators, that the creation of a separate Eye Institute is essential to the progress of ophthalmic research, just as I have been convinced by the forthright statements of the Association for Research in Ophthalmology, the Association of University Professors of Ophthalmology, and the American Association of Ophthalmology. As members of such professional groups, and as individual physicians and scientists, you must be ready to present your arguments fully and clearly before the appropriate Congressional committees at such time as hearings are called.

I ask you not to be discouraged by what may seem to you to be excessive caution and deliberation in proceeding toward such a necessary and logical objective as a National Eye Institute. The voice of ophthalmology is unfamiliar, even in this health-conscious nation. The responsibilities of the Congress are enormous and diverse. But I can assure you that it will move in response to the will of the people. It is your job—and I accept it now as my own—to demonstrate continuously and enthusiastically that this step must be taken if we are to move intelligently and vigorously in our efforts to cope with increasing problems of visual disorders and blindness. I can assure you of my personal dedication to this effort. And I am confident of your own.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIDER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for July 14, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, on July 18.

Mr. PELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material during consideration of the bill H.R. 15750.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DINGELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. GIAIMO in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2947. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9599. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States;

H.R. 14888. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1947, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate in screwworm eradication in Mexico; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes.

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.R. 14122. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 18, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2563. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain enlisted members of the military services who lost interest on amounts deposited under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, or prior laws authorizing enlisted members' deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1965–May 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2565. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the valor of American youth as demonstrated by the award of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service for 1964, pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, Stat. 397–398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. Additional and minority views on H.R. 14765. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1678, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 390. An act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; with amendments (Rept. No. 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 16114. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the determination of basic compensation of employees of the Federal Government for purposes of certain employment benefits, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 913. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15111. A bill to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty (Rept. No. 1698). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 16246. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of pension payable to widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16247. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows and to liberalize and make more equitable the provisions of that title relating to the payment of pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 16248. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Tulsa, Okla., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 16250. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 16251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 16252. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 16253. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to authorize contributions from the general fund of the Treasury to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and to the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and otherwise improve the social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 16254. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of brigadier general for an officer of the Air Force while serving as Assistant Surgeon General for Veterinary Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16255. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RACE:

H.R. 16256. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 16257. A bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 16258. A bill to abolish the office of U.S. commissioner, to establish in place thereof within the judicial branch of the Government the offices of U.S. magistrate and deputy U.S. magistrate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16259. A bill to amend title XVIII of the social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 16260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities with a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 16261. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 16262. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 16263. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 16264. A bill to revise the Federal elections law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 16265. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 16266. A bill to provide that certain television and radio receiving tubes be appraised under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 16267. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 16268. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 16269. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to State and local governments in an annual amount equal to a specified percentage of the gross national product; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16270. A bill to designate the Blanchard Dam on Bald Creek, Pa., as the Foster Joseph Sayers Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 16271. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 16272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow for deduction for contributions to candidates in Federal, State, or local elections to broaden participation in political activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1212. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower the Congress to regulate the distribution of pornographic literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 829. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 914. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate certain matters within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 915. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the administration and enforcement of Federal laws; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 16273. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Zaharias, also known as Georgios D. Zaharis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 16274. A bill for the relief of Pablo De Ungria, M.D., and his wife Estrellita Gensoli Ungria, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 16275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William C. Jones (nee Librada Guevara); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 16276. A bill for the relief of Nick Karagianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 16277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara K. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 16278. A bill for the relief of World Mart, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 16279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sabina Riggi Farina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hoffman-La Roche Indigent Patient Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the indigent patient program conducted by the Roche Laboratories of Hoffman-LaRoche Inc., Nutley, N.J., a pharmaceutical house in my district. This pharmaceutical company has pioneered in the institution of this program in the drug industry, for they have long considered it their obligation to make available a selection of their drugs without cost to indigent sick and handicapped patients in the care of private practicing physicians.

It is in the highest tradition of American medicine for physicians in private practice to care for indigent patients whenever possible, and Roche assists the medical profession in this endeavor by making its products available free of charge.

This splendid example of humanitarianism was introduced during May of 1962. All of the drugs are obtained by the treating physician who informs Roche of the circumstances of each case, the medication needed, and the dosage strength. Hoffman-La Roche does not require the doctor to reveal the patient's name and should the indigent require additional medication, the physician may write to the company and request additional supplies for as long as the patient requires it.

I want to commend one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies for the inauguration of such a program of merit. Once again, we see that it is possible for self-sacrifice and the desire to aid our fellowman to overshadow the profit motive. Even though we enjoy today a most progressive and rich society, there still remain many unfortunate people who are suffering from the effects of ill health and poverty.

The Roche indigent patient program is indicative of the manner in which private industry can work to insure a more secure and comfortable life for our citizens.

Effects of Revision of Residual Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised in a letter from Charles W. Colsen, counsel to the New England Council for Economic Research and Development, dated May 31, 1966, that due to revision in the residual oil import quotas announced by the Secretary of the Interior, March 25, 1966, quotations on residual oil in New England were down 35 cents a barrel from the period immediately before the quotas were removed.

It is estimated by the council that this will result in a saving of more than $30 million to the New England consumer. This, I believe, is sufficient evidence of the wisdom of the strong efforts made by all 25 New England Congressmen in bringing to the attention of the OEP and the Secretary of the Interior, the inequities of the system of import quotas. The old system benefited no one and burdened the consumers of New England as well as placing unnecessary strain upon relations with those countries which are principal exporters of residual oil.

We should be aware that under GATT, the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, subscribed to by some 75 nations, import quotas are regarded as highly inimical to the best interests of world trade. The removal of the import quota on residual oil is in line with GATT policies and I am sure will be so recognized by other signatories in future tariff negotiations.

I am pleased to have had a part in bringing about a decision beneficial to my constituents as well as to our announced policy of liberalized world trade.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication asserted:

> No nation is any greater than its agriculture permits it to be.

There is a great deal of truth in this statement. I believe that many of my fellow Congressmen have become aware of this fact in recent months. Those of us who represent this Nation's highly efficient and productive agricultural States have been aware of this truth throughout our lifetimes. The only change of mind we have experienced relative to our knowledge of the essential role agriculture plays in this Nation's economic well-being is one of increased devotion to the cause of the American farmer and heightened respect for his productivity.

As our Nation has shifted to an era of migration from the farm to the city, many of our citizens have all too often forgotten the farmer. When drought has stricken large sections of our food-producing lands, the city dweller in nonagricultural areas has given it only passing notice. For the city dweller has become so accustomed to the shelves of plenty supplied by the American farmer, that he knows despite the loss of millions of bushels of food, he shall not want for his next meal.

We in America have been truly blessed with an abundant food supply. That blessing has been so extensive that too

many have been willing to take it for granted. In failing to respectfully recognize the farmer for the vital role he plays in keeping American stomachs filled and American bodies nourished the general public has all too often done him a great disservice.

When the price of food has gone up many have been too ready and too willing to caustically assail the farmer. They have chided him for his complaints of not receiving a fair price. They felt sure they were correct in doing so because they considered it obvious that he was receiving substanitial income from the additional money they were spending for food.

Some doubted our contentions that though the consumer was paying 33 percent more for food in 1965 than in 1947–49, the farmer was receiving 10 percent less for his product than in 1947–49. I, and several of my fellow Congressmen from agricultural States have done our best to tell the farmer's story throughout the land this year. Our story has been a simple one—the American farmer, rather than being the principal cause, is in reality the victim of inflation. I feel the farmer's story told in recent months has been communicated well. I think the American public has learned a lesson in agriculture and I sincerely hope that lesson can be cast indelibly in the minds of all consumers.

Steadfast in his purpose, undaunted in his willingness to nourish the soul of our countrymen, and determined to blanket this country's fertile lands with abundance, the American farmer has met the challenge of hunger that has throughout history plagued man with sorrow and death. Not only has he met the challenge of this Nation, but he has contributed substantially to meeting the challenge of hunger throughout the world. I know, you know, and the American people know that the farmer will continue to meet this challenge.

Let us now resolve in this period of history when the eyes of the Nation have focused on the American farmer, to pay him his due respect, to assure him of our support and confidence and to pledge him the heartfelt thankfulness he so justly deserves.

Rogers Lauds President's Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have been keenly interested in the future of oceanography were pleased by the enthusiasm shown yesterday by the President at the commissioning of the *Oceanographer*.

The President's call for redoubled efforts in marine science and technology should be a rallying point for our future efforts in ocean research.

As the President pointed out, we have started on this trip into our last frontier, but we still have a long journey. The President's endorsement of oceanography will help speed the journey.

Community Development Districts—Another Layer of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to support the action of the House Appropriations Committee when, in April 1966, the administration's agricultural budget was trimmed by $113,611,000 less than the original request. This restored funds for proven programs while cutting back where reductions were needed.

One saving I favored, which was made at that time, was a $2,431,000 reduction in the request by the Rural Community Development Service. I agreed with the statement of the committee that existing Department of Agriculture personnel could handle the workload more effectively without an additional layer of supervision. But now we are faced with the revival of a similar request, under the guise of a new bill, S. 2934, despite the fact that the House already this year opposed expansion of the Rural Community Development Service. In addition, S. 2934 would duplicate existing governmental and private programs and would aggravate the problem of inflation.

Thus far, the bill has been railroaded through Congress. Public hearings in the House Committee on Agriculture consumed only 2 days, time which had previously been scheduled for the more vital school milk and child nutrition programs.

A committee minority report expressed disappointment with the limited scope of the hearings, as the committee failed to hear representatives from numerous agencies which conduct programs which would only be duplicated by this legislation. As the bill has been reported favorably by the committee, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the House should take a close look at this bill and vote it down when it is presented for our consideration.

The proponents of this bill allege that it will make available to rural communities the same type of development planning assistance as is now available to urban areas. A regional "community," usually embracing several counties, would be organized through State action and a planning board established in the district with members elected by the governing bodies of the various political subdivisions represented. Then the planning board could receive a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in drawing up development plans.

UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION

The main trouble with the bill is that it may create an administrative boondoggle which will prevent officials at any level of government from solving rural problems. Existing planning programs already are available to rural communities on an individual or multicounty basis. Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 permits Federal planning grants to nine different types of State, local, and regional planning units. Of the grants made under this program through fiscal 1965, $43 million have gone to 4,500 small communities and counties, $23 million to 130 metropolitan and regional planning areas, and $15 million to 30 States for statewide and interstate planning.

In addition to this HUD authority, planning activities are authorized through the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and HEW, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year, the Appropriations Committee noted that rural problems had been handled effectively through the regular established agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which have been working successfully with rural people for many years. These agencies can function more effectively if additional layers of supervision are not added between Washington and the rural areas.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ACTION

In addition, most States and localities have planning agencies of their own, both governmental and private. Local chambers of commerce are deeply involved in community planning. Communities in my State of Wyoming are participating in total community development programs as outlined by the National Chamber of Commerce.

Another rationalization for this bill has been the argument that local communities are not aware of their opportunities under present programs and that this bill is needed to acquaint them with the various Federal programs available. But the Department of Agriculture publishes an Agriculture Handbook which covers every program in existence. The National Chamber of Commerce has a clearinghouse service providing information on Federal programs applicable to local communities. Finally, myself and my colleagues in Congress are only too glad to help any State or local unit of government which is interested in utilizing a Federal program. I, personally, have processed hundreds of such requests.

INFLATIONARY PROBLEMS

With this country involved in a war and with the current problems of inflation, this bill provides for an open-end authorization, so that no one is sure how much money will be spent. Estimates have ranged from $5 million to $230 million.

The House should adhere to its previous policy of supporting the well established and useful agricultural programs, such as the school milk and school lunch programs, while cutting back on the unnecessary spending represented by bills like S. 2934.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of this bill argue that it would cure the ills of our cities by making the countryside more attractive. I

have long been an advocate of helping the people in rural areas in order to discourage them from moving to the cities. It is quite true that many urban problems are the result of rural maladjustments that have been neglected. But these problems will not be solved by more plans. We have plans to implement today, only if we had the funds to do so. The money that will be spent for planning under this bill could be better put to use on current projects. It does no good to spend money on plans if you are afterward too broke to implement them. I represent a State which is largely rural and no one is more eager to develop this area than I am, but more planning boards are not the way to go about it.

There is absolutely no need for this legislation. There has been no evidence presented which shows that there is a deficiency of rural community planning or that there is not sufficient information available concerning Federal programs. This bill would only confuse the situation by creating another administrative unit, duplicating present efforts, and continuing to aggravate inflationary problems.

This session of Congress has compiled an admirable record of safeguarding the economy by reducing inflationary administrative requests. The House should continue to perform this vital role by defeating this unjustified and redundant legislation.

Long Wharf Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Council of the Arts awarded the Long Wharf Theater in New Haven, Conn., a $50,000 grant. I would like to tell you about some of the unique innovations which the theater has instituted.

The Long Wharf Theater is a year-round, professional repertory company. It could be called an experimental theater. The distance between the play and the audience has been eliminated, not only by abolishing the proscenium arch, but also by conducting seminars after the performances, by discussions between the actors and the audience, and by free workshop productions.

In addition to the regular performances, Long Wharf has several special programs. These special programs enable people who ordinarily would have no contact with the theater, to acquire an appreciation and an understanding of the theater.

Young people have benefited especially from the programs at Long Wharf. The high school program brings the theater to the students and the students to the theater. Since October, the touring company has visited 33 schools. During the same time, 17,000 students from 110 schools and 75 towns in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York have taken advantage of reduced student rates to preview regular performances. The Children's Theater presents plays which have been written especially for children. Disadvantaged students in all grades are able to attend productions by means of grants.

The experimental programs also reach two adult groups which have limited incomes. Grants have been established so that the elderly and the members of the adult literacy classes might attend theater performances.

The grant from the National Council of the Arts has helped make these innovations possible. It has enabled the theater to develop independently its unique cultural services and it has enabled Americans from all walks of life to understand and to enjoy the performing arts.

Many of the successes of the Long Wharf project and the recognition given it by the National Council prove the validity of the establishment of this council. Such work as Long Wharf's should clearly be supported, and I am proud to bring it to the attention of the Congress.

Remarks of the President at the Swearing-In Ceremony for Barnaby Keeney as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the 88th Congress I introduced legislation to establish a National Foundation to promote progress in the arts and the humanities.

This idea became a reality in the 89th Congress when the bill to establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

Today, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, former president of Brown University, was sworn in as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities in an impressive ceremony at the White House.

For the benefit of all of my colleagues, but especially for those who cosponsored the legislation, I insert the eloquent remarks of President Johnson on this occasion.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY FOR BARNABY KEENEY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Carl Sandburg, our great poet and good friend, speaks in one of his poems of our endless search for things beyond mere wealth. Americans, he writes, always come—

"To the time for thinking things over;
To the dance, the song, the story—
Or the hours given over to dreaming."

Today we gather not only to honor Barnaby Keeney as he begins a new chapter in his distinguished career. We are here to help our best minds find "the time for thinking things over"; to encourage our singers and story-tellers; to assist our scholars and thinkers whose hours of dreaming assure our years of greatness.

It has been less than a year since I signed legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Humanities—only a few months since the members of the Humanities Council took their oath in this room.

But in a short time, they have raised large hopes. Under the wise and spirited leadership of Dr. Henry Allen Moe, the Council has underwritten 200 summer fellowships for young scholars and teachers; 50 grants to established scholars in the humanities; awards totaling $300,000 to museums and historical societies for their education projects.

The council's grants are making our American classics more widely available; assisting historical researchers; distributing recorded classics to the blind; and improving the quality of educational television and radio.

The new chairman of the Council and the Endowment, Dr. Keeney, is a product of a great public university—the University of North Carolina—and a great private one, Harvard. He served in World War II and has distinguished himself as a professor of history, dean, and president of Brown University.

But I know he agrees that his new responsibilities will be the most demanding of his career.

For Dr. Keeney and the Council will be dealing with far deeper questions than how to distribute dollars. They will be probing deep into the heart of our people and our society for answers to the ancient mysteries: What meaning has life? What purpose has man?

That is the veil mankind has always sought to part; it is the mystery that has challenged and shaped us as a Nation from the first.

Our first soldiers and politicians were also our first scholars and philosophers. The Nation they brought forth excited all men—because it promised answers to the ancient mysteries, new meaning and fulfillment for man.

Ours was the only Nation ever based on an idea—that all men are created equal—that every man is entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But today, we still ponder the questions of the meaning of life and the purpose of man.

We know the answers are not wealth, or weapons, or wise government. These can help make life possible—but they can never make it meaningful.

So we turn for our answers to those whose profession is ideas; our scholars and writers, our historians and philosophers; our men and women, boys and girls of the Arts and Humanities.

They have contributed as much to our national life as our soldiers and politicians. They have lighted our path for almost two centuries—and the centuries ahead ask even more of their mind and heart.

That is why I have such great hopes for the Humanities Council—greater, perhaps, than the Endowment's budget—but I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that small budgets can spur large imagination.

And if the council has only a small membership and staff, I know that accomplishment does not depend on size.

I think of the Council as a small spark which can give the Nation—and the world—great light.

All of us, Carl Sandburg has written, are reaching out "for lights beyond . . . for keepsakes lasting beyond any hunger or death."

These keepsakes are not the products of industry, or spoils of war, or luxuries of

wealth. They are the old ideas, the old words. The older they are, the more their meaning excites all men.

Freedom is one of them. Truth is another.

How well we preserve these priceless keepsakes, Dr. Keeney will depend a great deal on the work which you and your colleagues do.

So I wish you well. I welcome you—and I am happy to be your witness as you take the oath of office.

Thank you.

Noted Americans Honor Washington Correspondent Ben Cole on His 50th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to get prominent people to write perfunctory laudatory letters about someone on his 50th birthday.

But it is impossible to get people to write letters of the warmth of those which follow, unless the person praised has actually earned a warm spot in the hearts of those who do the writing.

To paraphrase Will Rogers, I never met a man who didn't like Ben Cole.

The letters follow:

STATE OF INDIANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

BENJAMIN R. COLE, Esq.,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Somehow it seems appropriate that you are marking your 50th birthday exactly ten days after the inauguration of Medicare. Fifty years are not the same as sixty five years, but they do demonstrate your determination to reach that golden age when Geritol calls.

Your long tenure as a scribe on the Washington scene probably means you have a book up your sleeve. Louis Ludlow wrote *From Cornfield to Press Gallery*. Your rural beginnings, your service as a political reporter, and your career at the Nation's Capitol match the record of Ludlow remarkably. But your record is Ben Cole's record and you have covered the news of your era well.

Happy birthday, Ben!

Sincerely,

ROGER D. BRANIGIN,
Governor of Indiana.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFF DIRECTORY,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent, The Indianapolis Star, National Press Club Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: When we first met during the Indianapolis mayorality campaign in 1947, neither of us were thinking much about fiftieth birthdays or Washington.

This note is to tell you how much I appreciate the full measure of yourself you have given your friends during the short, short nineteen years that have, someway, passed all to suddenly.

During those years I have usually agreed with what you wrote and have always agreed with your sense of justice, your kindness and your sincerity as you wrote.

Together you and I went through an interesting period when, for all to short a time, we had a President in the White House who was younger than we. I expect we, and all those in our general age group, aged more in those days than is possible on any one birthday since.

Congratulations. Happy Birthday. You're only one day older than you were yesterday.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
(Former 11th District Representative, State of Indiana.)

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLE: I join your many friends in offering warmest congratulations as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. You have my good wishes for continued good health and happiness and a long career of covering activities in behalf of the people of Indianapolis by Congressmen JACOBS—first the father, now the son, and—who knows—maybe one day the grandson.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. BEN COLE,
McLean, Va.

DEAR BEN: My warmest congratulations to you upon the anniversary observance of your 50th birthday. I hope in the years to come you will celebrate many more bearing witness to years of health, activity and usefulness.

When I arrived in Washington, of course we were friends already and had worked together when I was in the Legislature and you were working in Indianapolis. I was delighted when you were assigned to Washington shortly after I was elected to Congress. Both in Indianapolis and in Washington it has been extremely gratifying to work with you. You have respected my confidence and I think your reporting has been objective and of the nature that a reporter should strive to achieve. I have always found when I needed information or advice from a trustworthy source I could call on you. This policy has stood the test of years and I have designated you a journalist of the highest integrity.

Because of your pleasant bearing and optimistic attitude, you are always a welcome visitor and I know you will see through the window-dressing to the core of any matter we are discussing.

Just let me say, Happy Birthday from one good friend to another.

Sincerely yours,

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Member of Congress.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
July 6, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Correspondent,
The Arizona Republic,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: This is not the first congratulatory letter I've had the pleasure of writing to you and I trust it will not be the last.

Your tenure in Washington goes back much further than mine, of course, but in my limited time here I have come to recognize why you are held in such high professional regard by your colleagues in the press corps, your editors and publisher, and by those members of the Congress whose offices you cover.

Citizens in Arizona as well as Indiana are indeed fortunate to have a man like you reporting in the capital. Your work has always been distinguished for accuracy and fairness, and no public servant could ask for more.

On the occasion of your 50th birthday, it is a privilege to join with your many other friends in Washington in expressing the hope that you will be covering the Arizona-Indiana beat for many more years.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

PAUL FANNIN,
U.S. Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JACOBS: Secretary Freeman is in the Far East and will be out of the country on July 12, when the reception honoring Ben Cole is to be held.

I know the Secretary will be disappointed at being unable to attend this event. Please extend to Mr. Cole birthday greetings and wishes for success and happiness.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. MCDONALD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

GATES, GATES & MCNAGNY,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Columbia City, Ind., July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
c/o Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I have been advised of your 50th birthday which occurs on Sunday, July 10th.

I am indeed sorry that I cannot attend the reception which is to be held for you on July 12th.

I want to congratulate you upon reaching the ripe old age of 50 years.

It has been my privilege to have known you personally during one-half of that half a century and as you know, I have always had a deep affection for you and have appreciated the fine friendship that we have enjoyed through that span of years.

I trust that you have continuous success, happiness and good health in the years ahead.

I shall always remember you best during those years when you were covering the State House. I recall particularly the time that I sent for you to offer you a position in the State Government and you were under the impression that I had sent for you to be critical on some of the articles that you had written. You were greatly relieved when you found out that I wanted you to take a position in the State Government and that I was not critical of you. You, of course, made a great decision when you stayed with the Indianapolis Star and you have made great progress since that time and your friends are proud of the great success that you have had in the newspaper field.

Again I congratulate you and I am sorry that I cannot be present at your reception. I do trust that before too long a time I will have the privilege of seeing you and enjoying a good visit.

I am grateful to Congressman JACOBS in advising me of this occasion and giving me this opportunity to write you.

With kindest personal regards to yourself and family, I am

Sincerely,

RALPH F. GATES,
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
July 12, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply regret my inability to be with you tonight for reception honoring Ben Cole. He is an excellent correspondent, one in whom I have the highest esteem, and I only wish I could be there with you in marking his 50th birthday. The Arizona Republic is as proud of him as am I.

BARRY GOLDWATER.
(Former United States Senator, State of Arizona.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It's a pleasure for me to offer birthday congratulations.

And it's doubly pleasant to join in a tribute to you and your service to your newspaper and to the people of Indiana.

Since words are your stock and trade, I couldn't hope to impress you with my Congressional rhetoric.

I'll say only that I appreciate your interest in the Ninth District. I appreciate your accuracy and honesty in writing about me and my work. And, on behalf of all Hoosiers, I appreciate your fine sense of humor.

Your friendships on both sides of the aisle attest to your integrity and fair play.

Many happy returns of the day.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

HANDLEY & MILLER, INC.,
July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
National Press Club,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I couldn't pass this opportunity to extend birthday greetings from both Barbara and myself, and to wish you continued health, happiness and success in the years ahead.

As one who is already past the 50th meridian of life, I do want to reassure you that life really does begin at 50—that is if you just care anymore.

I am only sorry that I can't attend Andy's birthday reception for you Sunday but, unfortunately, HARTKE still has my plane ticket in his pocket, and has had since '58.

Best wishes.

Your old friend,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: It gives me great pleasure to add my good wishes for continued success upon this most fitting observance of the 50th birthday of one of Washington's most outstanding correspondents, Ben Cole.

My acquaintance with Ben dates back many years. I am proud to say that my esteem and appreciation for his fine talents as an excellent journalist and a truly fine person have grown over the years and have become deeply rooted into a lasting friendship.

Congratulations, Ben, for the splendid record you have made for yourself not only on the Washington scene, but also with your readers throughout the years.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I am indeed pleased to congratulate you as you celebrate your fiftieth birthday. Speaking from experience, I can assure you that the second half-century can be even more enjoyable than the first. All of us who have come to know you and appreciate your keen insight into the Washington world and to value your opinions and advice are indeed grateful for the service you have rendered, not only to those of us in the Congress, but to the public as well. I am sure that we can continue to enjoy the warmth and wisdom of your friendship and understanding for many years to come.

You are an honest newsman—indeed a credit to your profession—and, above all, a good and dear friend. I am proud to be among those who honor you on this auspicious occasion. Many, many happy returns.

With best personal wishes,

Your friend,

CARL HAYDEN,
U.S. Senator.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
Lafayette, Ind., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLE: Recently I heard a journalistic anecdote which may be an old one to you, but it was a new one to me. It goes like this.

A new copy boy, working nights on a large metropolitan paper, stopped the night managing editor and announced that he had been a copy boy long enough, he now wanted to be a reporter. When the editor asked him why he felt he was qualified to be a reporter, the boy replied, "I've been watching them. It's easy!"

I suspect that the readers of your newspaper columns may be somewhat like the copy boy: your excellence and journalistic ability make it seem so easy. On the contrary, I know that it has taken dedication to duty and painstaking effort to interpret correctly for the enlightenment of your readers the many facets of the Washington scene.

I send heartiest congratulations to you on this day, your mid-century birthday. I hope that all the readers you serve will continue to benefit for many years to come from your insight and uncanny ability to analyze and report the complex national and political problems that face our nation and affect us as individuals. Without reporters of your great interpretative ability, we citizens would be hopelessly entangled in shrouds of ignorance and misunderstanding.

With many happy returns of the day, I am,

Yours most cordially,

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: Thank you for your kind invitation to the Vice President to attend a reception celebrating the birthday of Benjamin Cole to be held July 12.

The Vice President would like to be able to accept. Unfortunately, he will be in St. Louis at that time. However, the Vice President has asked me to pass along his regrets and to thank you for thinking of him.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM CONNELL,
Administrative Assistant.

JACOBS AND JACOBS,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SON: Ben Cole is a kind, generous and just man. His discourse is stimulating and always seasoned with good humor. He would never willingly hurt anyone.

You are good to honor him on his 50th birth anniversary. He was your friend when you were a boy. He comforted me while you were away at war. He is my friend and I consider him one of God's noblemen.

You recall that through the years I have told you that he was one of the few I missed when my constituency came to miss me so deeply it voted overwhelming for me to come home.

May Ben have as many more birth anniversaries. The world will be richer for every one.

Love,

ANDREW JACOBS, Sr.,
(Former 11th District Representatives, State of Indiana.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been asked to respond further to your invitation to the President to attend the reception you are planning for Mr. Benjamin R. Cole on July twelfth.

Although it will not be possible for the President to attend or send a personal message, he is certainly appreciative of your thoughtfulness of him and sends his warm, good wishes for the occasion.

Sincerely,

W. MARVIN WATSON,
Special Assistant to the President.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, July 11, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLE: It is a pleasure to join in paying tribute to a talented journalist.

Although the term "public service" is generally used to describe government work, it is most certainly applicable to your career as a seeker and reporter of truth.

Best wishes for continued success.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH.

MCHALE, COOK & WELCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Providence has given to America riches, strength, and power, and may I paraphrase Bill Herschell who wrote "Ain't God Good to Indiana" by saying "Ain't God good to The Indianapolis Star and its reader for He has given us Benjamin R. Cole, Indiana's greatest Washington correspondent". I regret that I cannot be present to celebrate the deserving recognition you will be accorded on your 50th Anniversary by your many friends in recognition of your great ability to accurately and fairly report the doings and happenings in Washington without slanting the facts. In so doing, you have ingratiated yourself into the hearts of us all and when the legislative history of Washington during these years is written, the

historians will have to get the facts from Ben Cole's files.

I am proud of you and of your great work and of the fact that I went through high school in Logansport with your beloved mother and your uncle, and therefore, I could expect nothing else from you.

As the Irish would say, "May the good Lord hold you in the palm of His hand and may the wind be ever at your back" for many more years.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. MCHALE.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
Rochester, N.Y., July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Many thanks for the invitation to join the birthday party for Benjamin R. Cole.

As one who regards Washington as the news capital of the world, and who never ceases to recall with pleasure five years on the Washington scene, I would like nothing better than to meet with you, Ben Cole and the others—I never miss a Washington press corps rally if I can help it.

I have a trip to the mid-West on Tuesday, however, so all I can do is say thanks again for counting me in and congratulations on the idea of honoring Ben Cole, one of the tops in the Washington press corps.

With very best wishes to you both,

Cordially,

PAUL MILLER, *President.*

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
Indianapolis Star and Arizona Republic.

DEAR MR. COLE: I want to join with your many friends in extending heartiest congratulations to you on your birthday.

May you enjoy good health and happiness today and for many years to come.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Central Newspapers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Happy Birthday! It is a real pleasure to express my good wishes to you on your "half-century" mark—and it would take another half-century to say thank you for your friendship and many kindnesses to me. Arizona, as Indiana, is proud to claim you, and fortunate to have a newspaperman of your integrity, dedication and talent on whom to depend and call. Working with you over the past years has been a very gratifying and happy experience, and I look forward to many more years of this pleasant association.

May you have many more happy birthdays, each bringing you only the best and happiest years.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Bureau, The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: One of the real pleasures of being a Member of the Indiana delegation in Congress is the constant working acquaintance and friendship I have with you.

Not only are you a competent and careful craftsman of the journalistic trade, but you are a true friend and adviser to those of us who represent the people of Indiana.

In my three terms in the House, I have come to regard you not only as a fine correspondent and talented writer, but actually as another Member of the Hoosier delegation in Congress.

We have all benefitted many times from your great store of governmental information and experience, and your wealth of Indiana and national political knowledge.

I consider you, Ben, as one of the finest newsmen on the Washington scene, and wish to offer my sincere congratulations for your past years of service to your employer and the citizens of Indiana.

My warmest wishes, too, on your 50th birthday. May it be the beginning of a very happy and successful year for you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 8, 1966.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: Thank you for your letter of July 5 inviting Secretary Rusk to attend a reception in honor of your friend Mr. Benjamin R. Cole and to send a message of congratulations on the occasion of his 50th birthday.

Secretary Rusk has not yet returned from his trip to the Far East, but in view of his very full schedule following his return I regret that he will not be able to accept your kind invitation to the reception or to send a message. I know, however, that he would want me to send best wishes on his behalf to Mr. Cole.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

KNOX, IND.,
July 9, 1966.

DEAR FRIEND BEN: I am proud and happy to extend my warmest congratulations on your 50th birthday, and regret very much that I cannot attend Representative JACOBS' party in your honor on the 12th. I well recall our fine relations during your tour of duty at the State House and I still enjoy your column in the Star.

Best wishes to you and your loved ones.

Sincerely,

HENRY F. SCHRICKER.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana).

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
The Arizona Republic,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: It occurs to me that July 10, 1916, was a rather significant date in history. For example, on that day the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Omnibus Revenue Bill by a vote of 240–140, Pancho Villa issued a proclamation declaring his intention to recapture parts of Arizona for Mexico, the French advanced to within one mile of Perrone in their drive to remove the Kaiser from France, and President Wilson told a World Salesmanship Congress in Detroit that the Democratic Party was a friend of business.

Yet one must confess to a certain disinterest in the aforementioned when they are compared to an even more momentous event of overriding importance—the birth of Benjamin R. Cole.

Ben, we are indebted to your mother and father for their foresight. Without your fine, journalistic hand, life here in Washington might occasionally grow tedious.

My very best wishes to you on this birthday. The entire staff joins with me in the hope that the next 50 years will be just as you want them to be.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

As always,

GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, Ind., July 9, 1966.

DEAR BEN: Andy's much appreciated letter announcing your 50th birthday on Sunday, July 10th, and inviting me to the reception in your honor on Tuesday, reached me during my absence from Court while on vacation. I am grateful to him for the announcement and invitation so that I too can be among those of your host of friends to give you birthday greetings and best wishes on this happy occasion.

I need not tell you of the high esteem in which I have always held you, both as a man and as a writer—my warm regard and respect for you, I am sure, have spoken that message many times. So it is with real joy that I—and Vitallas joins me—wish many, many more happy birthdays, and may you and your family be blessed with an abundance of good health in the years to come.

Except for the distance that separates us, I would certainly be present on Tuesday.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,

Cordially,

BILL STECKLER.

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL,
New York, N.Y., July 6, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
c/o Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN COLE: I regret very much that I cannot attend the reception that Congressman JACOBS is giving in your honor on Sunday, July 10. I am compelled to be in Chicago this weekend and will not be able to get back in time.

Although I have not had the privilege of meeting you personally I know your name and your reputation quite well and I salute you on the fine work that you have done for your newspapers in Washington over the years.

I'm glad that Congressman JACOBS is celebrating your birthday and not your retirement. Carry on!

Cordially,

MIMS THOMASON,
President.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 12, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN COLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Not only do I want to congratulate you for the singular achievement of reaching the age of 50 with your imagination, professional integrity, and zest for the job undiminished, but I also want to congratulate ANDY JACOBS for having the foresight to honor you on this occasion.

As ANDY noted, the first Congressman from Indiana you were assigned to cover was his father. In a similar vein, when I came to Washington as a freshman Congressman you were the first reporter that it was my pleasure to become acquainted with. The constructive and understanding way you have covered not only Arizona news but my own personal part in it has earned you my greatest respect. I am happy to count you among my best friends and hope we are both around to mark the successful conclusion of your second 50 years.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, July 7, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
Washington Correspondent,
The Indianapolis Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: As you reach the ripe, young age of 50, I want to join your host of other friends in expressing appreciation for the fine job you have done and are doing to keep us Hoosiers informed about the Washington scene.

With your background of reporting governmental and political affairs in Indiana, you continually bring to us news and comments tailored to Hoosier readers. The fact that you occasionally deal with the antics as well as the actions of legislative and administrative leaders in Washington, and particularly of those from Indiana, adds flavor to the newsy reports and columns.

John Barnett tells me the members of the State Chamber staff rely heavily on your informative weekly reports outlining the votes of Indiana members of Congress on issues.

I wish you many more happy and successful years of reporting from Washington about Hoosiers and for Hoosiers. If our paths do not cross before then, I hope in any event to have the opportunity to visit with you again at the Chamber of Commerce Congressional Reception next spring.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER W. WALB,
President.

JULY 8, 1966.

Mr. BENJAMIN R. COLE,
% ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
234 Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Congratulations on your many years of faithful interpretation of Washington to Hoosiers.

Knowing the characters involved as I do, I have a real appreciation of the quality of the job you have done and sincerely feel that all of us have a much better understanding of the problems of our national government.

May we have many more years of your wisdom!

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

MATTHEW E. WELSH.
(Former Governor, State of Indiana.)

How Long Will the War on Poverty Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the innovator of the war against poverty in modern times was the Emperor Napoleon III. After his exile, he continued to write about this favorite subject in London. But even Napoleon III had the intent of ending poverty in his country, France.

We had understood this was the intent here too—to end poverty yesterday if not tomorrow in the United States of America, to wipe it out, to eliminate it. Alas, this does not seem to be the true intent of this administration.

For Lyndon B. Johnson has allowed the Office of Economic Opportunity to buy a vast array of new office equipment. Included are such items as electric typewriters, file cabinets, film cameras, and a host of others. This monumental acquisition of shiny new supplies for the sumptuous offices of those directing the war on poverty can only mean, I submit, that the President and his aids expect our poverty war to go on a long, long time. I only hope that the purchase of adding machines does not mean that in the back of the high command's mind is the thought of adding to the number of poor.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Veterans' Administration, and the Post Office, all agencies which have proved they can, given the chance, produce, have been ordered to cut new equipment to the minimum. The Army in Vietnam may have 29 items in short supply in the Vietnam war area as reported by a Senate committee.

But Sargent Shriver's chair-borne home command is now adding to its record of having stamp lickers getting $50-a-day record salaries, the best and newest machines for their war in which the poor are often the chief sufferers.

I would suggest that if the President does not intend the war on poverty to go on forever, he might at least order the new machines for the permanent agencies and let Sargent Shriver's circus employ their used equipment. Or maybe the money could even go to help the poor.

Pioneer Spirit—1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the pioneers first started filtering into the south Florida area, the only contact they had with their friends and relatives in the North was by mail.

The mailman of the last 1800's and early 1900's did not have to worry about a 70-pound limit or a ZIP code. He had only to worry about Indians, alligators, hurricanes, bandits, and sore feet.

For you see, the mailman, aptly titled the Barefoot Mailman, serviced the hamlets and towns between Baker's Haulover in Miami and Jupiter Inlet by foot, walking the distance of nearly 70 miles on the beach.

As we grew sophisticated and the methods of transportation improved, the route of the Barefoot Mailman was abandoned and assumed by more modern methods.

But each year Boy Scout and Explorer units undertake the trip. They made the same trek under existing conditions as the Barefoot Mailman did some 80 years ago. They sleep on the beach at night and walk by day.

I would like to commend their incentive and sense of history. I only wish that other youths might be inflicted with such a pioneer spirit.

Address of Vice President Humphrey at Michigan State University Commencement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point in the RECORD to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the remarks made by Vice President HUMPHREY at the recent commencement at Michigan State University. He congratulated American youth, our greatest natural resource, and encouraged them, while being mindful of the lessons of history and past traditions, to have the will to do and the soul to dare for the future challenges and responsibilities of this great country.

The text of the address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICH., JUNE 12, 1966

HUBERT HUMPHREY feels a kinship with college students.

I like to be where the action is.

I was raising Cain with the system before you were born, and as I am just beginning to get started, I don't doubt that I will be raising Cain when you are running things too.

In fact, I wish I were being graduated today. I might have a better idea where my next job is coming from.

Today I speak in a relatively new role. I speak for management.

As management's spokesman, I wish first to thank you for service to your nation.

In all these years of study, I am sure you thought you were improving your position to compete in the years ahead or to enter a profession. But you today are more than college graduates.

From management's viewpoint, you are valuable national resources.

More Americans are in college this year than all the Americans alive when our nation was founded. More Americans are in graduate schools today than all the Americans who bore arms during the Revolution. Those are lots of resources.

And we will need them all.

For by the time one of you is likely to stand in this place at some future Commencement, the American people will number more than 300 million—and the people in the world almost too many to even think about.

And I need not recite for you the future needs and problems of those people.

You will be in charge. You will be responsible for our national security and my medicare.

You will be responsible for the education of my grandchildren and the freedom of my great-grandchildren.

So I propose to take a look at you and have a talk with you.

But first, about your parents—it may be hard to believe but, in another century's history books, the very people who have been helping with your tuition may be ranked among the greatest radicals in modern history.

Some of your parents might flinch if you told them there were radicals in your family. But they have been nothing less.

Theirs is the first generation in all of history which, by its own hand, has surrendered the privilege of telling its offspring: This is how things are; this is how they always have been; this is the way the world goes.

Your fathers and mothers were born children of hills and valleys. Today they see the galaxy itself.

They have created amazing new systems of management, science and technology. They have found new and better systems to care for people. And I have been right in the midst of it with them, just as I am with you.

I am not going to bore you with tales of the Great Depression, or of World Wars, and of the hardships your parents faced. Nor will I recount the struggles that took place in our country to achieve the measure of well-being and social justice we have reached today.

But I can tell you, it has been no picnic. It has been no improvised "happening." It has taken involvement, and hard work, and study, and self-doubt, and passionate disagreement, and finally, understanding and motion.

Progress has ridden no fast express. It has been a local all the way. Thus, as older generations welcome you aboard, I think you ought to know that they've not been cooling their heels waiting for you.

The generation of your parents has lived amid the floodwaters of history. Most of them have known genuine hardship. Many of them have lost loved ones on other continents. Their old horizons have gone far off in space, yet they have followed, cautious but willing. The world has come to their dinner table, and at times has seemed to stay a long while, yet they remain hospitable.

They have made history. Yet to many of you, I know, it seems "the heavy hand of history." Remember this: The challenges they have faced didn't leave room for some of the niceties of today.

They have had to meet trouble in large sizes. They have had to feed and clothe and house and transport and produce and educate and struggle in big portions, just to overcome the clear and present perils of their time.

Individualism has been the backbone and concern of their work. Yet to serve the individual, they have had to build on a scale which has seemed at times to dwarf the individual. By and large they have been, I believe, a resourceful and courageous generation. And now, to you, I know, it seems they have hidden their history. Over the battlefield they have laid out the golf course.

For those of you who have grown up within putting distance of a country club or within walking distance of a second car, it is hard, I know, to recognize many vestiges of radicalism. "Where's the action?" you ask. And I reply: There's plenty of action. Roll up your sleeves and have some.

Your parents had to fight desperately, at your age, to stave off poverty at home and violence abroad—and they in large part succeeded.

Yet the challenges you face are far greater, and far more exciting, than those they faced. The scale of effort to be required of you will be far greater than that required of them.

For the fact of our time is this: The poverty our nation knew in the Great Depression . . . the peril that mankind knew in World War II—these are nothing compared to the poverty and peril that surround our strong, rich America in the world today.

There are desperate conditions of injustice and hunger and disease throughout most of the human family.

There are, in human society, conditions which not only bring a sense of shame and insufficiency to those of us who live in such a blessed land . . . but conditions which can lead to the eruption of the little disorder, which can grow to the small war, which can build to the cataclysm which could destroy rich and poor, black and white, believer and non-believer—all of us alike.

That is where the action is.

This is the environment in which you will be in charge. This is the human adventure on which you embark. I believe you sense the full measure of what you face. I feel a sense of concern and of involvement among you. I have seen you in the Peace Corps, helping strangers. I have seen you marching down dusty roads on behalf of fellow Americans whose skin doesn't happen to be white. I have seen you, in VISTA, lifting the forgotten to a place of self-respect in life. I have seen you, standing calm, resisting the temptation of violence, for what you believe in.

I have seen you, wearing your nation's uniform, fighting bravely for a cause far more difficult to understand than any we have defended before. I have seen you speaking out, from deep personal conscience, without thought of personal popularity. You perform remarkably well in the system your parents built, yet I know that you are probing relentlessly to find your own personal relationship to it . . . desperately seeking identity in a society of bigness.

For your generation, the old labels seem to have little meaning. Whether you are part of the "New Left" or the "New Right" or the "Out" or the "In," your concerns are far more for basic humanity than they are political. And I think it is a mistake to see in either your protests, your reservations, or your dissent, much than can fit into the traditional political categories.

Indeed, if much of our political history seems to have escaped you, you are not too troubled by the loss. You are deeply and personally caught up in what matters today. You set high standards for yourselves, and you judge yourselves harshly. And you show a remarkable degree of serious introspection for the children of prosperity. And I sometimes fear that, in your introspection, you may come to believe you are alone.

I tell you now that when you stand alone, you are not alone. When you speak out and act alone in America, you are more a part of this land and more a source of its strength than are all of the multitude who join in silence, no matter how vast they may seem. "The most dangerous enemy to truth and freedom amongst us," said Ibsen, "is the compact majority." Oppose that compact majority, and you are sure to collect a few bruises. But I have found that the best remedy for a bruise is to collect a few more.

The more you speak out, and the more you act, the more you are going to discover that you are lending courage to a surprising number of people whose feelings will come to the surface in response to yours.

True freedom in any land is a relentless, never ending process of self-discovery among its people. This you will preserve, for our own land, not because it is your inheritance; nor because some destiny says you must; but because your own free search for individual identity in the living present, demands it.

The strongest bulwark of liberty is man, free and in search of himself. A good number of your generation have already learned this lesson, in search of themselves in places and causes far distant from East Lansing, Michigan.

It is your opportunity to carry that lesson into forgotten corners of our country—and of the world—where people have never had any reason to learn it, or believe it.

We face today the incomparable opportunity—in the red dust of South American villages, in the neon minefield that is Watts, California—to stimulate the will to seek identity and to discover one's course.

You will be tempted to chart your progress by Gross National Product or by trade indices, or by many other of the quantitative measures you so distrust today.

Keep your distrust of these things. Measure your progress by whether those you help—those who have known in their lives nothing but despair and defeat—by whether they can begin to have faith, by whether they can begin to have hope, by whether they can begin to find themselves.

Yours is the opportunity to prove in the world what the generation of your parents has already begun to prove in America: That the course of history is not a mindless juggernaut we are powerless to control, but a fresh challenge susceptible to courageous action in each generation. I hope you will be sensitive to that opportunity. I hope you will waste no time in seizing it.

The story is told that Pericles of Ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply devoted to causes, who wished to change immediately what was wrong in the world. Pericles chastized the young man for being too bold and brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men. The older man patronizingly said: "Of course, I understand for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved." To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

Despite the fact that I represent management here today, I will tell you this: If you do not choose to follow, precisely the trails that others have blazed, then I do not think we ought to count the future unsafe in your hands.

In your search for identity and self-knowledge, you will have much to discover before you determine what is worthwhile, and what is worthless. But in a land of individuals, better the mystery of the search than some counterfeit security. In a world society desperate for change, better your dedication to it than your fear of it.

It is the special blessing of this land, that each generation of Americans has called its own cadence, and written its own music—and our greatest songs are still unsung.

Peter Schoemann Honored by Wisconsin State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wisconsin delegation to Congress participated in a luncheon meeting at the Congressional Hotel at which the Wisconsin State Society presented its first annual Distinguished Citizenship

Award to Peter Schoemann, president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a distinguished son of the State of Wisconsin.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD at this point, a report of the proceedings on that occasion:

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS FOR AWARD PRESENTATION OF THE WISCONSIN STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., TO MR. PETER T. SCHOEMANN, GENERAL PRESIDENT, UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 13, 1966

(Mr. Jerome O. Hendrickson, President, Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., presiding)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The invocation will be delivered by Bishop Tanner.

Bishop TANNER. For the invocation today I have chosen the Blessing of St. Benedict: O Thou who clothest the lilies and feedest the birds of the sky, who leadest the lambs to the pasture and the hart to the waterside, who has multiplied loaves and fishes and converted water into wine, do Thou come to our table as Guest and Giver to dine.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We are happy to see you today. I want to read some communications: John Cosgrove, Assistant Director in the Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning wrote as follows:

"Dear Mr. Hendrickson: I deeply appreciate the invitation of the Wisconsin State Society to honor Mr. Peter T. Schoemann on the occasion of the presentation of the Distinguished Citizenship Award to him on July 13, 1966.

"I regret that I cannot be with you. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than joining in so deserved a recognition. I worked with Mr. Schoemann in his capacity of Chairman of the Standing Constitutional Committee on Education of the AFL–CIO, and know of his contributions to education in general and the National Defense Education Act in particular. His dedication, integrity and qualities of leadership continue to be an inspiration to all of us who have the privilege of associating with him in whatever capacity.

"Please extend my regrets and cordial best wishes to Mr. Schoemann on this important occasion."

I also would like to read a telegram from the Staff of the Milwaukee Labor Press:

"Our best wishes on being designated Wisconsin's most outstanding national labor leader. May God continue to bless your future endeavors as he has in the past."

I would like to make some introductions:

Mr. James P. Schoemann, the son of the man we are honoring this afternoon. Jim Schoemann is the Administrator of the International Training Fund, a joint labor management trust which extends financial and technical assistance for the apprentice and journeyman training of the plumbers and pipefitters;

Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Representative of the 2nd District of Wisconsin;

Andrew J. Biemiller of Milwaukee, former member of our Wisconsin Congressional Delegation and currently Legislative Director of the AFL–CIO;

John Loomis, a Vice President of the Wisconsin State Society and former General Counsel of the Agency for International Development;

William F. Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL–CIO and a colleague of our honored guest on the AFL–CIO Executive Council;

The Treasurer of the Wisconsin State Society, Charlotte Norris;

Casey Ireland, Secretary of the Wisconsin State Society;

Congressman LYNN E. STALBAUM, from the 1st District of Wisconsin;

Charles Donahue, Solicitor of the Department of Labor and former Research Director of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters;

Congressman JOHN A. RACE from the 6th District of Wisconsin;

The Most Reverend Bishop Paul F. Tanner, native son of Milwaukee and the General Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference;

The Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor;

Congressman HENRY S. RUESS, past President of the Wisconsin State Society and Representative of the 5th District.

We had expected to have with us today at the head table Mr. Martin J. Ward, General Secretary-Treasurer of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, who was regrettably called away to Chicago yesterday by the untimely death of his father.

My Executive Committee directed that this presentation ceremony be bipartisan, and we are very fortunate to have received acceptances from the two Wisconsin Members of the House of Representatives who have the longest term of service for their respective parties.

Our Democratic Representative is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It is my distinct pleasure to present Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Representative from the 4th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Hendrickson.

Your Excellency, Bishop Tanner, our Honored Guest, my Colleagues, distinguished guests, this is truly a great privilege for me to be able to say a few words today as the Wisconsin State Society honors one of America's outstanding labor leaders and a fine son of Wisconsin, Peter T. Schoemann.

Knowing you as I do—your vast energies, your broad range of interests and your searching intellect—it is not easy to select one or two topics to dwell on in the few minutes alloted to me.

Since this week in Congress we are considering the Foreign Aid Bill, I think it appropriate to dwell briefly on the contributions which Pete Schoemann and the American labor movement are making to American policies and programs abroad.

As you all know, the AFL–CIO has supported the President 100 percent on Vietnam and our efforts to block communist aggression there and everywhere.

Pete Schoemann has been one of the most outspoken of our labor leaders on this subject. He has frequently stated his support for President Meany's vigorous anti-communist stance on the part of American labor in international labor circles. Among labor leaders from other nations he has been a constant, effective proponent of U.S. policies.

To me, Pete Schoemann represents the dedication to the American way of life of the labor movement in this country.

Communism, as you know, has classically aimed its appeals at the workers of the world, promising them a paramount place in their "new society."

American labor has rejected these blandishments and, for the most part, has refused even to toy with the suggestion that there might be something to gain under communism.

At the same time, our trade unions have been in the forefront of the free labor movement of the world. They have tried to impress upon the workers in other countries the benefits which can be obtained through participation in a democratic system.

In short, Pete Schoemann and other American labor leaders have not been content to be merely anti-communist. Rather, they have made, and are making, vigorous efforts to promote free institutions abroad which can act as a bulwark against Marxist philosophies, and rarely has any effort had such success as that undertaken by the labor movement.

For example, the Foreign Aid Bill now before the House contains a provision for assisting labor's efforts at providing low-cost housing for workers in Latin America.

American labor has invested millions of dollars and much time and effort in demonstrating U.S. techniques for building, financing and marketing privately developed housing. In doing so our trade unions have helped alleviate a crying need for decent housing for Latin American workers.

But Pete Schoemann can tell you much more about this labor program than I can. He has been in the forefront of these efforts, as he has been in the forefront of other progressive projects of American labor.

Because of his leadership, Pete has gained tremendous respect here on Capitol Hill and in the Executive agencies downtown. He has become well known in the past few years as one of the most vocal and effective spokesmen for the labor movement.

His fellow plumbers and pipefitters are all indeed fortunate to have such an able leader, and a man who is unafraid to speak out courageously on those public issues which touch the welfare of his own membership and the entire labor movement.

It is our hope that this Citizenship Award from your fellow Wisconsinites will—in some measure—express the general recognition which exists in Washington for the fine contribution which you, Pete Schoemann, are making to the labor movement and the progress of our nation.

Congratulations!

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Now, we are privileged to call upon Representative ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of the 10th District of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and my colleagues in the House: After the very appropriate remarks made by Clem, I think that any words will merely be supplementary to the wonderful thoughts that he has expressed.

It is a great privilege for me, Pete, to be here and to take part in the ceremonies honoring your great service and your great contribution.

Just because we are honoring and awarding you today doesn't mean we are asking you to quit and to give up. You are still young in spirit, you are still young in heart, and you still look young.

Pete, people of America, people of Wisconsin, and people of the world I think have good memories of your dedicated services to mankind.

You know it is an accomplishment to be singled out in your life for a single accomplishment. It is an honor to be designated as a great labor leader and to be designated so in one field. That in itself is honor enough. But when you have a man who is singled our not only for his contribution to labor but for his contribution to another field of activity, then I think that is a real achievement and real accomplishment.

Peter is known in the field of education for his accomplishment in that field just as he is known for his accomplishment and achievement in the field of labor.

There are hundreds of thousands of young people in America today who are enjoying

the privilege of education because Pete was a forerunner in that field. Because Pete felt what good does it do to bring all these emoluments to labor if they don't have the privileges and benefits of getting the fruits of that labor, namely, getting their children adequate education.

One of the reasons the United States of America ranks as high as it does in the field of vocational education is because of the pioneering spirit and the tenacity of Pete Schoemann over here the man we are honoring today. He started in the State of Wisconsin where he is not only known as a labor leader but as a leader in education as well.

Incidentally, I first heard about Pete Schoemann not about the labor movement, I heard about his work in the field of education in Wisconsin. He was on the school board of Milwaukee. I believe he is the only living—or dead—citizen of Wisconsin who has been honored by three governors of three different parties. Ordinarily most states have only two parties. We have three. Wisconsin always offers more.

But here was a man singly honored not by one governor of one party but honored by three governors of the State of Wisconsin that needed his consultation and work and his effort in the field of education.

I just want to say to be recognized in the world for just one achievement is a good thing but when a man is recognized for the things you have done in the field of education, besides the things you have done in the field of the labor movement, it is a double honor.

I am privilege indeed to stand before these people and pay tribute to you and pay you honor. You deserve it. No man deserves it more.

Apart from his direct activities within the labor movement, Pete Schoemann's favorite extracurricular activity—if I may call it that—has certainly been his interest in education; and this is of particular interest to me as a former teacher.

Many years ago, when he chose to become active in politics in Milwaukee, his interest in education led him to choose membership on the school board as a target of his efforts. He was a member of the Milwaukee Board of School Directors for 21 years and was twice president of the Board.

His involvement has included all kinds of education, both academic and vocational, and at all levels.

For 18 years, he was a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, serving under Wisconsin governors of three different political parties. He was also president of the Board for seven years.

Long before he came to Washington, then, in order to take over as president of his own international union, Pete Schoemann had captured the spirit of organized labor's traditional stand of as much education as possible, and for as many people as possible, in the United States.

President Meany of the AFL–CIO made an excellent choice in selecting Pete Schoemann to be the Chairman of the AFL–CIO Committee on Education, in which capacity he often appears before committees of both Houses of Congress to present the AFL–CIO's position on various education bills.

Once upon a time, it seemed that the barriers to eventual passage of federal aid to primary and secondary education were practically insuperable. Those barriers have finally been broken down, and for this achievement, the school community—the school boards, the supervisors, and the teachers—owe a lasting debt of gratitude to their friends in the American trade union movement who kept up the fight year after year and never gave up in the face of what amounted at times to very discouraging odds. This persevering and very effective assistance is personified in labor leaders like Pete Schoemann who long ago recognized that it would profit little to achieve better wages and shorter hours and improved working conditions for themselves, if they could not help their children prepare for a richer and fuller life than they themselves had known.

Peter Schoemann's dedication to improvement of the educational system has always been reflected in his constant efforts to improve the quality of apprenticeship training for members of his own union. The high value he has placed on continuous training for skilled craftsmen has resulted directly in new and improved programs of training for journeyman members of his union as well.

Today, the apprentice and journeyman training system of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters in conjunction with employers at both the national and local level is rightfully considered one of the very best, if not the best, in this country.

Two characteristics of Pete Schoemann's fight for bigger and better apprenticeship programs deserve mention. One is his resistance to substitute methods of training in the form of spot training in some few skills of the trade for a shorter period of time than the full five years which his craft requires. Secondly, there has been his insistence that apprenticeship and journeyman training are primarily matters for joint labor-management determination and control; and that while government assistance is welcome and profitable and even deserved, the nation's various systems of apprenticeship training must never become comprehended into, and consumed by, an overall governmental manpower program.

By way of proving this latter point, his international union under his direction has established in conjunction with large interstate or national construction firms a very interesting trust arrangement known as the International Training Fund. Although, in the construction industry, apprenticeship is locally directed and locally financed in the first instance, it is the role of this Fund to assist local training programs through direct financial grants, and also by maintaining a corps of five full-time technical experts in the field whose job is to help local apprentice committees improve the quality of their training. I understand that this International Training Fund has made grants totalling more than $8 million in the ten years it has been in existence, and that all of this money was contributed in the first place by employers of union plumbers and pipefitters.

This emphasis on the rightful place of private enterprise in the total American scheme of things is an example of Pete Schoemann's political and social philosophy. The American trade union movement today is distinguished from labor organizations in many foreign countries by the fact that it believes in the fundamentals of the capitalistic or private enterprise system. Pete Schoemann, however, is one of those American labor leaders who stands out by being unafraid to say just that; that is, he is not content to give lip service to such things as private ownership of the means of production, competition in the market place, and the right of business owners to a fair profit, while relying largely on government initiative to solve our big social problems. He frequently speaks out on the rightful role of business and labor in solving some of these problems, not merely as following the leadership of public officials, but sometimes as taking the initiative.

Lastly, any tribute to Pete Schoemann at this time from a Republican would be incomplete without mentioning his outspoken insistence just within this past year upon greater political independence for the labor movement. Labor has always maintained a formal or technical kind of political neutrality, and every now and then supports a Republican. I myself am very proud of the constant and loyal support I have received from union members and their chosen leaders in my own congressional district. Sometimes though, we are led to believe that it is almost futile for a Republican member of Congress to vote for what he conscientiously believes is the real welfare of the working men and women of this country, because his Democratic opponent in the next general election is sure to take what is sometimes called a more "liberal" stand on certain issues, and this alone will be sufficient to win him the endorsement of the labor movement.

Pete Schoemann has lately pointed out, in connection with the fate of the 14(b) repeal and the situs picketing bill, that "liberal" and "pro-labor" do not always mean the same thing. I believe this point is very, very well taken and heartily recommend this consideration to other leaders in the trade union movement. I believe we are beginning to see the signs of an awakening to this political truth. I believe we saw that during the AFL–CIO Executive Council meeting this past winter down in Miami. I believe we saw that also during the National Legislative Conference of the Building and Construction Trades Department held here in Washington this past March. Most assuredly, liberal and pro-labor are not the same thing, and they who are mostly intent upon securing enactment of a long list of welfare programs are not necessarily they who recognize the need for legislation that will stimulate organizing initiative on the part of labor and enable labor to better serve the welfare of its membership at the bargaining table.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman HENRY REUSS of the 5th District to make a special presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you very much.

Reverend Clergy, colleagues, brothers and sisters: Wisconsin is illustrious for its cheese, renowned throughout the world for its beer, but there is nothing of which it is prouder than its great, clean, progressive labor movement. And no man has brought more luster to that movement than that peerless plumber, that sterling steamfitter, that genial journeyman, Pete Schoemann.

A lot of us in Milwaukee, when Pete left for bigger things in Washington a dozen years ago, were fearful that this might go to Pete's head, that he would forget his old friends in Wisconsin and the problems of Wisconsin. But as the history of the last dozen years demonstrates, he has not forgotten us. And we have not forgotten you, Peter.

I have the privilege of presenting on behalf of the Wisconsin State Society to you, Peter, a flag of the United States which has flown over the United States Capitol. If anyone doubts that fact, I have in this packet a letter duly signed and subscribed to by J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, saying it has flown over the West Wing of the Capitol. It may be the last flag ever to fly over it. [Laughter.]

I know, because the love of your country has been your great philosophical characteristic all your life, that this flag will ripple proudly over the Schoemann home and illuminate your love for your country—and I hope, sir, remind you that Wisconsin loves you.

On behalf of the Wisconsin State Society I proudly present this flag to you.

Mr. SCHOEMANN. Thank you very much.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Some months ago the Wisconsin State Society thought it would be an excellent idea to have a suitable award or citation to confer deserved public recognition on distinguished citizens of our State. We felt that since we were the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., that our recipient should be a person who has distinguished himself in some way, both in our home State and also here in the Greater Washington Area.

The man we selected to receive our Distinguished Citizenship Award certainly fills the bill on both counts. He was a leading citizen of the City of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, not only in his chosen field of labor union leadership, but in a number of other civic activities as well. He left all that behind to come here to Washington to become a top executive official of his own international union. His union, The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of The Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, has been known for many years as an organization which was willing to try bold new experiments in labor management relations. It is a union which in the past has been in the habit of producing national leaders. Among its members have been numbered the late Senator Patrick V. McNamara from our neighboring State of Michigan, who passed away just this year; also, the late Martin P. Durkin from another of our neighboring states, Illinois, who was Mr. Schoemann's predecessor as president of the union and the first Secretary of Labor under President Eisenhower. Another outstanding member of the same union is Mr. George Meany, the first and until now the only president of America's merged labor federation, the AFL–CIO.

I would like to mention also that we are most happy to have with us today still another of Mr. Schoemann's fellow union members, Mr. James A. Brownlow, who until his retirement was president of the Metal Trades Department, AFL–CIO.

For the rest, I think I will let this scroll tell its own story.

The scroll says: "The Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. Presents to Peter T. Schoemann its Distinguished Citizenship Award.

"Whereas Peter T. Schoemann is a native son of the State of Wisconsin, having been born in the City of Milwaukee, where he received his formal education and his apprenticeship training in his chosen calling, the plumbing trade; and

"Whereas he labored faithfully at that trade in Milwaukee for many years; and

"Whereas he answered the call of his brother journeyman plumbers to serve their interests as an officer of Plumbers Local Union 75 of Milwaukee for eighteen years; and

"Whereas he occupied an influential role in building up the city of Milwaukee by serving as President of the Milwaukee Building and Construction Trades Council for some twenty years; and

"Whereas he was not content to confine his abilities and influence to his home town alone, but played an active role also in his international union, serving as an elected official of that body from 1928 continuously to date; and

"Whereas dearly as he loved the labor movement, he was unwilling to allow it to become the sole focus of his attention, but instead devoted himself to the general welfare of his fellow Wisconsinites by serving on, and sometimes chairing, such bodies as the Milwaukee Board of School Directors, the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education, and the Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee; and

"Whereas in 1955, he was chosen General President of one of America's largest and most influential trade unions, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, a position to which he has been twice re-elected unanimously by conventions of that body; and

"Whereas in the exercise of his high office, he has given the American trade union movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage and administrative excellence; and

"Whereas he has never allowed his necessary involvement in large national and international issues to cause him to forget that the welfare of his brothers is grounded upon protection of his union's work jurisdiction and continuous training; and

"Whereas he was most instrumental in preserving and reshaping the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes in the Building and Construction Industry, for the purpose of keeping intra-industry disputes in private hands where they belong; and

"Whereas he has encouraged and promoted the extension and improvement of apprenticeship training, the only adequate form of training for preparing a journeyman to work at his trade; and

"Whereas under his guidance, the United Association cooperated with national construction firms to establish the International Training Fund, an altogether unique institution for the purpose of providing financial and technical assistance to training programs for apprentices and journeymen; and

"Whereas by establishing the International Training Fund, both the United Association, under his leadership, and the national construction firms have provided a model which other skilled crafts may well follow in training the craftsmen needed by American industry, thereby saving American taxpayers millions of dollars annually; and

"Whereas as a Vice President of the AFL–CIO, he has fought a vigorous campaign for an American labor movement, whose affiliates are unified in purpose and free to pursue their individual members' needs; and

"Whereas his ability and interest in international labor affairs have led to his twice being appointed as a labor advisor to International Labor Organization conferences, and as an AFL–CIO delegate to a Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and

"Whereas his knowledge, skill and authority within the labor movement have caused him to be named to such bodies as the Atomic Energy Commission Labor Management Advisory Commitee, the National Manpower Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, and the Missile Sites Labor Commission; and

"Whereas in all of his service to various private and public interests, he has kept steadfastly before him the truth that labor is not the same thing as government, while business is different from both; so that while he has shown a capacity for tempering private demands in the light of public necessity, he has refused to equate labor statesmanship with a forgetfulness of the needs of those who elected him to union office; and

"Whereas especially by this means, he has provided an example of leadership that is a bulwark of American democracy, wherein the state is not the whole of Society; and

"Whereas he has, for all the causes above recited, reflected glory and honor upon his native State of Wisconsin, and endeared himself to his fellow Wisconsinites who now reside in Washington, D.C.: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That on this thirteenth day of July in the year of our Lord the nineteen hundred and sixty-sixth, and of the statehood of Wisconsin the one hundred and eighteenth, the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C. hereby confers its Distinguished Citizenship Award upon Peter T. Schoemann, with all the rights and privileges consequent thereto."

Mr. SCHOEMANN. Most Reverend Bishop Tanner, Honorable Congressmen, Mr. Toastmaster, Members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D. C., my Colleagues and Friends:

I am deeply grateful for this honor you have paid me, and I cannot tell you how much pleasure it gives me to accept this award here in the company of so many friends from the labor movement and from the State of Wisconsin, with whom I have been associated for many years.

It is a special honor to accept this award from my two good friends of many years standing, the distinguished Congressmen who have the highest seniority rank among members of their respective parties in our Wisconsin congressional delegation, CLEM ZABLOCKI and AL O'KONSKI. Both of them are friends of the working people of this country, and both have stood up time and time again to be counted on issues where the welfare of all our citizens was at stake.

Incidentally, the same goes for the man who earlier made the presentation of the flag that flew over the Capitol, that dedicated and very able Representative from Milwaukee, HENRY REUSS.

Thank you too for all the good wishes for a successful convention which so many of you have expressed to me here today.

I am especially pleased by those words in the scroll which say that labor statesmanship is not the same thing as forgetfulness of those who elect you to office. When you say statesmanship, you immediately suggest the relation of the individual citizen to the state and government at various levels, and you also suggest the relation of the individual to his community at various levels. There are situations where the overriding concerns of the larger community require us to curb our own particular aims and ambitions, but we do not always arrive at the goal by forgetting our own special interests from the very beginning. I wonder whether we have not become so cynical in our view of certain things which go on here on Capitol Hill, for example that we miss the deeper meaning in a complex process that makes our American democracy work.

Thus, labor unions, business interests, farm interests, the school lobby and all the rest are often described as pressure groups for special pleaders. Statesmanship for their representatives is supposed to consist in forgetting their own special aims to take the broader, general welfare viewpoint.

In the field of economics, we once had the unseen hand of Adam Smith. The theory was that, if everyone sought his own maximum gain most selfishly, then by the operation of an unseen hand the selfishness of all would produce the greatest good for all. During the years of the Great Depression, if not before that, we finally learned that the hand was not only not seen, it simply wasn't there.

Could it be that the pendulum has now swung too far in the opposite direction? Could we be missing the important lesson that the general welfare is sometimes very well served by those seeking their own private interest, that sometimes it cannot be well served in any other way?

The better job one makes of his own talents and his own possibilities, the more he has to contribute to the general welfare.

Furthermore, proposals made in the name of public interest are not always what they claim to be, and unless they are subjected to the criticism which springs from private interest, what we could end up with is a great collection of foolishness enacted in the name of the general welfare. Special pleaders then serve as devil's advocates to make our public-spirited servants prove their case.

Perhaps our great public policy debates are somewhat similar to the situation we have in a courtroom. The judge is there to serve the administration of justice, but so are the lawyers for the plaintiff and the defendant. The judge does it by being an impartial judge; the lawyers do it by being the most persuasive advocates they can be for their own respective clients. To get the whole job done, we need the impartial judicial decision of the judge, and we also need the special pleading of the attorneys for both sides. For one thing, justice cannot be served unless the litigating parties get everything that is coming to them, and to get that they have to fight for it. For another, on a given question it can happen that the judge is wrong while one of the special pleaders might be right.

And so it happens that our private groups can serve the general welfare by making out the best case they can for their own special interest. Since the start of this year, a number of such issues have come up involving my own and other unions.

One such issue is that of the wage guidelines. We are supposed to be acting in the public interest if we keep negotiated wage gains within the guidelines, and contrary to the public interest if we exceed them. But is it in the public interest, given our free enterprise economic system, for labor organizations to bow their heads meekly to a decision in which they had no opportunity to participate, and which is dictated unilaterally by an agency of the government? No, not of the whole government, but only of its administrative branch. Much the same can be said of business firms on the question of price decisions that are made.

Another such issue would be the relation of federal manpower policy to the institution of craft apprenticeship. It is alleged that apprenticeship, in its present state, cannot provide the skilled craftsmen needed by American industry, and that therefore those who sponsor apprenticeship should permit and even encourage the establishment of every sort of less-than-apprenticeship training program. To do so is said to be in the public interest, and to obstruct the new development, so it is argued, can proceed only from motives of selfishness.

Our argument with this position is that its wisdom does not equal its sincerity. It overlooks the truth that even now many gain entrance to the skilled crafts without apprenticeship preparation, and that some of them do not survive very long; that many of those who leave the skilled trades were not totally without training, but rather did have some kind of vocational school or technical institute training, approximately the equivalent of what they would receive under many of these manpower training proposals.

To take another example, the racial issue is indeed a serious national issue, and the achievement of full racial equality and racial justice would be a precious national asset. But have we not other precious national assets which need not be torn up and consigned to the rubbish heap for the sake of solving this one problem in social justice? The school system which does not discriminate on racial grounds would be a precious national asset, but so—I would argue—is the neighborhood school, provided it is not used as a cover-up for discrimination. It is good and right that our society provide everyone a full and fair opportunity to work at the occupation of his choice, but so is the requirement that a person make some effort on his own part to obtain the occupation that he chooses to follow.

While there is a selfishness and a self-centeredness that is disruptive of the community, so is there a well-regulated love of one's own self and one's own group, and a socially necessary campaign for self-interest, both personal and collective.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the officers and members of the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, D.C., and to everyone here present who has played a part, large or small, in these various activities that are recorded in this handsome scroll you have presented to me, and that was made possible by my activity in my labor organization that I love so dearly.

This scroll will occupy a place of honor in my office and be a constant reminder in my remaining years of the inspiration and encouragement I have received over these many years from my fellow Wisconsinites.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call on Honorable John F. Henning, Undersecretary of Labor.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. Chairman, Friends: I am honored to be here in joining in this tribute to Pete Schoemann.

The mere mention of the name Wisconsin recalls some of the great progressive traditions of American political life. In fact, I think we can agree that in the years between the turn of the century and the First World War, Wisconsin was perhaps the most enlightened, the most active of all the states in terms of social legislation.

Wisconsin was the first state in the union to acknowledge the coming of the Industrial Revolution and establish those industrial laws which would protect the worker against the abuses of the factory system. And it is only proper that a state with such traditions should honor Pete Schoemann.

Pete is President of one of the greatest trade unions of America. In fact, by family tradition I am compelled to say he is President of the greatest labor union in this nation.

Pete, I would meet another loyalty test. I must say that you head the second most skilled craft in America. The first, of course, being the lathers. The lathers of Los Angeles and Boston where Neil Haggerty worked his trade.

It is a great tribute that Wisconsin provides to Pete Schoemann today. It is a magnificent thing. Pete has given the great years of his adult life, the great productive years of his life, and he gives them still, to the national interest and the cause of the American worker. He has achieved wonders for the people he represents but above that he represents the independence and the integrity of the American trade union movement. Pete Schoemann and men like him have made the AFL–CIO the greatest trade union organization in the history of the free world.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At this time I would like to call upon Congressman JOHN A. RACE for a presentation to our distinguished guest.

Mr. RACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Honorable Bishop, Our Honorable Guest today, My Colleagues, Members of the Wisconsin State Society and Officers and Members of the different union organizations present.

Pete, it is a distinct honor to be with you today and I want to personally congratulate you. I feel very akin to you. I happen to have been a member of the Machinists for the past 25 years. I have served on the State Board of Adult Education of Wisconsin recently, and I see our background is similar. I don't think I will ever be a president of an international, but being a Member of Congress is another honor. I hope to stay here awhile.

I have a letter here, Pete, from the Wisconsin Congressional Delegation, which I would like to read:

"Mr. PETER T. SCHOEMANN,

"General President, United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Washington, D.C.

"DEAR PETER: The Wisconsin Congressional Delegation wishes to take this occasion to thank you for the honor you have brought to our State, the Labor Movement, and the Nation.

"We know that you are one of the great leaders of the Labor Movement. We also know of your contribution in the field of education, both academic and vocational. For eighteen years you were a member of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education serving under Wisconsin Governors of three different political parties.

"You believe that democracy demands wisdom of the average man. Without the exercise of wisdom, free institutions and personal liberty are inevitably imperiled. For this, we thank you.

"In the exercise of your high office, you have given the American Trade Union Movement a constant and faithful example of wisdom, courage, and foresight. You have imparted to the familiar language—what too many have come to treat as the cliches of Christianity—a new poignancy and vibrance. You did not do so by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them.

"Because much work remains to be done, we hope that you will be with us a long time. The people of the Labor Movement need your services, the young people of America need your example of selfless dedication, and we need your friendship and counsel. We not only wish you success in your approaching Convention, we predict it.

"With kindest personal regards, we are

"Sincerely yours,

"Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Congressman LYNN E. STALBAUM, Congressman ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Congressman VERNON W. THOMSON, Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Congressman JOHN A. RACE, Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, Congressman JOHN W. BYRNES, Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS."

And also last but not least, the dean of our Congressional Delegation, "Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI."

Mr. SCHOEMANN. Well, this is a very pleasant surprise. I am deeply moved and sincerely grateful to both Senators and all of the Congressmen from my home State for the kind sentiments and good wishes expressed in this letter.

And I am deeply pleased to accept it from such a fine, outstanding young Congressman as JOHN RACE. JOHN may your performance during this 89th Congress mark the beginning of a long and successful career here in Washington. Thank you again.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. We have men from all walks of life and the labor movement with us. I would like to introduce a Federal Judge who is a member of the Wisconsin State Society, Jim Durfee.

I want to thank Bob Shafer, Charlotte Norris, Bob McMillen of the United Association who is on Pete Schoemann's staff, Larry Gilbertson, Past President and Awards Committee Chairman of the Society, Dick Nelson

and John Loomis of the committee, as well as Carm Dye and Sukey Wray.

At this time I would like to close by calling on Bishop Tanner before he gives his benediction to tell us of a little sidelight on our honored guest.

Bishop TANNER. This will only take about a minute but it is a story that I think is important to illustrate Pete's character.

There aren't many people in this room who were adults in 1932, the black, desperate days of the depression. At that time I was in youth work in Milwaukee and we were graduating a class of about 75 young men from law school who could probably earn $75 a month any place in town. Pete gave them a talk and an opportunity which I regret to say they didn't take. It amounted to this: He wanted them to get jobs in a shop and not to mention they ever went to high school, and above all that they were graduated lawyers, but to work themselves up to be shop stewards and after that Pete would pull them up in the labor movement.

I have never forgotten it because in those days a union wasn't very popular and unions needed intelligent leadership. And Pete had the intelligence to offer it.

(Benediction).

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 15, 1966

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of mercy and love, we are deeply disturbed this morning as we come before Thee in prayer. Life many times shocks us because of the actions of man's inhumanity. In this U.S. Senate, we are grateful that the individual citizen is remembered in his needs. The importance of the one person, the one opinion, the one conviction, the one vote, the one tragedy that affects all of us makes this government of the people, for the people, and by the people lasting and strong.

Today, this Nation, O God, is shocked by the murder, by a deranged person, of eight lovely girls training to be nurses in Chicago. It is for our own needed discernment that we recognize the evil facing mankind on every hand. We are a part of this evil because we do not sincerely seek a spiritual, moral, and mental development of our people to help in these days of tensions, despair, anxiety, and unrealistic evaluations of life. Forgive us and help us, O God.

We pray Thy strengthening and comforting presence upon the families who are numb at this moment. Only the Most High can bring them from the depths of despair and mourning.

Be with our President, this governing body, the Nation, and the individual citizen that all may contribute to the solution and prevention of personal and world tragedy. Shape us into a better nation, a peaceful people, and a world with a future. Mold us and make us after Thy will, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 14, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 13, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2950) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1967 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to maintain parity between military and civilian pay, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 15750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3498. A bill to facilitate the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes Between States and Nationals of Other States, signed on August 27, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1374); and

S.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold an International Conference on Water for Peace in the United States in 1967 and authorize an appropriation therefor (Rept. No. 1373).

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 1375).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana, from the Committee on Finance:

Winthrop Knowlton, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to measures of control, and the protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, relating to the entry into force of proposals adopted by the Commission (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3617. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3618. A bill to make certain expenditures for public facilities by States, municipalities, or other local public bodies more fully allowable as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3619. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary suspension of duty on certain steel cylindrical tanks; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3620. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to expedite and facilitate adjustments of payments under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address delivered by Vice President HUMPHREY to participants in the Fourth Annual National Youth Camp, and the address of the President at the commissioning of the new research ship, the *Oceanographer*.

Program, leadership seminar initiating Citizen Workshops on Clean Water for America, welcoming remarks by Reynolds T.