ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 23, 1967, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him, to all that call upon Him in truth.—Psalm 145: 18.

With reverent and thankful spirits, our Father, we bow before Thee in the quiet peace of this moment. Our hearts are filled with gratitude for all the privileges and opportunities which are ours. Knowing that we can show our thankfulness through lives of usefulness to Thee, we pray that Thou wilt give us courage in the face of temptation, confidence when confronted by difficulties, and calmness amid danger. As Thou hast made this world fair for our use, grant that the trials of life may not through our grumbling ingratitude be turned into occasions of unhappiness and misery, but that we may accept with cheerfulness whatever Thou dost send.

Make us true and just in all our dealings and straightforward in all our ways. Give us, we pray Thee, such quiet strength as will enable us to prevail without loud speaking and such gentleness of spirit as will enable us to use our strength with due regard for the rights of others. Reveal to us the path we should take, tune our ears to hear Thy call, keep us ever in Thy way, and be with us as we go; through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 304. An act relating to the Indian revolving loan fund and the Indian heirship land problem;

S. 778. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

S. 1727. An act to authorize the consolidation and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups; and

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

TONKIN GULF RESOLUTION SUPERSEDED BY CONGRESS' MARCH 16, 1967, POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. REUSS. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the administration has made much of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution 3 years ago as congressional authorization for the Vietnam war. The Tonkin Gulf resolution declared:

> The United States is . . . prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

I remind the administration that this language has been superseded by more recent language setting limits on "the use of armed force." In the statement of congressional policy in the Military Construction Appropriation Act of March 16, 1967, Public Law 90–5, the Congress declared "its support of efforts being made by the President of the United States and other men of good will throughout the world to prevent an expansion of the war in Vietnam."

Yet here we are expanding the war in Vietnam. The President has announced that he will dispatch an additional 45,000 American soldiers to South Vietnam, raising our presence there to more than 500,000 men. And the bombing of North Vietnam has been extended close to the Chinese border. This morning's headlines report "Two U.S. Bombers Shot Down Over China."

Congress expressed its sense last March 16 that the war in Vietnam should not be expanded. The United States is expanding it. The administration should reread the March 16 congressional statement.

THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill to eliminate the oil depletion allowance. I said at that time and I repeat now that the oil depletion allowance gives unfair advantage to persons and corporations which are the least in need of tax relief. It is an unconscionable gimmick.

My bill has been referred to the House Committee on Ways and Means and I hope that the committee will take favorable action on it. However, if it does not start hearings by mid-September, I intend to file a discharge petition to force the matter to the floor for a vote. If this becomes necessary, I shall appeal to my colleagues in the interest of fair play to sign the petition and I hope that we can obtain the necessary 218 signatures to bring the matter to the floor.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and, Mr. Speaker, pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half the time to be allocated to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and one-half to myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12474, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important statement. I think that there should be more

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Members present. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 228]

Bow	Hathaway	Rivers
Brock	Holifield	Roudebush
Button	Hungate	Roybal
Clausen, Don H.	Long, La.	Scott
Corman	McCulloch	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Ga.	McEwen	Stuckey
Diggs	Mink	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams, Miss.
Eckhardt	Pucinski	Willis
Gettys	Rarick	Wyman
Giaimo	Resnick	
	Riegle	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, 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. 12474, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 397 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the appropriations bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1968.

The appropriation for this agency should have been included in the regular independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for 1968 which was earlier considered in the House and passed May 17.

NASA, as an independent agency, was not included in the regular bill because the authorizing committee had not acted at the time.

The legislative committees have recently completed action on the authorization bill—and the conference report for NASA has recently been approved.

Last evening the President signed the authorizing bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Chairman, we are pleased that the President took cogizance of the big cuts we have made in the appropriation bill at the time he signed the authorizing bill last evening.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a UPI dispatch and we also have available the President's full speech on the authorization for appropriations for NASA.

I want to read portions of what the President said regarding the appropriations for this vital agency:

[UPI, Monday, Aug. 21]

SPACE

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson Monday commended the House Appropriations Committee for cutting the fiscal 1968 budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Johnson took this unusual position for a Chief Executive in a special statement as he signed the $4.96 billion authorization for NASA. The bill reduced Johnson's January budget request for the Space Administration by $234 million.

The House committee last week, operating within the reduced authorization, reported out a NASA appropriation of $4.6 billion, a cut of $517 million below the January budget.

Money bills for the various agencies must pass the Congress in two steps. The first is the authorization which sets an upper limit and the second is the appropriation which actually sets aside the money. The appropriation can be less, but not more, than the authorization.

Johnson said ordinarily he would have opposed such a cut, but that conditions had changed greatly, since January.

He pointed out that the Nation now faces increased expenditures, reduced revenues, a deficit that might reach $29 billion and the 10-percent tax surcharge requested by the administration.

Against this background Johnson said, "some hard choices must be made" to distinguish between "the necessary and the desirable."

"We need not and dare not eliminate the necesary," he said. "Our task is to pare the desirable."

Johnson emphasized that his approval of the reduction signaled no lack of confidence in the space program. Nor did it indicate weakening a program for space exploration, he said.

"Because the times have placed more urgent demands upon our resources, we must now moderate our efforts in certain space projects," the President said. "But our purpose still remains as constant as the heavens we seek to explore; to master the challenge of space."

We have made some hard choices.

We are pleased that the President supports our cut and agrees with the Committee on Appropriations—the President has commended the action of the committee in making these cuts, pointing out that conditions have changed since the budget was prepared last year.

We have distinguished between the necessary and the desirable.

Many of the space programs are desirable but can be deferred.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, that the delay in bringing this appropriation to the floor has also been due to the investigatior of the causes of the tragic accident that took the lives of three of our astronauts in January.

Committees of both Houses of Congress have investigated the causes of this disaster—both have made recommendations—and NASA is proceeding to correct mistakes and to take steps to prevent a recurrence.

Let me assure you that all members of our subcommittee have given careful, thorough and extensive consideration to the future funding requirements of NASA.

We have all weighed these needs carefully, considered priorities, and taken into consideration our present budgetary situation—the cost of th. Vietnam war and the needs of vital domestic programs. We have concluded that NASA programs must be funded, but at reduced levels.

GENERAL BUDGETARY SUMMARY

The President has recommended $5,100,000,000 for NASA and its programs of space exploration for 1968.

The conferees recommended a cut of $234 million below the budget estimate—and our committee is recommending a further cut and reduction. We are recommending a reduction of $516,600,000 below the budget estimate. A cut of more than one-half billion dollars.

This is $282 million below the conference action.

In an overall way the total space program for this Nation—NASA and Defense and other agencies—has totaled some $7 billion.

For the past several years funding for NASA has been held to a steady level of about $5 billion, but this annual level of spending has been cut and reduced and is still declining to provide a more orderly and more economical operation.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Let me call your attention to the summary of appropriations on page 2 of the committee report. There are three primary areas of appropriations for NASA, as follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Budget estimates, 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
For research and development	$4,352,000,000	$3,899,500,000	—$452,500,000
For construction of facilities	76,700,000	35,900,000	—40,800,000
For administrative operations	671,300,000	648,000,000	—23,300,000
Total	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	—516,600,000

The amount recommended will enable NASA to continue a viable space program—at this reduced level.

We have made some deep reductions. Make no mistake about that.

Some of the members of our committee and others feel we have gone too far.

Certainly, there would have been less reduction under less stringent fiscal conditions.

All programs are being funded at reduced levels.

The long-range programs after Apollo have been reduced or denied at this time.

NASA MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS IN 10 YEARS

NASA has come a long way since created by Congress in 1958. In 10 years much has been accomplished.

As we all know, Congress has empowered NASA to construct advanced research and development relating to space and aeronautics in support of both civilian and military requirements—and research in the utilization of space for peaceful purposes.

This Nation has come from behind since sputnik was launched by the Soviets.

We have overcome many difficulties and many deficiencies—as NASA has moved this Nation forward in research and development, technology and space exploration.

We have completed the Mercury program.

We have completed the Gemini program.

And now we are well advanced into the Saturn-Apollo program.

Sixteen manned space flights have been made—all successful.

More than 200 unmanned flights have been made successfully.

We have achieved dramatic breakthroughs.

The fact that there has been only one tragedy—as tragic as it was—should not deter the United States from moving ahead in space and developing the technology that is as important as the conquest of space itself.

CONFIDENCE IN SPACE TEAM

As indicated in our report, the committee expressed great confidence in the ability, dedication and knowledge of Administrator James E. Webb and the space team—officials of the space agency and our astronauts.

The cuts and reductions, made by the committee, should in no way be interpreted as a lack of confidence in our space program—or in its leadership and personnel.

Following the regrettable tragedy, I wrote to nine selected astronauts and asked their individual opinions as to whether the space program should be cut and reduced or delayed.

Every response was favorable.

All responded that the space program should proceed with full budgeted appropriations.

Col. Gordon Cooper, Jr. said in his response:

> I feel that it is extremely important for us as a Nation to maintain our technological position and prestige in the world community.

If these men can lay their lives on the line—certainly we can support them. We have the world's greatest scientific team at NASA—we must not dismantle it.

BENEFITS: CONTRACTORS AND EMPLOYEES

This Nation receives great benefits from the investment in the space program.

We must remember that these funds are spent right here on earth—in every State in the Union.

These funds are not spent on the moon, as some allege.

These funds are not providing jobs for men on the moon—they are providing employment and jobs for our own earth people.

There are more than 320,000 people employed in the space program. While this is down 100,000 from the peak of 421,000, the more than 320,000 employees working in private industry, represent a significant part of the work force. Ninety-four percent of the research and development money is spent with industry.

Employment in the space program is expected to drop below 300,000 by the end of fiscal 1968. By reason of reduced budgets NASA contractors have been laying men off—at the rate of about 5,000 per month for the past 18 months. Despite the fact that the number of contractors continued to decline from a peak of about 36,000, this employment continues to have a substantial impact on the economy.

There are, of course, many benefits from the space program.

Much new knowledge has been developed—new skills, new approaches, new scientific leadership, new technology—which is all important to our defense and security.

So a viable space program will be continued.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Let me call your attention to the appropriations for research and development as broken down in the table—shown on page 4 of the report:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Budget estimate	Authorization	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
1. Apollo	2,546,500	2,521,500	2,496,000	−50,500
2. Apollo applications	454,700	347,700	300,000	−154,700
3. Advanced missions	8,000	2,500		−8,000
4. Physics and astronomy	147,500	145,500	130,000	−17,500
5. Lunar and planetary exploration	142,000	131,900	125,000	−17,000
6. Voyager	71,500	42,000		−71,500
7. Bioscience	44,300	41,800	40,000	−4,300
8. Space applications	104,200	99,500	88,000	−16,200
9. Launch vehicle procurement	165,100	157,700	145,000	−20,100
10. Space vehicle systems	37,000	36,000	35,000	−2,000
11. Electronics systems	40,200	39,200	35,000	−5,200
12. Human factor systems	21,000	21,000	21,000	
13. Basic research	23,500	21,465	20,000	−3,500
14. Space-power and electronic propulsion	45,000	44,000	44,000	−1,000
15. Nuclear rockets	74,000	73,000	46,500	−27,500
16. Chemical propulsion	38,000	41,000	35,000	−3,000
17. Aeronautics	66,800	66,800	65,000	−1,800
18. Tracking and data acquisition	297,700	290,000	260,000	−37,700
19. Sustaining university program	20,000	20,000	10,000	−10,000
20. Technology utilization	5,000	5,000	4,000	−1,000
Total, research and development	4,352,000	4,147,565	3,899,500	−452,500

We have made this breakdown to show the committee and NASA where we think these cuts can be made and should be made. Some will disagree as to which projects shall be reduced.

As will be noted in the report, all of these research and development items have been reduced.

Two new programs which were budgeted have been cut entirely: the advanced missions program and the Voyager program.

These are both planned and projected beyond the moon landings.

The 18 other items have been reduced.

Ongoing programs involving outstanding contracts are being continued at a reduced level.

Concerning launch vehicle procurement, NASA will continue to procure the Scout, Agena, Centaur, and other smaller space vehicles.

The committee was most impressed with the potential and possibilities of the nuclear propulsion program for long-time, long-range space flights—but we want to achieve other, more immediate objectives first.

NASA maintains a nationwide and worldwide tracking and communications system in which signals are constantly being recorded from satellites in orbit.

Our contracts with countries around the world must be maintained and continued.

With the big Saturn-Apollo missions projected for flight, these facilities will be utilized more extensively.

Operation and maintenance funds must be provided.

The committee recommends funding for the sustaining university program at a level of $10 million.

As many other NASA research programs involve contracts with universities and colleges throughout the country, it was felt that funding could be reduced for this purpose at this time.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

Concerning the construction of facilities budget the committee recommends funding for no major new construction—only power stations, powerlines, some launch-pad work and maintenance.

There are no new laboratories.

There are no new major construction projects.

Two-thirds of the construction items recommended in the budget estimate were deleted. The construction funds were cut by two-thirds—$40 million.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

The authorizing committee took a close look at the administration of NASA—at its personnel policies.

There have been layoffs in recent months.

The authorizing committee made some reductions and our subcommittee made an independent study of administrative operations.

We arrived at about the same figures as the authorizing committee. We are recommending $648 million—about the same level as last year.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, we have cut and reduced the three major items in NASA's budget: research and development; construction of facilities, and administrative operations.

While recognizing the immense benefits accruing to the Nation from the space program, the committee is acutely aware of the many demands currently being placed on the financial resources of the country, including the Vietnam war—and we have thus deferred items that could be deferred at this time.

We have made some hard choices. We have tried to distinguish between what we think is necessary and that which is desirable.

As many of our countrymen are concerned about the rate of the Soviets' progress in space, let me discuss briefly the information provided our committee on Soviet space exploration.

In the first place, the Russians are a world technological power and they are exercising that power in the area of space exploration.

Testimony before our subcommittee indicated that the Russians last year launched 44 space flights—and that thus far this year they have completed 17 space missions.

Testimony indicated that some of these flights are for military purposes—some for scientific purposes—some for meteorological purposes—and some are for the further development of manned flight.

It cannot be denied Russia was first to orbit in space—and first to land an unmanned vehicle on the moon.

Testimony before our committee indicated that the Russian space effort is at a greater proportionate level than ours—comparing the space budget with the gross national product.

The Russians still exceed in the area of booster rockets and in heavy payload.

We have surpassed the Soviets in some areas of technology—but not in these important areas.

I want to emphasize that much of the military technology used in Department of Defense space programs comes from the NASA space program—in fact, testimony was to the effect that the DOD depends upon NASA to develop the basic technology which it then applies for military purposes.

We cannot afford to concede space dominance to the Soviets—for defense or any purpose—or in any area.

And let me assure you that if the Communists can compel and force us to abandon our space commitment by maintaining the pressure in Vietnam—then, to them their investment in Vietnam indeed has yielded rich dividends.

This technology holds the key to successful competition in many areas of the future.

This technology will be developed.

The question is:

Will we develop it—or will the Soviets?

Let us acknowledge the fact that the systems approach and the techniques developed in the space program have revolutionized many phases of industrial production.

This systems approach is being used to assist in the solution of problems in our cities large and small.

This concentration of resources and research is being applied to municipal problems of transportation, air and water pollution, housing, land use, and others.

And, of course, we have the great scientific advances brought on by the space program in the fields of meteorology, communications, health care, and education.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, deep cuts have been made in this program.

But NASA can stand these cuts.

The technology is largely developed.

The spacecraft and boosters are on order.

The training is underway.

The flights are on target. The program will proceed.

The cuts we have made are in excesses—things that can be deferred or delayed—Voyager, advanced missions, university support program, and construction.

This program can be made more efficient by the experience of adjusting and streamlining NASA's operations in line with the committee's recommended funding.

A more streamlined NASA can be a more efficient NASA.

A recent editorial in the Washington Star called for cutting more than the $234 million made by the authorization committees.

The editorial called for a new look.

We have taken that new look.

And these recommendations are the result of our reexamination and review of NASA's needs and requirements.

This bill calls for a cut of $516,000—more than a half billion dollars.

This is a crucial, critical period.

We have reduced the budget as much as we feel is possible. There are those who want to cut further; there are others who want to restore some fundings.

I hope the Members will stand by the committee.

We believe the space program should go forward—and it will go forward under the funding recommended.

While the cuts are large, the amounts recommended—$4.583 billion—will certainly provide for a strong and viable space program.

The program will not be dismantled.

Our space team will not be disbanded.

We urge the Members to support the committee—and our recommendations.

In this program, second best is last.

We urge your support.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from Tennessee has given a very thorough and detailed analysis of the bill before you. It will not be my purpose to talk about specific items, programs, or missions in order not to cover the same ground he covered and the ground that was covered so effectively in a lengthy debate a few weeks ago when we had the authorizing bill on the floor.

At the outset, however, I would like to say that we considered this bill and the budget request in the light of certain facts that we all ought to recognize. These facts involve the deplorable fiscal situation our country is in today. The President himself in a statement yesterday, which was quoted by the gentleman from Tennessee, stated that conditions have greatly changed since January when his budget was originally submitted. As a matter of fact, $50 million in the budget request was an afterthought on the part of the President himself. He did not even include it in the original budget, but it was sent up as an amendment to the original budget. This is the item that calls for the Nerva II and some construction to support it.

Conditions have changed in other respects since January. The war in Vietnam continues. We are spending about $2 billion a month on it. Unfortunately, there is no evidence or any prospect of its diminishing in scope in the foreseeable future. Other demands are being made upon the Congress for funds. The President is calling for more and more money for grant-in-aid programs to the cities. We are faced with demands from about 3 million civilian employees of the Federal Government for substantial pay increases. You and I know we cannot increase civilian pay unless we increase pay for the men in uniform.

We have a constantly increasing deficit in postal operations. The President is now calling for increased postal rates. We have increasing demands for more funds for health, education, welfare, for transportation, and for all of the myriad activities in which the Government is engaged. We are faced not only with an increase in postal rates, which is a charge on the business enterprises of the country as well as individuals, but we also face a 10-percent surtax charge on all corporate and individual incomes in order merely to reduce the deficit that is expected to approach $30 billion next year.

This is a deplorable situation when it follows a deficit of $9.9 billion last year. As a matter of fact, we have not had a balanced budget in this Government since 1960. The deficits in recent years seem to accumulate to even higher figures. So it was in the light of those facts and this situation that your Committee on Appropriations considered this NASA request for additional new obligational authority.

The very distinguished legislative Committee on Science and Astronautics has the respect of our committee. We recognize that the members of that committee spend long hours worrying over this budget and over the request for authorizations. We do not mean by our action today to undertake to put our judgment over theirs.

But it is proper to state, I think, that the members of that legislative committee, as knowledgeable as they are on this subject, as hard working as they have shown themselves to be, are primarily concerned with and have jurisdiction only over the legislation to authorize new missions and new programs on the part of NASA.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from North Carolina is pointing out, and has pointed out, the fact that we as members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations do not pretend to be technical experts on these matters. However, if there is indicated the need for reprograming in the research and development portion of the budget, and if the experts in this field feel that they should transfer a certain amount of funds from one program into another research program, they have the flexibility to do that.

And, specifically, we have already authorized procedures which the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out by which they could utilize these funds as needed.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad that the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the subcommittee, mentioned that. It breaks my train of thought and I hope I can come back to it but I am glad he made the point.

His statement shows that we did not approach this task of reducing funds

with a "meat ax," but identified areas where we thought cuts ought to be made. But, as the gentleman from Tennessee said, we do not pretend to be the experts. If the very able experts down at NASA headquarters feel that they would like to rearrange some of the many items as funded, the authority and opportunity exists for them to do it through reprograming procedures, if they stay within the limits of the funds provided for research and development. They can accomplish that purpose by coming up here and undertaking to obtain approval for such reprograming. We can say that and disclaim any purpose or intention of giving anyone downtown a blank check. I can say this because, if that action is taken, it will have to be taken within the limitation of the appropriation items for R. & D. and it will have to be within the limitation of the missions and projects set forth on page 4 of the report, all of which have been approved by the legislative committee of this body, by the legislative committee of the other body, and by Congress as a whole in adopting the conference report on the authorization bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, while we have made a substantial reduction below the amount authorized by Congress recently, exactly $282 million, we did not do this as the result of any lack of confidence in the legislative committee, or any lack of appreciation for the knowledge of the members of that committee on this subject. But we did it because we felt we were required to do it in the exercise of our responsibility to consider not only the appropriation for NASA, but the other appropriations with which to operate the Department of Defense, which protects the security of our country, and appropriations for housing, education, transportation, and all the other activities of the Government.

In other words, the Appropriations Committee has the responsibility of relating this appropriation bill to all of the other bills we have to consider during the year and of trying to keep total appropriations in a given year as close as possible to expected receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

There are a few things I would like to say which I believe will justify the action of the committee.

You will recall that, as the gentleman from Tennessee has already said, the amount appropriated for NASA last year was $4.968 billion. The budget request this year was for $5.1 billion, which includes the extra or supplemental request of $50 million for NERVA. The House authorized $4.927 billion. The Senate authorized $4.851 billion. The conference authorization was $4.865 billion.

Now, the bill before you today is for $4.583 billion. That is $282 million under the authorization, and it is $516 million below the budget. That is, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, a substantial cut; it is 10 percent, one of the highest cuts made by any subcommittee on appropriations this year. But even though it is a 10-percent cut, even though it is a reduction of $516 million, it is nevertheless $4.5 billion plus—$4,583,000,000 to be exact.

It is the recommendation of your Committee on Appropriations that that is all of the new obligational authority we should allow NASA in view of our other worldwide commitments, and the need for increased spending at home and the possibility of a tax increase and the heavy deficit that lies ahead..

It is in view of those things that we are hopeful that the Committee today will accept the recommendations of the committee, and not make any effort to restore the cuts made by the Committee on Appropriations.

May I say that while I have great respect for the people who run this agency, they are not infallible. We found, for example, that in the Apollo program they are working a number of people, around 10,000, either 6 days a week or 7 days a week. That looks like a crash program to me, to be working Saturdays and Sundays, at great cost in overtime and premium pay.

Gen. Sam Phillips, who runs the Apollo program, responding to a question I asked, filed with the committee a few days before the hearings were printed a statement showing that in July of 1967 the amount of overtime, Saturday and Sunday work in the Apollo program alone, amounted to 9.9 percent of the entire work force, and that the extra cost in overtime and premium pay amounted to $7.3 million a month. It does not take much of a mathematician to figure out that if July is an average month, the taxpayers are paying out about $87 or $88 million a year in overtime.

I just do not know in view of the budgetary situation and our fiscal problems how anybody can justify spending $7½ million a month on overtime just to try to reach an objective that somebody made the mistake of announcing 6 or 8 years ago, that we were going to put a man on the moon in one decade. I do not believe it is worth that amount of extra money.

We have already shown the world that we can land a spacecraft on the moon. There are those who think it is justified for us to engage in this crash program and spend all of this unnecessary money. I do not believe it is. I, myself, would like to see the program reduced to what the Supreme Court would call "deliberate speed."

I would like to take advantage of the technology that we are developing and absorb all of the new knowledge that we are acquiring and not continue to operate a crash program just to fulfill some objective that was set several years ago and which I think was not well advised.

There are some other things about the operation of NASA that I think might be worth noting. For example, in the Apollo applications about which we heard a great deal in the debate when the authorizing legislation was on the floor of the House, there was quite an argument here as to whether the missions for the Apollo applications are really clearly defined. Well, we found out, when we went into the subject, that NASA is asking for $23 million in that program to pay universities around the country to identify new missions and new experiments that will later have to be considered by NASA and approved. I thought that we had the greatest experts in this field in existence at JPL, Ames, Lewis, Goddard, Langley, and other installations. It would seem to me that NASA, with all the talent it has, could identify its own experiments.

NASA plans an increase in personnel cost, that is in-house personnel, of $9.5 million for 1968 over 1967. That is an increase of 400 jobs; 300 of this increase is to go to Cambridge, Mass., to the electronics research center. NASA already has 700 people working there and they have not even built a building to house them. They are in rented space. NASA made the mistake of letting two contracts. They let a contract to build the foundation and then went out for bids to other contractors to build the superstructure to go on that foundation. Well, the foundations for the three buildings are practically completed. But the bids for the superstructure to rest on the foundation were about 30 percent above the estimates so they all had to be rejected. Now NASA is having to redesign the buildings to fit the foundation that is already in place. Yet, they want 300 more people to go up there in that kind of a situation.

They want another 100 people to go down to Langley on the Voyager program, which will be eliminated if our figures stand up. So I do not think they need money for additional in-house personnel.

We found another interesting thing. NASA spends $19 million a year on travel. I admit that theirs is a widespread operation. It is spread all over the United States, but $19 million a year for travel seems excessive to me. On this point I will take the time to remind the members of the Committee, as I have on other occasions, that the travel bill—that the Government's travel bill is budgeted for $1.9 billion in 1968.

It has gone up from $1.6 billion in 1966, to $1.7 billion in 1967, and to $1.9 billion in 1968.

I was glad that the gentleman from Tennessee read the statement issued by the President yesterday. I was sure in my own mind that if we did not make substantial cuts in this bill, he was going to freeze some of their funds just as he did last year. He froze $60 million of the money we appropriated for NASA last year, and they therefore did not obligate or spend it.

We ought to cooperate with the President. I appreciate his statement commending the House for these cuts. I am willing to continue to cooperate with him whenever he proposes cuts in non-essential spending. I do not know of any more important task facing Congress than to reduce substantially the requests for more spending authority as contained in the current budget we have been considering all year. I still hope we can reduce this budget by not less than $5 billion before the year is over. We are approaching that, but we still have a task ahead of us to meet the goal. I think the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations intends to discuss that subject, and I shall listen to him with interest.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chair-

man, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS FOR 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I have felt it my duty to speak out frequently during the session in behalf of economy and restraint in fiscal matters. This has been fully warranted. I am confident a majority of the Members favor making reductions wherever reasonably possible.

A great force which, of course, motivates us is the possibility of having to vote a tax increase and the threat of the greatest deficit since World War II.

The President in his January budget held down his requests, in my judgment, far below what they would have been had no war been in progress. Nevertheless, what we have been trying to do is to make substantial reductions in the President's budget.

On yesterday, we got a special assist. The morning paper states that the President had endorsed the $517 million cut which will be achieved by the House in the event the NASA appropriation bill is passed today as now drawn. Of course, $234 million of the reduction was achieved in the authorization bill.

Including the pending bill, the House will have reduced the President's budget requests in appropriation bills at this session, in bills for fiscal year 1968, in the total sum of $3,816,000,000. This has not been achieved without a great deal of effort on the part of many Members of the House. We are having and will have a great deal of difficulty in conferences with the other body in holding appropriation bills to the House figure, but we are determined to do the best we can in view of the very critical fiscal situation confronting the country.

The President stated last week that he hoped to reduce his January expenditure budget for civilian programs for the current fiscal year by at least $2 billion. This would offset a $1.5 billion escalation, he advised, that has already taken place in certain noncontrollable civilian programs above the January budget.

To achieve a reduction in the spending or expenditure budget in the sum of $2 billion would probably require a reduction in appropriations and program levels of perhaps as much as $5 billion.

What the President is trying to do for the current fiscal year is to hold down the spending of some of the funds made available to him by Congress so we will not go into the red so deeply.

As we all know, the passing of an appropriation bill by the present Congress does not mean that all of the money will be spent during the current fiscal year. If we should appropriate $10 billion for submarines today above the budget, let us say, the chances are that not more than 5 percent of the money would be spent during the current fiscal year. Many of the funds which we are providing at this session are for long lead-time items and they will, by no means, be spent in toto during the current fiscal year. They will, of course, be spent in future years unless the funds are withheld from expenditure by the executive branch or rescinded by Congress.

Including the pending bill, on appropriation bills at this session for fiscal year 1968, we have cut the President's budget requests for appropriations as I have said, by about $3.8 billion. The best calculation of the Committee on Appropriations—and we have conferred with the Bureau of the Budget—is that our appropriation reductions if enacted into law would result in an expenditure reduction in fiscal 1968 of probably $1.4 billion. Of this amount, some $900 million would be assignable to civilian programs and the remainder would be in military programs.

Now, we should be abundantly clear about the $2 billion civilian expenditure reduction goal set by the President for fiscal 1968. It is not in addition to reductions that Congress makes. It is not on top of civilian expenditure reductions resulting from congressional actions on the 1968 budget. The $2 billion target includes the congressional reductions. In other words, the House to date, according to our calculations, as I just mentioned, has cut civilian expenditures for fiscal 1968 by some $900 million, or nearly one-half of the $2 billion. We will have significant opportunities to add to that, but we cannot overlook the fact that the other body has not yet agreed to the bulk of the reductions thus far made.

It is felt that the foregoing statement is appropriate upon this occasion when we are taking action on a bill which will reduce appropriations by one-half billion dollars and probably reduce expenditures by some $300 million during the current fiscal year.

THE SPACE PROGRAM

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the pending bill, I am troubled by the magnitude of the reduction which we have made. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and the Members of the House do not want to injure the space effort. We believe the program has been very valuable and that additional benefits to the Nation will accrue. What we have done is to seek to make reductions in line with the requirements of the present disturbing fiscal situation. We have been encouraged that the President has reacted favorably to the efforts which we have made in connection with the pending bill.

But let me repeat, I am deeply concerned that in all our actions and efforts, sufficient flexibility be left to the executive branch which is responsible for flying the large boosters and carrying out the program to do the things that are required for success. We do not want to hamper the success of the space effort. Furthermore, if the House of Representatives makes a mistake in the reductions proposed today, further action will be required by the other body which will as a matter of course evaluate our actions and bring to bear the judgment as to what should be done about the space program. Final action will come after the Senate-House conferees have come to agreement.

We seek, in the light of the present fiscal situation which jeopardizes all citizens as the result of the threat of overspending and inflation, to take the wise course. And we are pleased that the President concurs that substantial reduction in the light of this fiscal situation can be made at this time in the NASA appropriation bill. As the President pointed out yesterday, the bill as drawn by the House, despite the one-half billion dollars cut, still carries the sum of $4.6 billion, a rather monumental sum for a civilian program in time of war and great fiscal stress.

The reductions proposed in the space program do not in any way represent any lack of confidence in Mr. Webb, the able administrator of the space program and in the agency which he heads. There have been mistakes made, which to some extent is understandable in a program of this magnitude and complexity, dealing with so many unknowns and new fields of technology. But in the overall, a good job has been done.

Mr. Webb has great capacity as an administrator and unbounded energy and determination to make the program a success. I would not want him, as I am sure the House of Representatives would not want him and the people in the space agency to feel that this reduction is a vote of no confidence. It is not. We have a great respect for and confidence in Mr. Webb and the space agency. We hope that by the judicious expenditure of these funds a successful program can be achieved—that the program for space may continue to be successful.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I merely want to join the gentleman from Texas in his statement that this really is an able organization which Mr. Webb has put together. Mr. Webb himself is one of the ablest men I have run into in Government. Anyone would have to acknowledge that who sits there and listens to him testify hour after hour, almost without reference to notes, about all aspects of this complicated and complex program.

While we may not agree with all he says, we all have to admit he is right on top of his job. He knows what he is doing. He is a very strong advocate and has impressed our subcommittee, as has Dr. Seamans, his deputy, and all the others of the team of outstanding scientists he has around him.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his remarks.

The program has been well led. Great achievements have been made. In my opinion, great achievements are in prospect in future years.

I would say of the gentleman from North Carolina that he has been among those in the House who have been most vocal and active in seeking to reduce nondefense appropriations and nondefense spending. He is entitled to a great deal of credit for the size of the reduction which has been made in this space program.

The members of the Committee on Appropriations generally are unanimous on the pending matter. I hope that if efforts are made to increase the bill or to further reduce the program we may stand together in support of this com-

promise program, which suits no one precisely but which was the best we were able to achieve under the circumstances.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. While reference was made to cuts in the program, I do not remember whether the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] made the point or not, but if he did it is worth repeating. Congress has appropriated for NASA, since the beginning, about $27 billion. The cuts have amounted to only a little more than a billion dollars, or about 4.3 percent, as I recall. So we have not even made substantial cuts. We have not destroyed the NASA program, Mr. Webb admitted that in his testimony before the subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the moon shot program—the Apollo program—has not cost the amount the gentleman referred to, but the entire space program for which we have provided funds has, or will when available funds are expended.

The gentleman made reference to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. EVINS]. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has worked as an indefatigable exponent of a successful, well-run program. I commend him and the gentleman from North Carolina and the other members of the subcommittee for the work they have done in trying to assist the House in making determinations on this highly important and expensive program.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON COMMITTEE REDUCTION IN THE SPACE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to include the full text of the President's statement of yesterday to which we have referred:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON SIGNING S. 1296, THE FISCAL YEAR 1968 NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL

I have today signed a $4.86 billion authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for Fiscal 1968. This bill—S. 1296—reduces the January budget request by $234 million.

In addition, the House Appropriations Committee last week, operating within the reduced authorization, reported a NASA appropriations bill of $4.6 billion, a total reduction of $517 million below the January budget.

Under other circumstances I would have opposed such a cut. However, conditions have greatly changed since I submitted my January budget request.

I outlined the economic and fiscal realities now facing the Nation in my recent Tax message:

They deal with increased expenditures and reduced revenues.

They deal with a threatened deficit that could run as high as $29 billion.

And they deal with a 10 percent tax surcharge that the American taxpayer has been asked to bear.

The times demand responsibility from us all.

Every Federal dollar must be scrutinized by the Congress before it is appropriated and by the Executive Branch before it is spent. And in the process some hard choices must be made. The test is to distinguish between the necessary and the desirable.

To reach our expenditure reduction target will not be easy, for the January budget was lean. By working together with the Congress we will pursue that goal. To attain it, we need not—and dare not—eliminate the necessary. Our task is to pare the desirable.

The Administration and the Congress must face up to these choices in the space program. I recognize—as also must the Congress—that the reduction in funds recommended by the House Appropriations Committee will require the deferral and reduction of some desirable space projects. Yet, in the face of present circumstances, I join with the Congress and accept this reduction.

Let us be clear about one point. These reductions do not signal a lack of confidence in our space venture. Nor do they indicate that we have lessened our resolve to maintain a strong program of space exploration, science and technology. This was clearly the meaning of the House Appropriations Committee when in its Report, it stated:

"The Committee is impressed by the knowledge and dedication of the officials administering this program. The United States has made great strides in space exploration. We have come from behind in less than ten years and have overcome deficiencies in both military and non-military space programs. We have launched 16 manned flights, and all have been successful. NASA has launched more than 200 unmanned flights and achieved dramatic breakthroughs otherwise since Congress declared that we should undertake a broad and expensive space program. The fact that there has been one tragedy to date should not deter the United States from moving forward and making further advancements. Even with budgetary stringencies facing us, this Nation must move forward in space exploration."

I fully share in this determination.

Because the times have placed more urgent demands upon our resources, we must now moderate our efforts in certain space projects. But our purpose still remains as constant as the heavens we seek to explore: to master the challenge of space.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS AFFECTING THE FISCAL 1968 BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted, I am supplementing my earlier remarks by including some elaboration pertaining to the matter of congressional actions to date that affect the President's budget for the current fiscal 1968, which began nearly 2 months ago on July 1.

Of course, the business year of Congress is the whole session, which cuts across fiscal year lines. We have dealt with some fiscal 1967 supplements at this session, but the main fiscal business has been the fiscal 1968 budget.

I must say that there are some unavoidable complexities—both technical and nontechnical—that make for some difficulty in understanding just what Congress, as a whole, has done or is doing to the budget and just where we are fiscally at any given time. In attempting to promote understanding and a better perspective of the situation, the inherent complexities may result in more confusion. And in attempting to avoid this hazard, too much oversimplification may result in misleading.

For one thing, the budget totals, the deficit, the borrowing, and the taxes are set up in the budget on a cash basis—cash income and outgo. Congress, on the other hand, acts in terms of spending authority or authority to obligate for future spending. This authority to obligate and to spend which the Congress provides by its actions extends beyond the single budget fiscal year. Therefore, it is sometimes difficult to relate congressional actions, which are not technically on an expenditure basis, to the President's expenditure budget.

The expenditure budget total is the one that usually gets the most emphasis in the budget and other Presidential messages and the more widely used figure in the press and elsewhere. That is the one that totaled $135 billion in the January budget, and more recently revised upward by several billions. But while important, it is not the budget basis on which Congress acts in the various authorization and appropriation bills. Congress considers and acts not on estimates of amounts to be expended during the year, but rather on the budget requests for authorizations and appropriations for the fiscal year, which are basically on the concept of authority to obligate regardless of the particular fiscal year in which the authority is to be "expended" by the actual issuance of checks drawn against the Treasury.

It is the rough rule of thumb, based on experience, that for the whole Government, for any fiscal year, about 70 percent—more or less—of the appropriations made for the year will be actually disbursed—"expended"—in that same year—in other words, not only appropriated; not only obligated; but also actually checked out of the Treasury, all in that same year. More than 70 percent could and usually would be obligated in the first year, but the amount obligated over the 70 percent would not be paid out until later years. The 70- to 30-percent rule varies widely as between programs, depending on their nature, such as ordinary running expenses where the first year disbursements might be 90-percent-plus; or a long-lead-time major procurement or other program where the first year disbursement might be in the 10- to 25-percent range; or even an advance commitment program involving little or no first-year disbursement.

Another thing, legislative actions affecting the President's budget come at many times, in many ways, in several forms, and from a number of sources. Inactions, as well as actions, affect the situation. The exact scorecard on congressional action in relation to the budget is never at a standstill during the session; it is almost constantly in some state of change. Even budgetary and fiscal recommendations change quite frequently as the President submits modifications, both up and down, to meet changing requirements or as he translates lump-sum, one-line budget allowances into specific line-item requests for appropriations.

And, of course, Mr. Chairman, as the President's recent tax message so well articulated, the complexion of initial January budget projections not infrequently changes due to operation of forces altogether aside from specific congressional actions. Changing economic assumptions that underpin the budget can alter the budget revenue outlook. Market conditions heavily influence the fixed expenditures for interest as portions of the public debt are refinanced. Other mandated-type expenditures that occur under fixed legislative provisions—public assistance, veterans, price supports, and so on—change with changing workloads, weather conditions, and the like.

Now, as to actions thus far, some figures are firm and certain, others are

necessarily tentative. Some are estimates that can and sometimes do change. Some are wholly unpredictable at this point.

Several bills have cleared both Houses, some only the House. A few have been enacted into law.

Several bills are still in committees of one House or the other. Some are pending in conference.

Several of the annual authorization bills have dragged badly, thus delaying some appropriation decisions.

Some of the President's budgetary proposals have not had committee hearings even though it is now late August. One or two, I am advised, have not even been introduced in bill form—and may never be.

What I am saying is that a great deal of our fiscal business is not yet finalized. We have much yet to do.

HOUSE ACTIONS ON SPENDING SIDE OF THE 1968 BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, in the 12 appropriations bills for 1968 thus far acted on, including the NASA appropriation today, the House has reduced the President's budget requests for appropriations by the sum of $3,816,000,000. I have made a dozen or so status reports on actions taken in appropriation bills during the session. The up-to-date figure is a $3,816,000,000 cut in requests for appropriations in the 1968 bills.

I am referring only to original House actions, not later Senate actions or conference actions. I am referring only to fiscal 1968 bills, not the two supplemental bills earlier this session. And I am referring only to the bills out of the Committee on Appropriations. While the great bulk of the outgo side of the annual budget is handled in the appropriation bills, there are some portions—often important or key portions—of the budget that can be and are directly affected by what is done—or not done—by the legislative committees with respect to budgetary matters within their jurisdiction. And I am using the traditional, generally well-understood "appropriation" basis of counting—the one we have used over the years. The executive branch uses a so-called new obligational authority counting method, which is nearly always identical to the "appropriations" method but does differ in a handful of cases.

But, Mr. Chairman, as indicated earlier, it would be wholly inaccurate to assume that the $3,816,000,000 appropriation reduction thus far made by the House—or the related $3,464,000,000 "new obligation authority" reduction—would result in a $3.8 billion, or a $3.4 billion reduction in the President's fiscal 1968 expenditure budget. It would do nothing of the kind—nowhere near that much in fiscal 1968. But a dollar reduced is a dollar saved; a dollar not appropriated is a dollar that cannot be obligated and thus cannot be spent.

If $3.8 billion was to be obligated; or if $3.4 billion was to be obligated it was also to be spent. Thus its denial means it cannot be spent. In this context, it is somewhat immaterial whether it was to have been spent in fiscal 1968; in fiscal 1969; or in the year, or years, after. A fiscal year is but a brief, arbitrary period in the biggest continuing business on earth.

But the fiscal year is nonetheless a fiscal measurement period to which budgets and bills are tied, and it is essential to various purposes that the expenditure consequences of fiscal actions be related to these fiscal periods.

As to the effect of the $3.8 billion appropriation reductions by the House in 1968 bills on fiscal 1968 budgeted expenditure estimates, we have undertaken, with some assistance from the executive branch, to roughly approximate the impact of the $3.8 billion appropriation cut on the fiscal 1968 budget expenditure estimate. In round figures, the $3.8 billion cut in appropriation requests would probably result in a reduction of roughly $1.4 billion in fiscal 1968 budget expenditures.

Of this total, roughly $500 million—perhaps slightly more—would relate to defense expenditures, the remainder of some $900 million to civilian purposes. That would be in the 12 appropriation bills.

There are at this writing a couple of expenditure offsets in other legislative actions where, according to our information, the House went above the administration's budget recommendations. While these are instances where the actual appropriation has not yet been either requested or made, they involve mandated-type expenditures by granting a license to obligate and spend in anticipation of a supplemental appropriation:

[In millions of dollars]

	House increase over 1968 budget recommendation	
	New obligational authority	Expenditure
1. Veterans' pensions and benefits, S. 16, adopted by House in March 1967 (the Senate version was over by some $107,000,000)	+68	+68
2. Federal employees insurance liberalization (the final $48,000,000)	[1] +32	[1] +32
House total, these 2 bills	+100	+100

[1] Bill was subsequently vetoed.

So that, Mr. Chairman, at this time, in round figures, and to some extent being repetitious, I would say that the House has taken these actions with respect to the fiscal 1968 administrative budget:

First. It has reduced the budget appropriation requests by some $3,816,000,000, net;

Second. It has reduced the budget new obligational requests by some $3,364,000,000, net; and

Third. It has, by these actions, probably reduced the budget expenditure estimates by roughly $1,362,000,000.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, as a practical matter it has done more than that. At least, some first steps have been taken. For example, the House recently took a first step on the 1968 military construction program when it passed the authorization bill, cutting the request by $316 million. The consequent expenditure reduction figure for fiscal 1968 would be less, but we will not know until the actual appropriation is made.

PARTICIPATION SALES AUTHORIZATIONS

The matter of so-called participation sales authorizations under which certificates are sold against pools of Government-owned loans has been the subject of some controversy this year. They are treated in the 1968 budget as offsets to expenditures and thus are a factor in rendering a comparative account of what Congress has done to the budget.

In the House, $4.3 billion of such sales authorizations for 1968 have been considered; $1.946 billion were authorized. In the appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the House, by floor amendment, struck $2.354 billion of such authorizations from the bill. This did not change actual Government outlays in prospect by a single dime, but because the proposed sales were counted in the overall budget totals as an offset to expenditures otherwise to be made, rather than as either a receipt or as a borrowing, the effect was to make it appear that the prospective budget deficit had thereby been widened—or deepened.

This is a technical budget presentation rather than a substantive expenditure question. It is complex and not too well understood generally. I have not taken it into account in the figures I gave, but technically, to make a precise comparison, it would have to be reckoned in the comparisons.

SPENDING ACTIONS YET TO BE PROCESSED

The House and the Congress have many opportunities yet remaining to try to improve on efforts to hold the line on the 1968 appropriation requests and expenditure estimates.

What has cleared? Only three appropriation bills for fiscal 1968 have been cleared by Congress—Treasury-Post Office, Interior, and legislative. They reduced the budget obligational authority requests by $145,000,000, and reduced the estimated 1968 budget expenditures by about $103,000,000. But according to our information, this spending reduction would be substantially offset by the veterans pension bill—S. 16—as finally cleared by Congress. We understand that the expenditure effect was $94,000,000 higher than the budget recommendation.

Some $9,000,000,000, plus, of additional appropriation requests are yet to be reported to the House, for military construction, foreign assistance, antipoverty, and various other programs. The House gets two bites at most all of this because the annual authorization routine applies. As I mentioned, it has already taken a first step toward reducing the military construction total. The foreign assistance authorization may possibly be materially reduced. The antipoverty authorization bill has not been reported from committee.

Among other pending fiscal 1968 budget propositions that will have an important bearing on the record of what the House, and finally the Congress, does to the President's 1968 budget are such matters as:

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

The budget figured $700,000,000 as the fiscal 1968 value of the postal rate increases asked by the administration. The proposed July 1 effective date is, of

course, no longer realistic, thus at least threatening some loss of fiscal year 1968 revenue. Whatever the resulting loss, such event would increase 1968 budget expenditures by that much because postal revenues are classed in the budget as offsets to postal expenditures.

PAY INCREASES

The 1968 budget allowance for pay increase legislation is $1,000,000,000. If Congress legislates more generously than that, 1968 budget expenditures would be breached accordingly. This is an item to which the President's recent tax message referred.

REFINEMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

There was a proposition in the 1968 budget designed to refine various veterans benefits provisions designed, as I understand, to retrench expenditures in fiscal 1968 by some $89 million. If the legislation is not enacted, it would, presumably, raise the 1968 expenditure $89,000,000 above what the budget included.

REVOLVING FUNDS—REA AND POWER MARKETING AGENCIES

If the earlier propositions—resubmitted in the 1968 budget—to put REA and the Interior power marketing agencies on revolving fund financing are not enacted—and there seems to be some basis for saying they may not—that would have the effect, according to my figures, of raising 1968 budget expenditures by some $340,000,000. Actual outlays for the programs are not affected. Again, this is a technical matter arising from the fact that the budget reflects such business-type funds on a net basis, and because of that, budget revenues would also be raised by the same $340,000,000, though the actual income would not differ.

BEAUTY-SAFETY TRUST FUND

There was a proposition of legislation in the budget to create, as a trust fund, a separate financing arrangement for the highway beautification and highway safety programs and to divert 2-percent excise tax on automobiles from the general budget to supply it. Failure of that legislation would raise 1968 budget expenditures—but not actual outlays—by some $195 million. But because the revenue diversion was priced at $400 million for 1968, the effect of not enacting the bill would be to actually narrow rather than widen the 1968 deficit in comparison to the budget.

There are pending in one place or another several other legislative propositions for which the 1968 budget carried some allowance, but in the aggregate they do not bulk large. I have, I believe, named the major pieces of business that have significant fiscal implications for the current 1968 budget.

CONFERENCES

The Senate has added materially to the appropriations in the Agriculture and Labor-HEW bills, both of which are in conference. It has many other important opportunities to exercise every restraint wherever it reasonably can. We hope it will do so. It ought to do so.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that the House will make substantial reductions in the fiscal 1968 budget requests for appropriations. It will be well in excess of $4 billion, probably closer to $5 billion. It is also clear, of course, that the first-year—fiscal 1968—budget expenditure reduction effect flowing from the appropriation bill reductions, combined with the impact of fiscal actions in other bills, is going to be considerably less.

But as we assess the budget impact of all our fiscal actions in respect to fiscal year 1968, a key thing to remember is that we face a budget deficit unseen since the closing years of World War II.

Even though Congress by its actions, in the aggregate, stays within, or lessens, the 1968 new obligational authority requests and the 1968 expenditure estimates shown in the President's budget, we cannot afford to be satisfied with the record. For as the President advised in his recent tax message, "the estimate of non-defense spending for fiscal 1968 has already increased by $1.5 billion." That has happened without Congress turning a hand or casting a vote—and the fiscal year is only 7 weeks old! The $1.5 billion represents merely an updating of the natural sequence of events:

First, a $600 million increase in 1968 spending because of release late last fiscal year of funds previously frozen and withheld from expenditure as an anti-inflation measure.

Second, a $900 million unestimated growth in programs whose payments are fixed and ordained by basic law— public assistance and health; farm supports; medicare; and so forth.

This $1,500 million increase in nondefense spending estimates is in addition to the $4 billion additional for defense mentioned as a possibility in the President's tax message.

Already, as I pointed out, the House has taken actions that probably would contribute to fiscal 1968 expenditure reductions—below the January budget figures—of some $1.4 billion, of which perhaps $900 million would be in the nondefense area. As I mentioned earlier, that would be a part of the President's announced $2 billion civilian expenditure reduction goal. But it is a long way from the goal.

In my opinion, the people of the country generally are not convinced that Congress and the executive branch are doing all that can reasonably be done to reduce spending. The imperative need for fiscal restraint requires us to make every possible expenditure reduction short of jeopardizing the Nation's security and well being.

Mr. Chairman, I include two tables—one summarizing the totals of the appropriation bills, the other recapitulating, in summary form, an approximation of congressional actions on the budget to date, and noting some of the program proportions yet to be considered:

SUMMARIZED "SCOREBOARD" OF APPROXIMATE CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON THE FISCAL 1968 BUDGET AS OF AUG. 22, 1967 [1]

	Appropriation reduction	Fiscal year 1968 new obligational authority reductions	Approximate impact on fiscal year 1968 budget expenditures
House actions (spending):			
1. In 11 appropriation bills	−$3,300,000,000	−$2,948,000,000	−$1,152,000,000
NASA appropriation	−516,000,000	−516,000,000	−310,000,000
12 appropriation bills (of $124,163,000,000 in requests)	−3,816,000,000	−3,464,000,000	−1,462,000,000
2. In legislative bills—			
a. Veterans benefits (S. 16, House version)		+68,000,000	+68,000,000
b. Employee insurance liberalization (later vetoed)		+32,000,000	+32,000,000
Total, spending actions	−3,816,000,000	−3,364,000,000	−1,362,000,000
Divided:			
Defense	−1,289,000,000	−1,289,000,000	−490,000,000
Civilian	−2,527,000,000	−2,075,000,000	−872,000,000
Final actions (spending):			
1. 3 appropriation bills (Treasury-Post Office; Interior; legislative agencies)	−145,000,000	−145,000,000	−103,000,000
2. Veterans' benefits (S. 16)		+94,000,000	+94,000,000
Total, final spending actions	−145,000,000	−51,000,000	−9,000,000
Final actions (revenue)[2]			

[1] Various pending items (spending and revenue):

	NOTES
1. $9,000,000,000 plus, appropriation requests pending in committee.	Military construction, foreign aid, poverty, etc.
2. $700,000,000, postage rate increase, effective July 1.	Probably some loss—slippage of time.
3. $1,000,000,000, pay raise allowance in budget.	Question of how the pay bills will compare.
4. $89,000,000 (reduction), refinement of veterans' benefits.	No bill introduced. Inaction would thus be equivalent to an expenditure increase above the budget.
5. $340,000,000, create REA and power marketing revolving funds (technical).	Inaction would inflate budget expenditure, and also budget receipts. No effect on deficit.
6. Beauty-safety trust fund item (technical).	Inaction would have about $195,000,000 net favorable effect on the administration budget deficit.
7. Revenue bill, 10 percent surcharge; extension of certain excise taxes; acceleration of certain tax collections.	A $7,400,000,000 package for fiscal 1968.

[2] Investment tax credit restoration bill as enacted resulted in some loss of revenue for fiscal 1968 as compared to budgetary recommendations.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF AUG. 22, 1967

[Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills. All figures are rounded amounts]

	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	$14,411,000,000	[2,3] $124,163,000,000	$138,574,000,000
2. Amounts in 14 bills passed by House	14,238,000,000	[2,3] 120,347,000,000	134,585,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−173,000,000	−3,816,000,000	−3,989,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	14,533,000,000	[3] 27,795,000,000	42,328,000,000
2. Amounts in 7 bills passed by Senate	14,457,000,000	[3] 29,434,000,000	43,891,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−76,000,000	+1,639,000,000	+1,563,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 7 bills	+219,000,000	+2,434,000,000	+2,653,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered	14,533,000,000	9,349,000,000	23,882,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 5 bills enacted	14,394,000,000	9,204,000,000	23,598,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	−139,000,000	−145,000,000	−284,000,000

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

[2] Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, $980,000,000; House bill, $925,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, $75,000,000; House bill, $65,000,000).

[3] And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget $4,300,000,000; total in House bills, $1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, $700,000,000.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I had intended, while the gentleman was in the well, to propound a question or two, which I shall appreciate his answering at this time.

First. Notwithstanding the assist the President has given the committee in supporting the reduction which has been made on an appropriation basis, considering all the previously appropriated and unobligated and unexpended funds, is it not quite conceivable that the spending rate could go on as is, that there would not really be any significant reduction in the expenditure level, notwithstanding the statements the President has made?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I intended in my remarks to call attention to the fact that NASA is by no means impoverished, even with this half billion dollar cut.

NASA has in hand some $2 billion of unspent funds previously appropriated. It must be said that much of that money is obligated, because this is a program that requires long leadtime in the purchase of hardware and the manufacturing and fabrication of it.

Mr. MICHEL. That is understandable. Does the gentleman have any figures on unobligated funds?

Mr. JONAS. The latest figures we have are for July 1, 1967, when it was testified that NASA had $277 million of unobligated funds. While this sum was unobligated, a considerable part of it is committed or earmarked.

Mr. MICHEL. So certainly, supporting the chairman's statement that they are not being cut short here to any extent, while I am happy to see what the committee has done, still my own personal feeling is that more and deeper cuts could have been made. Maybe an additional 5 percent would be in order. My calculation is that comes to an additional saving of some $265 million. However, whether or not I will be recognized for that purpose is questionable, but I should like to offer that motion at the appropriate time and I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the chairman of the subcommittee, and also the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] for the work they have done on the Independent Offices Subcommittee. Likewise my compliments and thanks to Messrs. BOLAND, SHIPLEY, GIAIMO, MARSH, and PRYOR on the majority side and on the minority, Messrs. MINSHALL, WYMAN, and TALCOTT for the reception which they gave me before the subcommittee when several of the members suggested I appear and give some recommendations on the NASA budget for fiscal year 1968.

At the authorization level in addition to the reductions made by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I felt there should have been a $250 million cut. The House accepted $201.4 million of those cuts. The committee, on the Apollo program accepted, before bringing the bill to the floor, a $25 million cut. There is no doubt that the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee under the leadership of the gentleman from California, GEORGE MILLER, have worked hard on this program, both the majority and the minority, as well as the professional staff.

Congress must realize that the NASA budget is approximately $5 billion a year, which is a rate approximately one and a half times the total budget of the Federal Government in President Hoover's last year in office. By the time NASA lets contracts, and Congress establishes the management mechanism to monitor the contracts, and by the time scientists have developed and proposed new programs in every direction for space and science as well as aeronautics, one can see what a complicated kettle of worms the NASA authorization, appropriation, oversight, and direction can be. It is obvious that there can be many varieties of opinion as to the resource allocation, as to the policy emphasis at various levels, and as to the probable results to be achieved from specific scientific research and development endeavors. Every Member knows the purpose of research and development is to find out and try out, but nobody knows ahead of time what is going to be the result.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some comments on the committee action, with all due respect to the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations. Congress should strongly emphasize certain current programs and must defer other programs of lesser national importance.

In no case should Congress oppose any proposed research and development program that has a long leadtime.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. There is so much in the hearings that I would be surprised if the gentleman from Pennsylvania has had an opportunity to read all of the testimony that was given before our Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I have gone into it rather thoroughly.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman has read all of the testimony and has heard all of the testimony in hearings that was given before the Committee on Science and Astronautics. However, we could not get either Mr. Webb or Dr. Seamans, or any of the other witnesses to pinpoint any places where they could make cuts, because they argued against any cuts in the program. But they did say that if it came to a choice—Dr. Seamans, rather—that all of the new programs and the post-Apollo programs contained in this request which amount to $600 million, it was his opinion—and I believe I am fairly quoting him, as well as the testimony of Mr. Webb—if they had to take a half-billion-dollar cut they thought it ought to be in the programs that had not yet been started instead of reducing further the ca-

pabilities of the programs in which we are now engaged.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to have the comments of the gentleman from North Carolina, because that is the direction, I believe, in which I am generally going.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation is now at the crossroads of its space effort. There should be serious thought given to the philosophy of what the Nation should be doing in its space program. A searching analysis of the current and past efforts necessarily leads one to conclude that the only realistic philosophy is—the opportunities for future progress must be kept open and not stifled by premature commitment to existing and obsolescent systems.

The space agency should not be permitted to commit this country far into the future on space boosters, spacecraft, and propulsion systems which will be obsolete within a relatively few years. Rather, the space program should concentrate on fulfilling its one approved commitment; namely, to land and return safely a manned flight to the moon. All other efforts should be devoted to improving all of our systems and technology so that the national space program can forge ahead using technology that is up to date.

Hence, the funding for the Apollo lunar landing program should be allowed to continue at the level approved in the authorization bill. No attempts to further reduce this level should be considered. The House Science and Astronautics Committee accepted my modest reduction of $25 million for the NASA budget request for Apollo. This figure represents the maximum amount of economy that could be applied to a highly complex and sophisticated program already suffering delays and higher costs due to general inflation and the tragic Apollo 204 accident. The accident alone has cost the Apollo program over 1 year in its schedule and many hundreds of dollars which must be absorbed within already restricted monetary limits.

The Apollo program was approved on a bipartisan basis and unanimously. It is the one program which the world has consistently looked to the United States to accomplish. Congress must not disappoint them. Congress must not jeopardize the success and, more importantly, the safety of America's astronauts through unreasonable reductions in funds for Apollo. The Congress has solidly supported the recommendation made by several members of the Science and Astronautics Committee, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] and myself, and contained in my motion to recommit, that NASA establish an independent Space Safety Panel. These safety procedures in NASA are designed to prevent a recurrence of the Apollo 204 disaster. Congress must not jeopardize such safety measures by further restrictions of Apollo funds.

In line with the national requirement to proceed at all reasonable speed and with the maximum of efficiency and safety with the Apollo program, it is also necessary that adequate funds be made available to the NASA tracking and data acquisition program. Proposed appropriation action would reduce the funds for this vital program down to a level of $260 million for fiscal year 1968. An additional $10 million is essential if this program is to fulfill its mission to support the Apollo program. Such an additional sum would only bring the total level to the fiscal year 1967 level, and would still require NASA to absorb increased costs due to escalation of prices as well as increased services in support of the Apollo mission.

There are numerous additional items of tracking and data acquisition equipment which will become operational for the first time in fiscal year 1968 and which have never been funded before. The minimum level recommended is required to support the six manned space flight network stations, five instrumented ships and Apollo tracking aircraft, all directly related to the Apollo program. All of these facilities will require contractor support personnel, checkout, tests, and simulation testing prior to commissioning.

These new tracking facilities will be needed regardless of how many manned space flights are effected in any particular year. Their proper functioning is an absolute necessity for insuring flight safety, mission success, and the well-being of our astronauts. This is small insurance for the successful accomplishment of this most important milestone in the national space program—the lunar landing.

Another important program complementing the national Apollo lunar landing mission is the NASA lunar and planetary exploration program. Not only will the results of these unmanned space flight missions to the moon, such as Surveyor and Lunar Orbiter, be beneficial to the manned lunar landing, but other program efforts are equally vital to the future manned space flight. The objective of the lunar and planetary exploration program is the scientific exploration of our solar system, using automated spacecraft and earth-based research before the Nation undertakes the ultimate step in committing our astronauts to such tasks. For this reason, it is essential that the lunar and planetary exploration program be maintained at the level approved in the authorization bill.

The past successes of the Ranger, Surveyor, and Lunar Orbiter flights have contributed materially to the planned landing of our astronauts on the moon. The Ranger project, now completed, yielded over 12,000 photographs which have provided a better understanding of the nature of the surface of the moon and hence have permitted space designers to inject safety considerations in their work on the lunar landing spacecraft.

The current series of lunar exploration missions involve a total of seven soft landings by the Surveyor spacecraft to conduct scientific measurements on the lunar surface and to provide detailed high and low resolution photography of the moon at surface level. The Lunar Orbiter program will eventually provide five orbiting spacecraft around the moon for the purpose of providing data on potential Apollo landing sites and to help the Nation's space planners to select those sites where the landing risk is at the absolute minimum. The first two Lunar Orbiters covered 30,000 square miles of the lunar surface, including wide angle photographic coverage of 22 potential Apollo landing sites, not to mention photography of 4 million square miles of the far side of the moon.

Both the tracking and data acquisition and the lunar and planetary exploration programs are important contributors to the national goal of landing men on the moon and returning them safely. They provide the necessary preliminary data and tracking support to insure the safety and success of the Apollo program.

While our national philosophy should be to support our commitment to the Apollo program and its supporting programs, it should not include the commitment at this time to large, follow-on programs involving the same technology and space equipment. The current NASA effort to mount a large Apollo applications program without definite mission planning for flights to take place 6 to 7 years from now and using hardware which was under development for the past 5 or 6 years, should be curtailed.

The opportunities for progress should not be closed by the NASA intention to award long leadtime contracts to purchase large quantities of equipment and hardware already developed or under development at this time. These items not only include the uprated Saturn I boosters but, contrary to the understanding of some, also the Saturn V boosters and the various spacecraft and hardware developed exclusively and specifically for the Apollo lunar landing mission. NASA should be prevented from procuring equipment far in advance to eliminate the possibility that American astronauts will be using spacecraft and booster vehicles that are almost certain to be obsolete.

If NASA is permitted to engage in large advanced purchasing beyond its currently approved needs, it will phase out the possibility of later including new developments, progress in research, and beneficial modifications and improvements. NASA would also be uselessly spending money for booster vehicles and spacecraft for which no known and approved missions exist.

On the question of scheduling for the Apollo applications program, which involves uprated Saturn I, Saturn V, spacecraft and other equipment, there is serious doubt that proper scheduling factors have been considered.

NASA presently intends to produce two Saturn V boosters per year for 1971 and 1972 and four Saturn V boosters per year for 1973 and 1974. Using cost estimates supplied by the space agency itself of a unit cost of $230 million per Saturn V booster at a rate of two per year, and a unit cost of $193 million per booster at a production rate of four per year, these 12 Saturn V boosters would cost the country a total of $2,464,000,000. However, if these 12 boosters were to be produced at a rate of six per year, they would cost $508 million less. It appears inconsistent to purchase these obsolescent boosters for delivery 6 to 7 years

from now at the least economical production rate unless it is the intention of NASA to keep these production lines open at all cost. The mission of NASA is research and development, not production and fabrication.

In addition to these scheduling factors, there is the more important question of uprated Saturn I and Saturn V booster vehicles, with their associated spacecraft. They will become surplus to the Apollo lunar landing program and hence would be available at no cost to any missions, when they are approved, for the Apollo applications program.

Current estimates place the expected date for a successful lunar landing program at the launching of the seventh or ninth Saturn V booster. If such is the case, one can readily see that between six to eight of these enormously expensive liquid-fuel boosters will be available. In addition, the best information available indicates that at least four or more uprated Saturn I boosters available from the Apollo program in an excess status.

Yet, NASA persists in planning to purchase at least four more uprated Saturn I boosters and long leadtime items for an additional two Saturn V boosters. NASA witnesses testified that even with a reduction of over $107 million in the Apollo applications program, NASA would still use $57 million for the production of additional uprated Saturn I boosters and $20 million for the procurement of long-lead-time items for two additional Saturn V boosters.

There are no definite, approved missions under the Apollo applications program as yet. If the Congres approves the program as presented, even with the reduction already effected, the Nation will find itself committed many years in the future because of small, incrementally funded purchases by NASA during the coming fiscal year. It should also be noted that the Congress has authorized $6.2 million in fiscal year 1967 for advanced missions planning. This program supplies the planning for future missions, such as Apollo applications. Before NASA is permitted to make long advance purchases of equipment, which even NASA admits will be stored for later use, NASA should be required to carry out the necessary advance planning. NASA has yet to obligate or spend 1 penny of the $6.2 million authorized for the fiscal year just finished. Yet, NASA has testified in appropriations hearings that they intend to spend $23 million with universities for experiment definition when they have yet to spend 1 penny for the vital and necesary in-house planning for advanced missions.

By being permitted to commit the Nation far in advance with large purchases of equipment to be delivered 5 to 7 years from now, NASA will be procuring obsolete equipment which will not be capable of absorbing all of the new research developments and improvements which are certain to come forward during that period.

The supporting philosophy to the main philosophy expressed earlier is that systems should be put into competition with each other and that there should be no selected instruments or "sacred cows." Congress has consistently supported the development of alternate systems for chemical liquid fuels, such as solid propellants, nuclear upper stages, new forms of engines and other promising research areas. NASA must not be permitted to utilize for the next 10 to 20 years the same types of fuels, with only minor improvements, that were used in the 1930's by Goddard and Von Braun.

Much of NASA's activities, as can be seen readily from the proposed Apollo applications program to maintain production capabilities, have degenerated into manufacturing and fabrication. NASA must be required to develop new technology rather than to utilize old or existing technology. The national needs for new and more efficient fuels, solid propellant boosters, space storable fuels, nuclear and other advanced upper stages, reusable boosters and spacecraft, and other research developments will not be fulfilled unless and until NASA returns to a program emphasizing research rather than hardware fabrication under programs such as the Apollo applications programs.

The Nation should not, and must not be "frozen" into using obsolescent space equipment in the 1970 decade by advance, incrementally funded, purchases by NASA at this time of items now in existence for delivery 6 to 7 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I have 5 minutes more?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the previously stated philosophy that "opportunities for future progress must be kept open," there are several specific programs in fiscal year 1968 that deserve the full support of Congress. These include the NERVA Voyager, Sunblazer, solid propellant booster, and the sustaining university programs.

For future space exploration involving missions of extended duration some means of propulsion surpassing the present chemical means will be needed. Improved propulsion capability can be achieved by further refinement and development in the chemical propulsion field or further development in the nuclear rocket propulsion area or through a combination of both.

The nuclear rocket potentially provides a major increase in propulsion capability. It is the next major advancement in propulsion for which there is already established a sound technical base. It misleading to consider nuclear rockets solely in terms of specific missions anymore than we now consider chemical propulsion in terms of specific missions.

Although no specific mission has yet been assigned for the NERVA II engine, major potential missions for a nuclear engine of this nature are possible, such as: earth-orbital operations—maneuvering large spacecraft from orbit to orbit and return in the space about the earth; lunar logistics—increasing payload delivered to the moon; solar system exploration—unmanned space probes; and manned planetary exploration—fly-by and landing missions to Mars and Venus.

Extensive mission analysis has defined a single NERVA engine that could perform all of the major missions for which nuclear rockets would offer significant advantages over chemical rockets. The NERVA II engine will develop about 5,000 megawatts in power and provide a thrust of from 200,000 to 250,000 pounds. The proposed engine could be incorporated into a standard propulsion module, capable of being installed in a third stage to increase the utility of the Saturn V chemical booster rocket. This module could be used singly or it could be clustered to provide the thrust required.

The advantage of nuclear rockets comes from their high specific impulse. A 760-second specific impulse level has been demonstrated in the recently completed KIWI reactor series of tests. Design changes, already identified, can be effected that will permit this value to be increased to 800 seconds. Preliminary studies indicate that further laboratory research may lead the way to achieving specific impulses of up to 900 seconds in the not too distant future. These values compare favorably with specific impulse levels achievable from advanced chemical propulsion systems amounting to only 450 seconds.

These increases in specific impulse would result in an increased payload for the Saturn V booster of 90 percent, over any other upper stage available for flight to the lunar surface directly and over 100 percent advantage for planetary flights of longer duration. Therefore, with a NERVA upper stage, a mission can be accomplished with only half of the several hundred million dollar Saturn V boosters otherwise required.

From the end of 1963 to present, the goal of the nuclear rocket program has been the establishment of a strong technological base through analysis, research, component tests and systems testing which will permit the development of a nuclear rocket engine suited for a wide range of mission applications. It is now time to use the technology thus developed. Failure to support the President's proposed NERVA engine development program in fiscal year 1968 will result in at least partial disbanding of the unique Government-industry nuclear rocket capability which has been developed. Reconstitution of this team at a later date will add 4 years to the normal development cycle.

The proposal to eliminate the funds requested for research and development to support the NERVA program and the $16.5 million for Nerva testing facility construction is not considered in the best interests of advancing the state of the art in new propulsion technology.

The Voyager program should be strongly supported. It is the first major increment of which was included in the fiscal year 1968 NASA program.

The authorization act for fiscal year 1968 included $42 million for Voyager. The House has deleted appropriations for the project.

The Voyager program calls for launches in 1973 and 1975. Opportunities for launching spacecraft toward Mars oc-

cur on 25-month intervals. The fiscal year 1968 request is crucial to meeting the 1973 opportunity.

The President's Science Advisory Committee's report on "The Space Program in the Post-Apollo Period" unequivocally endorses and recommends that highest priority be assigned to planetary exploration, particularly Venus and Mars. The report also strongly recommends an expanded commitment to the Voyager program for fiscal year 1968. Now this is not NASA talking. The recommendations in this report are the product of inputs from 40 outstanding scientists throughout the country, the vast majority of whom are associated with major universities. The Congress should strongly endorse their recommendations.

The primary objective of the Voyager 1973 mission is to acquire fundamental scientific information concerning the planet Mars, particularly the physics and chemistry of the planet's body, surface, atmosphere and other environmental factors. It will result in the acquisition of vital scientific information concerning the origin and evolution of our solar system, the origin, evolution and nature of life and the application of this information to an understanding of terrestrial life.

The proposed Voyager system will be equipped with 12 separate scientific experiments in the orbiter and 10 experiments in the landing capsule. This means that a single flight to Mars will provide data from 22 experiments, as opposed to three on Surveyor, one on the Lunar Orbiter and six on the projected Mariner flight to Mars in 1969. This demonstrates a forthright step in advanced planning to increase spacecraft capability for planetary exploration.

The Russians have launched planetary spacecraft at every opportunity since 1960 and there is every evidence that they will continue with a vigorous planetary exploration program. Soviet spacecraft two or three times heavier than our Mariners have been launched both to Venus and Mars. Unless we, as a nation, are prepared to relinquish our preeminence in space, a more aggressive effort such as the Voyager program is essential.

The Sunblazer project, which involved a total of $6.4 million for fiscal year 1968, is a small investment for the dividends it will yield. This is basically a small sun-oriented spacecraft weighing from 15 to 60 pounds designed to measure the electron density and other features of the sun's corona. The use of both lightweight spacecraft and low-cost Scout launch vehicles makes it economically attractive to launch several spacecraft per year to more closely observe solar activity.

The Congress should support relatively low-cost projects such as Sunblazer in preference to the more complex and more costly projects in the physics and astronomy program, such as the orbiting astronomical observatory project.

The Congress authorized $3 million more than the amount requested by NASA for chemical propulsion programs with specific language in the bill limiting the use of this $3 million for the large solid motor development. The effect of the appropriation action will be to eliminate any hope for continuing the large solid motor and will cause a further reduction of $3 million in the planned NASA propulsion program. There are no other major developments in this program, but there are a number of technology items that are essential to the Nation's maintenance of its position in space research. The development of safe, inexpensive and completely storable solid boosters is essential to an efficient and economical alternative to the high-cost liquid-fuel boosters presently being used. This program would be another instance of "putting systems into competition with each other."

The fiscal year 1968 NASA Authorization Act includes $20 million for the sustaining university program, of which $7 million is for training grants, $10 million for research grants, and $3 million for facilities grants. The House action on appropriations for this program has reduced the amount to $10 million without specific reference to any particular element of the program.

In my opinion, Congress should support the full amount of the request for training grants amounting to $7 million. The purpose of the training grants program is to provide financial support for 3-year predoctoral programs for selected students at qualified universities offering Ph. D. degrees in space-related subjects, and thereby help to replenish the pool of highly trained manpower which is drawn upon by NASA projects. We in the Congress must bear in mind that in order for this Nation to maintain preeminence in space, we must have highly trained people to do it.

A total of 3,681 students are now engaged in the program. One hundred and fifty-two universities representing every State in the Union have received training grants. A total of 530 doctorates have been conferred as of April 1, 1967. Another 350 will enter the program in September 1968. Funding of $7 million in fiscal year 1968 is required to maintain this input.

The $10 million requested for research grants to universities should be sustained to support basic research in space and aeronautical related fields. This element of the program will develop expertise in the academic community so urgently needed to enhance the space effort.

The Congress should not allow the $3 million requested for facilities grants to universities in fiscal year 1968. This should not be construed as a lack of support for this element of the program since it is necessary to provide laboratories throughout the Nation for space-oriented research work. However, $7 million was authorized for these purposes in fiscal year 1967. None of these funds have been obligated to date. These funds should be spent before new money is appropriated for facilities grants.

Therefore the Congress should support the sustaining university program to the extent of $17 million in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who is chairman of the important Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, today this House will make decisions that will affect our capability to achieve and maintain preeminence in space for many years to come. I mean preeminence in terms of our national security, our technological vitality, and economic well-being. The budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was appreciably cut before its submission to Congress; $100 million was cut from the Apollo program by the Bureau of the Budget. Another $100 million for the development of a space station was also eliminated from the budget; $172 million was taken from the Apollo applications program by the Bureau of the Budget. All of this money, Mr. Chairman, was cut from this budget before it reached Congress. The House and the Senate, in authorizing funds for NASA further reduced the amounts requested, and now in the appropriations bill before you an additional reduction of $452.5 million has been made from the NASA request. Over half a billion dollars has been cut from the NASA request in this appropriations bill in addition to the $372 million cut by the Bureau of the Budget before NASA's requirements reached the Congress. In effect, what has been done by the executive department and the Congress is to cut over three-quarters of a billion dollars from our national space program.

In view of this situation, it seems important to look back to our condition in 1958. When Sputnik I made its first flight, we were behind in the space race. We had made the mistake of being complacent—of believing that our technological capability was greater than that of any country on the face of the earth. I recall at that time Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, Columbia University, had told me almost a year before the flight of Sputnik I that we could orbit an artificial satellite within 60 days at any time we wanted to. We failed at that time to realize the implications of the space program and we did not want to orbit a satellite badly enough.

With these reductions in our spending on the national space program, are we making the same mistakes over again? It seems that we may well be making these same mistakes again—overlooking the fact that every dollar spent on the space program is being spent right here on earth, every dollar that we are spending is developing a technology useful not only to the development of new knowledge but also to the improvement of our capability for national defense. The NASA budget in total represents approximately 7 percent of our defense budget and about 3½ percent of our total national budget. Furthermore, NASA expenditures contribute only six-tenths of 1 percent to the gross national product. Even though these numbers are not large in the aggregate, they are an important factor in our economy. NASA employment has been a key factor in the economy because it employs highly skilled personnel. The number of these people in the space program is currently declining at a rate of about 5,000 people per month from a peak of 350,000 people. We are beginning to decimate a major skill capability that this Nation, for the long run, can ill afford to lose. I remind the Members again that we must not—we cannot, allow a repeat of the mistakes

made in 1957–58 at the dawn of the space age.

The original Space Act of 1958 defined our objectives in space as the extension of human knowledge, the development of space capability and efficiency, the utilization of space, and set forth the goal of U.S. leadership. Since that time we have made major strides toward achieving those objectives in constant competition with the Soviet Union. We have made great progress and I caution my fellow Members not to let this progress slip through our fingers by faint support of the space program at this time. The space program has achieved its successes such as the outstanding Gemini program and had its problems such as the tragic accident when three great astronauts lost their lives. But through all of this, NASA has matured into an effective and capable agency. For example, even out of this tragic accident of last January positive benefits have resulted. Among these are—

First. Significant advance in combustion technology, which can be usefully applied to space projects and to other of man's activities.

Second. Added attention to spacecraft escape system designs rather than wait for more accidents to occur.

Third. Increased awareness of the hazards of ground tests, which will cause them to be treated with less complacence.

Fourth. Emphasis upon the dangers of general complacency in the space program which has stemmed from an amazing series of successes even though less than maximum attention was given to safety and reliability.

Fifth. Step-up quality control and inspection procedures.

Sixth. Indication of the need for a full-time, ever alert safety organization within NASA.

Seventh. Addition of a dimension of seriousness to the attitude of all concerned, including the contractors whose business reputations are at stake, the NASA managers whose leadership competence is put in jeopardy, and the astronauts whose lives are being risked.

Eighth. Improvement in the design and safety of the Apollo spacecraft, so that more reliable equipment will have a greater likelihood of success.

Ninth. Decrease in the chances of accidents in flight, in part because the fire on the pad permitted detailed analysis of the contributory factors.

Tenth. Revelation of the fact that a responsible Government agency can conduct a thoroughgoing investigation of its own and its contractors' performance, even to the point of self-embarrassment.

Eleventh. Demand that there be improved management controls through the subcontracting levels, and also that experiences and techniques be borrowed from previously successful programs.

Twelfth. Emphasize to the public the beneficial role of the Apollo program in furthering technology, education, exploration, international prestige, and the national security, while at the same time revealing the dangers of carelessness in such a complex and important assignment.

Mr. Chairman, these are indications of the growth and maturity of our national space program. To fail to support an adequate budget for NASA at this time would serve our country poorly. Statements have been made on the floor of this House that alteration of NASA's schedules would save money—that NASA is building up an inventory of surplus and obsolete boosters. I have answered these views on this floor and will not take your time to do so again. But I must point out that NASA has a well-scheduled and orderly program with detailed objectives defined for both Apollo and Apollo applications programs. These programs are deserving of our support so that the American taxpayer will receive maximum return on the investment which has been made in the program to date.

In the years to come the establishment of our preeminence in space will very likely be as significant as our preeminence on the high seas. Our greatness as a nation has grown, through history, with our prowess on the high seas, and I believe will continue to grow as we develop and establish our preeminence in space. This we must not fail to do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to cutting the outrageous spending by our Government, there is no doubt, I am sure, in the minds of my colleagues where I stand. But today I must vigorously protest the cutting of $27.5 million from the nuclear rocket vehicular application, better known as NERVA.

While I am fully aware that Congress is in an economy mood, the cutting of the $27.5 million from the NERVA project is in essence, cutting our nose off to spite our face.

The NERVA project serves a dual purpose. Our future in space and our future in military planning. The NERVA system is versatile. And may I point out that any delay in this program, brought about by the proposed $27.5 million cutback, will place us far behind the Russians in rocket development.

It is all well and good to say that this is an expensive project today, but what of the future. Dr. Mac C. Adams, Associate Administrator, Office of Advanced Research and Technology, stated August 15, 1967, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I quote:

> If we do not initiate it (the program) this year then we will have to start to cut back substantially on that unique industrial capability that is in being. If later the program is started up again it will cost us time and dollars to retrain personnel. We will perhaps not get back the same people. We will have to get many new people. It will take time to retrain those people and dollars as well. If we do not start now, if we lose a year, it will cost us about two years in time and the cost in dollars also will be up substantially.

And may I add that Dr. Adams felt that the 2 years' loss in time is a conservative figure. And, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to give the Russians a 2-year lead.

This is no time for us to be cutting back while the Russians are moving ahead. We must think of the future. If we do not, we may not have any future.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider and put back the $27.5 million for the NERVA project and the necessary funds for construction of facilities pertaining to the NERVA rocket development program.

Mr. BROTZMAN. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I fully realize the pressures on the Committee that brought this bill to the floor, yet I question the wisdom of completely eliminating Project Voyager. We are being penny wise but pound foolish.

We all remember the crash program that followed Sputnik.

This program was expedient but inefficient because of the time factor involved.

We are now in the race to place the first man on the moon and to bring him back.

In Project Voyager, we have the opportunity to proceed on the next phase of man's exploration of space—and the preservation of our competitive position with the Soviet Union.

I believe we should avoid the next gap—the interplanetary exploration gap; we should avoid the possibility of having to spend additional millions or billions of dollars to catch up.

At the very least, I believe we should keep the nucleus of our Voyager teams alive. These teams are truly a national resource both difficult and expensive to reassemble.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have been around here a few months and I have learned to be thankful for small favors. In this case I want to thank the committee for lopping off the amount of money it did, but it should have been more.

Let us not be carried away by the fact that this is a $516 million reduction from the budget. It is a reduction, and an appreciated reduction, that the committee provided but it is $516 million off the asking price, and the asking price is always inflated, as everyone in this Chamber well knows.

I wish I could share the esteem in which some of the gentlemen of this committee hold Mr. James E. Webb, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Someone is responsible for the terrible tragedy that took place in the Apollo capsule at Cape Canaveral last January. Up to this time I know of no one on whom this responsibility has been placed.

I remember the newspaper stories of last January after that totally unnecessary tragedy occurred, costing the lives of three astronauts, when the same James E. Webb tried to place the blame upon Congress for failing to provide necessary funds. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], in the hearings on this bill—which I want to say to the committee are excellent—asked Mr. Webb:

Mr. EVINS. Can any blame for this tragedy be placed on this committee and on the Congress for lack of funds?

And Mr. Webb—and I believe the hearings were held in April—answered:

Mr. WEBB. No, none.

An administrator of a program such as this, who in January would try to place any part of the responsibility on Congress, and then would come along in April and categorically say that no blame attaches to Congress, does not deserve to hold the job of administrator, and he ought to have been fired long ago.

I am sorry the committee investigating the Apollo fire did not summon a gentleman by the name of Shea to get his views on what happened with respect to this tragedy, which, I say, grows out of the crash program to put a man on the moon. I am sorry that the committee did not summon Mr. Shea to come in and give his views, because he said there had been all kinds of malfunctions and mistakes.

I remember, although I cannot quote him verbatim, that he said last December, a month before the tragedy occurred:

I hope to God the failures and mistakes have been corrected.

There are reports—and I do not know whether there is the slightest truth to them—that Mr. Shea has been kicked out of NASA, and is living in virtual isolation in the Washington area. I am curious to know what has happened to Shea. Perhaps there is someone in this chamber who knows and can tell us what has happened to this man.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas if the gentleman can shed some light on that question.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Dr. Joe Shea, a man for whom I have much admiration, was assigned to the Apollo project and was stationed in Houston, Tex. He was brought to Washington and he worked in Dr. Miller's office for many months. I talked to him many times when our hearings were going on. Subcommittee members talked to him. He has recently chosen to leave the Government service and go to Polaroid. That is where he is at the present time. But he was not living in an isolated place. He was working in the office of Dr. George Miller here in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas why we have never heard from Mr. Shea, since he was the manager of the Apollo project and in direct charge, although Webb, of course, was the top Administrator? Why have we never heard from Mr. Shea?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that it was almost my responsibility to pick the witnesses who appeared before our committee, and I could have picked 100 people including Joe Shea, but when we took Dr. Webb, and Dr. Seamans, and Dr. Mueller and Dr. Gilruth, and Dr. von Braun, and Kurt Debus, there was just so far that we could go. When our subcommittee went to Florida, Mr. Joe Shea was on the plane with us, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] talked with him almost all the way down and back.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the first man almost who should have been called was the man in charge at the time of the disaster, not only then but previously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. What about Dr. George Lowe?

Mr. GROSS. Call them all.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. We could not go on forever. If we called the whole 200 people in the United States, we could not go on forever.

Mr. GROSS. But here was the man, Shea, who was the manager at the time and previous to the time of the tragic Apollo fire.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the tragic accident has been investigated by the House, by the authorizing committee, by the Senate committees, by the Appropriations Committee, and by a special committee appointed by James Webb, and in this special committee there was some thought that since it was appointed by him, it would exonerate the space agency, but they took full blame and did not lay it at the door of Congress.

The matter has been investigated. It is a tragic thing. But it is back on schedule and back on time. We have a new manager of the Apollo program, General Phillips.

Mr. GROSS. The question remains, Who is the individual or individuals responsible for the long series of mistakes, failures, and malfunctions that Shea said had occurred and which culminated last January in the deaths of the three astronauts.

In considering this huge program, costing billions of dollars, we have every right to know.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, in these days when our Nation is confronted by a $135 billion budget, an awesome deficit of $28 billion, and a persistent President who is demanding a sizable tax increase, we in Congress cannot continue to ignore the inefficiency and mismanagement prevalent in Government programs.

Today, we have been asked to appropriate in excess of $4.5 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. While this agency is responsible for a number of very worthwhile programs, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the agency's recurring uneconomic operations in one area, the acquisition and employment of automatic data processing equipment.

In 1963 the General Accounting Office advised NASA, and reported to Congress, that $1 million in rental overpayments had been made for data processing equipment. This overpayment resulted because operational use time had not been determined or consolidated in accordance with contract provisions. NASA responded by assuring the GAO that controls were being installed to provide for the accurate accumulation of operational use time so that rental charges would be computed correctly in the future.

In 1965 the GAO made three separate reports to Congress concerning NASA and its automated data processing operations specifying rentals were reported to be overpaid by the sum of $690,000. NASA obviously had not installed controls to assure the accurate computation of rental charges. The GAO in 1964 undertook a study of leasing versus purchasing selected components of the ADP system. Unnecessary cost and losses that would have been avoided if the equipment were purchased at time of installation totals $1,812,000.

NASA did not escape the critical eye of the GAO in 1966, either. They found that leased computers were "significantly underutilized and, as a result, had incurred relatively high computer costs." Thus, in 3 years when dollar estimates of uneconomic actions were supplied by the GAO, $3.5 million were wastefully expended by NASA in this one area alone.

Other uneconomic activity within NASA cost the taxpayers over $5.8 million in 1965 and 1966. These mistakes resulted from equipment procurement and continued leasing rather than purchasing of electric power facilities.

Mr. Chairman, not only does the wasting of millions of taxpayers' dollars disturb me, but the recurring nature of the problems attests to NASA's unwillingness to heed sound management practices. NASA established in 1958 has yet to develop or submit an accounting system that meets GAO standards and in other instances has failed to comply with the recommendations of the Comptroller General. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9164, aimed at accelerating the speed with which the executive agencies develop sound accounting systems and reducing recurring waste such as I am now describing. This bill includes a timetable for compliance and provides that no agency should have authority to make expenditures if the agency fails to conform with GAO standards within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. Chairman, the executive departments and agencies are neglecting sound management practices. This must be combated if governmental waste and inefficiency are to be eliminated.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to find this appropriations bill taking a course which is going to be increasingly necessary for us as time goes by.

This is a bill which reduced the recommendations of the executive branch by $516.6 million. Even more significant than this, the recommended appropriation is $384.6 million below the actual appropriation for 1967. Thus we are reducing the budget in this area by over a quarter of a billion dollars.

We have already made other reductions in the budget and I believe that we should continue to look for further opportunities to reduce our spending in nonessential fields.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS WHO HAVE SPOKEN IN DEBATE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

who have spoken today on the bill may revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, supplies, materials, equipment; maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $3,899,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I supplement what the gentleman from Texas has said about Joe Shea before we leave the subject? We must remember that at Cape Kennedy Dr. Debus was in charge of the operations there while Joe Shea was stationed at Houston. He was not in direct charge of the operations. Later, he was in Washington with Dr. George Mueller, who is in charge of the all manned space flight matters. We did visit Cape Kennedy and brought in the various operational personnel and, as a matter of fact, we cross-examined many of them and made a good record. I would recommend to the gentleman from Iowa that it would be wise to look into that.

Various witnesses were requested. I must say about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that he had every witness that we on the minority side asked for. In several instances where it was thought there would be duplication, he wisely ruled against such duplication. On the actual managerial and performance portions of the investigation, the subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Science and Astronautics, went to great lengths both in Washington and at Cape Kennedy. Likewise, we went to the Manned Space Flight Center at Houston and observed research experiments regarding safety of materials. Likewise, to examine other experiments for future manned space flight use, some of us on the committee went to Phoenix and to Tucson, Ariz., and to Denver, Colo., for further study.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the chairman of my committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I should like to recall to the gentleman's memory that perhaps one of the most pertinent witnesses before this committee was Col. Frank Borman, one of the astronauts, a man who was asked if he would have gotten into the capsule that morning and said willingly he would have gotten into it.

I recall to the gentleman's memory again that Astronaut Stafford at the very time this experiment was taking place was in a similar capsule in California under 19 pounds per square inch pressure of pure oxygen.

I do not think one can pinpoint this to anyone or anything. It was just one of those things that happens in the development of the state of a new art.

I wanted the gentleman to remember those things.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. My point to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics as well as to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the head of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, that I believe the investigation was well run and that enough witnesses were called.

My point was not in justifying the Apollo 204 accident, because my comment had been, for a mere test, I could see no difference between the pure oxygen atmosphere and a sea level air atmosphere in handling the largely mechanical tests.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was Shea driven from the service; and, if so, by whom and for what reason?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe there are other factors of a personal nature with regard to Mr. Shea which I do not consider should be commented on. I think the gentleman had better get that from him and not at this juncture.

Each individual has his own career. Of course, this was a terrible tragedy for anybody to undergo, as it was for many of us, because we lost highly competent astronauts we had grown attached to and with whom we had worked over the years.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Is it not true that Astronaut Grissom was on the simulator at Cape Canaveral? If so, did the committee go into that?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, I brought that up in the hearings. It was not on the capsule as such.

Mr. GROSS. A training simulator.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It was a training simulator, not a part of the particular capsule in which the Apollo 204 accident occurred in.

NASA did have communications difficulties; there is no doubt about that. They were continuing even at the time of the accident.

My complaints centered strongly on the failure of NASA to take care of the ordinary needs at this particular time. I complained likewise about the facts that the oxygen could not be cut off, and that it was manually controlled.

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

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

I should like to direct a question to one of the members of the committee as to whether this cut here today will have any effect on the Sunblazer project.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I know of the gentleman's great interest in this project. I know he has been persuasive about it ever since this committee started to consider the budget for NASA. He has been in touch with me frequently on it.

Yes, the cut in this budget will knock out the Sunblazer project. It will defer it, at least, until a better budgetary period.

As I understand it, NASA requested $2 million for research and development, and $2.88 million for construction of facilities. When the authorization committee came back from conference, the $2.88 million was left in, but the $2 million for research and development was stricken. The Senate insisted on this.

Also, the authorization provided that the Director of the space program, if he could find the money by transfer to go ahead with the project. The cut that has been made by the authorization committee in research and development. It was the considered judgment of the members of the subcommittee that there was no sense in leaving the $2.88 million for construction. The committee felt, with the $2.88 million in for construction and the $2 million knocked out for research and development, that the whole project should be deferred.

Mr. CONTE. Therefore, it was the thinking of the subcommittee, in view of the fact that there was no money for research and development, that therefore you should not provide money in this budget for construction. Is that right?

Mr. BOLAND. That was the precise reasoning of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Speaking further on this point, $1.5 million is for the launch vehicle, and $2 million for the spacecraft. One can see, if NASA is going to have an actual launching, Congress should be asked for the construction of facilities funds far ahead of the actual launch. The construction of facilities is the item that has the longest leadtime and paces any program. I served on the committee that agreed between the Senate and the House in conference. The House conferees wanted to leave the whole $6.4 million in, because Sunblazer was considered a fine program. Instead of killing the project the conferees agreed to authorize the construction as the pacing item in this solar research effort. Sunblazer studies the sun's corona, analyzing radiation emissions which affect our communications, radio and television on earth. It is designed to learn much more about the sun solar energy and the myriad effects they have on earth. Sunblazer is very practical in relation to the studies of energy particles constantly bombarding the earth and the current research on solar energy.

Mr. CONTE. May I interrupt the gentleman? I think we both agree on the project and I strongly favor it, but if I correctly remember it, the authorizing committee, when they met in conference, came out with a report that if NASA could find the money, then they should

go ahead with the project. As I understand it from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, NASA could not find the money for research and development and therefore, the money is not in this budget for construction.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Again I understand that was the reason why the subcommittee, with some justification, did that. I may say also this subcommittee did look very carefully at brand new starts. This is a completely new project, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has so well stated. It is a project we will get into in the future, and when the budget situation is a little bit better, I know we will, because it is worthwhile and is one that will be necessary in the future.

Mr. CONTE. I certainly appreciate those comments from my colleague from Massachusetts. I hope when the subcommittee meets again next year they will give this item top priority. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts will be in there fighting for it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike "$3,899,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,799,500,000".

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, I should like to commend the committee for its report and particularly for the fact that it has specified on page 4 line items with respect to research and development. It may well be the first time this has been done on the NASA budget. It is important so that NASA itself will understand the intent of the committee and of the Congress and can plan for the future.

I am gratified that the committee has seen fit to adopt the substance of my amendment, offered to the authorization bill, which was designed to reduce the funds for the NERVA program under the line item of "Nuclear rockets" to NASA's original fiscal year 1968 budget request—prior to the amended budget request in which NASA later attempted to include funds for the initiation of a new stage of the NERVA program.

This new departure would have gone beyond the originally intended phasing down of technology studies nearing completion and committed us, through extensive hardware development, to a vast and costly development in the field of nuclear propulsion—the justification for which is a potential manned Mars mission which has neither been agreed to as an objective of the space program nor would necessarily receive public support at this time since it would involve an expenditure of at least $200 billion in the next 18 years. In addition to the lack of requirement for the costly Nerva engine which is proposed for use in the third stage, according to my technical advisers, this nuclear engine has not been fully justified on a technical basis even should a manned Mars mission be contemplated. I think it is clear that the committee on appropriations has intended, by limiting NASA to its original request of $46.5 million, that initiation of this Nerva flight hardware development designed for a manned Mars mission should be deferred pending serious consideration by the Congress of this costly mission and its hoped-for benefits. I trust that NASA will feel bound by this decision of the committee.

The amendment which I have offered today would reduce the amount of funds for research and development by $100 million, from $3,899,500,000 to $3,799,500,000. The purpose of this is to bring under control the program which was discussed earlier by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the Apollo applications program. He pointed out that that program has gone from $80 million in fiscal year 1967 to $300 million in the proposed appropriation for fiscal year 1968. I believe very strongly that we can with great justification reduce this by $100 million. My amendment will in no way impede the progress of NASA's operations. If NASA should disagree, it will certainly have the opportunity to present to the Committee on Appropriations a request for a supplemental appropriation. At that time I would hope it would do so with more explicit justification and with a clearer definition of the Apollo applications program than it has done up to now.

There are several reasons why I urge support for this amendment.

In the first place, the Apollo program itself has been delayed by more than 1 year as a result of the fire in spacecraft 012.

Mr. Chairman, the Apollo applications program is intended to be a follow-on program which will find means to make continued use of Apollo hardware.

The delay in the Apollo project certainly will result in a delay of the follow-on activities. So whatever urgency NASA suggested when the budget was originally submitted for Apollo applications has been vitiated by the fire.

Second, it has not been made clear what missions are contemplated for the Apollo applications program. We are being asked to appropriate $300 million for programs which have not been explicitly defined. I think this is important to bear in mind. In fact, the committee hearings point out that some $23 million in this program would be used for the definition of "experiments."

As I indicated in my additional views to the House Science and Astronautics Committee Report on Authorizing Appropriations to NASA:

This project, which according to conservative estimates will cost the Nation at least $5 billion in the next 5 years, is justified on the basis of being simply a full investigation of man's role in the effective exploitation of the environment of space (NASA fiscal year 1968 budget estimate, vol. V, p. RD-2). In other words, the committee is recommending an experiment to determine not *whether*, but *how* we should thereafter proceed to spend, say, $200 billion for space missions which have not yet been determined to be in the national interest.

Third, there are two types of data to be collected by the Apollo applications. One type is scientific data to be collected by instruments. This data could be much less expensively collected through unmanned satellites. The other objective is to determine man's ability to survive and to work in space for long-duration missions. Here we have at least an apparent duplication which has never been sufficiently investigated by Congress, because the Department of Defense, through its Manned Orbiting Laboratory program, is conducting this same type of investigation.

As I pointed out in my additional views:

We have no clear idea the extent to which the Defense Department and NASA may be duplicating each other's efforts and "reinventing the wheel" at vast, unnecessary public expense.

This is certainly an area to which Congress should address itself in its efforts to reduce unnecessary costs. Deferring funds to permit Congress to give greater scrutiny to this program would in no way limit its potential benefits. Simply finding means to continue to procure Apollo hardware is not a sufficient justification for appropriating $300 million during this fiscal year.

Fourth, we have the study which has been performed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], which he described earlier, regarding the Saturn V boosters which have been procured in excess of presently contemplated mission requirements. NASA has on order 15.

It is intended that the manned landing on the moon will use either booster No. 7, 8, or 9. There will be at least six surplus Saturn V boosters. NASA in the meantime has ordered two additional boosters for which no justification is given. There are also 12 uprated Saturn I boosters in the current Apollo program, of which at least four will be surplus.

NASA is intending to order seven more of these boosters without any reason which we can yet determine. The effect of this hardware procurement would be to simply force us to find ways to justify these expenses by giving our approval later to any variety of missions that NASA may suggest.

It has been pointed out here today that NASA is "not impoverished"—having at present a bank balance of some $2 billion—at least an eighth of which is totally unobligated. It would be well to remember, also, that NASA has recently rescinded some $326 million of unused authorization under section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which requires that unused authorizations be rescinded 3 years after enactment. This is a total only up to fiscal year 1964, and further unused authorization remains on the books.

It would be entirely appropriate to reduce the funds for Apollo applications by an additional $100 million. NASA can always submit a supplemental request including the following submission which we do not now receive from NASA and which is the sort of information we should specifically require from NASA in future years in relation to all important programs.

(a) A 5-year cost, launch schedule and mission projection for the program based

on several assumptions concerning Apollo success.

(b) An assessment of costs and data deficiencies for an alternative program based on MOL and unmanned flights with, first, no postlunar Apollo vehicle procurement and, second, a minimal post-Apollo vehicle-only procurement for storage against future contingencies.

This would give the Congress a chance to participate in the charting of a clear, rational, and efficient course for space exploration.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the President has already reduced this budget for research and development and the authorizing committee after careful consideration and thorough study, reduced it by $204,435,000 more. The Appropriations Committee has further cut the item to the extent of $248 million. This represents a total cut of $452.5 million below the budget request. Mr. Chairman, this is as great a cut as this item can safely stand.

Research and development is the very heart of our space program. This would be a meat-ax cut of $100 million with no one knowing where it would have its effect. I believe we have gone far enough, and I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I believe that it is very clear that we have to cut some areas of nonessential spending. Public works, farm subsidies, and a stretching out of the space program seem to me to be areas this body could well consider cutting.

Certainly the post-Apollo applications program is a prime area where cuts could be made without any significant concern to the future of our space program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the cut of some $100 million that Mr. RYAN has suggested is an appropriate cut, particularly in light of the fact that this program has gone from $80 million to $300 million although the post-Apollo missions have yet to be fully defined.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this cut in nonessential spending.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is just possible that I may never again have the opportunity to support an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. RYAN. Because this one involves a substantial cut in this legislation, I hasten to seize the opportunity.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is overwhelmed by the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, and I certainly hope he will also support other proposals and amendments that I may offer in the future, particularly those which reach the heart of the problems of our cities.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to catch the gentleman in an economy move here today, and I want to support him.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if in cutting this bill it will have any effect on curbing Mr. Webb in dishing out research money for such things as a book on "Social Indicators." I would hope the gentleman's amendment would serve to put the brakes on Mr. Webb on the uses to which he has put some of the so-called research money.

I do not know whether research money goes into the building of wind tunnels, but out of 250 wind tunnels that the Federal Government owns and maintains here, there, and everywhere around this country, NASA has 64 of them, hypersonic, supersonic, transsonic, and subsonic.

At any rate, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, to cut $100 million out of this bill, will serve in any way to put a brake on NASA and some of James Webb's expenditures, then I am all for it.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, and that is why there is 5 percent transferability of funds provided for in this bill? Why should 5 percent of $4 billion be permitted to be transferred to any and every place in this operation?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I want to say to my friend that a transferability of 5 percent among the three NASA appropriations—research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations has been carried in this bill for a number of years. The Congress has allowed them this limited flexibility.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman believe 5 percent is a pretty big transfer allowance, based upon the total amount?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Some Members felt there should be a larger amount so if they find that a certain research program has great potential they then would be permitted to transfer a limited additional amount for this purpose. It was the feeling of the committee that if they should need to transfer additional funds beyond this authority, that they should be required to come back to the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not feel that this transferability in this amount is giving away too much control over the purposes for which the money has been designated for spending by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In reply to my colleague, I would say that we are not the technical experts. We are authorizing the amount of the appropriation, but as for the technical aspects, we have considered that there may be the possibility that a transfer of some of these funds may be needed. This limited transferability to the extent of 5 percent between the three appropriations for NASA has been the practice we have followed in the past. I believe we should continue this practice in the bill again this year, particularly in view of the reductions we have made.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. In regard to the point the gentleman is making, I am informed that no missions have been scheduled or defined in the Apollo applications program.

I think there is a clear case here for a cut in nonessential spending.

I might add that part of the appropriations, according to page 55 of the hearings, is $57 million for production of updated Saturn follow-on boosters that will not be required until 1973 and 1974. In addition, the budget for the Apollo applications program includes the following other items, most of which indicate the limited definition of the program to date: $23 million to universities for definition of experiments; $80 million for spacecraft modifications; $69 million for an orbital workshop; $55 million for a manned telescope; $20 million for long-lead-time items for Saturn V; and $35 million for support. Certainly, this is an area in which we could reduce expenditures at this time.

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

Mr. Chairman, obviously the "party" is split. But I stand as a member of the special investigating subcommittee on the death of those unfortunate military personnel engaged in the space disasters, and as appointed by the Committee on Armed Services. Also, Mr. Chairman, I speak as a 7-year member of the Subcommittee for Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, there are many fallouts of this program in the form of research and development such as weather, navigation, geodesy, mapping, and other areas wherein we might be cutting off our nose to spite our face, should this amendment pass.

If I read the report correctly, we have already reduced the research and development portion of this appropriation bill by almost a half billion dollars, or specifically by $452,500,000.

Now I realize that most bills can be reduced further. I step down to no Member as a watchdog of the U.S. Treasury. But, I think the entire point of this program has been befuddled by the different Saturn programs that are involved. I would refer specifically to the Saturn IB as contradisposed to the Saturn V, which former is the entire basis for the Apollo applications program, versus the Saturn V, which would bring much of the additional research and would be involved in a subsequent program. On the latter, it is possible there should not be too much procurement of follow-on hardware.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to utilize properly the information and full capabilities developed under the Apollo program for practical applications in space, we must have these flight operations. The funds for the follow-on procurement of the Saturn IB launching vehicle are contained in this budget.

The current level for the "Apollo applications (practical)—and I do insert that parenthetically—program," contained in the appropriation bill for $300 million is close to the minimum number needed to sustain this Saturn IB production.

The major cuts are applied to the AAP and hence to the Saturn IB production and it will be severely slowed down because they are already under order. If I understand correctly, they are currently being melded together in the Michoud facilities in New Orleans, as far as the first stage is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this because I believe that further reduction in this program without the scientific expertise on the part of this Agency would indeed, as the chairman of the subcommittee said so shortly and so succinctly—"Rob us of that which we may benefit from, and derive from, a program that is underway and for which the hardware has been ordered."

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to cut the NASA budget by an additional $100 million. Adoption of such an amendment would deal our space program a wound from which it would be hard to recover.

As a matter of fact, the reduction of the NASA authorization by the Appropriations Committee is a matter of regret to me, but all our actions in this Congress are affected by the long shadow of Vietnam. Our Committee on Science and Astronautics made an extremely careful review of all of the projects in the Nation's space program during the authorization hearings held over a period of many weeks, beginning in February of the current session of Congress. Three standing subcommittees of the Science and Astronautics Committee met simultaneously virtually every day of the week during that period. In my opinion, our committee extensively pruned the space agency's budget request, but with discernment.

The Appropriations Committee was, I think, not quite so discerning. But I am satisfied that it has done an honest job with respect to the bill before the House today, and I intend to vote for that bill, however reluctantly.

Reluctantly because I fear that a reduction of a half-billion dollars in NASA's budget for this fiscal year will ultimately result in a loss of momentum in the Nation's space program, and may even jeopardize America's supremacy in space exploration. I would remind the Members of the House that it took America 10 years to develop our present capability whereby we can now make claim to leadership in space in many fields.

I am satisfied that in the long view of history the American space effort will prove to be one of the most significant undertakings of our generation. Fiscal year 1968 may be remembered as the nadir in this important program's course of development.

I look hopefully to the time when the long shadow of Vietnam is lifted, permitting a reversal of the current trend in the funding of America's space program, so that NASA's activities may again move on apace.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Ryan amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901; 80 Stat. 299); minor construction; supplies, materials, services, and equipment; awards; purchase of not to exceed three and hire, maintenance and operation of administrative aircraft; purchase and hire of motor vehicles (including purchase of not to exceed twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only); and maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; $648,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under this appropriation for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 3, line 5, strike out "$648,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$611,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the funds for administrative operations by $37 million from $648 million to $611 million. The reason for this is that administrative operation funds are related to programs, and are in support of R. & D. progams. The committee in its wisdom—and I think the committee did an effective piece of work in that—has reduced the R. & D. funds approximately 10 percent from the original NASA request. My amendment would reduce the administrative operations by $37 million, which is about 9 percent, and which is comparable to the reduction in the research and development funds.

I think it makes good sense to keep the two figures comparable. In other words, a reduction of 9 percent in this item compares to a reduction of 10 percent in the overall total reported out by the committee. The authorization was $648,206,000, and what the committee did was to remove the $206,000 to make it $648 million for administrative operations.

I would simply reduce that amount by a comparable percentage. A serious problem exists in dealing with the NASA budget and in determining the actual cost of individual programs under NASA's overall space program. This is because NASA continues to present classical line-item budget instead of one that is clearly program oriented. It prevents us from having a true understanding of the actual money figures involved in any program. This is most clearly seen in the budget request for administrative operations.

The funds are in support of various programs which NASA undertakes. The amount of funds is related to the work undertaken on these various projects and should be clearly understood as such—to see whether the amount requested for any particular program is reasonable in relation to the size and cost of the rest of the program, and also to see whether the actual entire cost of a given program approximates what we think it is.

The fact is that NASA presents these figures as Administrative Operations costs according to location of the various NASA centers. For each location there is an overhead analysis in terms of salaries, travel, equipment, and so forth. It is not possible from these presentations to understand which part of the Administrative Operations funds are intended to support a particular NASA effort. One cannot determine the actual cost of a given program in any one fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very concerned about this problem of NASA's antiquated inadequate budget presentation, and after considerable thought I proposed to the committee in May that all funds for administrative operations be deferred until NASA presented us with a complete breakdown of administrative operations' funds—assigning them to relevant programs in the research and development portion of the budget. I attempted to explain this problem in my additional views to the House Committee Report on Authorizing Appropriations to NASA. On that occasion I said:

> AO budget requests are presented according to location at the various NASA centers. For each location an overhead analysis is provided in terms of salaries, travel, equipment, and so forth. It is not possible from these presentations to discern that portion of AO funds intended to support a particular NASA effort. One cannot determine the actual cost of a given item such as, say, aeronautics during any fiscal year.
>
> Confusing and incomplete testimony should not be relied upon to clarify deficiencies in NASA's original budget submission. Recent testimony leaves the impression that AO support of aeronautics is approximately 75 percent of the direct aeronautics budget and AO support of technology utilization may amount to over 200 percent of the technology utilization direct budget. We are not in the habit of multiplying by a factor of 3 when we consider the cost of technology utilization and evaluate its related benefits. Congress will not have a sound basis for judgment of NASA's requests until NASA reorders its presentation of AO funding to reflect its direct relations to programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that in future years program orientation should be a primary requirement in NASA's entire budget submission. But I believe that this is a good time to take the first small step, and the administrative operations funds are a good place to start. I believe we can begin this process by asking that the figure appropriated for administrative operations reflect the amount of funds appropriated for research and development projects since the connection between the two is self-evident.

I think it is worth our considering the possibility of insisting, in future years, that this relationship be spelled out even more clearly, to the point where NASA

includes in its budget presentation, a breakdown of administrative operation funds as they relate to R. & D. programs so that the Congress may be informed to actual program costs under consideration.

My amendment will not only not harm NASA's operations, it will promote improved planning procedures within NASA management and clarity and frankness in NASA's presentations to the Congress, which are sorely needed for the continued success of the Nation's space program.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Does not the gentleman agree that the subcommittee did go into this question at the time that it cut a half billion dollars off this budget?

Mr. RYAN. I can only say, unfortunately, the subcommittee did not reduce the administrative operations part of the budget. I think it could have been cut in proportion to the reduction in research and development, and I do not think it would have done any harm to the space program.

We would still have a very viable program. It would simply require NASA to straighten out some of the management difficulties which have plagued that organization for so long. One of the things that came through clearly in the hearings on the Apollo disaster was the mismanagement of the program. Anything we do to tighten the program and require NASA to give an accounting to the Congress would be of benefit to the program in the future.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, if we cut down the R. & D. money, which has been done, by more than $400 million, we cannot cut down on the in-house operations because of the nature of the contracting. The requirements of in-house staff for management and supervision, and so on, increases as you cut down on the R. & D. The findings of the gentleman are in contrast to the findings of the committee and logic and reason.

Mr. RYAN. I disagree with the gentleman. I think there is a clear relationship between the funding of level of R. & D. and the cost of in-house operations. It is curious reasoning to argue that overhead costs should rise as other program costs decrease.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish only to emphasize what was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of this subcommittee, when he says there is a greater need for a closer look at the operations of NASA when there has been such a substantial cut in research and development. There is no question about the fact that competent personnel in administration are necessary to make sure that there is proper monitoring by NASA employees.

My understanding is that NASA has arrived at a very critical stage in its operations, that it is getting to some flight stages where there is an absolute necessity for competent personnel. A cut of $37 million in this area would be terribly unwise.

I agree with the gentleman from New Hampshire that this is one place where a cut ought not to occur, and this subcommittee did not cut management operations. It accepted almost in toto the amount recommended by the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that we are now getting to the point where we already have invested more than $20 million in the Apollo program to put a man on the moon? That it is here where we need this in-house capability? The pending amendment would lessen NASA's effectiveness in respect to the Saturn launches which are indispensable to our huge investment in this program; would it not?

Mr. BOLAND. There is no question about it. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, but on the face of it, it does look unusual that there should be a reduction in research and development of approximately a half billion, and just about no reduction in the administrative operations.

Mr. BOLAND. As I have indicated, and as the gentleman from New Hampshire has indicated, I think where there has been such a substantial cut in research and development, there is an absolute need for sufficient administrative personnel to properly monitor and contract these programs.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, it looks to me somewhat like the application of Parkinson's law. I understand there is more appropriation for administrative expense than last year, and there is less to administer, so we have a classical application of that law.

Mr. BOLAND. But I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that where cuts have been so substantial in research and development, the requirement for administration of the program is greater.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted, apropos of the gentleman's last question about comparing this year with last, that last year NASA transferred about $15 million out of other programs into administrative operations, and in 1966 they transferred, as I recall it, about $28 million. This money is not all for the payment of salaries here in Washington. It is to operate Lewis Research Center, Goddard Space Flight Center, Langley Research Center, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and others engaged in research.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree that it might be not only possible, but it is probable they will have to transfer funds into administrative operations to run this program?

Mr. JONAS. We were so cautioned, at least, and particularly if there is a wage increase voted into effect this year.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The amendment would result in the laying off of scientists, technicians, and other skilled people in the agency. The authorizing committee took a close look at the funding needs for personnel. We took a separate look and came up with about the same level, recognizing the need, that NASA had to transfer funds into this appropriation in previous years.

This would mean laying off personnel who are very essential to the program.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, 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. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the 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. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LANGEN. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 12474 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 92, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—312

Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hunt
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rarick
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—92

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashbrook
Ashley
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Blanton
Brock
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Cleveland
Collier
Conyers
Cunningham
Curtis
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Flynt
Foley
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Hagan
Haley
Hammer-schmidt
Harrison
Harsha
Henderson
Hutchinson
Ichord
Joelson
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
McClure
McDonald, Mich.
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Montgomery
Moore
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
Ottinger
Poff
Pollock
Railsback
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegle
Roth
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Skubitz
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Watkins
Watson
Wyatt
Zwach

NOT VOTING—28

Addabbo
Bow
Clausen, Don H.
Corbett
Cramer
Diggs
Gettys
Giaimo
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Hansen, Wash.
Herlong
Hungate
Long, La.
McClory
McEwen
Mink
Murphy, N.Y.
Patman
Pucinski
Rodino
Roudebush
Saylor
Smith, Iowa
Stubblefield
Thompson, N.J.
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Don. H. Clausen.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Patman.

Mrs. Mink with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Gettys with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. WATSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 12048) 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 on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12048, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] will be recognized for 2½ hours, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] will be recognized for 2½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 12048.

This bill authorizes $3,158,919,000 for the foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1968 and $3,576,545,000 for fiscal year 1969.

The authorization in this bill, together with authorizations made in previous years, is sufficient to cover the executive appropriation request of $3,226,420,000 for fiscal 1968.

The committee made a net cut of $219,286,000 in the authorization request.

I know that there are those who say this was not a very deep cut.

I have also heard the argument that because of the cost of the war in Vietnam, the United States could not afford to spend money on foreign aid.

I recognize that there are many who regard the money we spend on foreign aid as a sort of international charity on

the part of the United States. They are inclined to evaluate the success of our foreign assistance program in terms of the benefits which the recipients in foreign countries have derived from the money we have spent.

It is easy to reach the conclusion that because we are spending more to defend the people of South Vietnam against Communist aggression, we ought to reduce our expenditures to carry forward the programs which are authorized in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we faced the facts of life with respect to the foreign assistance program. It is time that we considered foreign aid, not in terms of what it does for foreigners, but, rather, what it does for the United States.

Now, I am sure that I would not have to go very far to find those who would say that if we judge foreign aid in terms of what it has done for the United States, it has been a colossal failure. They can talk about the fact that we have given billions to our Europen allies who are not willing to fight beside us in Vietnam. They can cite almost daily criticisms of the United States and our policies from leaders of nations which have benefited from our aid.

In spite of all this, I still maintain that the foreign assistance program has made a major contribution to maintaining the security and the prosperity of the United States in the past.

I want to say further, in all sincerity, that without the funds authorized in this bill, we cannot win the war in Vietnam, we cannot look forward to working out a peaceful settlement in the Middle East, nor can we expect our neighbors in Latin America to defeat Communist subversion.

I am not saying that all you have to do is pass the foreign aid bill and these problems will be solved. We ought to face up to the fact, however, that if we eliminate or drastically reduce the programs authorized in this bill, these problems will not be solved.

Just consider the war in Vietnam. There is no money in this bill for military assistance to Vietnam. Military aid to Vietnam was included in the Defense Department appropriation beginning last year. This bill does include $550,000,000 of supporting assistance, without which the economy of Vietnam could not operate during this period of military disruption.

This money finances commodity imports for the civilian population and the relief and reconstruction work in the villages.

It is generally recognized that we cannot win in Vietnam by military action alone. Unless the people in the countryside find that they can live in security and earn a decent living, the conflict will go on.

Without large scale economic assistance from the United States, we might as well throw up the sponge in Vietnam.

This bill provides military assistance to 50 countries, not including Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos which are now included in the Defense Department budget, but three-fourths of the money is programed for five countries along the borders of the Soviet Union and Red China—Korea, China, Iran, Turkey, and Greece.

These five countries maintain almost 2 million men under arms. If these countries could not continue to maintain these forces, the Defense Department has estimated that it would cost over $10 billion to replace them with U.S. units.

Although the fighting is concentrated in Vietnam, the Communist military capability has not diminished elsewhere in the world. The Communist forces are ready to move in wherever a weakening of the common defense effort presents them with an opportunity.

U.S. defense strategy is dependent on the availability and the readiness of these forces in key areas. Any action by the Congress which would cause these countries to doubt our continued support would not only endanger our operations in Vietnam, but would make it necessary for us to reorganize, relocate and reequip our own defense forces.

It is easy to overlook the rather impressive success which our economic assistance has attained in a number of countries. It is generally conceded that the Marshall plan saved Western Europe from going Communist. Formosa has developed its resources to the point where economic aid from the United States is no longer required. Korea is making remarkable economic progress.

Nevertheless, we are all aware that there are some countries, where we have invested large sums of money over a period of a good many years, which do not appear to be much better off today than they were when our aid began.

We should not conclude that our efforts to assist these countries have been futile and that our money has been wasted.

It is not popular in diplomatic circles to mention the fact that the United States has a selfish interest in assisting certain of the less developed countries. The fact that these countries have remained independent—have not fallen under Communist domination—is worth a good deal to us.

I had this in mind when I indicated at the beginning of my statement that we should not judge our aid programs primarily in terms of the benefit derived from them by foreigners.

The United States, during the last 20 years, has invested billions of dollars in subsonic jet aircraft, very few of which ever engaged in combat. Most of these aircraft are obsolete and are no longer of any use to us.

No one argues, however, that it was a mistake to build these planes. We needed them to meet an imminent danger. We write off our investment in them as part of the cost of maintaining our security. It is too bad that we have to replace them.

It would be a better world if we could get along without spending money for planes and missiles. We all recognize, however, that our security requires that we continue such expenditures.

The situation with respect to foreign assistance is somewhat similar. We have invested enormous sums in helping countries maintain their independence. In some cases, they have made impressive economic advancement during this process. In other cases, their progress has not been too encouraging.

We should not accept the argument, however, that our investment was wasted or that we should not continue to spend money for this purpose even in countries that do not show much improvement, or where their government officials are critical.

The basic question is whether it is in our interest for these countries to remain independent. How long we continue such expenditures depends on how long we are confronted with the problems that make them necessary.

If the United States were to announce that we were going out of the foreign aid business, the effect on countries in all parts of the world would be devastating. It is not that the aid we supply them constitutes a large part of their resources; except for a few cases such as Vietnam, the United States supplies only a small fraction of the resources available to a country.

The important thing is that governments everywhere feel an obligation to improve the lot of their people and know that they need outside help if they are to succeed. As long as they know that the United States is standing by ready to give assistance, even though the amounts may be limited and the terms severe, these governments can see some hope of attaining their objective. They may announce that they do not want our aid, or do not need our aid, or will accept it only with no strings attached, but if the United States announced that we would no longer assist the less developed countries, the entire outlook of the world would change.

The point I have been trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that the Foreign Assistance Act provides the President with certain tools he needs in order to deal with the problems and the crises which confront us in our relations with other countries.

The United States finances several other programs which are beneficial to foreign countries, but none of these programs are readily adaptable to meeting the needs of a particular situation.

The Foreign Assistance Act provides the money for financing our foreign policy strategy.

In a sense, it is misleading to refer to the "foreign assistance program." This bill really includes funds for four distinct programs, each different in purpose and in operation.

The bill authorizes $650,000,000 military assistance for 50 countries, of which only 32 get military hardware. The rest receive training assistance only.

As I have indicated, most of the money goes to a very few countries who have important responsibilities in the implementation of our collective defense against Communist aggression.

The rest of the money goes in relatively small amounts to assist several of the less developed countries to defend themselves against subversion. Helicopters and electronic communications are particularly important for such purpose. They cost a lot of money, and the people

who operate such equipment require extensive and expensive training.

Our military assistance program focuses on present dangers and shortrun problems.

On the other hand, the development loan fund relates to long-range problems and is available only for countries which are making economic progress and appear to be on their way to becoming self-supporting. These are all dollar repayable loans.

The bill authorizes $600,000,000 for development loans for the fiscal year 1968 and assistance to 22 countries has been planned by the Executive.

Included in the bill is an authorization of $243,000,000 for technical cooperation and development grants. This type of assistance is useful in dealing with both immediate and long-range problems.

This authorization carries forward the old Point 4 program, which has enjoyed almost universal support and commendation.

Every one of the undeveloped countries needs technical assistance. Nearly every country wants technical help in dealing with certain of its immediate problems. Others are concerned with long-range development, recognizing that their people cannot enjoy better living conditions unless they make better use of their resources, both human and material.

The United States should have the means to assist countries who come to us on short notice for help in dealing with a specific problem, as well as to provide technicians to assist with programs and projects which may require several years to carry out.

I have already referred to the supporting assistance program. In addition to the $550,000,000 for Vietnam, there is an authorization of $170,000,000 for other countries. It is planned to provide supporting assistance to nine countries in addition to Vietnam.

Two-thirds of this money is for Korea, Laos and Thailand, all of which are directly concerned with the war in Vietnam.

Supporting assistance goes entirely to countries where the United States has an immediate foreign policy interest. It is economic aid and is used primarily for the purchase through normal commercial channels of raw materials and other essential imports.

While supporting assistance contributes to the economic and social development of the countries which receive it, the amount and nature of such assistance is related primarily to increasing the capability of a country to defend itself against Communist expansion and to maintain economic and political stability.

The availability of suporting assistance funds is essential to the conduct of our foreign policy.

None of us should overlook the fact that this bill authorizes $650,000,000 for the Alliance for Progress for fiscal year 1968. Assistance to 21 countries of this hemisphere is contemplated. For reasons of geography, as well as history, we have a special relationship with the other countries of the North and South American continents.

The people of Latin America are determined to better themselves. The governments of these countries are threatened with Communist subversion, including guerrilla warfare. They recognize that they must cooperate with each other and with us. They look to us for guidance and for assistance.

It is essential that we do nothing to shake their confidence in our continued interest and support.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the United States faces grave dangers.

Every one of us is dissatisfied with the way the war in Vietnam is going and with the world situation in general.

Let me point out that a vote against foreign aid will not have the effect of being a protest vote. A vote against the bill will not make things better. It will make the situation worse.

We need the funds authorized by this bill to bring the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion.

We cannot deprive the other nations around the world of the assistance that they need and expect—or we will be creating many, many new crises around the world.

I support this bill, and I hope the House after long and careful debate and its consideration under the 5-minute rule will give the President the tools he needs to conduct the foreign policy of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we are all accustomed to having the press take very quick notice of those who set endurance records whether they be for flagpole sitting or underwater swimming. Little recognition was accorded your Committee on Foreign Affairs when it completed its action on the foreign assistance bill for 1967 after a record of 53 sessions. It may be that this indifference was because those who cover the committee's work were as numb as the members. Or perhaps it was a sense of bewilderment as to what we did during those sessions of the committee.

Certainly we did little to respond to the fiscal difficulties that affect our Nation. The President's request for 1968 was reduced by only a little more than $200 million. We had not a word of testimony on the needs for 1969. We therefore accepted the President's request without alteration. If it is difficult to justify the sums for 1968, it is impossible to explain or justify those he requested for 1969. Certainly if we are going to have a 2-year authorization—and I try to have an open mind on that subject—although I find it most difficult—then we ought to know something about how the amounts requested for 1969 were determined and how the 1968 funds were spent.

As never before, the difficulties the committee has had in the matter of studies in depth of these far-reaching programs have troubled me. I am more than ever convinced that if the testimony from the various areas were submitted to the committee's subcommittees, who have developed no little expertise in their subjects, we could bring to the House a far more intelligent presentation. The chairman does not agree to the idea, and I do not mind his disagreeing with me, the chairman having told us it was tried only to fail. I confess I am a "try and try again" person, and have not abandoned the idea.

Amendments will be offered during committee consideration of this bill to reduce the authorizations for various parts of this program. For my part, I am of the opinion that reductions in parts of this bill can be made without impairing the program in the slightest. I intend to support such amendments.

Our chairman has explained the numerous provisions of the bill. I shall confine my remarks to a few points that I consider could stand further discussion.

One provision over which the committee worked at great length is that for assistance for voluntary family planning. The report spells out clearly our thinking on this subject:

> The Agency for International Development is giving special emphasis to food production in the less developed countries and has inaugurated a program of assistance in family planning. The committee feels it is important that this be pursued aggressively. In order to counteract any possible tendency for the Agency for International Development to continue business as usual and to regard family planning programs as a fringe operation, $50 million of economic assistance funds have been set aside to be used only for this purpose.

Again we heard the familiar theme that our aid was geared to self-help. We were given a few examples in a few countries to buttress this contention. It is significant, however, that we heard nothing about the use of the Joint Commission on Rural Development that was initiated by our former colleague, Walter Judd, and used so successfully in Taiwan. It brings local officials into association with our personnel in the planning and execution of rural programs. Last year Congress broadened the language in the expectation that it would be used more widely. Certainly this is self-help. Why has AID not availed itself of this tested device to hasten its self-help program? We just wonder at some of these things they have not attended to.

For more than a decade I have urged our officials to devote more attention to Africa—a continent of hope and frustration, of opportunity and unfulfilled ambitions. Often I have felt like a lonely pleader. A bit perhaps like Billy Graham, I can say that "I have no knowledge that the CIA has helped finance any of my crusades." Only sheer persistence particularly by Congress has moved the executive branch to shift into higher gear on Africa.

Last year the executive made a study and a report on Africa that I find very disturbing. It was not told the committee. It was an executive branch report that was marked "confidential," pretty much top secret. It was impossible to get it. Some far-reaching recommendations with serious policy implications were contained in it. If adopted as the official policy of our Government, Congress would be called upon to implement it. It was prepared by a former Ambassador to Ethiopia but it does not represent the judgment of many of our Ambassadors

to African states who have considerably more expertise in matters pertaining to Africa. The gist of the report was that greater emphasis be placed upon the use of multilateral agencies in the development of that continent, and give to regions, not just to single states. Admittedly there are some programs that can best be handled on a multilateral basis. We can handle them that way, but these are relatively few.

To urge, even to insist upon, nations still seeking national identity to forsake that goal for untested and precarious approaches to regional development is to expect too much too soon. We must never forget that modest bilateral programs can have a far-reaching political as well as economic impact on these countries. Furthermore, our bilateral programs carry with them policy considerations that are in our national interest.

Foreign assistance is more than assistance by our Government to other governments. It involves tapping the total of our human and material resources which in the United States often lie in private hands. From the beginning of our legislative efforts we have always included in the annual foreign aid bill provisions to stimulate the use of these private resources. This bill is no exception. The investment guaranty program now in law is extended and strengthened in this bill, thus making possible the greater availability of the managerial and technical skills of our citizens. Members should note that this program has been highly successful, if not as highly publicized as other parts of the program. Through 1966 our Government has paid out only $300,000 against a total reserve of about $300 million.

In 26 years of service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been a participant in, and a witness to, many legislative battles on matters pertaining to our foreign relations. I have served in time of peace and in times of war, both hot and cold. I am aware of the deep emotional concerns that foreign assistance stirs among our citizens.

Foreign assistance cannot be characterized in simple words like "good" or "bad." It contains within itself many implications for our Nation, not only for today, but for the future. It has obvious deficiencies and shortcomings. Your committee has applied itself diligently to overcoming these as they have become apparent. No statistical chart can depict either its successes or failures. These have to be determined in the sum total of our foreign policy goals. At the same time, we have to balance these goals against our resources.

Those who would urge its termination have a burden to prove that it is not responsive to our national interests even in times of national fiscal difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I want to say from my heart. When we deal with these other countries, it seems to me that we become a little too eager to tell them what to do and how to do it. We do it from the top. We ought to do it from the heartfelt standards of life. What people care about is what we care about in them. They do not want to know what we think is so perfect, because it is not perfect. When we try to make them do things we think are right, perhaps those things are not suited to them at all. So I have tried to urge at every possible opportunity that we try to give the other countries this understanding. Let me divert myself for just a moment at this point. People do not like to ask for help. When they have had it given them, they are apt to turn away from the friends who have given it. Let us not forget that. Let us not become impatient when those things happen to us in the national area.

I hope very much that the House is going to pass this bill. I have found myself sometimes wishing it would not, just wondering what would happen if we did not pass it. But I have come here today to vote for the bill, and I shall hope exceedingly much that the Congress will pass it with a sufficient majority to make it really useful in more ways than one.

I have served many years here with various chairmen and various members of the committee. I find it quite impossible to sit down without saying "Thank you" to Dr. MORGAN for his patience. The man is very patient. We put him through terrible things sometimes in the committee—do we not?—and he is so gracious and so quiet. He does not snap back at us and he could do so many times. I see that many, many Members agree with me. He has discharged his responsibilities as he saw them with skill. For my colleagues on the minority side, I want to express to him our very deep appreciation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I do urge that this body support this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967.

At the outset, I should like to compliment our distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN, for the endless patience and high degree of statesmanship which he demonstrated during our committee's consideration of this legislation.

It is seldom, Mr. Chairman, that a committee of the Congress spends 4 months working on a single legislative bill. Yet this is precisely what happened this year with the foreign assistance legislation. We began holding hearings on April 4 and we reported the bill on August 11.

TRIBUTE TO THE CHAIRMAN

During that entire time, Dr. MORGAN did everything in his power to assure a comprehensive examination of the foreign aid program, and to give all members of the committee—both the majority and the minority—every possible opportunity to summon and question expert witnesses.

I pay my tribute to Mrs. BOLTON who cooperated with our chairman—and who made sure we were all in the act together.

If anyone should complain about lack of information relating to the foreign aid program—how it operates and what it has accomplished—it is not because the opportunity to obtain such information has been lacking.

There are detailed presentations prepared by the Agency for International Development and the military departments—presentations which examine the program in detail, country by country.

There are unclassified summary presentations which run into hundreds of pages and which were made available to all Members of Congress.

There is the record of the hearings held before our committee—a record which fills nearly 1,400 pages of print.

There is a 137-page report submitted by our committee which describes in detail each and every provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 in addition to dealing with the major issues of the overall program.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the excellent remarks of our chairman, Dr. MORGAN, made at the outset of this debate, which contain a fund of valuable information about this program.

I shall not attempt to duplicate any of those sources. Instead, in rising in support of H.R. 12048, I should like to underline several considerations which argue on behalf of this legislation.

CUTS IN THE PROGRAM

The first point relates to the reductions mads in the foreign aid authorization by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Our committee cut the fiscal 1968 authorization by $305 million—or nearly 9 percent of the Executive request.

We cut $150 million from the Development Loan Fund;

We cut another $100 million from the Alliance for Progress;

We cut $25 million from the contingency fund;

And we cut military assistance by some $30 million.

These are substantial cuts. They trim off what fat there was in the program, and even cut a bit into the bone. They represent the maximum that can be cut from the program without jeopardizing some very important U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stress that while we were working on the Foreign Assistance Act, all of us were keenly aware of the need to reduce Federal spending.

We knew how much the war in Vietnam is costing.

We knew what is involved in some of our long-range security undertakings.

And we were also aware of the fact that the President has asked the Congress to approve a surtax to help balance our budget.

All of these factors went into our decision to cut the foreign aid program by over $300 million—or nearly one-tenth of the proposed program.

But these same factors—and the compelling demands of our national security—also argue against any rash or irresponsible further reductions in this program.

We must not forget that this program is the principal instrument of our efforts to build peace and stability in the world.

We know how much the world's failures to keep peace have cost.

We know how much World War II cost. We know the cost of the Korean war. And we also know that we are spending at the rate of more than $20 billion annually in Vietnam.

The cost of war is extremely high. We try to avoid those costs by working for peace through our foreign aid undertakings. This is low-cost insurance against world disaster. We would be foolish to let it lapse—or to try to "economize" by missing some premiums.

We must also remember that the cost of wars cannot be measured by dollars alone. Loss of human lives, and human tragedy brought about by war, cannot be converted into dollars and cents. And it is human lives, and human welfare, that are our most important considerations.

STRENGTHENING FOREIGN POLICY DIRECTION

Mr. Chairman, the second point which I wish to make is that H.R. 12048, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, represents a great improvement in the direction of strengthening civilian foreign policy control over our various international undertakings.

First of all, the bill reasserts our support for the principle of cost sharing in the field of mutual security.

For years, our committee has emphasized the need for our allies—in Europe and in other areas—to share the cost of common defense.

We said time and again that the United States cannot shoulder those expenditures alone.

And we endorsed cost-sharing arrangements in NATO, and in other international security arrangements, whereby our friends have been picking up an increasing portion of the tab for mutual security.

Our efforts are going to be strengthened because the bill before the House today continues our close oversight over such programs as NATO infrastructure and international military headquarters.

MILITARY SECURITY—AND SALES

There is, however, another way of sharing defense costs. And we have also stressed this approach.

During the 1950's, Mr. Chairman, three-fourths of our military aid—aid required for mutual security—went in the form of grants.

We gave away weapons, weapons systems, planes and ships, and provided other services to our allies—virtually all of it for free.

Today, three-fifths of that assistance—of military articles and services required to keep the free world safe and to improve internal security—is being paid for by our allies.

It is being paid for through military sales—both direct sales and credit purchases.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said in recent weeks on the subject of U.S. military sales. And I regret to point out that a considerable amount of misinformation has been circulated in the process.

What are the facts of this matter?

First, military sales are an integral part of our foreign assistance program.

We do not, and should not, go around the world dumping weapons left and right. Each and every sale requires the approval of our civilian foreign policy authorities. Through the State Department review of the proposed sales, we try to see to it that they complement and strengthen our other efforts to improve free world security and to stimulate economic development of the less developed countries.

Second, most of our military sales—90 percent of them, as a matter of fact—are made to our Western European allies, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

These are developed, industrialized countries which maintain substantial military establishments for the sake of our common security.

They need defense articles and services for those military establishments. They fill some of their requirements at home. And they fill others abroad—in the United States or in some other country which manufactures the kind of equipment that they need.

Only one-quarter of their defense procurement is made in the United States.

Surely these facts should dispel the illusion fostered by some people that our Military Establishment is some kind of an ogre, peddling its wares to anybody and everybody who wants them.

Nothing is further from the truth. What is true, however, is that we have cut down on our grant military assistance program—saving the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars—by emphasizing sales where the recipient country can afford to contribute more to our common defense.

What is also true is that these military sales have strengthened the defense capability of the free world—helped to prevent the proliferation of inefficient and expensive national defense industries—headed off potential Communist influence in a number of critical areas—and helped to create conditions of internal security necessary for any kind of social and economic progress in a number of the developing countries.

IMPROVED COORDINATION

The third major way in which the bill before the House strengthens the implementation of our foreign policy is by effecting closer coordination between several major activities including the disposal of surplus property, utilization of foreign currencies, and "food for peace."

Those undertakings relate directly to our foreign policy. They are the instruments which our Government must use to achieve our national objectives abroad. Their use should be coordinated, therefore, and made increasingly responsive to the requirements of our foreign policy.

IN CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the relationship between this program and Communist designs for world domination.

There are a number of provisions in the bill which strengthen the prohibitions on the provision of assistance to Communist countries and to countries assisting such regimes through shipping, sales, and other ways.

These restrictions are advisable in some cases, absolutely necessary in others.

But they do not give us the whole picture.

In a larger sense, and in a much more forceful way, the entire foreign aid program can be a potent weapon against those who would perpetuate misery—subvert freedom—and extend their totalitarian rule over an increasingly large segment of the world's population.

This program itself—and the way in which it is used to help others help themselves—is as vital to the cause of freedom as some of our most advanced and complicated military weapons systems.

The point is—much depends on how this program is used. And this involves the flexibility which we give to the President of the United States to conduct the day-to-day operations under this statute.

There are ways of crippling this program without cutting one penny from it. There are ways of loading it down with amendments and prohibitions which would immobilize it and make it useless.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will resist such amendments. I hope that we will instead continue to improve this undertaking in order to make it as effective as possible for the advancement of human freedom and the improvement of the human condition.

Mr. Chairman, I urge House approval of H.R. 12048.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentlewoman from New York yield for a question?

Mrs. KELLY. I glady yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was wondering whether during these 53 sessions of your committee how much time was devoted to reviewing the various programs in which the United States is participating through the United Nations. That is the responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is it not?

Mrs. KELLY. It certainly is, Mr. Chairman.

I would answer the gentleman by saying that I cannot tell the gentleman the exact number of hours we spent examining these particular programs. But I want to tell the gentleman that in addition to extensive consideration of this subject by the full committee the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held long hearings on the various operations of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We have held extensive hearings and spent many hours in that field.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, what I am trying to get at is this: Can the gentlewoman recall any United Nations program in which the United States does not participate?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentlewoman yield to me for the purpose of responding to that question?

Mrs. KELLY. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for the purpose of answering the interrogation propounded by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we did have hearings with respect to all of the programs in which we participate with the United Nations. In fact, there are several hundred pages of hearings relevant to that particular question.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Then, perhaps, I had better wait until the gentleman from New Jersey presents his statement.

Mrs. KELLY. I would like to have the gentleman rephrase his question.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, for many years I have complained about the fact that the United States is always a participant in every program of the United Nations, even at times when we were providing up to 90 percent of the cost of the programs. And I have been working for many years trying to get that amount reduced and in an effort to get a greater participation among other nations. Further, I have expressed the belief on several occasions that where the United States contributes as much as 50 percent of the total cost of any program, they could probably do it better——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I hope that the gentleman from Missouri is aware of the fact that we have gradually reduced the contributions which the United States is paying to the United Nations programs, through the initiative of the U.S. Congress. Furthermore, there is only one program—and that is our support for the Palestinian refugees—to which we make a contribution in excess of 50 percent, in fact, about 65 percent.

Of course, U.S. contributions to many other programs have been reduced to about 32 percent, and even lower, over the years.

As the gentleman knows, the congressional delegates who are assigned periodically to the United Nations, participate in the deliberations and decisions of the U.N. General Assembly. I was fortunate to have served as a U.S. delegate in the United Nations and I want to assure the gentleman that we worked hard to reduce the percentage of U.S. contributions to various U.N. programs.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It was cut down this session?

Mrs. KELLY. I was not present at the last session of the U.N. General Assembly and I do not recall the specific reductions achieved at that time. But I can assure the gentleman that there has been a downward trend in U.S. contributions. The report on the bill H.R. 12048, on pages 31 through 39, gives a detailed explanation of those contributions and of the reductions in the U.S. share of various U.N. programs.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 230]

Bates	Clausen, Don H.	Dulski
Blackburn	Corman	Evins, Tenn.
Blanton	Dickinson	Flynt
Bow	Diggs	Gettys
Clancy	Hardy	Giaimo
Herlong	McCulloch	Taylor
Hungate	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Ichord	Pool	Thompson, N.J.
Leggett	Pucinski	Williams, Miss.
Long, La.	Resnick	Willis
McClory	Roudebush	Wyatt
	Smith, Iowa	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 12048, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 399 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would join with those who have paid tribute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] the ranking minority member. During the 53 sessions of the committee that ensued before we brought this bill to the floor they were both patient, tolerant, and helpful. I think it is also worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, to commend the committee as a whole for the time that it spent in hearings and in 7 weeks of markup before this bill was brought to this floor. Regardless of what you may think of its content, certainly it cannot be said that we are here with inadequate hearings and with inadequate consideration in the markup of this legislation. During the debate some questions may be asked about matters which are classified. I think it is worth mentioning that both on the majority and minority tables there are classified books relating to economic and military programs which are available for the inspection of Members during debate.

I would also point out that in the report accompanying this bill there is in the final pages thereof a section entitled "Minority Views."

Those of us who prepared and signed those views invite your thoughtful attention to them.

Mr. Chairman, this is the year in which foreign aid as a program ought to be reexamined. When one says that, it is not said to deny the fact that there are some worthwhile elements in this program. I would mention some parts of the technical assistance program and parts of our military assistance program.

But having in mind the fiscal situation in which our Nation finds itself, and having in mind the demands for the taxpayers' dollars, certainly this is the year during which to examine more fully than ever before our whole foreign aid program.

Foreign aid is, admittedly, an arm of our foreign policy. Some say it is also equally designed to insure the independence and freedom of nations throughout the world. With that view one would find it difficult to differ. But as an arm of our foreign policy, a brief look around gives rise to a very serious question as to how effective it has been.

In recent votes in the United Nations, as we point out in our minority views, how many times has the position of the United States—and I would say as recently as on the question of the Arab-Israel war just concluded—how many times have nations which have benefited by our aid programs failed to support the position of the United States and, indeed, through their leaders, taken positions and made statements diametrically in opposition to the welfare and the public position of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, two nations may be singled out in the years since World War II. We have given France more economic and military assistance, approximately $9 billion. Everyone within the sound of my voice knows the present attitude of the leader of that country.

Halfway around the world we have extended to India $6.7 billion in assistance. As recently as the Arab-Israel war, the Prime Minister of India made statements in support of those who opposed us.

Since the end of World War II our assistance in the form of loans, grants, and foodstuffs has amounted to more than $130 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if we ask ourselves whether foreign aid as represented by that use of our resources and as an arm of foreign policy has been successful, we must certainly answer in the negative.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from Indiana yield to me briefly at this point?

Mr. ADAIR. I gladly yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Indiana has called attention to the fact that France voted contrary to our vote in the U.N. The gentleman seemed to be drawing the conclusion that those countries which had benefited from our programs in the past and which have received substantial amounts of foreign aid, they should not take positions differently from ours. I deplore the fact that the position of the French Government in many cases is not in accord with our position, and I should have liked to have seen France vote differently in the U.N.

However, I do not see the relevance of the aid which we might have given that country in the past to the policies of the present French Government.

I would hope that we are not trying to buy the allegiance of any country, and the future governments of a country, because we give them assistance for a particular reason.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I think it has been amply demonstrated that even if we were attempting to buy their allegiance, which we are not undertaking to do, it would have failed.

I am simply trying to point out that in areas where we have placed a great many of our taxpayers' dollars, we find a reluctance to come to our support when we need support, whether it be in the U.N., in Vietnam, or in support of our position in the United Nations.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the gentleman suggesting that we should not have given aid to France because we might have anticipated that at a later date she would not automatically support us on every issue that we thought was of importance to us, but where France might feel differently? I would think that the position of France is determined not on what we might have given her in the past, or not given to her, but rather upon what she believes is in her national interest.

Mr. ADAIR. I am suggesting that one of the failures in our foreign aid program is the lack of selectivity in determining the nations to whom we give aid. That criticism refers not only to the past, but is equally applicable today as we look around the world at the nations to whom we are giving aid.

We are unwisely, in my opinion, in too many instances giving assistance to those nations whose goals and aims, as enunciated by their leaders, do not seem to be in accord with those of our Nation.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I understood the gentleman to say we should not try to buy allegiance?

Mr. ADAIR. I said it proved we cannot buy it, and we should not try.

Mr. BELCHER. I do not believe we can, either, but certainly when we furnish military aid to someone who is going to be an enemy, how silly can we get, when we furnish military equipment and hardware and everything else to another nation without having any idea whether they are going to shoot at us or shoot with us. I most certainly do not believe that that would be a very smart foreign policy.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman brings out the point I made a moment ago, that we have not been sufficiently selective in the nations we have aided, both economically and militarily.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something in reply to what the gentleman from New Jersey said.

I do not suppose all of the billions—and I use the word advisedly—that we have poured into France over the time since World War II, or the time after World War I—which, incidentally, they did not repay—would buy their allegiance, or even get them to support our position. But it does seem to me that the President of France who, for some reason or other, some myth that I cannot penetrate, is supposed to be a great military hero—and if there is any legitimacy toward his being a hero it was provided by the American troops who moved into Paris and let him tag along after them. One would think the least we could expect from him was that he would not try to destroy the United States, and that he would not try——

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

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Yes, I yield further.

Mr. HAYS. That he would not try to destroy the currency of the United States; that he would not try to undermine the position of the United States at the United Nations; and that he would not try that which the French press quotes him as saying, to throw the Americans down because they are too powerful.

I do not believe we can expect him to always support us, but I believe the least we can expect is that he would not try to destroy us, and to that extent I agree with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about the arithmetic of this bill for a moment.

In round numbers the House committee has before it today a bill reduced from the Executive's request by about $219 million. That produces a bill of $3.15 billion plus that we are now considering.

The question is sometimes asked, and it may be relevant and it may not be relevant, as to what the other body did. Again, in round numbers, the other body reduced the foreign aid request by about $750 million net.

Our committee made reductions in these major portions of the bill, the Development Loan Fund, the Alliance for Progress, the contingency fund, and a very minor cut of some $30 million in the $596 million military assistance request. But the restoration of the NATO infrastructure funds of $84.1 million brought the military figure back up to $650 million.

There will be opportunity offered in the course of the reading of this bill for amendment for the Members to vote upon further reductions in the dollar amounts of this bill.

As to the pipeline, that is the amounts that are unexpended, it is about $6 billion of which $4.4 billion, again in round numbers, is economic—and $1.6 billion is military.

It is frequently said that these funds are in fact obligated for expenditure. To a considerable extent that is true. But there remains the right to deobligate and to reobligate.

Through the years we have seen that done time after time, and I think with reason we can expect that to be done again.

Thus it can be said that there is in the pipeline unexpended at this time an amount roughly equal to 2 years' requests for foreign aid appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, there are some good things in the bill. We have strengthened the private enterprise sections of the bill. We have before us a 2-year bill which many think ought to be a 1-year bill. There will be opportunities to vote upon that.

I have tried to point out both the good and the bad in this bill. It is my intention on final passage to vote against this bill. Each Member of this body must weigh his own obligation in the light of the demands for the taxpayers dollars and in the light of the demands of the war in Vietnam and in the light of the requests for a tax increase, as we consider what our vote will be on this year's foreign aid bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. 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 gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as we commence consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, we once again begin an annual debate which has become more agonizing with each passing year. Whether we wish to recognize it or not, foreign aid as we have known it as a national policy in the past stands at the crossroads. Never before has there been such widespread discontent with our foreign assistance programs, both economic and military. Never before has there been more dissatisfaction with the failure of our aid policies in recent years to show more positive results, and never has the Nation had so much hesitation and so little enthusiasm for the future of the program.

Why has so much disillusionment set in with our aid program? There are undoubtedly many contributing factors—reports of waste and inefficiency which come to the Congress each year, growing concern over our commitment in Vietnam, a persistent balance-of-payments problem, an alarming Federal deficit, and serious social unrest in our own cities, to name a few. All of these compound the present dilemma, of course. Just as importantly, I believe, is the fact that the world has changed since the Marshall plan was first conceived after World War II but, in my estimation, our aid policies unfortunately have not. The initial objective was to help free nations of Western Europe regain their economic stability and national security to resist the spread of world communism. It was also designed to assist these nations in developing democracy as a way of life and, we had hoped, create a more peaceful and stable world. The Marshall plan was initiated as a temporary, emergency, regional program—yet, over the years foreign aid has far exceeded its original purpose and is now presented as a permanent, worldwide network financing dozens of programs in the Near East, Southeast Asia, the Far East, and Latin America. Many times, too, we have found that our aid has benefited countries whose policies have been detrimental to our own national interest. Also, the cost is misleading, to say the least, for it is almost impossible to accurately estimate the true amount our Nation has contributed for this purpose since 1946—but we know that it is at least $140 billion.

Now, under the administration's foreign assistance program next year, 100 countries and five territories will receive

more American assistance in either economic or military aid or food for freedom—and while the bill now before us would authorize $3.1 billion for fiscal 1968 and $3.5 billion for fiscal 1969, we know this is only a part. To this must be added the millions for Public Law 480, for the Peace Corps, and for United States participation in the various international development organizations—so that when we total it all up, we are talking instead about at least $5.5 billion in foreign assistance in 1968 alone, as the Senate debate brought out last week.

Despite this huge past and proposed outlay of our tax dollars, we find ourselves today in the untenable position of losing more and more prestige abroad and having fewer friends on whom to rely when the chips are down. The failure of our aid program to win friends for America is well known, but it was forcefully demonstrated once again in the recent Arab-Israel crisis. When the key vote was taken in the United Nations, we saw such "friends" as France and India, both recipients of substantial American aid over the years, vote with the Soviet Union. We question, also, whether it was our own military assistance to these nations of the Middle East which indirectly precipitated this conflict, just as a year ago we saw open warfare between India and Pakistan, also made possible to a large extent with American aid. In the light of such events, it is not surprising, therefore, that the American people are beginning to doubt the direction in which our foreign assistance program is taking us—to wonder how much it may actually contribute to the world arms race. We can question, too, just how effective an assistance program so widely distributed and thinly spread can really be in promoting our national interests and whether numerous small programs in many countries in reality only raise local hopes which the United States cannot possibly fulfill, thus resulting in frustration and resentment. I think the time has come to seriously reevaluate the question as to just how far we can reasonably be expected to go in policing the world. After all, we are already shouldering a tremendous free world burden in Vietnam—a responsibility which daily grows more costly.

The urgent need today is for the Congress to put the question of foreign aid in proper perspective. We need to set priorities in this field just as surely as in our domestic policies. The war in Vietnam is now costing at least $25 billion annually—probably more. We are told that the deficit for the Federal Government this year will be twice as large as any year since our aid program began, perhaps reaching as high as $30 billion. The President is calling on our taxpayers to pay an additional 10-percent surtax to meet the rising costs of Government, and we see the dollar's position grow more precarious as our balance of payments fails to improve. Certainly it would be unrealistic under these circumstances for the Congress to fail to give first priority to our own needs over those of others. What happens to the cause of freedom if we have a fiscal and monetary crisis in America and if we continue to make commitments all over the world which we cannot honor?

I have not supported foreign aid bills in the past, and since becoming a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations I feel even more keenly that this entire program as it relates to our foreign policy must be completely reassessed. We now have over $6 billion in unexpended funds in the foreign aid "pipeline," but still we are being asked to obligate American taxpayers to another $6.6 billion in aid projects for the next two years. In my judgment, not only is it essential that the Congress have an opportunity to review aid programs annually—but the critical need at this time is to establish meaningful priorities in Federal spending. Until the war in Vietnam is resolved, other less urgent foreign assistance must be postponed.

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, as we take up the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 it would be well for every Member of the House to give serious consideration to the economy of the Nation and our vast military requirements before placing an additional financial burden upon the American taxpayer.

We are considering a bill which authorizes appropriations of $3,158,919,000 for fiscal year 1968 and $3,576,545,000 for fiscal year 1969 at a time when the deficit spending of the Federal Government is reaching alarming proportions.

We debate a foreign aid bill at a time when the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress a proposal to add a surtax of 10 percent upon personal and corporate incomes.

We are called upon to give consideration to making available additional billions of deficit dollars during a period when there is a clamor in the Nation for increased domestic spending for the relief of poverty, to revitalize our cities, and for countless other internal projects.

Military assistance, in my judgment, is in an entirely different category from the economic assistance program which has been so costly to this Nation. It is my feeling that a careful and intelligent program of such military assistance for friendly nations dedicated to the cause of freedom is thoroughly justified. Unfortunately, the legislation now before the House does not give an opportunity for one to support the military assistance program unless he is willing to go along with the economic assistance program. That I cannot do.

Mr. Chairman, the United States cannot continue to furnish billions for foreign economic aid, billions to win the military and ideological war against communism, and billions to finance domestic spending without placing an intolerable tax burden upon the American people.

We must face up to the fact that accelerated Federal spending, for whatever purpose, will result in further deficits with their disastrous economic results or an increase in Federal taxes.

The American people are aware of this fact. Probably more than at any other time in recent history they are demanding that the Federal Government reduce Federal spending.

I have not received a letter from one of my constituents advocating an increase in Federal taxes. They do not oppose appropriations for national defense and essential domestic programs. They are strongly opposed, however, to giveaway programs at home and abroad.

They are demanding that the Federal Government make a sincere effort to reduce spending before placing an additional tax burden upon them.

They are aware that they are being asked to provide additional tax dollars to strengthen the economies of some overseas nations engaging in a flourishing trade with our Communist enemies. They feel that they are being required to strengthen overseas economies, which in many instances are competing for their jobs.

They know that the billions of foreign aid dollars which have been appropriated every year since World War II have not defeated ideological communism or won strong allies in our military efforts to halt the spread of communism by force of arms.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that the time has come for our Nation to take a realistic view of the economic, military, and political situation existing in the world. Yearly foreign economic aid appropriations have become as much a part of Federal spending as are our appropriations for the operation of our executive departments.

Foreign economic aid has become a way of life. The acceptance of this type of American foreign aid is now looked upon by many overseas nations as a right to which they are entitled. Some of those who have been eager to accept our dollars have found every reason in the world to excuse their lack of enthusiasm for the sacrifice Americans are making in Vietnam to protect the free world.

If the American people are to be saddled with an additional tax burden to preserve freedom in the world, they have the right to expect those they are protecting with their lives and their resources to give them at least moral support in their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, if a start is to be made in relieving the tax burden of our people, it can begin by the defeat of this foreign aid bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise to demand closer congressional control over military assistance and sales authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967.

This Congress is being asked to authorize $650 million for military aid in fiscal 1968 and $714 million for fiscal 1969. But does the Congress know to which country this American money and arms will ultimately go?

Mr. Chairman, the Congress does not know. Despite so-called justifications for

military aid to over 50 countries, there is nothing to stop the giving of this military aid to 50 entirely different countries.

Congress does not exercise meaningful control over the military aid we extend to other countries. The Defense Department—which has the chief responsibility—has often made allocations to the wrong countries in the wrong amounts for the wrong reasons, frequently against the long-run interests of the United States and the stability of the free world.

The military assistance program started in 1949 with 14 countries. In fiscal 1968, if Congress approves this authorization request, 53 countries will receive some type of military aid—not counting Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand, now in the Defense Department budget.

This country is thus now involved in the military affairs of almost half the nations on this globe. Yet this country has never conducted a thorough examination of why we are giving arms aid to so many countries, how it serves our national interest, and what effects it has on the countries themselves.

Greece and Turkey were the first recipients of American military aid because they were faced with a Communist threat—one internal, the other external. There is internal instability in much of the underdeveloped world today. Must the United States become involved? This is what Secretary of Defense McNamara himself said last year:

> It would be a gross oversimplification to regard Communism as the central factor in every conflict throughout the underdeveloped world. Of the 149 serious internal insurgencies in the past 8 years, Communists have been involved in only 58 of them—38 percent of the total.

I do not see any necessary connection between a civil war between two overambitious generals in an underdeveloped country, and the security of the United States. And I think it is high time for Congress to have a say in which countries are vital to our defense and in which we should not be meddling or wasting our money.

It is claimed that 75 percent of the dollar amount of the military aid program is given to five countries, and that Congress really need not concern itself too much with the remaining 48 recipients. I submit that these token contributions are often insignificant and meaningless at best, pernicious and destructive at worst.

There are those who say that we should ban the export of high-speed aircraft, tanks and warships from developing countries, but ignore the impact of less sophisticated weaponry in a less advanced nation. Helicopters and small arms do make up a large part of our grant aid program—since they are glibly called "vital to internal security." Yet they also have the greatest potential usefulness in civil wars, repression of civilians, and military dictatorships. The small military training program for foreign officers—casually mentioned in the Defense Department's presentation to Congress—might one day tip the balance of power in an internal struggle which is none of our business.

Only a few years ago, Nigeria was a "showcase" of African stability. Today, she is embroiled in a bitter, tribal war. The Nigerian military has benefited from about $1 million in military aid—chiefly training. Certainly the United States didn't benefit. Giving aid to the military—especially in Africa and Latin America—is no guarantee of internal stability, and it is time we stopped making that assumption. It is a deception of the American taxpayer to ask him—in the name of American security—to contribute to the potential of foreign military around the world to wage war against innocent neighbors, as the Arab States did against Israel, or their own constitutional governments, as the military did in Greece.

The decision to give military aid to a specific country is not just a military decision—it is above all a political decision—and it should not be undertaken without examination by Congress of the implications of U.S. involvement in each specific case. Congress must tighten the reins of decisionmaking now.

Has the executive branch been doing a good job with the power Congress has permitted it to exercise by not holding it to account for each country program?

Our military aid program—which has been over one-third of our foreign aid budget from 1951 to 1966—has been characterized largely by its support of over-size and frequently rightwing military elites more interested in power than in improving society. Our military aid has fomented arms races and diverted money which could have contributed more to internal stability if it had been spent on economic development. It has stoked revolutions and wars on every major continent. Yet it has been disappointing in building up the resistance to Communist aggression for which it had been intended.

Take Latin America as an example. A noted American expert on the military in Latin America, Edwin Lieuwen, said this about our country's military program there:

> Despite more than a decade of military assistance to Latin American nations, the military power and warmaking potential of these nations account for practically nothing.
>
> In so far as military aid programs have increased the political influence of the armed forces, prospects for democracy appear to have suffered. The military tends to resort to non-democratic procedures to achieve internal order and stability.
>
> For the great majority of Latin Americans [the military is less than 5 per cent of the population], who see no great danger of aggression from outside, the U.S. military program compounds their internal problems, interferes with the process of social change, and hinders progress in economic development.

In the proposed military aid program for fiscal 1968 is a small amount—only 2 percent of the total—for civic action programs. But this small amount is distributed among 25 or 26 countries, principally in Latin America. As defined by the Defense Department, the program's purpose is twofold: To employ military forces on economic development projects; and to improve relationships between the military and the civilian populace.

Why should the United States become involved in improving the image of the military in 26 countries, especially in Latin America? I would call it unwarranted and unnecessary intervention. It is against the longrun interests of both the United States and Latin America. If there are economic development jobs to be done, let those responsible for economic development do them.

If the Congress approves a lump sum for military assistance, some of this aid will go to Argentina. Argentina is also a recipient of the infamous Export-Import Bank country X arms loans—$21 million worth. She also obtained another $1 million through direct Pentagon lending. But Argentina already owes the United States $374 million.

Argentina has one of the highest per capita incomes on the continent. It suffers under a military dictatorship which overthrew a constitutional government last year. What then is the justification for military aid to Argentina? A Defense Department spokesman explained it:

> Our program to Argentina is based on supporting broad governmental interest, in a major country in Latin America.

This answer does not satisfy me, nor, I suspect, any Member of this House.

Stationed in Argentina, by the way, are 63 U.S. military assistance personnel engaged in training and the administration of the military aid and sales program. What is the reason for supporting so many boosters of American military weaponry and services, especially in Argentina?

In neighboring Chile, there are 67 personnel in the American Embassy's military section, compared with 55 diplomatic employees. This grossly inflated military representation was strongly criticized by the former American Ambassador to Chile, Ralph Dungan. Dungan was most upset by rumors that the American military advised Chile's armed forces to deal directly with them, bypassing the Ambassador, who is supposed to be chief of the country team. It is this military interference with political decisionmaking that Congress should put an end to.

Underdeveloped countries can ill afford modern weapons, and our arms program only whets their appetities. Why should this country lend or give them money for military hardware and then lend them more money for economic projects they could have financed with their own money if they had not squandered it in the military marketplace? This procedure does not make us a greater friend, it just makes us a greater creditor, and there is no gratitude for that. The Executive has clearly failed the course in military and economic bookkeeping.

Peru is in the market for supersonic jets—she wants to be the first with the latest in Latin America. Peru has already received a $4 million Eximbank country X loan and $1 million directly from the Pentagon for arms purchases. That is the very same country that also received about $18 million in American economic aid in fiscal 1966, and even more in fiscal

1967. Peru already owes us around $200 million, and she is in such dire economic straits now that she is seeking a large American loan to bail her out. There is something wrong with our military aid program—and our foreign policy—when we fail to examine thoroughly each country's total program—military and economic—and tailor both kinds of aid to the particular situation in that country. It is clear that we are not doing this now. What we are doing now is giving from both pockets, and the left hand neither knows nor cares how much the right hand is giving out.

The respected President Eduardo Frei of Chile recently deplored the effects of American military aid on economic growth in an article in which he pointed out that:

> The annual expenditure of the Latin American countries on armanents has reached $1.5 billion. Yet the average yearly sum [in economoic aid] made available by the United States to Latin America in the period 1961–65 was $1.1 billion. The two figures clearly show that present arms purchases seriously undermine the objectives of the Alliance [for Progress]. . . . The armaments race encourages distrust and nationalism and these in turn are among the chief enemies of [economic] integration. It also diverts important resources which should be utilized to satisfy the urgent need for economic and social development.

Our military aid is underpinned by unjustified assumptions. Chief among these is that the arms we provide will be used for the purposes for which we give them.

We poured arms aid into Greece and Turkey because they were members of NATO and we counted on them to fight Communist aggression. Instead, they rattled American weapons at each other over Cyprus, and the Greek military got a bonus use in the overthrow of its own constitutional government.

Pakistan used to be our stanch ally against Red China, so we flooded that country with arms, which she promptly used against India. It was the Russians who acted as peacemakers between the warring neighbors at Tashkent. Pakistan today is closer than ever to Red China.

A Foreign Affairs Committee report pointed out last year:

> Unless issues which the United States regards as important enough to go to war about are regarded by countries receiving military assitance as of comparable importance, we cannot count on them to use their forces to carry out a joint strategy.

Russia has had its share of setbacks, too. Total Communist bloc military aid to Indonesia from 1956 to mid 1965 amounted to over $1 billion. Yet that same Soviet-equipped Indonesian Army blocked a Communist-backed attempt to seize control of the government on October 1, 1965. In Algeria, a Soviet-equipped army overthrew Russia's friend, Premier Ben Bella. And today, a hostile, Soviet-equipped Red Chinese Army glares across the border at Russian troops.

Arms will be used the way the country possessing them sees fit. Military allegiance cannot be won by gifts of arms. Yet our military aid program persists in operating on the assumption that it can.

Fallacious also is the logic that flooding an area with arms automatically breeds stability. Instead, it breeds arms races. We are all familiar with the Middle East arms race whose bitter fruits we are still tasting. Instead of contributing to the escalation of military weapons inventories, we would do better to devote equal effort and zeal to breaking that vicious spiral.

The Defense Department also holds the unjustifiable belief that if the United States provides the weapons, it can maintain a greater degree of control over their proliferation than if they were purchased from other countries. Under this assumption, we sold Argentina 25 A–4 aircraft last year. So Chile went right out and purchased $20 million worth of Hawker Hurricane jets from Britain, and Peru is in the market for Mirage supersonic jets with the made-in-France label.

The Pentagon sold Iran a squadron of F–4 Phantom jet fighter planes after Iran threatened to buy them from Russia. Iran has recently completed a $110 million arms deal with the Russians anyway.

It is not argued that Congress should eliminate military aid. Certainly we should come to the aid of countries on the frontline of Communist aggression. We should offer our assistance when there is a clear and present Communist aggression. But Congress should retain the power to decide in each instance where such clear and present danger exists.

Congress should put an end to the scattering of American arms largesse wholesale around this earth. I believe that Congress should take a long, hard look at the destination of each program of military aid. Congress should not give automatic assent to military intervention in 50-odd countries. Military assistance should not be extended to any country unless Congress gives its specific approval to a program in that country. The blanket powers Congress gives to the Executive to operate our military aid program must end.

During the reading of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 for amendments, I intend to offer an amendment to require all military aid and sales to each country to be approved by Congress in specific dollar amounts. Congress must reassert its control over America's foreign policy. All Members of this House are urged to support this reaffirmation of legislative oversight and authority.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the annual multibillion-dollar bargain basement is now opening in the House of Representatives and the line of foreigners, tin cups in hand, is forming on the left.

Some in this lineup are affectionately described by the Amercian society of bleeding hearts as underdeveloped and underprivileged. But a goodly number in the lineup are professionals in the international art of chiseling and glorified blackmail.

Prohibited from even approaching the bargain counter the House is opening today, and therefore underprivileged spectators, are millions of tax-ridden Americans.

For 20 long and weary years they have been relegated to the sidelines, while from hell to breakfast, and from Ouagadougou to Timbuktu, they have watched billions of dollars—the end product of their enterprise and toil—disappear into the wild green yonder.

Meanwhile, in the corridors adjacent to the bargain basement there will be no lack of bureaucratic advice on how arms may be saved from being twisted out of their sockets. And through the telephones that serve the bargain counters there will be no lack of advice from Foggy Bottom for the next 2 or 3 days as to when and by how much the price tags should be changed in order to get the best possible deal—for the foreigners.

It is possible that in the next day or two the sales force in the bargain basement may be asked a few embarrassing questions. For instance, and for the $140 billion that has been looted from the pockets of American taxpayers for the assorted foreign handouts, what peace, tranquillity, and friends have been established around the world?

Outside of the Koreans and the Thais, what other nations around the world, that have fattened on our international dole, are shedding their blood and spilling their guts in actual combat in Vietnam? Bear in mind that the Australians and New Zealanders have not had their hands in the pockets of our taxpayers.

It will be remembered that President Eisenhower, as misguided as his predecessors and successors in the White House on the subject of foreign handout programs, said that as a result of foreign aid, "our friends among free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces 250 strategic bases, 5 million ground forces, 30,000 aircraft, and 2,500 naval vessels."

Well, in Vietnam where are these men, warships, and planes that our $140 billion worth of love and charity was supposed to produce? No less than 50,000 American lives have been lost in Korea and Vietnam to halt the spread of the Communist world conspiracy. And four times that number have been maimed and wounded. Aside from the Koreans and Vietnamese, and a few other token forces, what nations that have picked our pockets so clean are willing to spill their blood and expend their substance in the common cause?

Take, for instance, the British. Through the years they have borrowed, begged, and otherwise connived to extract billions of dollars out of the U.S. Treasury. For many of these billions, and going back as far as World War I, this Nation's taxpayers are holding the sack. The great, great grandchildren of today's taxpayers will still be holding the bag, for the British are not about to pay up.

Instead, and with the perfidy that marks altogether too many of those who have fattened at the trough in this bargain basement, the British have sent ships under their flag into the ports of Communist North Vietnam with hundreds of thousand of tons of supplies to support our enemies. But for anyone with

a reasonable memory this should not come as a surprise, for in the first year of the Korean war the same shameless British traders made 120,000 tons of rubber available to our Chinese Communist enemies along with oil, steel, aluminum, electrical equipment, copper wire, and other strategic materials.

And helping maintain the economy of Cuba, the spawning ground of communism in this hemisphere, are the same British traders.

Yet the British Government, a past master in the art of glorified blackmail, served notice earlier this year that it would withdraw the few thousand troops it has stationed in Europe unless the United States purchased $60 to $80 million worth of military equipment in Britain. A spineless U.S. Government capitulated to this international blackmail.

To top it all off, the Johnson administration is today joined hand-in-glove with the perfidious British in an economic boycott of the South African country of Rhodesia. It is a shameful effort to bring Rhodesia to her knees because she seeks independence from Britain.

Arthur Goldberg, President Johnson's Ambassador and mouthpiece to the United Nations, speaking on the subject of Rhodesia, told the Security Council:

> The international community will not tolerate the existence of a discriminatory system based on minority rule and in defiance of the United Nations and its principles.

What "principles" is Goldberg talking about?

What government in Africa can be designated as a majority government? Does Goldberg mean to say that Ethiopia, the Sudan, Egypt, Algeria, Ghana, Nigeria, and the Congo, to name a few, are not subject to minority rule in the hands of a monarchy or military dictator?

Cuba has a minority government, and if memory serves me correctly, this government even helped bring dictator Castro to power.

As a matter of hard and cold fact, Soviet Russia and all its satellites are minority governments, yet they all hang out at the United Nations and enjoy Goldberg's "principles," whatever they are.

Meanwhile, President Johnson joins in cozy conferences with the hierarchy of the Soviet minority government, sponsors consular treaties, and calls on Congress to build higher and wider bridges to the heartland of the massed dictatorships.

For sheer, unadulterated hypocrisy the Johnson-Goldberg venture with the British in trying to appease the African Caesars by destroying the present Government of Rhodesia is probably without equal.

And this brings us back to the bargain basement. If the Rhodesians had been lining up in the past for their share of the foreign aid boodle it is unlikely the effort would now be made to bully them into submission.

The Rhodesians should have taken a leaf from the books of the Middle East beneficiaries of our economic and military assistance, all of which was designed, we were told, to keep peace in that area of the world. It all blew higher than Gilderoy's kite a couple of months ago, and the pieces have yet to be put together, but here we are at the same old bargain counter, again ready to intrude our long noses and our cash. Who is it we expect to save from communism in the Middle East the next time around?

Incidentally, the newspapers reported a few days ago that this government had made some $27 million available to Israel for food and other supplies. What, I would like to ask those who maintain hot lines with the executive branch of Government, has transpired with respect to Israel's settlement for the bombing, strafing, and torpedoing of the U.S. Navy vessel, the *Liberty*, with a loss of 34 Americans killed, 75 wounded, and heavy damage to the vessel? Is this Government now, directly or indirectly, subsidizing Israel in the payment of full compensation for the lives that were destroyed, the suffering of the wounded, and the damage from this wanton attack?

It can well be asked whether these Americans were the victims of bombs, machine gun bullets and torpedoes manufactured in the United States and dished out as military assistance under foreign aid.

Bear in mind, too, that the Great Society operates a superdooper, worldwide arms sales agency in Secretary McNamara's Defense Department. How contradictory can the Johnson administration be when it peddles $2 billion worth of arms around the world each year and at the same time spends several million a year on a lush payroll of so-called experts to talk disarmament.

This is but one of the scores of contradictions that make a mockery of the whole range of U.S. foreign relations.

Mr. Chairman, for years we have been fed the specious talk that in no time at all the foreign giveaway program would provide such a warm and enchanting investment climate that private investors would flock to the highways and byways of foreign lands. Then and there, they said, we could turn off the faucets of foreign aid.

Nowhere was this to be more true than in Latin America. It hasn't worked there or anywhere else.

Every Member of the House knows that this Government is in serious trouble, financially and otherwise. It is not within the capability of 6 percent of the world's land mass and 5 percent of its population to feed, police, and finance the rest of the world.

This bill ought to be killed now and the billions in the pipeline cleaned out. If necessary, those funds can be deobligated and reobligated.

At a minimum, the time has come to cut this program right into the bone and end it. The time has come to tell the President and the State Department that no longer will these multibillion-dollar handouts be available as diplomatic crutches. No longer will the shoddy business of trying to buy our way around the world be tolerated.

The bill before you carries a price tag that is far too high. Amendments will be offered to slash it and I urge you to support those amendments in the interest of restoring at least a semblance of fiscal sanity in the affairs of this Government.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UTT. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa yielding.

He made reference to the situation in Rhodesia and the sanctions there against a friendly country that never asked for any foreign aid. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that one of my great objections to the sanctions against Rhodesia was that America was critically short of chrome and copper. As a result I said at that time we would have to find new sources of chrome. We did find those sources. Last year alone the U.S. Government purchased from Russia $70 million worth of chrome which they could have brought from friendly Rhodesia and could have given the money to them instead of sending it to our Communist enemies. I think, as you say, it is time to call a halt.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has been so enthusiastic in his support of this legislation that it may be superfluous for me to say anything more in favor of it, but so long as the chairman has yielded this time to me, I shall proceed with a few points which I consider to be legitimate to advance in favor of this bill.

I do agree, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] said, that this is a vitally important time for us in the consideration of this bill which has come before us this year as in the past. It is a watershed, I believe, because we are meeting the demands of the civilian economy and the demands of the war in Vietnam with their heavy requirements and therefore it is essential for us to examine carefully every aspect of this foreign aid program.

It has been well said that foreign aid is a program which has no constituents. There is no one to lobby, nor voters to exert pressure. On the other hand, I do not believe—and I think everyone will agree with me—that this deficiency should be a reason why we should not support the elements which are in the interests of the United States.

Of course, over the years, this program has had its shortcomings and its defects. I have served on the Hardy subcommittee and I served on the committee which is presently under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. We are greatly aware of the shortcomings in the administration policy that we have discovered in this program over the years.

On the other hand, we find the same thing to be true in the military program. We find the same failures in other great national programs. I submit that individual imperfections are not enough to warrant us in jettisoning the entire program. We have had successes in this program also. There have been countries which have been given sufficient assist-

ance so that they can move into an area where they are self-supporting and self-sufficient. One example of this is the nation of Venezuela which we helped through a difficult time.

Another which is in the process of development and in the process of creating self-support is Taiwan, where substantially all economic assistance has ceased and we are confined now to granting to that nation military assistance only.

Brazil is a nation which in another field of aid we have helped over some difficult and critical times. Truly, this country is not wholly out of the woods. But, nevertheless, I think that this use of our economic assistance has been in our national interest and has helped the nation of Brazil and has contributed to the security of the hemisphere.

After all, that is what we are trying to do. We are not trying to work any miracles.

I was happy to see agreement on the part of everyone speaking here today to the effect that we are not trying to buy friends through this assistance and if there is really any justification for this program, it is because it is in our self-interest to strengthen certain nations and thereby to add to general security.

Mr. Chairman, three-fourths of the military assistance about which some speakers have been critical, goes to five countries, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has said. These countries include Turkey, Greece, Nationalist China, Korea, and Iran. Obviously, Iran, Turkey, and Greece are on the periphery of the Communist world and restrain Communist adventurism.

If we reduce military assistance—and if it is not provided in some other fashion—it means that the Greek Army, the Turk Army, the Iranian Army, and the Chinese Army will have less than the necessary military equipment.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I commend the gentleman for properly mentioning the countries on the periphery of the Communist world. Is my recollection correct that the State Department has withheld some military supplies from Greece because of its displeasure with the present anti-Communist government there? It would seem that that would be in contradiction to the gentleman's position.

Mr. MONAGAN. I cannot answer that specifically. There may be some selectivity. But I know—and I think the gentleman from Illinois is well aware of the fact—that over the years during which we have been discussing the problem of providing equipment for the Greek Army, which is facing the Bulgarians at a very, very strategic and narrow point in Greece, one of the criticisms of the cutback in military assistance in the past was made by no less a witness than General Lemnitzer, and it was to the effect that it would prevent the Greeks from obtaining equipment which would be on a par with that new materiel which had been provided the Bulgarians by the Russians.

Mr. DERWINSKI. At the risk of being misunderstood, I definitely agree with the gentleman that the Greek armed forces are one of the groups we should continue to support.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. I would say to the gentleman I believe we are continuing to support the Greek armed forces. I believe military assistance is continuing to go to Greece. Greece is a NATO ally and we depend on the armed forces of Greece to implement our defense strategy.

Mr. MONAGAN. I had expressed my doubt that what the gentleman from Illinois said was entirely true.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MONAGAN. Now, reference has been made to the action of the other body, as if that was necessarily something that we should automatically follow. But I should like to point out that some of the reductions that have been made there, 34 percent in military assistance, for example, would make it virtually impossible for us to carry out these programs that I have been referring to which are unquestionably of vital interest to our Nation, and I say that, as it turns out with this program, if it is not done here in this bill, it will have to be done in the defense budget, or in other budgets throughout the Government, because these things are necessary and in our national interest.

The total amount of the reduction, as has been said, was $219 million, which is rather substantial. At the same time, we have added $84 million because the bill proposed to take away the jurisdiction over the NATO infrastructure which this committee had had over the years, and transfer it to the Defense Department. And in line with the very logical and sound suggestion which the chairman of this committee has made, that all matters which concern foreign policy and foreign affairs should be concentrated in one bill, it has been the action of this committee to return this matter to the confines of this foreign aid bill, and it is my understanding that the other body in this case has agreed.

With reference to the suggestion that sufficient consideration has not been given to the issues which are raised and inherent in this legislation, I should simply like to point out that the hearings on these programs began on April 4, 1967, and concluded on August 2, and that there were 53 meetings of the committee; that every witness who wanted the opportunity to be heard, whether governmental or private, was heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Not only that, but every member of the committee who wanted an opportunity to suggest witnesses or bring in witnesses had that opportunity, even to the extent of boring other members of the committee who had previously heard it and subtracting years from the life of the chairman.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, this program is essential. Certainly it is not perfect, there could be changes made as a result of experience; nevertheless it is one of the tools that the President needs to carry on the foreign policy of the United States and to protect our national security.

I hope that the House will agree with me and support this legislation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, after the analytical statement by the gentleman from Iowa, we ought to close general debate and proceed to effectively trim the bill.

But the rules of the House will be followed and other Members will, of course, have plenty to say. But I do think the gentleman from Iowa was especially effective today. He presented us with a high-level bit of corn, which is in keeping with his Iowa background. I do recall 2 or 3 years ago that he even put some of his words into poetry. Of course, this afternoon he used only prose which shows that it is hard to find something poetic in this dubious program.

Mr. Chairman, I would also commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] who spoke earlier and who gave you very sound reasons for opposing the program and cutting it down to size. I notice that since he spoke most of the Members have left the floor of the House, obviously convinced that we should make massive cuts in this bill.

So rather than repeat why the bill must be cut, why on behalf of the taxpayers we have to use a hammer to chip away at this bill presented to us by the committee, I would like to digress a moment and inject a few personal observations.

I would first compliment our chairman who very patiently brings this bill to the floor every year. I have never asked him to deny it, but I know that down deep in his heart it must be difficult to stand up and defend the State Department on such a program as this. But he does it heroically enough and even though I may not agree with his arguments for the bill, I admire his courage in telling the House with a straight face that this is a fine program.

I also have great respect for the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] who just spoke because, one of the countries that does not receive foreign aid is the land of his ancestors, Ireland, and I think it is wonderful that the proud Irish do not have their hands out—or as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] would say—their tin cup out. It is interesting that a son of the Old Sod like JOHN MONAGAN would defend a program even though Erin is not benefiting by it.

When we really get down to it, as I see it, the issues before us in this bill are just two. One is, as we Members of

the House know, that our real strength as a legislative body is that we represent the public. The other body, detached as they are by their 6-year terms, are usually aloof from the American public. They do not do as good a job of representing the public as we do. It strikes me as being especially disturbing that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body and the members of that committee get all the attention and all the notoriety when the real skill in dealing with foreign affairs is to be found in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. So I would think that one way to get the proper attention and recognition in this field is to do a better job of cutting this bill and a deeper job of cutting this bill than was performed in the other body.

I believe if we support the comments and later the amendments of the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Iowa and others of us who will have proper amendments to offer we can do a fine job to restore control of our foreign policy to where it really belongs, to the House of Representatives, the true spokesmen of the people of this country.

The second thing that we ought to keep in mind is that there is not anything that will have as sobering an influence on world affairs as effective cuts made by the Congress in the foreign aid program. Frankly, all the benevolence that we have in this bill is taken for granted.

If we do take meaningful steps in cutting down the program, I believe the aid that we will continue to provide will be appreciated. I would think that even though they would not admit it publicly, our distinguished Chairman and the other Members who must heroically struggle to defend this program might deep down in their hearts be saying, "If we could really trim this to the bone we would then be appreciated abroad."

No one really appreciates a sugar daddy. It is someone who carefully gives you a little practical help that you appreciate far more than the very benevolent individual.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for recognizing that the Members of the House, particularly the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, are more knowledgeable in international affairs than those in the other body. Knowing and realizing that, can the gentleman honestly say that we would be so irresponsible as to cut this bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, I am not saying that would be irresponsible. What I am saying is that when we cut the bill, we would actually help the State Department by giving them some spine, some firmness, and strength that they cannot on their own develop.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. I am somewhat confused by the gentleman's statement. I wonder if he is trying to say something similar to what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] said yesterday in relation to another bill: I am "agin" the bill, but I hope it passes. Am I correct?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. what I am really trying to do is to mellow the gentleman so that when I offer my constructive amendments in the next few days, I might get some good support on his side of the aisle.

Mr. MORGAN. I must say that I have enjoyed the gentleman's service on the committee. He has been an asset to the committee with his humor and good will. A number of the amendments he has offered in committee has made a significant contribution to shaping the bill we have here today.

Mr. DERWINSKI. In keeping with this wonderful spirit of Camp David, Glassboro, or whatever else prevails today, I intend to offer many constructive amendments in the next few days. They, of course, will be in the pattern of reducing the bill. I am pleased that the chairman will have a tolerant and objective point of view toward my amendments.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. In keeping with the "spirit of Derwinski" I might say I hope the gentleman's amendments will have the same success as did most of his amendments in the committee.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I hope my amendments will have as much success as the Israel Army did against the Arabs. In fact, I feel just as virtuous.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has described his amendments as "constructive amendments." I presume the gentleman would not have an amendment to discontinue the program entirely. He would not be that irresponsible, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DERWINSKI. What I think we could do is to suspend new authorizations for at least 1 year and let them live off the $6 billion in the pipeline. Then we could come back a year from now and, and who knows, find that we may not need the AID program. I do not think cutting off the AID program would be irresponsible. I think we would be really appreciated by our taxpayers. I think now we are taken for granted abroad. Psychologically, we are taken for granted around the world because of the unnecessary charity of the AID program.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Proceeding with the thought of the chairman of our committee, knowing the gentleman's great ability for statesmanship, if he knew his vote would contribute to a discontinuation of the program, would the gentleman desire to have his vote on record for such a discontinuation?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Positively. I think that would be a moment of great glory. We would really restore some sanity to our foreign policy, which is greatly in need of it.

Let me point out, realizing the chairman has referred to the fact that I occasionally try to help an amendment through with humor when I cannot do it with voting muscle, that seriously, one of the troubles about debate in Washington is that there is too much attention centered on the other body, where they have been engaged in personalities. In the next few days when we offer the amendments, they will not be offered in the spirit of deliberately embarrassing the President or adding to the confusion that may exist in the world over debate on foreign policy of the United States. We want to help the State Department to make the cuts they do not have the guts to make themselves on behalf of the poor American taxpayers.

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

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. With friends like that, the State Department needs no enemies, and I am sure they do not require that kind of advice to conduct their business.

Mr. DERWINSKI. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, the State Department is not necessarily held in as high a repute as some of the truly benevolent agencies in our country, such as the Red Cross, the Cancer Society, or other proper benevolent groups. The State Department is really masquerading as an international benevolent association at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer without elementary results.

As the gentleman well knows, our amendments will be so constructed that the overpowering logic of our position, I am sure, will prevail, and then, of course, we will fortify the chairman's hand when he goes to conference by insisting that the deeper cuts made by the House be sustained in the conference.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, these are times in which, as related in "Alice in Wonderland," you have to run faster just to stay in the same place. This comes to mind as I think of our Nation's worsening of the payments deficit. The more we spend in foreign lands, the worse the situation becomes and the harder we run trying to catch up.

If foreign countries would spend as much with us as we do with them, the race of course would be about even and gold would stop flowing from our country to theirs. But inasmuch as their spending is not likely to increase, the only way to narrow the race in our favor is for us to spend less abroad. And right

now, on the floor of this House today, is a good time to initiate a cutoff program.

The time is ripe because we are today considering again an administration request for authorization of more billions of our taxpayers' dollars for our bureaucrats to spend freely—and, I am sorry to say, wastefully—in all parts of the globe.

Just a few simple figures tell the story of why it is necessary to cut not only foreign spending but some domestic outlays as well. Unless the 10-percent surtax on incomes proposed by the President is approved—and there is, as we all know, no certainty that it will be approved at that level—we may have a $29 billion deficit in this fiscal year, as administration spokesmen now frankly admit. Even with the increased income tax, a deficit of $20 billion or more impends.

With such a tremendous proportion of our total budget for this year earmarked for national defense and for fixed charges such as the astronomical interest on the national debt, there are not many places in which the budget can be effectively trimmed to the extent needed to bring the looming deficit within the bounds of reason. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is one such place—it is in the bill which is before us for consideration today.

The administration, through its spenders in the State Department and the Agency for International Development, is engaged in the annual effort to lead the American people, and their representatives in the Congress, to believe that unless foreign aid is continued on its present broad base, we will lose friends around the world.

But a survey of the attitude of the nations of the world toward the United States today does not make it appear that our spending of far more than $130 billion over the years has gained us any friends—or even gained us the respect of the rest of the nations.

So I would ask you, ask all of my colleagues in this House today, why should we also lose our money and put our monetary system in perilous jeopardy? I do not think there is a reasonable answer to this, except in the minds of those who believe in "check book" foreign policy under the theory that more spending is the answer to every problem.

I would point out to you that only last week, our Commerce Department reported that the U.S. dollar drain during the April–June period exceeded $500 million for the second straight quarter. If this trend continues, the Nation could experience its worst deficit in 3 years in the international balance of payments.

I think this is a situation which cries out for the most stringent economy in our foreign aid spending. As much as I wish it were not so, I recognize the fact that all foreign aid spending cannot be abruptly stopped. But it can and should be reduced well below the figure recommended in this bill before us. And this objective can be accomplished to a great degree, it seems to me, by limiting our distribution of aid funds to needy and worthy nations on which the United States can count in these troubled times.

We have for too many years been doling out our funds, to the great detriment of our own solvency, to too many nations which not only are not our friends and have no intention of becoming our friends, but which are in many cases at best "neutral against us" and in some cases downright and abusively hostile to us and noticeably partial to our Communist enemies.

Beyond this, we have—as every Member of this House knows—allowed the channeling of our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars into countries which in effect used them for the purpose of providing goods of all kinds to our enemies. And—as AID officials reluctantly admitted when caught in the act—we have allowed our assistance funds to be used to fatten the personal bank accounts of corrupt officials of some so-called friendly countries.

I repeat that we cannot, as a practical matter, abruptly turn off the foreign aid spigot. But I also repeat that we can, as a practical and also necessary matter, curb the flow of our dollars through that spigot. I do not think this is a political matter—it is a matter which calls for responsible action by a responsible Congress, for bipartisan action throughout this Chamber. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting this year to impose sharp limitations on this program.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, "stability" is the great goal for the developing countries of Southeast Asia, but there is a problem in defining the term. To some people, it means an insistence upon a static society, an immobile state—an eternal status quo. Or it may mean more simply preventing the Communists from taking over by open attack; as long as that calamity is averted, these people believe the desired stability is achieved.

I believe that stability in Southeast Asia is a freer term, a higher goal, and a more dynamic possibility. Stability is not only military security, though it must include it; stability is not a police state, though it may have to pass through it; it is not just a rising GNP, though it comprises it; nor is stability preservation of the wealthy, though it may need it.

In short, stability is not keeping a society's head just above water. Rather it is learning to swim, for the whole body politic. Stability, in fact, is development—the development of people and their institutions.

Let me illustrate the status quo in Southeast Asia by repeating to you a true story from northeast Thailand. It demonstrates the difference between what we might call "static" and "dynamic" stability.

Lek was a 27-year-old Thai from Don Saeng village. He was single, and he lived with his family of 12 on 5 acres of paddy land. If the rain was good and not too many pests or diseases blighted the crop, they had enough rice to feed themselves. In a bad season, they tightened their belts and tried to find extra work for additional rice. The family usually tried to grow 1 acre of fibrous kenaf, but often there was not enough water for retting, so it was of poor quality. They raised two pigs, seven buffalo, and four head of cattle.

Lek's friend Sangwan had been his classmate in a sideless school attended by about 200 children. Since no higher level of education was available, their schooling had ended at the fourth grade. Sangwan was married and the father of two children. They lived with his family of eight on 4 acres of paddy land; enough to produce about half the family's needs. They raised two or three pigs a year, but most of the additional family income came from cutting trees and sawing unauthorized lumber in the forest.

Although they were farmers, neither Lek nor Sangwan had ever seen a rice or agriculture officer, and they had little contact with any government officials. They had never heard of a Farmer Club, Farmer Association, or 4-H Club. These young men wanted a better life. They really had not thought much about the future, but they wished to continue farming, as their ancestors had, and to learn a new skill. They had heard of a rice demonstration near Lerngnokthar, where chemical fertilizer had nearly doubled rice yields. They had seen the rice and it looked good, but they did not know how to use the new fertilizer. Besides, they had heard it cost 15 cents per kilo—15 cents they did not have. Lek had also given some thought to becoming a driver, but had no way to learn how.

About 2 years ago, Lek's brother-in-law started talking to him about the future. His comments were something like this:

> The Thai Government is very bad. They will not let you cut trees to build your houses unless you pay bribes. When the police come to the villages, they come to arrest someone, but do they ever help you? Thailand is really a colony of the United States: you can see that by the number of American troops living here. But the Thai people have friends to help them fight against the corrupt government and the colonialists, friends in North Vietnam, China, Cuba, and elsewhere. When they come, all the Communist party will be united and the farmers will have a better life. It is the only way.

Lek thought about what his brother-in-law had said. After all, his cousin had been arrested and fined $10 for taking trees to build a house. Another neighbor had three buffalo stolen, but the police never did help him find them. Maybe this government really was not very good.

Some time later, a friend persuaded Lek and Sangwan to come abroad to a progressive country where they would learn all they wanted. They went on foot with guides through the jungle to North Vietnam. Once there, they entered a training group of 143 Thais, men and women. They were then broken into smaller groups of four and not allowed to talk about their families or homes. Daily instructions were given by North Vietnamese instructors on Communist ideology, weapons, jungle survival, guerrilla

warfare, the organization of Liberation Associations, and many other topics. The program continued for 8 months, but the group had to move regularly to avoid attacks by American bombers. Twice they went to Hanoi to see a "really progressive city," although they were accompanied by a guide and were not permitted to speak to any of the people. They were not much impressed by what they saw, although they did admire the large buildings.

After their return to Thailand, they were assigned to work in small groups. They were told how to move in and kill selected village headmen, schoolteachers, or the like, and get away fast. Their leaders discussed setting up various liberation associations—for farmers, priests, students, women, and so forth. The groups often went into a village to help the farmers plant or harvest rice and talk to them about organizing a liberation association.

But life in the jungle was hard. Often they had little or no food to eat, and at times there was none for 3 days. At other times, perhaps a milk can of rice had to suffice for three men, supplemented by bitter roots and leaves. They were constantly on the move, evading antiterrorist squads.

Sangwan began to think more and more about his family and how he would like to go back to them. Life as a farmer might not be so bad after all. He had been warned that the only way to leave the Communist party was to be killed, either by the Communist or the government. Even so, he was tired of running. He decided to give himself up to the district officer, who welcomed him and took him into his home. Lek held out until he was captured by a suppression squad. At first, he was very hostile and would not say anything but: "I haven't seen"; "I haven't heard"; "I didn't do it." Eventually, however, he volunteered to tell his story.

Lek and Sangwan were misled by the Communists because they had no real basis of comparison, no way of testing the validity of their statements. What our AID people are doing is reaching into Don Saeng village and bringing the outside world to people like Lek and Sangwan. They are helping to provide opportunities for Thai peasants to obtain a better education, better employment, to learn new techniques of farming or to turn to other occupations by learning new skills.

Our task is to help the Thai Government develop techniques whereby Lek and Sangwan can identify their own problems and recognize that there is something they and their people can do about them; our job is to help the Thais improve existing institutions and create new ones which will give Lek and Sangwan real benefits instead of the empty promises of terrorists.

But human and institutional development requires much from those who dare to believe in it. It takes men and money. It takes talent. It takes time and belief.

THE NEED FOR MEN

To date, the Agency for International Development has sent into the Far East more than 4,000 American men and women to work on stabilization programs. They are there because they must take the seed to the farmer, must teach the use of fertilizer, and help in the harvest. They must build the schools and instruct the students. They must carry medicine into the jungles, treat the sick, and shelter the homeless. And in some areas, they are needed in the villages to secure safety by day and to protect the peace of the night.

Men are also needed to prepare others to build their own institutions. They must train them to build roads, houses, industries, airfields, and communications systems required for 20th-century living. Men must help other men organize for their common good—to form cooperatives, professional and labor associations, credit unions, banking facilities, and administrative and planning organizations. When people inspire others to help themselves in the development process, the most enduring and powerful force on earth has been unleashed.

The less developed countries must do most of the job themselves. But by their very definition, they cannot do it without some outside help. Only men can reach Lek and Sangwan. The Communists sent men to tempt them with illusions. We send men to help them with concrete realities.

THE NEED FOR MONEY

Of course we cannot increase the stability of the world community by money alone; neither can we do so without it. Money is needed—for material, machines, and for labor. Without it, no program for stability can be set in motion. And if we do not plan for dynamic stability, history's wars tell us that we will pay an even higher price for a static one.

In fiscal 1967, the Congress appropriated approximately $2.15 billion for global development work. Of this amount, $768 million, or about 36 percent, was designated for the Far East region, which includes Southeast Asia. Our rationale for this action can be demonstrated by means of a simple analogy: A man may spend massive amounts for fire and theft insurance on his property, but if he does not spend a little to improve his neighborhood, it will run down, and his own damage risks will rise. So will his insurance rates.

No one denies that we now live in a world which requires immense military outlays. But dynamic stability, in our neighborhood or world community, requires much more from us than just insuring a precarious status quo. It also demands that we maintain, improve, and expand the community in which we live. It takes AID money to improve the world community in which we all live and move.

If an analogy between a private homeowner and the United States as a whole seems too facile, let us consider the assertion of each successive U.S. administration in the past 20 years, with bipartisan support in the Congress: that our national interest is well served by our foreign aid program. In the words of the House Appropriations Committee report on the foreign assistance appropriations bill of 1967:

> It is hardly arguable that our past aid in defense of the free world has paid dividends by helping to thwart and frustrate the world communist drive. Not only has it foiled aggression; it has brought stability to a number of countries.

Additionally, and this is a factor whose significance should never be ignored, every major industrialized country that I know of has a foreign economic assistance program. Some take a larger portion of their national income than ours, some take less. It is striking that some of the nations which we consider most realistically practical—such as France, West Germany, and Japan—have very large programs. So do the Communist-bloc countries. All these governments have concluded that it is in their national interest to have a foreign economic aid program, even though with their smaller wealth, it means a greater sacrifice for their people than for ours.

TALENT

Yankee know-how has achieved legendary status. Our confident "can do" approach and the results it gets constitute probably our most familiar characteristic. With achievement, however, comes responsibility—as every high school valedictory reiterates throughout the country. But because this is almost a cliche, it is not the less true. We do have a responsibility to share what we know and can do. It may even be more than that. It may sound fanciful, but the only way to increase knowledge is to give it away. Ideas and know-how will not keep; they must be nourished in many minds and take root in fresh soils. Talent needs to be shared.

Southeast Asia needs our generosity now, just as we need to share. The human resources of that region of the world alone are almost inexhaustible. The special knowledge that is there—and there is a lot of it—urgently needs release. And it takes talent to develop human resources.

It is not enough just for men and money to fight against something. People must fight for something. Dynamic stability in any country requires freedom from hunger, disease, and ignorance. For fiscal 1968, AID is channeling its diversity of talent to place special emphasis on agriculture, health, and education—with an increase of 25 percent in funds in the latter two areas alone. AID intends to give highest priority to the war on hunger, family planning, and nutrition improvement through its emphasis on improving a country's agricultural, production, population-planning, and child-feeding program.

Public Health is already receiving extensive doses of AID talent. The well-being of any nation rests fundamentally upon the health of its people, and when they are cursed by disease, their hopes grow dim. Education is another essential of future development. It takes an educated people to man the factories, to conduct the administration of public and private business, and to teach the young.

TIME

It takes time for people and institutions to develop. We have time to wait.

Instant success may be true for instant

coffee and for TV dinners. It is not true, however, for people and their communities. The development of people and their institutions cannot be rushed if what we build is to endure.

When societies are changing from within and are threatened from without, it is not easy to take time to let a pattern of development root itself securely. The temptation is always there—to do it for them, to push too fast and too hard, to force our way on theirs, because we already know it works for us. But what works well for our Midwest and our South may not always be best for their Southeast Asia. Southeast Asia has a unique people and culture, and it is worth our time to take both seriously.

Let me illustrate. Recently, the Agency for International Development planned to build a much-needed water storage facility for the rural people of a village in southern Laos. The aim was to conduct this program on a self-help basis. AID knew how much the villagers wanted this project, and they were eager to get the job done as fast as they could. Men and machines were moved in, plans drawn up, the site confirmed, and labor recruited. The time schedule called for an impressively swift job. Everything looked good—except for one thing. The people of the village suddenly refused to work. Despite AID's pleas, they would not help—the self-help principle notwithstanding. And time was passing.

If the story ended here, we could too easily dismiss the Laotians as lazy, ungrateful, wasteful farmers. We could ease our anger by describing their stubbornness as just another sign of the inscrutable and indolent Asian. They simply would not try, even with our offer of help; apparently they really didn't want the job done after all.

The ingredient that is missing in such an attitude is time—time to consider the people of the land seriously. There was a very good reason why the villagers refused to work. It seems that Pi, a sacred spirit, lived on the very site which Western engineers had designated as the best place along the river to construct the facility.

All that was needed, in this instance, was sufficient time for a resident AID anthropologist to win the trust of the local shaman-priest and then ask if it were possible to move the sacred spirit downstream. It was, and Pi was given another home. When time was taken for that, east and west were ready to build together.

The incident encompassed only a brief period; in many cases, years are involved. But although the delays encountered may seem excessive to our western minds, they are worthwhile investments. A water-storage facility is not very big, but it means a great deal to Laotian villagers. Their spirit means a great deal, too. Accommodation could be made for both.

BELIEF

I have already indicated that dynamic stability in Southeast Asia takes men, money, talent, and time. It also takes a lot of belief. Southeast Asia needs our good faith today. They need someone to confirm their right to be what they are, including their right to be different from us and to develop on their own national terms. People and nations who do not believe in that right become tyrants. They push other people and nations around and spread their own brand of distrust over the world. On the other hand, people who believe in their right to be themselves, to be different, and to develop on their own terms hold this belief for others. So they dare to build.

We believe in the people of Southeast Asia, in their integrity and their longing for stability. And so we have the courage to follow our belief and work with them and for them. We trust each other.

It is true that our stability program in Southeast Asia requires many ingredients. It takes much to accomplish it. But what it takes, it gives back. It gives back men, prepared to live with and contribute to the requirements and benefits of a modern world. For our financial investment, it returns a richer, more peaceful society in which we can continue to prosper. If it takes talent to build and to develop, stability gives back minds grown generous and free through cross-cultural contact. If we must give time and belief, we get back time to enjoy the dignity of our fellow man, and a renewed belief to strengthen and expand the foundations we have laid together.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I shall sincerely try to speak simply. There is nothing that is closer to the American heart than foreign aid. When I was a boy, money was hard to get, and a penny and a nickle were large coins. Good people would give their pennies and their nickles and their dimes, when they ill could spare them, for the missionaries. These missionaries went all over the world, where there is hardship, where there are problems, and they taught what? Religion? Yes. But they were the builders of education and health.

I have great respect for a former colleague on this committee, Dr. Walter Judd. He was a missionary, a medical missionary, and he knew the heart of America and the heart of foreign lands. When he was in this House and a member of this committee, he was always a strong champion of the foreign aid program.

I think we make the foreign aid program too complex. I am not going to quarrel with those who think that our America, in the administration of the foreign aid program, should go out teaching to all the world how many children they should have. I do not believe in that. Our image, the image of Uncle Sam, must be one of sincerity, of simplicity. We are going into other lands to help them raise their economy and to help them raise their standards. I do not think we are raising the stature of Uncle Sam in the foreign eyes when we say we are going into other countries to say how many children they are going to have. Yes, if their complexion is brown, they may have one child or two children, and if it is white, then more? I do not know.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a fine program. Yes, we spend billions of dollars to make war and we are making war in an unhappy and uneasy and changing world. Should we grudge the little money in this program to advance understanding, to build in the ways of peace?

That is all that is at issue here. I know, some are saying, "The foreign aid program is not popular at home." What do they mean, that it is not popular? The women's clubs are for it. The churches are for it. The labor unions are for it. Many of the industrialists are for it. What do they mean, "It is not popular"?

Do not be frightened off. This is the most popular program we have.

Oh, yes, it can be misrepresented. Some can say, "Do you believe in throwing away money?" Of course no one believes in throwing away money, but we do not throw away money when we are seeking to lift the curse of poverty and the curse of ignorance and the curse of disease from foreign lands. That is not throwing away money. That is an investment in the future.

Now let me talk of how I see this program.

Whenever I look at television I have to go through a lot of commercials, and sometimes I do not like the commercials, but I know they cost a lot of money. I do not hear the stockholders of these companies saying, "Oh, they are throwing away millions of dollars just to give amusement or boredom to the American people." It is money spent as an investment. It is money spent to bring in more business.

Every dollar we spend in foreign aid is just that. We can value it only from that standpoint.

I know a little something about Africa. I am amazed by the great wealth of Africa.

Only a few years ago South-West Africa was nothing but desert. Then they found some diamonds. Ten years later they found some more diamonds. Ten years later was the greatest diamond find in the world.

Mauritania was mostly desert, with less than 1 million population, and they found deposits there of minerals of untold wealth.

The little country of Niger, the poorest of all countries, just recently found minerals of tremendous value.

This is the world of Africa. Yes, there should be a little help to Africa. In Africa we are missing the boat. We are not doing much for Africa. If all this authorization goes through, there still will not be very much for Africa. If it is cut down, there will not be anything for Africa.

Africa is going to be one of our great markets. Why, the Africa of tomorrow, which is right around the corner, will give to us tremendous foreign trade. It is worth cultivating.

So it is all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, my heart is in this bill. My faith is in this bill. I see this bill bringing the near tomorrow, as I have seen during my lifetime the America of yesterday brought into the America of today. When I was a boy the population of California, of the entire State of California, was less than that of the city of

Philadelphia, and that time in Philadelphia the population was 1.2 million. In my boyhood in all of California there were less than 1 million people.

What happened?

Development.

Yes, we can call it foreign aid coming from my State of Illinois, foreign aid coming earlier from New England, going west. Foreign aid—that is the money that built up California. That is the money that built up the great West. First we had railroads and transportation, and then we developed waterpower. Think of the market that California gives us today. Would my Illinois be as prosperous if it were not for California? And what has come about in the development of the wealth and resources of California? My friends, the world of tomorrow will be so much richer because of the money we have put into foreign aid in order to build up the economies of countries which are now small but of tremendous stature in wealth and resources. Build up their economies and they will become our customers and our markets. Our factories will be turning out goods and we will find markets all over the world in a world of plenty that has been made by the little money we are now putting into foreign aid.

Mr. Chairman, I am filled with emotion. I know I am near the end of the road. When you are 85 you know that there are not too many years ahead, and sometimes when you are near the end of the road and you look back at the road you have traveled you can see with greater clarity the vision of the road ahead, the road of tomorrow.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield to my very good friend.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman in the well for a very eloquent presentation. I might say while he may be somewhat older than some of us in years, he is young in spirit and has been a great addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I should also like to say that the State of Illinois has provided a very sizable contribution in the form of the gentleman from Illinois to our country. I think we are all grateful to it.

In reference to the gentleman's emphasis on Africa, I am very pleased that he did mention the significance of this continent, because it does seem to me this is an area which we have perhaps underemphasized in the past.

In that connection, I have been disturbed about the limitation placed by the other body on the number of countries to which we can give aid, because it seems inevitable to me that if there should be too severe a restriction, the African countries, the new countries, the ones where a token contribution in many cases might be of significance, would have to be stricken from the list of recipients.

Would the gentleman care to comment on the limitation placed by the other body on the number of countries to which we might give aid and what it might do to the countries in Africa to which we have been giving or might give assistance?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am so very pleased that my friend brought that matter up. If the reduction in the authorization decided upon by the other body prevails, there will be no help going to Africa. Africa will be entirely devoid of any help, and we will be missing the boat badly. I have always felt that the area closest to our interests was Africa and Latin America. Certainly we have an interest in the Far East, which is far away, but our closest interest is in Africa and in Latin America. I think it would be a tragedy if there should be such cuts in the authorization that Africa will be entirely cut off. It would be a tragedy.

In closing, might I respond to my friend. I would say that the greatest enrichment of my life in these later years has been my membership on this committee. We are all prima donnas on my committee. I say that with the warmest affection. Nobody quite can define foreign policy. It has been a complex sort of thing. In earlier days it was rather simple. We wanted to do business with countries, and that was all we were interested in. Now we have world responsibility. Nobody quite to the satisfaction of anybody else can define foreign policy.

Well, now, on the Foreign Affairs Committee my beloved colleagues—every one of them—can define foreign policy to their own satisfaction but convert no one else.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned the chronology of the aid program. I would like to say that I wish the other people of this Nation had one-tenth of his idealism, one-tenth of his dedication, one-tenth of the gentleman's vision, one-tenth of the gentleman's energy, and one-tenth of his ability.

There is a song about being "Young in Heart." The gentleman is young in heart, and insofar as I am concerned the gentleman robs old age of its terrors.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Well, I may have another primary next June and I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey would come to Illinois and do a little campaigning for me?

Mr. JOELSON. You bet I will.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the only thing lacking while the distinguished gentleman from Illinois was speaking is that we did not have 435 Members present. I do not believe we have had a better speech in this House during my tenure of service. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. As the gentleman advances in years, his eloquence, which I feel is a natural gift, advances with him. I hope the gentleman has many, many more years of service in the House of Representatives. We need him.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might say to the distinguished majority leader that I have always tried to practice humility. But if I listen to any more compliments of the magnitude which the majority leader has bestowed upon me, I will leave the well of the House with a big head.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, it would be a difficult enough task indeed for a freshman member—insofar as the Committee on Foreign Affairs is concerned—to come to the floor with all of the knowledgeable people upon both sides of the aisle and express views upon the legislation that is pending before us. But, coming as I do, after a Titan, the gentleman from Illinois, makes it an almost impossible job.

I would like to say the experience of serving on this committee has been a most pleasant and a most stimulating one.

I would join in the commendation of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the ranking Republican member, the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and, indeed, all of the members of the committee for the tremendous amount of attention that they have given to this bill.

As I have indicated in my additional views, I feel strongly that our national interest dictates that we continue a foreign aid program and try to improve that foreign aid program. And, it is in that spirit that I have offered some additional views, commenting as to the procedures that have been followed in the committee and the suggestions that have been made. Further, I would like to echo the recommendation of the ranking Republican member, my colleague from Ohio, as to the desirability of more use of the subcommittees in the consideration of the details of this bill.

When the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey read my additional views, he commented to me, in his usual perspicacious vein:

> I do not see how any Member with your seniority on the committee could dare come forward and present such suggestions for revolutionizing committee procedures.

Be that as it may, it is not my purpose today to go into further discussion of the desirability of such a change. Rather, I would like to talk about a basic question that is going to come up in the amendments as to whether or not the authorization under this bill should be a 1-year or a 2-year authorization.

I believe the issue involved here is whether or not this amounts to a downgrading of congressional supervision over this program. Would it not be a recognition of the fact that the executive and not the legislative branch is to make policy in this area?

For a few minutes today I also want to go into this to answer arguments that have been made in favor of a 2-year authorization, but it really comes down to what the responsibility of the Congress is, and how we can best do our job. I am convinced—and I believe most of the Members are convinced—that we can do it by continual review. I believe that

continual review can best be accomplished by the discipline, at least, of annual hearings.

Let me review for a few minutes the various reasons that have been given in advocating a 2-year authorization.

First, it is said that many countries no longer need short-term help. Well, that may be, but certainly there are many countries that may very well need short-term help, and short-term help in the near future. Indeed, there are some who have recently received such help, and I assume we should take another look next year at them to see what their progress has been. Let me cite just as points of illustration those nations in the Middle East, and perhaps Greece, where certainly there are changing circumstances. I believe there is a continual supervision and decision that could well and really should be made by the Congress, rather than the executive, as the conditions change, and the desires and the interests of the American people change.

Second, it has been said that we have enough experience to know that we can get results under a foreign aid program. We have enough experience to know we cannot get results in some instances as well, and I believe when we see we are not getting results, a 2-year authorization is too long a period for a change in the authorization which, given the opportunity, will be stimulated by the Congress.

It has been said also that congressional recognition of the foreign aid program as being in the national interest will be established by giving a longer authorization than a 1-year period. I believe the answer to that is very simple. The Congress has recognized the continuing nature of the foreign aid program for a period of 20 years, and I believe a study of the record of the past support of the Congress is sufficient to make that point. Certain programs such as the Alliance for Progress program, for instance, have been continuing programs, and authorized over a period of years. There are special reasons for doing so, and I would not upset this area.

It is said, again, that appropriations still will be annual, and that this is a sufficient safeguard for Congress. It seems to me that, quite the contrary, the fact that appropriations are annual means that the programs, at least to that extent, are continually subject to review. Why, if they are to be subject to review as to funds to be provided, should they not be subject to review as to the policy involved? One of the most frank statements made to me informally on this with regard to the 2-year authorization bears repeating here. It is that to go for a vote of the other body again next year might hurt the program more.

Well, if so, I believe we had better take this question head on. The implication is that the future conduct of our foreign policy in other areas than foreign aid can result in some kickback upon the foreign aid program. For those who would change our foreign policy, perhaps that would be a desirable thing. But in any event, if we are to make our decision upon foreign aid and on the basis of poor reasoning of this sort, then I believe the Congress, and indeed the Nation, will have arrived at a sad day.

Another point made by the director of the program before our committee was that perhaps a 5-year authorization might be desirable in some of these programs. He was asked, if this was true, why did he not ask for 5 years? He came out with what I think was quite a factual, truthful answer: that it was not practical to come out with more than 2 years and expect approval.

Thus, I believe really what this comes down to as much as anything else is a matter of convenience of the executive branch.

It has been said that too much agency time is spent in congressional hearings. Perhaps that is true. Some of the suggested reforms with regard to taking some of the more detailed aspects up with subcommittees would probably get down to the people who are actually in charge of a particular program and might be the remedy for this.

It has been said that there is an advantage of freeing the Congress from a yearly review, giving it more time to focus on special problems.

It seems to me proper procedural changes rather than a change in the years of authorization would be the way to handle this matter.

It is said that there has been too much attention to the errors and too little to the successes. Our job is to pay attention to those areas in which we find errors. If we have successes, then the Congress is not called upon to change those programs.

But I think it is our job to review the programs and to pick up errors that we see and point them out.

It is said that annual reviews dull rather than sharpen the interest of the Congress, to say nothing of the American people. But how can less activity create more interest? This just does not add up.

It is said that continuity is needed for sound management. As to this, I might add that sound management may call for continuity as well.

In sum, I do not think a case has been made for a 2-year authorization program. I think amendments should be offered and I, if others do not offer them first, will be offering amendments to cut back on these various programs that have been authorized for a period longer than 1 year.

The Committee might be interested in the figures, as to what the authorizations for 1969 total.

The total figure for 1969 is $2,775,325,000. That is an increase over 1968 of some $273 million.

In summary, if you attempt to justify increases from 1968 to 1969 on the basis of the record that has been presented to you, and that was before the committee, I think you will find very little justification for any 1969 increases there.

In conclusion the basic question still remains: Do you want to have the Congress maintain control and supervision and oversight over this area? Or do you want to give a blank check—well, perhaps not a blank check, but certainly one dated for the next year to the executive branch of the Government?

Do we feel that the Members of Congress are too heavily imposed upon to be called upon to review each of these programs every year and to work their will on these programs?

Mr. Chairman, for the information of my colleagues I include the following tables of the 1969 authorizations in foreign assistance which I expect to ask to be stricken:

1969 AUTHORIZATIONS IN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Subject	Authorization, 1969	Authorization increase over 1968
Development Loan Fund	$750,000,000	$150,000,000
Technical cooperation and development grants	260,000,000	17,000,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	14,000,000	0
International organizations	158,000,000	17,000,000
Supporting assistance,	170,000,000	0
Vietnam	550,000,000	0
Contingency fund	100,000,000	25,000,000
Military assistance	714,000,000	64,000,000
Administrative expenses	59,325,000	0
Total	2,775,325,000	273,000,000

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF].

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, foreign aid is an appropriate way to help our friends in the developing nations with self-help programs. Foreign aid, especially military aid, is not, and will never be, an appropriate way to reward countries antagonistic to the United States.

It is my sincere and sorry conclusion, after examining the conduct of certain aspects of the military assistance program included in our foreign aid program, that we often lack vision and direction in the execution of our policy of foreign aid.

It is not politically sound nor militarily logical to provide military aid to our adversaries. Yet there are in the United States today 20 men from Iraq and the Sudan still receiving training at our military bases. These countries have broken diplomatic relations with the United States, yet we continue to train their military personnel. The Secretary of State has tried to justify this policy but all that emerges is a weak apology for an inexcusable program. Our Nation appears not to recognize what is meant by the breaking of diplomatic relations. Against our best interests, we persist in providing men from countries militantly opposed to us and our policies access to security information on military bases in the continental United States. This type of aid must cease—as of now.

Mr. Chairman, while on this point, I wish to clarify a statement I made last week. I said that Libya had broken diplomatic relations with the United States. The source for that incorrect statement was the Congressional Relations Office of the Department of State. Only after further probing was I able to have this mistake corrected. It is most unfortunate that for two months the Congressional Relations Office was informing Members of Congress incorrectly that Libya had

severed diplomatic relations with the United States.

Although Libya has not broken diplomatic relations with the United States, I was interested in a story that appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, August 18. According to a dispatch from Cairo, Libyan troops are regularly defecting to the United Arab Republic. The latter is clearly an adversary of ours and it would be most embarrassing if American-trained Libyan troops were joining the United Arab Republic military.

Clearly when such an unfortunate possibility exists it is imperative that we evaluate carefully our policy of military aid to Libya. Whether or not a country has broken diplomatic relations should not be the only basis for considering the merits of military aid programs.

Jordan maintains diplomatic relations with the United States and expresses a desire to be our friend. Yet when the chips were down, when a decision had to be made, Jordan signed a military assistance pact with the United Arab Republic. Whatever may be Jordan's intentions, that country has a defense pact with an avowed adversary of our's and continued military aid to Jordan is not in the best interests of the United States.

We are told that if we do not provide military aid to certain Arab nations, they will receive that aid from the Soviet Union. I submit that we do not have to give way to this international "blackmail." Such attempts to play the United States against the Soviet Union are irresponsible and perpetuate, rather than lessen, cold war tensions between us and the Soviets.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues realize I am a strong supporter of foreign aid. I welcome projects that build self-sufficiency in the developing nations; for that is the purpose of aid. As our aid officer in Taiwan told me several years ago: His job was to make his job unnecessary, and he did just that. The program was so successful the Republic of China no longer needs economic assistance. Through our aid program we must strive to help the developing nations use their resources to become our trading partners; not to remain the perpetual recipients of aid.

Thus, while the principle of foreign aid has my support, there are ways we should alter the existing program to help deserving nations and, at the same time, consider our national interests.

The military assistance program should be separated from the economic aid program. The aims of these two programs are too diverse and their execution too different to properly lump them together in a single piece of legislation. By lumping them together Congress is deprived of certain freedom of action in amending aspects of the aid program. By lumping them together we lose sight of their different objectives. By lumping them together we incorrectly equate military and humanitarian aid. Clearly the bases for dispensing the two forms of aid are different and the two programs should therefore be separated to give maximum control to the aid program. Such a separation would also clear up misunderstandings about the execution of the aid programs and ultimately make foreign aid more effective for the donor and the recipient.

Also, while providing military aid when appropriate, we should move to greatly increase the number of foreign students studying at American universities. The Department of State explains that we train military men because they are the leaders in the developing countries. By doing this we merely extend an already unfortunate situation. Perhaps through a reexamination of our policy, and a marked increase in training of economists, political scientists, and managers, we can reverse the unhappy trend that makes political leaders of military leaders. I would not object to having 2,000 Iraqis and Sudanese studying at American universities. I do object to having 20 Iraqis and Sudanese studying on our military bases.

Mr. Chairman, let us train civilian leaders, not military leaders. Then we will benefit, the developing countries will benefit, and the world will benefit by an appropriate shift from an emphasis on the military to an emphasis on the political.

Foreign aid is unquestionably a wise program. However, indiscriminate and illogical giving will ultimately help no country, least of all the United States. I am sorry we cannot afford more than is requested in the budget for aid at the present time, for aid is one of the most potent weapons against international communism at our command. I do not take issue, Mr. Chairman, with the principle of foreign aid. I do, however, take issue with certain aspects of our foreign aid program as currently executed and I intend to offer amendments accordingly at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would just like to say that we have terminated all AID programs with Iraq and nations that are engaged in the war. The fact is, however, than there were military men training here, and the decision was made that since they were here, they could not be sent back during the war. They had nothing to do with the outbreak of the war, and since it was a short time they had to go in order to finish their training, a decision was made to allow them to continue and then send them home. But no new programs are underway. The programs we did have have been terminated.

Mr. WOLFF. The programs have not been terminated. The men are continuing to receive training. However it is true there are no new programs being initiated for either Iraq or Sudan.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I am saying we had several technical assistance programs with several nations, supporting assistance programs. All programs have been terminated. The one exception is the aid to military men who are here studying in the United States from Iraq. As I said, they were here before war was declared. A decision was made as to how best they could handle the situation. They could not be sent home immediately.

Mr. WOLFF. I do not understand why these men whose nations had broken relations with us could not be sent home immediately, since we were asked to bring our Ambassador home.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We did terminate relations. The problem was that these individuals were here studying, and so they decided they would let them go since they were here as individuals. But all programs have terminated.

I might say, too, that almost 90 percent of the cash-credit military sales have been made to NATO, Australia, and Japan, with more than 75 percent going to Europe alone.

Mr. WOLFF. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. However, I am sorry that these programs were not terminated as officially as our relations were terminated with the countries of the Sudan and Iraq.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time tonight.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 12048), to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LETTER TO THE SPEAKER FROM PRIME MINISTER KY OF VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter to the Speaker from Prime Minister Ky.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has just received a letter dated August 21, 1967, from Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam.

What this letter does is to reaffirm the principles which have guided the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in the conduct of its affairs. It has been sent to the Congress in recognition of the debates which have taken place here and of the sacrifices and contributions which the American people are making in Vietnam.

It states the position of the Government of Vietnam that the development of democratic institutions is of fundamental importance in the defense of freedom in Vietnam. It pledges support for the democratic process and for acceptance of the verdict of the people in the forthcoming elections.

We welcome this clear statement of policy. As the Vietnamese people go to the polls we can only wish them success in this great effort to establish representative government within a constitutional framework.

The Prime Minister has expressed the hope that the Speaker would call this

letter to the attention of the members of the House. I am therefore inserting the letter in the RECORD and I urge all members to read it. The letter follows:

AUGUST 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take the liberty to write to you at a time when the events in my country occasion passionate debates in the Congress of the United States. Since the American and Vietnamese nations are together defending freedom, and are consenting to tremendous sacrifices, I deem it my duty to affirm again the principles which command the conduct of national affairs by my Government.

The defense of freedom in Viet-Nam requires more than our joint efforts at war, it involves first and foremost our mutual commitment to the achievement of democracy and social justice. Should we stray from that basic commitment, or should you misconstrue our purposes, our alliance would indeed be in jeopardy.

As my Government is nearing the completion of its term of duty, I sincerely feel that we have dispatched our task with honesty and effectiveness under most difficult circumstances. I take special pride in the fact that we have successfully started the course toward democracy and equality for a society which was imprisoned within the deep walls of feudalism, corruption and intolerable social discrepancies. In spite of war, subversion and several grave crises, my Government has undertaken to organize five nationwide elections of vital importance within about a year's time: elections for the Constituent Assembly in September 1966, elections for hamlet and village administration in April-May 1967, Presidential and Senatorial elections next September, and elections for the Lower House next October. I do not know of any better way to warrant our determination to stay the course toward democracy. For it would be proper for all concerned to acknowledge the painful dilemma of our nation, torn between the dream to attain the integrity of democratic life and the necessity to fight for survival. We have lost many of our people, our soldiers, our cadremen in the past elections, and undoubtedly we shall lose many more in the coming weeks; we must devote a great deal of resources to the exercise of democracy which are badly needed on the battlefield; we run the risk of subversion and division at a time when the nation must unite in the face of the enemy. Yet we have all accepted the challenge without a shadow of reluctance.

It seems a cruel irony that some of our friends chose this very moment to voice doubt on our sincerity.

Perhaps the fact that my Government includes officers of the Armed Forces leads to misgivings, for I know of the inherent distrust toward military government in the advanced societies. But in our present historical context, the Vietnamese Armed Forces are of a very particular nature: 700,000 of our young men are under arms in a nation of 15 million people. Our armed forces are not composed of militarists or people inclined to the use of force or violence, but of all generations of Vietnamese within the age of offering the fullest measure of service to their imperiled fatherland. They are the present and the future of our nation.

Furthermore, my Government did not seize power; it was a civilian government which, unable to resolve instability and division, passed on to the Armed Forces the burden of preserving the nation from collapsing. We then formed a mixed team of civilian and military leaders, decided that our term of duty was to be a transitional one, and set out to establish the very rapid timetable for the advent of representative government. We are now reaching the final stage of that timetable.

Of course, two years are a very short period of time. We are convinced that we have engaged our country on the right path, but we are also aware that the tasks which we have begun, such as rural development, reorganization of the administration and of the army, reinforcement of the national economy, need to be continued. That is why, in good conscience, we deem it our duty to run for offices in due democratic process. We hope that the people of Viet-Nam will entrust us with further responsibilities on the basics of our past performances. But should the people decide otherwise, we shall readily accept their verdict.

I am particularly sad to hear accusations that the Vietnamese Armed Forces will resort to coups in the event the election returns should be unfavorable to us. We have devoted the finest hours of the past two years to bringing about the first democratic institutions in our country, we shall not be the ones to destroy them. I have repeatedly warned our soldiers, our civil servants, our cadremen against rigging the elections in any manner, for I think that dishonest elections would deprive our country of democracy for a long period of time. In 1963, the people and the Army overthrew a dictatorial government which was issued from dishonest elections.

That a few press correspondents should misquote my word of caution against unfair elections and make it sound like a threat of coup was, after all, understandable. But for a moment, I felt very discouraged to see some of the best friends of my country give credence to those inaccurate reports. Time and again I have proved that I am capable of placing the interest of our nation above all possible personal ambition; the decision I made on the 30th of June to withdraw from the Presidential race and to seek the Vice Presidency instead, was another instance of my sincerity.

I see therefore no reason for attributing to ill faith on the part of my Government the difficulties that the candidates may encounter in their campaigning. My country is short on physical facilities, several of our airfields are still unsafe, and the wind blows where it may. In my opinion, a dignified attitude for those among us who ambition to be public servants by popular choice should be to endure those misfortunes and persevere in seeking the support of the electorate, and not to display resentment against the adverse conditions which prevail for our entire people. In the meanwhile, I am satisfied that our Government has done its very best to give all candidates a fair share of the means for campaigning. The same amount of money is allotted to all tickets. The Government television and radio allow equal time to all candidates in direct broadcast, and anybody in Viet-Nam can testify that those means are used at their fullest capacity by our opponents, the Vietnamese press is free, and, in part, quite virulently anti-Governmental; on the other hand the foreign press is at full liberty to cover the campaign and the forthcoming elections.

If by the standards of a country with a long experience in the exercise of democracy, and free from the predicaments of war and underdevelopment, our elections still present serious shortcomings, I am the first Vietnamese to deplore that situation. But I can say without any doubt in my conscience that my Government does not deserve any lesson in honesty and patriotism from any quarter.

I am afraid that persistent criticism without substantiated evidence on the part of some prominent American figures may, in the long run, impair the harmony of our joint efforts. The Vietnamese are a proud people, they will accept any amount of tribulations and sufferings, but their dead count as much as the dead from all the friendly lands, and they will admit no discrimination in all the men's supreme tribute to freedom and human dignity.

I see an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to keep an appropriate perspective in the partnership between nations, large and small, which are in pursuit of a common ideal, for intemperate reliance upon the physical scale of strength would be the negation of that very ideal.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to convey my letter to all the distinguished members of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I stand in profound respect for the great traditions of democracy and justice embodied in your institutions. I greatly value the support of the Congress of the United States for the cause of Vietnam, and I am always ready to discuss in total candor with the distinguished Representatives who wish to further examine the developments concerning the common endeavor of our two nations.

Sincerely yours,
Air Vice Marshal NGUYEN CAO KY.

VIEWS OF HOWARD W. SMITH

Mr. SCOTT. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Fauquier Democrat, a weekly newspaper published in my district, had a column in its edition of August 17, 1967, writen by my predecessor in the House of Representatives, Judge Howard W. Smith, who served as the Representative of the Eighth District of Virginia for 36 years, referring to this as a dangerous time in the life of our Nation and giving his views on a number of matters.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this material in the RECORD at this point for the information of the present membership so that Members will know of his concern:

SMITH WRITES: WHAT TO DO IN "A DANGEROUS TIME IN THE LIFE OF OUR NATION"

(By Howard W. Smith)

BROAD RUN, VA.—Having been a Member of the Congress in 18 consecutive terms, beginning with the year 1930, in the early stages of the Great Depression which so drastically changed our whole system of democratic government, I have been a close observer for more than a third of a century of every branch of our democratic system of government.

I have participated in much of the revolutionary changes that have overtaken us. I have noted with dismay and anguish the surrender to the inordinate demands of minority groups in the country, yielding to their demands and too often encouraging their growth and power by actions or inactions in times of stress.

In a way, all of it has been a part of worldwide unrest and period of revolutionary spirit that has pervaded the human race throughout a period of such great advancement in science, in economic growth, and education that we all feel puzzled at what might be the underlying reasons and the remedies for the situation that exists, both at home and abroad—a situation in which we have taken a part that has appeared to some of us entirely beyond our government functions as a nation in connection with our foreign affairs and our domestic difficulties.

I fear that we have now reached a dangerous time in the life of our nation where we are faced with an incipient revolution in our own homeland that takes on a spirit of anarchy that must be dealt with firmly, patiently, and with all the joint and combined wisdom that we can command.

It seems to me that all of us in America ought to be willing to realize that we are all in it together, that we will accomplish nothing by trying to shift the responsibility from one political party to another, and from one segment of the country to another, but should devote our efforts to meeting the situation as it exists today.

Many of us remember the pronouncement of Winston Churchill when in the hour of Britain's greatest peril and danger, he took charge as Prime Minister, and in his first public statement said in effect, "If we use the present precious hours to quarrel with the past, we may lose the future."

It seems to me that those words are particularly appropriate to the present crisis in America. The future success or failure of any political party, or any political officeholder, fades into insignificance beside the crisis that has been brought upon us by whatever causes or deficiencies we may have had in our differing views about how this situation should have been handled.

If there ever was a time when we should forget past differences and fix our minds upon the solution of a problem that is becoming more serious daily, this is that time.

We are confronted with an unprecedented phenomenon, something that is new, different, dangerous and distressing in our system of democratic government. But as one who has no official responsibility, seeks no public office at the hands of the voters, no axe to grind—political or otherwise—and only a superficial knowledge of what is going on, it seems to me that I am eminently qualified to offer some sage, useful suggestions.

1) Stop passing the political buck. Postpone the election campaign until 1968. This is 1967 and a lot of things are going to happen between now and the election of 1968.

2) Persuade the television system of the country to cease giving the militant scalawags, revolutionaries, demagogues, and traitors equal time—and sometimes more—that the President of the United States or any other important public official.

Any militant Negro revolutionist of the type of the Rap Browns and the Carmichaels knows that if he can pick up some vicious language with which to denounce his country and urge the overthrow of it by force, and yells into the mouth of the television camera his intention to induce his people to burn their cities and overthrow their government by force and violence, he can have every television station in the country eager to display his ugly, contorted features, and his vicious, traitorous and criminal denunciations. Cut them off from their television appearances and you have cut them off from their greatest source of doing mischief.

3) Gas bombs and Molotov cocktails are homemade weapons by which the great conflagrations, that have taken place in the cities, are set off. They are made, designed and used purely for criminal purposes. If we do not have a law against them, pass one quick and enforce it. Fix severe penalties for anyone who makes, possesses or uses these incendiary weapons.

4) The sneaky snipers who conceal themselves on the rooftops and shoot indiscriminately into the streets during these upheavals should be shot on sight and, if captured, should be prosecuted for murder or attempted murder, and held for trial without bail.

5) Make use of the information in the secret files of the F.B.I. I believe that many people in public life have knowledge of some of the information that the F.B.I. has obtained by various methods concerning subversives, concerning the Negro revolution so to speak, and the connection between them and the Communists.

That information should be at least in the hands of people in the government who could use it to advantage in determining what is back of the Negro revolution.

Few people will believe that these riots and burnings and disturbances are organized by the local Negroes themselves. They are not characteristic of the American Negro. There is too much planning, too much concerted action to be spontaneous.

And where is the money coming from to support these revolutionists? We should know so that we would be in a better position to form a judgment about where the trouble lies.

6) Stop trying to find excuses for criminals who participate in the mob violence that seek to burn, destroy, and loot the cities of our land, and deal with them for what they are. Enforce existing laws, instead of shedding crocodile tears for the lawless.

Start using the laws already on the books. Section 2385 of Title 18 of the U.S. Criminal Code would be a good place to start. That law makes it a felony with long terms of prison for any person who advocates or urges others to attempt the destruction of any unit of government, national, state or local, by force or violence.

ROGERS ENCOURAGED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ACTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged to see that the Justice Department has at last begun to crack down on at least one facet of Rap Brown's violation of the law.

The arrest of Brown Saturday, on grounds of violating the Federal Firearms Act, at least gives us an indication that the Department is now aware of some of the activities of Brown.

I hope this is an indication that the Justice Department intends to pursue other violations of the law by Brown and is prepared to do the same when and if Stokely Carmichael returns to the United States, although there is some doubt now that he will indeed ever return to the United States.

Although I am encouraged that some action has been taken, I still feel that the Justice Department has not completely examined, nor even scratched the surface, of the many other violations committed by these two men.

I am still of the opinion, and I think the law is clear, that both have committed sedition on the face of their remarks over the past few months and I consider these charges more appropriate to their actions than a violation of the Firearms Act by Brown.

Leadership is expected of the Justice Department when citizens flaunt the law. Brown and Carmichael have done so. I repeat, I hope again that the action taken against Brown is only a prelude, and that charges befitting the seriousness of Brown and Carmichael's actions will follow shortly.

HELP FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my support for an important proposal encouraging the growth of educational television. I refer to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 which will soon come before this House for consideration.

Serious questions arise regarding the present and future of television in America:

Will television be developed to its fullest potential for the benefit of all Americans?

Will programing extend to the millions throughout our land the best of our historical and contemporary culture?

Will we have a nationwide system of television that truly serves the public interest?

I find thoughtful and convincing answers to these questions in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. It would carry on Federal support of educational television facilities construction and inaugurate similar support for radio as well. It would establish a nonprofit public corporation to strengthen and improve noncommercial broadcasting stations—without compromising their independence by any form of control. And it would study the present and the future of instructional television to help determine the best ways to enlarge its usefulness in the classroom.

I believe this legislation would enhance the stature and serviceability of public television and bring it the assistance it must have to flourish in peaceful competition with its commercial cousin. The sad truth is that educational television today is barely alive: it has been estimated that a full 40 percent of the viewing public fails to watch ETV due to the poor quality of its offerings. This legislation would stimulate educational television to offer the imaginative and diverse fare—symphonies, symposia, plays—its culture-starved audience demands.

The Public Broadcasting Act would accomplish this without reviving the specter of Federal control. The nonprofit, autonomous, politically free Corporation for Public Television would oversee a program of assistance to independent broadcasting stations, establish libraries of broadcast materials, and disseminate much-needed information.

If we are ever to meet the national need for innovation and quality in noncommercial broadcasting, we must begin now. And swift enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, it seems to me, is the best way to start.

THE WARREN REPORT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]

may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great attributes of the American people has always been their fair-mindedness. They want both sides of the story so they can make a considered judgment in matters of controversy. To give them both sides of the story, the Columbia Broadcasting System recently presented a series of four documentary programs dealing with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the Warren Commission's investigation of the assassination, the attempts by critics of the Commission to destroy the credibility of the Commission report, and the bizarre activities of New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in his efforts to build a conspiracy case around the Kennedy assassination. Mr. Speaker, CBS news correspondents Walter Cronkite, Dan Rather, Eric Sevareid and Mike Wallace have done a superb job of examining both sides of the points at issue. While millions of Americans no doubt watched the CBS News Inqury, "The Warren Report," other millions did not have that opportunity. The critics have had their day. It is only fair that the transcript of the CBS documentary be made available for all to read and ponder. Because the transcript of the four programs is lengthy, I will place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in eight daily installments. The first installment follows:

[As broadcast over the CBS television network, June 25, 1967]

CBS NEWS INQUIRY: "THE WARREN REPORT"—PART I

With CBS News Correspondents Walter Cronkite, Dan Rather and KRLD-TV News Director Eddie Barker.

Mr. CRONKITE. This is what a rifleman would see from a sixth-floor window if he tracked an automobile down Elm Street in Dealey Plaza, Dallas, Texas.

This is a marksman firing three shots from a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle at a target below him and moving away. These two reenactments represent the heart of the Warren Report. In the view of the Warren Commission, they describe fully the circumstance of the assassination of President Kennedy.

But is there more to this story than the Warren Report ever discovered?

On November 22, 1963, at precisely 12:30 PM, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the youthful 35th President of the United States drove triumphantly into this square, where hundreds waited to cheer him . . . and where another waited as well.

Seconds later a dying President sped away from Dealey Plaza—into history, into legend, into a national nightmare of suspicion that persists to this day.

In this country rumors spoke of left-wing plots, right-wing plots, Castro plots; even plots to elevate a Texan to the White House. Abroad, where the transfer of political power by violence is historically more familiar, no rumor was too extreme. Faced with this dangerous condition of rumor out of control, President Johnson quickly appointed a commission to discover the real facts of the assassination, a commission of seven Americans so distinguished that their conclusions must be above suspicion—or so it was thought.

As chairman, the new President literally drafted the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren. The other commissioners: Allen W. Dulles, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency. Hale Boggs, Democratic Congressional Whip from Louisiana. John Sherman Cooper, Republican Senator from Kentucky. Richard B. Russell, Democratic Senator from Georgia. John J. McCloy, lawyer, diplomat and adviser to Presidents. And Gerald R. Ford, Republican Representative from Michigan.

The Warren Commission had the mandates it needed to do the job. It could subpoena witnesses, could invoke the cooperation of any agency of the United States Government, could and did use the F.B.I. and the Secret Service as its investigative arms.

This is the result. On September 24, 1964, the Commission presented its findings in the form of this 888-page report to the President. Two months later, it published these 26 additional volumes, the exhibits and hearings on which the report was based.

(Dan Rather at the scene of the assassination:)

Mr. RATHER. The basic story pieced together by that Warren Commission Report on the assassination is this: A man named Lee Harvey Oswald crouched here in this dingy window of the Texas School Book Depository as the President passed below. Oswald, the Commission tells us, fired three shots. One missed. One struck both the President and Texas Governor John Connally, riding with him. The third killed the President. Oswald, the Report had it, hid his rifle over there, then ran down the stairs, left the building on foot, and hurried down Elm Street. He made his way to his rented room, picked up a revolver, and about 12 minutes later shot Police Officer J. D. Tippit.

Oswald was captured shortly after the Tippit murder, was questioned for two days in a madhouse atmosphere of confusion and then, in a grisly climax, was himself murdered right in the Dallas police station, by a night-club operator and police hanger-on named Jack Ruby.

Mr. CRONKITE. And that was to be that—an official version of the assassination, arrived at by men of unimpeachable credentials, after what the world was assured was the most searching investigation in history.

Yet in the two and a half years since the Warren Report, a steady and growing stream of books, magazine articles, even plays and a motion picture, have challenged the Commission and its findings; have offered new theories, new assassins, and new reasons.

Only a few weeks ago, a Harris poll revealed that seven out of ten Americans are convinced that there remain many "important unanswered questions," that the whole truth has not been told.

A Gallup poll shows more than six of every ten Americans question that there was a lone assassin.

MAN. Well, I don't think that all the facts were brought out. I think something was held back.

WOMAN. I think there were more involved in it than just Oswald.

WOMAN. The only thing that disturbs me is the fact that they've sealed away some of the evidence and I think that's rather disturbing to most people.

WOMAN. I've read the Warren Report, and as I say, I think those men are men of honesty and integrity. And I think they were asked to do a tremendous job within a very short period of time after the assassination, and I think they did the very best they could.

MAN. I think it's very accurate.

WOMAN. I don't know how in the world they could ever reach a conclusion that one person assassinated him. It's ridiculous. I saw the whole thing on television. I just happened to be home at that time and I don't think that Oswald . . . I think that he was working for the C.I.A. myself.

Mr. CRONKITE. Screening out the absurd and the irrational, we are left with a series of real and critical questions about the assassination, questions which have not been answered to the satisfaction of the people of the United States.

In this series of broadcasts, CBS NEWS will try to cast light on those questions. They fall under four headings, which we will examine on successive evenings at this same time.

Tonight's question: Did Lee Harvey Oswald shoot President Kennedy?

For the next two nights, we will take up the question of conspiracy. Tomorrow night we will ask, was there more than one assassin firing in Dealey Plaza?

On Tuesday night we will ask whether, regardless of the actual number of gunmen, there was a conspiracy leading to the President's murder.

And on Wednesday night we will ask: Why doesn't America believe the Warren Report?

We will examine these questions here in our studios in New York, in libraries and laboratories from coast to coast, with KRLD News Director Eddie Barker at the assassination site in Dealey Plaza, and with CBS NEWS Correspondent Dan Rather on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository as for the first time since the assassination, news cameras enter and explore the Depository building itself.

Tonight we ask if Lee Harvey Oswald shot the President. To help us answer that fundamental question we must resolve some lesser questions:

Did Oswald own a rifle?

Did Oswald take a rifle to the Book Depository Building?

Where was Oswald when the shots were fired?

Was Oswald's rifle fired from the building?

How many shots were fired?

How fast could Oswald's rifle be fired?

What was the time span of the shots?

First: Did Oswald own a rifle? There is no reasonable doubt that Oswald owned a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle No. C2766. This is the coupon with which he ordered the rifle, by mail, from Klein's Sporting Goods Company, of Chicago. Hidell is one of several aliases Oswald used from time to time. Oswald paid for the rifle with this money order. Here is the application for the post office box to which the rifle was sent—all these documents in Oswald's handwriting.

This photograph, traced to Oswald's own camera, shows him with an identical rifle. This photograph has been widely challenged by Mark Lane and other critics of the Warren Report. During his interrogation, Oswald himself said that his head had been superimposed on someone else's body. Several publications later admitted that they had retouched it and in so doing may have altered the rifle and other details. Lawrence Schiller, of Los Angeles, a professional photographer and photo analyst, made an independent study, of the original picture and negative.

Mr. SCHILLER. This photograph of Lee Harvey Oswald, which was found the day he was captured and disclaimed by him, has been used by numerous critics of the Report. They say that the disparity of shadows, a straight nose shadow from the nose, and an angle body shadow proves without a doubt that this head was superimposed on this body. To properly recreate the picture to see if the straight nose shadow does correspond to the body shadow, you would have to go to the same address, at the same day of the year and at the same time. We did that. This picture was taken on March 31, 1967, at 214 Neeley Street. And it shows without a doubt that a straight nose shadow corresponds with an angular body shadow. And that the fact

that there is a disparity of shadows, that fact cannot be used to discredit the photograph.

Mr. CRONKITE. Marina Oswald told the Warren Commission that her husband had posed and she had taken the picture. She also said he had owned a rifle.

Mr. BARKER. Did you ever see the rifle?

MARINA. Yes. But you know, I fear to take this rifle. I just saw it, you know, in the corner. I never touched it, his rifle.

Mr. CRONKITE. It seems reasonable to accept the conclusion of the Warren Commission Report that Oswald did indeed own a Mannlicher-Carcano 6.5 mm rifle No. C2766. The answer is yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Our next question is: Did Oswald take his rifle to the Book Depository Building?

At the time of the assassination, Lee and Marina Oswald were together only on weekends. He lived in a rooming house not far from his job and she lived with a friend, Mrs. Ruth Paine, in the suburb of Irving. Mrs. Oswald said her husband kept his rifle wrapped in a blanket in Mrs. Paine's garage. Oswald usually went to Irving on Friday nights with a fellow worker, Buell Wesley Frazier, but the day before the assassination his routine changed.

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, he come to me the Thursday, November 21st, and asked me could he ride on with me that afternoon, and I said yes. And I said, "Why are you going home this afternoon?" and he replied that he wanted to go home and pick up some curtain rods, so he could put some curtains up in his apartment.

Mr. RATHER. Oswald got a lift to the School Book Depository that Friday morning from co-worker Frazier. Frazier's sister, Mrs. Linnie Mae Randle, lived across the street from the Paine house.

Mrs. RANDLE. I was preparing lunches for my brother there at my sink, and I looked out the window and saw Mr. Oswald cross the street and come up cross my driveway and he had a brown paper bag in his right hand. It was about 27 inches long. It was made out of a heavy brown paper with heavy-looking tape on it.

Mr. RATHER. Incidentally, the search of the Book Depository Building made after the assassination failed to turn up any curtain rods. And the furnished room which Oswald was then occupying was equipped with curtain rods.

So Oswald made an uncharacteristic trip to the Paine home Thursday night, returning to the Book Depository on the morning of the assassination with a heavy-looking package that could pass for curtain rods. Was it the rifle? A difference of about eight inches has made this one of the most contentious points for the critics. Within this package I have a disassembled Mannlicher-Carcano rifle identical to Oswald's. Before I tell you the dimensions, you might want to try to estimate them, as Mrs. Randle and Wesley Frazier did, from memory. Mrs. Randle variously estimated Oswald's package of "curtain rods" as 27 or 28 inches long; her brother, Wesley Frazier said about two feet, "give or take a few inches." As a matter of fact, the disassembled Mannlicher is 34 and eight-tenths inches long. Furthermore, Frazier said Oswald, preceding him into the Depository building, carried the "curtain rods" under his armpit with his hand around the bottom. Now obviously, you can't carry this package that way.

Oswald had gotten out of the car first, and was then walking away from Frazier. The Commission decided that Frazier easily could have been mistaken about Oswald carrying the package. You can decide whether Frazier, walking some 50 feet behind and, in his own words, not paying much attention, *might have* missed the few inches of the narrow end of such a package sticking up past Oswald's shoulder.

Mr. CRONKITE. Despite the dispute about just how he carried the package, the reasonable answer to this question is that he did take a rifle to the Book Depository Building.

Our next question concerns Oswald's whereabouts at the time of the murder: Where was Oswald when the shots were fired?

These men have just witnessed the assassination of the President. They are co-workers of Oswald, photographed by Tom Dillard, *The Dallas Morning News* photographer, in fifth floor windows within a minute after the shots were heard.

Mr. RATHER. Walter, here in Dallas, Eddie Barker has reinterviewed those men who watched the tragedy from the window just below me. Later on, we will be hearing their own story of the assassination itself. But for now, we wanted to know just what Oswald was doing, and where he was doing it, through the morning of November 22, 1963. We spoke first to this man, Harold Norman:

Mr. NORMAN. That particular morning three or four of us were standing by the window and Oswald came over and he said, "What's everybody looking at and what's everybody excited about?" So I told him we was waiting on the President. So he just snudged up and walked away.

Mr. RATHER. Our next witness from the fifth floor window, James Jarman, Jr.

Mr. JARMAN. I was talking to him around about 10:00 o'clock. On the outside of the building some people had gathered. And he asked me what was they gathering around out there for, and I told him that the President was supposed to come by there that morning. And he asked me what time, and I didn't know what time it would be but some of the people had started gathering around. And he asked me which way would the President be coming, and I told him. And so he said, "Oh, yeah?" And I said, "Yeah." Then he turned and walked off.

Mr. RATHER. The last man known to have seen Lee Harvey Oswald before the assassination was another co-worker, Charles Givens. Mr. Givens saw Oswald here, on the sixth floor.

Mr. GIVENS. Well, he was standing about middle ways of the building on the sixth floor.

Mr. BARKER. What was he doing there?

Mr. GIVENS. Well, he was standing there looking with his orders in his hand.

Mr. BARKER. And what did you say to him?

Mr. GIVENS. I just said, "Fellow, it's lunch time, you going downstairs?" And he said, "No," he said, "Close the gates on the elevator when you get out." Well I, you know, kind of excited, wanted to see the parade, so when I got downstairs, I really forgot it. I just rushed off and went out to lunch.

Mr. BARKER. This would be about what time?

Mr. GIVENS. Well about one or two minutes after 12.

Mr. RATHER. So the testimony from those who saw Oswald inside the Book Depository is consistent. The testimony from eyewitnesses in the Plaza below is not. The Warren Commission had to choose between seriously conflicting accounts, and many of the critics think it chose badly.

Down in the Plaza, Eddie Barker can show us where those witnesses stood and what they were in a position to see, as they tell their own stories.

Mr. BARKER. Dan, Arnold Rowland was here with his wife on Houston Street in the crowd waiting for the motorcade. A few minutes before it arrived, Rowland told the Warren Commission, he noticed an elderly Negro man up in the window where you are now, where Oswald is supposed to have fired from. But he told the Commission, and a few days ago repeated his story for us here, of seeing a gunman lurking in another window entirely:

Mr. ROWLAND. And I just lookin' around and we noticed a man up in the window and I remarked to my wife, tried to point him out. And remarked that he must be a security guard or a Secret Service agent.

Mr. BARKER. So, the window, then, that you're referring to is on the opposite end of the building from where the main entrance to the building is?

Mr. ROWLAND. Yes, it is on the other side of the building. And he had a rifle. It looked like a high-powered rifle because it had a scope which looked, in relation to the size of the rifle, to be a big scope.

Mr. BARKER. Now over here, Dan, still on Houston Street and not very far from the Rowlands, was Mrs. Caroline Walther. Mrs. Walther says she saw *two* men with a gun in the Book Depository.

Mrs. WALTHER. I looked at this building and I saw this man with a gun, and there was another man standing to his right. And I could not see all of this man, and I couldn't see his face. And the other man was holding a short gun. It wasn't as long as a rifle. And he was holding it pointed down, and he was kneeling in the window, or sitting. His arms were on the window. And he was holding the gun in a downward position, and he was looking downward.

Mr. BARKER. About what floor would you say these two men were on that you saw in the window?

Mrs. WALTHER. The first statement that I made, I said the man was on the fourth or fifth floor, and I still feel the same way. He was about—in a window that was just about even with the top of that tree. I saw the man had light hair, or brown, and was wearing a white shirt. That—I explained to the F.B.I. agents that I wasn't sure about that. That was my impression on thinking about it later. That I thought that was the way the man was dressed.

Mr. BARKER. Now, what about this other man who was in the window?

Mrs. WALTHER. This other man was wearing a brown suit. And that was all I could see, was half of this man's body, from his shoulders to his hips.

Mr. BARKER. Now over here, on the corner opposite the Book Depository, stood a fifteen-year old boy named Amos Euins. A few days ago, Amos Euins came back here with us and gave a vivid account of the assassination itself and of a "piece of pipe" he saw poking out of a window—your window, Dan.

Mr. EUINS. When he come around, and when I was standin' here, I happened to look up and I seen a pipe, you know. So I never did paid no attention thinking it might be a pipe, you know, just a pipe stickin' out. So it was stickin' out about a foot, about that high, you know.

Mr. BARKER. Point out for me, Mr. Euins, the window where you saw the pipe.

Mr. EUINS. It was about on the sixth floor, right below the banister.

Mr. BARKER. Among the witnesses here in the plaza, the Commission relied heavily on the testimony of Howard Brennan, who, watching from just about here, said that he actually saw the assassin firing.

HOWARD BRENNAN. I looked directly across and up, possibility of a 45-degree angle. And this man, same man I had saw prior to the President's arrival, was in the window and taking aim for his last shot. After he fired the last or the third shot he didn't seem to be in a great rush, hurry. He seemed to pause for a moment to see if for sure he accomplished his purpose, and he brought the gun back to rest in upright position, as though he was satisfied.

Mr. CRONKITE. It should be noted here that the Commission failed to follow up Mrs. Walther's story. She was interviewed briefly by F.B.I. agents but never called before the Commission or its staff, who accumulated vast minutiae on the relatives of relatives of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Despite these discrepancies, his co-workers knew and certainly saw Oswald. The CBS

News answer: Oswald was in the Book Depository Building when the shots were fired, most probably on the sixth floor.

WHY NO BUTTER FOR OUR SERVICEMEN?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of Agriculture announced that butter and cheese have been added to the list of foodstuffs the U.S. Department of Agriculture donates to needy persons. The dairy goods are to be made available to 3,300,000 participants in the expanding food donation program, according to a July 12 USDA release.

There is a group of people who may wonder about this announcement since butter is not made available to them. I refer, of course, to the men of the Army and Air Force, who are denied the use of butter by a Department of Defense directive dated March 25, 1966. This directive has not been rescinded.

As of May 31, the Department of Agriculture held 91,880,000 pounds of pure, wholesome butter in storage. This is enough to butter a sandwich for every man, woman, and child on the face of the earth with the Russians going back for seconds. Our huge butter stockpile has not persuaded Secretary McNamara, however, to change the Department of Defense antibutter policy.

Apparently, our butter supply is large enough to permit expanded butter distribution to the school lunch program as well as to the direct distribution program operating in 1,460 counties in America. In fact, the Agriculture Secretary has urged 800 more counties to participate.

It is very strange that our country is rich enough to give butter to the needy, but cannot serve it to our fighting men.

The thousands of men that will soon go to Vietnam deserve the best table we can set before them. The half million men serving there now should not have to settle for second best.

I would direct the attention of the Congress to this inconsistency, and urge passage of the House resolution I am introducing today expressing the will of the House that the Department of Defense provide butter for our fighting men.

MORE TRIPS HOME

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is small wonder that the Congress and the Nation face great budgetary problems with seemingly no responsible answer to the continuously increasing deficits. Action taken by the House yesterday supplies a pretty convincing indication of why these most undesirable budget experiences have been so prevalent during the sixties.

Congressmen JOHN KYL, of Iowa; SAM DEVINE, of Ohio; and JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, with the assistance of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and others, are truly to be commended for their well-expressed desire to delay the approval of the House of a proposal to provide for one paid trip per month by Members to their home districts for as long as Congress may be in session.

While it is true that many Members, myself included, can surely find both advantage and convenience in such reimbursement, it does raise a serious question as to whether this is the time when such expenditures should be added to an already overburdened budget, brought on by both war and domestic expenditures. We are continuously reminded of the budget problem that confronts us, the hardships that have been created because of the inflation that inevitably follows, together with constantly climbing interest rates. There are those of us that have identified the dangers involved and continuously suggested that we ought to explore every possible means of curtailing anything but the most essential expenditures before further burdening the taxpayer by the recommended tax increase.

I have at times raised serious questions relative to expenditures recommended by the administration, and will continue to do so. However, it seems to me that if the Congress is serious in its desire to practice some prudence and frugality in the best interests of our Nation and its citizens, we ought to start with the costs involved in running our own shop.

While the item for consideration yesterday is relatively small, as the Federal budget goes these days, I am reminded that someone said if we pay close attention to the saving of pennies, the dollars will take care of themselves. The House might have done well to have set an example for all departments of Government, that in view of a nation at war and a greatly troubled populace, we as Members might establish a pattern that could serve as a guide and criterion for the entire scene of Government expenditures. I find small contribution, and rather added burdens, to our fiscal problems by virtue of yesterday's action.

In recent weeks, I have heard many complaints because Congress is in session too long, that we have difficulty in getting our work done because of the "Tuesday-to-Thursday club." Adding more paid trips back to the district can only further aggravate those complaints. It will become even more difficult to conduct business on Mondays and Fridays because of a lack of Members in attendance, and it might serve our cause and that of the citizenry even better were we to improve the workweek, complete the session at an earlier date, and so have additional time to spend in the district during the recess. This might serve the constituency as well as Members' families, in a better manner.

Every congressional office these days receives disturbing mail, reminding us of the sacrifices of dedicated people throughout the country in both human life and economic strain, brought about by the war in Vietnam. These conditions are most demanding of our concern and recognition. We had an opportunity yesterday to display, in a very realistic manner, our concerns for all of these problems, by but a very minor sacrifice, and I question whether conditions even warrant that description.

I am sure that everyone would have benefited, whether a Member of this House or a taxpayer and citizen, had we at least shown the courage of conviction to demand a recorded vote. To have done so would have been a great contribution to the entire image of Congress, which presently could stand a compliment.

I am also sure that such action would have made it much easier for us to cope with suggested tax increases, the continuous demand for additional expenditures, and the many other problems that confront the House. We should have displayed an attitude commensurate with the many other suggested needs for budget reductions. The House literally owes to the citizenry such a minimum contribution to the needs of a country that is heavily plagued and burdened by war.

VETERANS' PENSION EQUALITY BILL

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, now that the House of Representatives has approved social security benefit increases, we must make sure that veterans and their dependents, now living on pensions, are not injured by our action. Therefore, I am today introducing a bill to alleviate reductions in veterans' pensions due to social security increases.

The last time we increased social security benefits, thousands of veterans, widows, and other dependents ended up with less money each month due to congressional oversight and overlapping provisions in the two pension systems. We must guard against a repetition of that unfortunate situation.

My bill would refine income limits for the veteran pensions. If this bill meets with the approval of Congress, it will prevent a repetition of last year's problem. It would be unconscionable for Congress to increase benefits, only to discover that many of our veterans, their widows or other dependents, end up with less money.

I urge favorable consideration of this veterans' pension equity bill at the earliest possible moment.

RISING CRIME AND THE COURTS—STATE JUSTICES TAKE A STAND

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Conference of Chief Justices met in Honolulu with justices from 45 States attending. As was to be expected, they were very much concerned with the rising crime rate and the recent series of riots throughout the United States. The chief justices of the highest State courts in the Nation passed a resolution on this issue of which the U.S. Supreme Court should take notice. Among the observations made, this reference to the shackling of law enforcement authorities is being reiterated more and more throughout the land:

Among the causees of the spreading disrespect for law and its enforcement are the publicly held views that it is inordinately difficult, and many times impossible, to convict those who are guilty.

This resolution, adopted unanimously by the chief justices, speaks for itself and needs no further comment. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 28, 1967]

RISING CRIME AND THE COURTS—STATE JUSTICES TAKE A STAND

Why the spread of crime and riots?

Chief justices of the highest State courts in the nation suggest some answers—and some remedies. Without mentioning the U.S. Supreme Court by name, the justices say this:

"Among the causes of the spreading disrespect for law and its enforcement are the publicly held views that it is inordinately difficult, and many times impossible, to convict those who are guilty."

Demanded by the justices: swift and sure punishment for rioting, looting and arson.

The recent Conference of Chief Justices at Honolulu was attended by justices from 45 States. The resolution on this page was adopted on August 4 without a dissenting vote:

"Whereas, the course of events in our nation during the short 19 years of the existence of this Conference of Chief Justices has evidenced a malignant growth of disrespect for and disobedience of law, which in this year has culminated in unprecedented lawlessness and mob violence; and

"Whereas, over the years the members of the Conference have soberly reflected on this tragic course of events and the attitudes which direct it, having at our last meeting, in August, 1966, condemned all forms of disrespect for law by individuals and groups and reminded all of the necessity for reaffirmation of our faith in the rule of law as the only alternative to a lawless society; and

"Whereas, we have again at this assemblage deliberated the dangerously low state of law and order and the increase of crime in our beloved country, and have likewise concerned ourselves with an examination of both cause and effect of these conditions; and

"Whereas, we recognize, as all must, that the causes, whether real or imaginary, of the civil disobedience which is shaking the very bedrock of our political and social structures are manifold, yet it is our studied view that the foremost cause is a lack of respect for law and an utter disregard for its proper enforcement in the mind of a growing number of our citizens; and

"Whereas, if the requisite respect for law on the part of our citizens is to be maintained and enhanced and if civil order is to be preserved it is as imperative that those who breach the law be punished as it is that the innocent be protected, and it is equally essential that it be demonstrated that the law-abiding citizen will receive protection of the law from the lawless as it is that its guarantees will be afforded him who is accused of its breach;

"Therefore, be it resolved by the Conference of Chief Justices:

"1. That the strength and progress of our nation and the enjoyment of rights and liberties by all our citizens have always been and continue to be dependent in large measure upon the self-restraint and self-discipline of our citizens, as manifested by their belief in, respect for, and adherence to the rule of law;

"2. That to insure that we may have change amid order and order amid change, our form of government wisely provides an orderly remedy at the ballot box and in legislative bodies for effecting social change and correcting unjust laws and social injustices, and through the courts for striking down invalid laws and relieving from improper conduct of those charged with the administration of the powers of government;

"3. That those persons and groups who ignore these orderly processes, but instead seek redress of grievances—no matter how deserving—or change in our social order—no matter how much needed—through force, mob violence and riot, accompanied by looting, arson and murder, commit criminal acts of the gravest order, and must be swiftly, fairly and surely prosecuted and punished according to the law which they have violated; such conduct is foreign to the American way of life, and if left unchecked is certain to result in the destruction of the rights and liberties of all our citizens;

"4. That among the causes of the spreading disrespect for law and its enforcement are the publicly held views that it is inordinately difficult, and many times impossible, to convict those who are guilty of the gravest crimes against our society, and that there are unreasonable and unnecessary delays in the administration of justice; that to the extent these views are supported in logic and fact it requires that we, and all our judicial, executive and legislative bodies and agencies, reappraise the laws and procedures which affect the task of the policeman, the prosecutor and the courts in their effort to protect society, to the end that we will successfully meet the challenge of lawlessness;

"5. That as all true Americans have in time of war stanchly supported our armed forces, all Americans must now lend their active support to those who are charged with the onerous task of continuously waging the war on crime and lawlessness; only if we support the policeman, the prosecutor and the courts can they protect us, our rights and the freedom to enjoy them;

"6. That we implore all citizens to deliberately reaffirm their faith in liberty under law."

WHERE HAS THE MONEY GONE?

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations which has been advanced to help the ghetto areas of American cities calls for an infusion of more Federal funds to alleviate substandard conditions. The issue of adequate housing has been listed as an area in which monumental efforts are necessary. Yet some of those who seek refuge in the panacea of Federal funds either overlook or choose to ignore the Federal urban renewal program which has been in existence since 1949. The basic purpose of this program was to remove blighted urban areas and provide low and middle-income housing. Now, after the passage of 18 years it must be concluded that this program has been a failure, to state the case mildly. Senator EDWARD BROOKE, of Massachusetts, recently declared:

More low-income housing has been destroyed than has been built.

In the face of incontrovertible evidence that as far as low-income housing is concerned the urban renewal program has been a colossal flop, proposals calling for more Federal funds still issue forth from some circles.

Some recent developments in the housing field were treated by Mr. Willard Edwards, Chicago Tribune columnist, in the August 22 issue of that paper. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CAPITAL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, August 21.—As a paperback thriller, its title might be The Hundred Billion Dollar Mystery. Suggested subtitles: Where did all the money go? Why did it fail to prevent violent uprising in more than 100 American cities?

One hundred billions is the amount estimated by Chairman George H. Mahon (D., Tex.) of the House appropriations committee as the total appropriated by Congress in recent years to end poverty and improve living conditions in big cities.

Some quiet detective work has been conducted by influential members of Congress in an effort to discover why this vast sum has apparently evaporated with little visible effect on the slum areas it was supposed to benefit.

One of the fields explored was lack of low-income housing, often cited as a cause of civil disorders. A clear-cut conclusion emerged—that maladministration of housing programs has reached a scandalous stage.

A Senate housing subcommittee, after weeks of hearings, has reached a staggering and depressing verdict:

With billions available for many years no truly low-income housing is being built. In fact, more low income housing has been destroyed than has been built. Government red tape has strangled action.

NOT ANXIOUS TO PUBLICIZE VIEW

The subcommittee, headed by Sen. John Sparkman (D., Ala.), a loyal Johnson supporter, is not anxious to publicize this view. It is now wrestling with a plan to pull together "new approaches" to housing legislation, such as some form of subsidizer home ownership for the poor. The Democratic majority will play down past failures.

Meanwhile, Congress is resounding to panick demands for swamping riot-torn cities with fresh billions of dollars. Vice President Humphrey demanded a "Marshall plan" for cities. A Senate labor subcommittee approved a 3 billion dollar emergency slum job and riot damage program and tacked it on a 2.2 billion extension of the war on poverty.

Is more money the answer? Not, it appears, when its spending is entrusted to federal bureaucrats. Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R. Mass.), no foe to higher poverty appropriations, disclosed the story of what happened to one low-cost housing project in his state. With impeccable sponsorship, it

has languished for more than two years, the land lying vacant, because the Federal Housing administration is either unable or unwilling to move.

The mayor of Springfield, Ill., in testimony before the Senate subcommittee, provided an even more fantastic example of a frustrated urban renewal project. A five-block area was cleared by 1959 but eight years later only 24 units have been completed and stand occupied while 300 families vainly seek housing. A squabble between two federal agencies was responsible.

ONLY 40,000 UNITS ARE PRODUCED

With 2 billions available for six years, Brooke said, the FHA should have built 2,400,000 units instead of the 40,000 actually produced. Was the FHA, he asked, trying to prove that "hell is a government bureaucracy?"

Rep. Melvin R. Laird (R., Wis.) noted the words of a prominent liberal, Daniel P. Moynihan, former assistant secretary of labor, that "the mood of the administration is one of paralysis." Government, said Moynihan, is a superb instrument for redistributing power and wealth . . . but as an instrument for providing services, especially to urban lower class Negroes, it is a highly unreliable device. . . .

Laird said the failure of federal poverty and housing programs proved the need for a program of sharing revenue with the states. Congress may be slow to accept this approach but many members are beginning to be dubious that more billions will succeed where 100 billions have failed before. Never, they suspect, as long as the money is funneled thru an army of federal employees, now approaching 3,000,000 in number, who operate in a paper-work jungle, bound by regulations and policies which compound the very problems that spending is supposed to correct.

GUIDELINE FOR DETERMINING ROUTES FOR RURAL MAIL DELIVERY

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I wrote the Postmaster General about the need for updating the regulations which served as the Department's guideline in determining the routes for rural mail delivery. The criteria used was two families per mile.

With the continuing low prices and the technological revolution in agriculture to use larger and larger machinery, thus meaning larger farms, there has necessarily been a continuing exodus of underemployed farm families into cities. Consequently, the population density in rural areas has greatly decreased. The remaining farm families still have as much need, or perhaps even greater, for good mail services. Frequently, many of these people have been forced to drive 4 or 5 miles daily to get their mail, while others may get driveaway mail delivery. At the same time, most all cities of 2,500 people or more get house to house delivery. I have always felt that an unplanned discrimination was taking place, especially when the rural resident was aked to pay the same postage rates as those who were receiving more convenient mail service.

I noted then, with great interest, a section of a speech given by the Postmaster General at Cleveland, Ohio, on August 9, that he had heeded my earlier pleas and was reducing the requirement from two families per mile down to 1½ families per mile. The Postmaster General should be commended for moving in the proper direction of providing nondiscriminatory driveway mail service to all farmers. His press release also stated that this small loosening of requirements will benefit approximately 59,000 families in the rural areas.

POSTHUMOUS COMMISSIONS TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will correct a most serious injustice in the laws which govern the granting of posthumous commissions to American servicemen. Under section 1521 of title 10 of the United States Code, posthumous commissions and warrants are granted when the deceased serviceman has been selected for promotion but is killed in the line of duty before the promotion becomes effective. By granting posthumous commissions the armed services give public recognition to the particular contribution made by those members of the Armed Forces who, as result of their skills and actions, have earned promotion to a higher rank.

At the present time section 1523 of title 10 of the United States Code provides that the survivors of a serviceman who has received a posthumous commission or warrant are not entitled to any bonus, gratuity pay, or allowance as a result of the granting of such commission or warrant.

However, had not death in the course of service to their country cut short their lives too soon, these men would have become entitled to the higher rank and all of the privileges and benefits appurtenant to it.

This is a highly incongruous and inequitable situation for, in addition to earning higher rank by their earlier outstanding conduct, these men have made the greatest possible sacrifice for their country: they died to protect the freedoms and traditions which the rest of us continue to enjoy. This inequity was brought to my attention by one of my constituents whose son recently lost his life while serving with the Coast Guard.

This serviceman, who lost his life while participating in a rescue operation off the coast of Alaska, was a lieutenant at the time of his death. However, before his death he had been selected for promotion to lieutenant commander. Subsequent to his death he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant commander but his widow and children are only entitled to the pension they would have received had he not been promoted.

Because I believe this situation should be immediately corrected, I am introducing this bill which will repeal section 1523 of title 10 of the United States Code. This will enable the armed services to provide the survivors of servicemen who have been granted posthumous commissions with all of the benefits which normally accompany that commission.

The repeal of this provision will provide additional assistance to the families of some of our servicemen who give their lives in the line of duty, will make the granting of commissions much more equitable and will involve only a minimal expenditure of Government funds. I urge my colleagues to consider this bill carefully and to act favorably upon it.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the effective date of this bill is January 1, 1961, which will enable the Armed Forces to provide this additional benefit to the families of all servicemen who have died in the line of duty since the beginning of the Vietnam conflict.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important matters facing the leadership of this Nation is the present plight of the merchant marine industry. I shall not take the House's time to restate the facts of our present situation. This information has been well documented in the RECORD, on the floor of the House, and before our Merchant Marine Committee. The present status of the merchant marine is well understood. It is clearly unable to fulfill its role in our national defense requirements. The war in Vietnam has dramatized this.

I shall not comment on the recent administration proposals concerning the merchant marine. These statements of the Secretary of Transportation stand clearly as a continuation of a no-policy attitude. The Department of Commerce, where the Maritime Administration now resides, simply defers to the Secretary of Transportation in spite of clear expressions of the will of the Congress to the contrary.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a list of suggestions of possible incremental moves that may be made by every segment in the maritime industry—the administration, the Congress, the shipbuilders, the ship operators, labor in the shipyards, labor on the docks, and labor aboard ship. All of these segments of the industry have a responsibility and all may contribute to pulling this industry out of the chaos in which it presently wallows.

I sincerely request that the House, in conjunction with the Senate, accept our responsibility and develop a firm, forward

looking merchant marine policy and program. Time is very short. It must be done this year.

The specific proposals which I would like to suggest may be controversial. But I think that the time has come to get controversial and call names where they need to be called.

With respect to the executive branch:

First. The executive branch must conduct a complete review, within 6 months, of the projected requirements and capabilities of our merchant marine for both commercial and military needs. A particular view to handling of the military requirements in multiple trouble spot situations such as we just went through with the Middle East crisis and Vietnam is essential. This should be done within the executive departments since the Department of Defense only can provide military requirements. However, this review should be done in cooperation with representatives of the maritime industry. This must be done for the simple reason that at the present time, we have no real projections of what our total needs might be. Therefore, it is truly impossible to determine what must really be done in the way of new ship construction in order to bring our merchant marine capability back into line with our future requirements.

Second. The Maritime Administration should be established as an independent agency. It should not be swallowed up in the Department of Transportation. It is big enough to stand alone. The problems it deals with are different from those of other forms of transportation. There would be no difficulty in gaining cooperation between an independent Maritime Administration and other transportation agencies for coordinating an intermodal concept in scheduling and handling of freight.

The present Secretary of Transportation is grossly inexperienced in maritime affairs. He has displayed an amazing lack of understanding of the problems of the industry. He does not seem to know the source of the material which he has given before congressional committees. In fact, he displays what could be termed a "hostile" attitude toward the entire maritime industry.

Third, establish a continuing Committee on the Maritime Industry. This would replace the Maritime Advisory Committee. Membership of the Committee should be from the entire industry. The reason for this is that we do need a continuing committee, advisory only; one that would establish its own rules of procedure and would elect its own officers. Its function should include: (a) forum for industry cooperation; (b) to establish meaningful goals for the merchant marine; (c) to establish short-range objectives toward seeking these goals; (d) to monitor progress within the industry; (e) to make public reports including views which may disagree with other members of the Committee pertaining to the progress toward objectives, administration of existing laws, and suggested changes in the laws; (f) act as a conscience for the American people in matters pertaining to the merchant marine; and (g) monitor foreign trade rates in comparison with treaty agreements. It has been claimed that the rate conferences come to conclusions that are not necessarily carried out in all instances.

Fourth. Place all Navy shipyards on competitive bidding basis for new construction. An adequate overhead assignment could be made. We could then effect certain economies. We are facing massive spending and must look for reductions in spending at any point where possible.

Fifth. Improve procurement procedures by greater standardization, simplification, and multiple orders placed in any given yard. The idea of distributing a number of like ships in different yards because of unemployment statistics is fine from an employment point of view, but is intolerable when talking about construction costs of shipping.

Sixth. Expand and fund the Manpower Development Training Act programs to assist the merchant marine in the yards, on the docks and aboard ship.

Seventh. Expand and revise standard Federal regulations pertaining to design, construction specifications, manning—particularly in view of automation—safety, fire precautions, navigation, and communication equipment.

Eighth. Simplify and expedite Federal requirements pertaining to subsidy bidding determinations, routine paperwork proliferation, inspections in shipyards, design approvals, required auditing practices, and shipboard personnel for inspections.

Ninth. Extend to 5 years the allowable duration of Government cargo contracts where feasible and compatible with congressional appropriations. With the present 1-year limit, the operators are not in a position to bid as economically as they might if they had a 5-year contract.

Tenth. Reconsider and reevaluate the proposal to upgrade old ships for an active reserve fleet. The administration proposal is to upgrade 100 ships at a cost of approximately $3 million each to provide a continuing reserve fleet; $300,000,000 could be better spent on new construction, Mr. Speaker. These ships, even though up-dated and modified, will still find a very precarious position when it comes to the insurance underwriters when they pass the 20- or 25-year mark. If the administration continues this line of thought, then the Congress should refuse to appropriate the $300,000,000.

Eleventh. Evaluate cost effectiveness of national defense equipment required to be aboard all subsidized ships.

Twelfth. Establish "American first" as our cargo policy with a goal of carrying 40 percent of American trade in American flag ships instead of the 7 to 8 percent now being carried.

Thirteenth. Establish a goal to carry 100 percent of all Government cargoes with 80 percent as an absolute minimum. If we knew the truth, we would probably find that we are actually carrying far less than the 50 percent that we think we are carrying in American flags at the present time.

Fourteenth. Tighten up on the waivers under resolution 17 in Public Law 480 cargoes.

Fifteenth. Regarding specific construction recommendations: because we have no adequate projection of what our future merchant marine needs might be, it is difficult to give more than a very general requirement for construction. A recommendation of 250 ships by 1975 seems minimum. This figure is based on the fact that virtually all of our present merchant marine will be obsolete at that time and that the approximate 1,000 ships that we presently are using would therefore have to be replaced.

On the general assumption that new ships are four times as productive as present ships, the requirement then becomes one-fourth of 1,000, or 250. This will simply keep us, Mr. Speaker, in line with the condition that we are in at the present time. This would not upgrade the merchant marine other than by a factor of time.

Sixteenth. Authorize construction of certain passenger ships, but again defer to the findings of this survey, since we do not know what the projected requirements might be. The administration talks in terms of delivering personnel by air and yet looking at the Vietnam situation, we know that the merchant marine must carry 98 percent of the requirements.

Seventeenth. The financing of these might well be done in accordance with a recommendation of the Shipbuilders Council that the Government make amortized payments so that we do not have such large cash outlays during the construction program. The payments would be distributed over a 25-year period. The ships would be in operation and would be contributing to the economy, contributing to the taxes, and contributing to the national income which in turn would be required to make the payments. This may require congressional action.

The 250 ships would cost the Government, at 55-percent subsidy, approximately $2.5 billion plus interest. The amortization method would require about $25 million per year for 25 years for the first flight of ships up to $125 million per year when five flights of 50 ships each were being paid for. A good ship returns far more to the economy than the $500,000 annual payment required.

Action for the Congress:

First. Restrict subsidies to austere designs only. As long as we go on building custom ships, we are going to be paying custom prices. In foreign shipbuilding, we find that one of the reasons they are able to effect low prices is because they build standard ships. Certain variations, of course, are within the realm of possibility without increasing the cost. As the country which has shown the world how to generate mass production, we certainly are guilty of doing nothing about it in the shipbuilding industry.

The blame cannot be leveled at the shipbuilding industry. The blame actually lies with the administration. They have thwarted the opportunity to tool up for mass production of ships.

Second. Prohibit any operating subsidy to ships constructed in foreign yards and subsequently registered under the

United States flag. I do not preclude this for all time. Until our goals are known and what our requirements must be, we must look first to American shipyards and employment of American labor.

Third. Part of the costs that may be reduced because of various incentive systems which result in reduced subsidies should be returned to the yards and to labor so that they will in turn be provided with an incentive to help make greater cost reductions.

Fourth. Conduct hearings on the proper way to control the runaway flagships. A reasonable solution could be devised that would bring more and more shipping back under the control of the American flag to assure control in time of national emergency.

Fifth. Amend the tax laws to allow accelerated depreciation on shipyard improvements and accelerated depreciation on the incremental ship construction costs due to automation. This would give the industry an incentive to move toward the high productivity type of ship.

Sixth. Allow tax credits for investments in approved training programs. Make training costs, including subsistence loans, available to employees in the industry that have the desire to upgrade their own skills.

Seventh. Expand research and development. Maritime research is vital and basic to our economy. The present level of expenditure of $7,500,000 is a disgrace to the country, and to ourselves.

It must be increased, and should include the following:

Nuclear propulsion.

Hull form standardization. Basic cost reductions as a result of simplified and standard tooling and production parts can be a major factor in cost reduction. Ships are now being built in unitized sections which can be added on to existing hulls. Mass production techniques have very real potential. This modular concept of design must be explored.

New innovations are needed in stowage, containerization, cargo handling methods, palletization, and so forth.

Port handling facilities must come under scrutiny. Extensive employment possibilities exist here.

Research is called for on a detachable power unit of a ship, which would include the bridge, all control equipment, the engine room, and propulsion system. It would operate like a seagoing tug that could snap on to an already loaded hull, transfer it across the ocean, unfasten that hull and allow the port adequate time to unload that hull. The power section could immediately pick up another hull and continue on its return voyage. The power unit is the high capital investment of the ship and must be kept on the seas, not in the ports.

Eighth. An evaluation of the FDL versus modern high-speed merchant marine must be investigated by the Congress.

Ninth. Authorize fish factory ships to include canning, freezing, fileting, refrigeration, and fish protein concentrate processing.

The shipbuilding industry:

First. Must develop austere ship designs. These efficient ships can be built by mass production techniques. They must adopt standards models and let the industry choose between them.

Second. Investigate all cost reduction methods including modular construction which appears to be a major factor which shipyards could incorporate to effect substantial savings.

Third. Incentive programs must be developed throughout ship construction.

Ship operators:

First. Must agree on certain standardization of basic characteristics such as hull shape, general structural design, power range. Very little research would provide the answer to the most efficient hull for a given size and type of ship.

Second. Recommendations for standardization of cargo handling methods must be considered for greater efficiency for all ships and port facilities.

Third. The industry should organize a cargo computer center that would adequately handle all requirements for freight, space, for destination, required routing paperwork, et cetera. All of this could be handled very simply through one cargo computer center that would make the most effective use of American-flag ships; that would provide the most efficient routing and scheduling. It would also provide the Congress with an ideal source of statistics, independent of the administration, pertaining to the cargoes that are handled.

Labor is a major factor:

First. Labor in the shipyards must be willing to accept incentive programs to increase productivity in the shipyards.

Second. Must agree to accept training programs.

Third. Must agree to prefab and work simplification processes.

Fourth. Must broaden the skill definitions to eliminate expensive standby time.

On the docks, labor must cooperate with work simplification programs and standardization of dock gang requirements.

Shipboard labor must:

First. Train for automation.

Second. Must accept reduction of crew size where safe and practical on the premise of an increase in the overall industry employment.

Third. Establish mobility of pension funds as a means of stimulating and upgrading of the industry.

Finally, it is important that labor in all the maritime industry explore and research the possibility of the formation of nationwide, industrywide unions, incorporating all skills involved in the maritime industry.

This practice has been found satisfactory in other industries and has proven beneficial to all. Consecutive management-labor disputes within contract periods cannot be tolerated in the national interest.

I am preparing legislation, Mr. Speaker, to implement certain parts of this program. Most of it, however, will require the creative leadership of the executive branch, the cooperative spirit and new ideas of the maritime industry—labor, management, and Government.

It is time that we decided to work together for the common goal of steering a great industry out of the storms of indecision and inaction, and back on the right course toward progress and growth.

LEGISLATION TO HALT TRAINING OF ARAB AND OTHER FOREIGN MILITARY PERSONNEL FROM COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE SEVERED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to bring an immediate halt to all U.S. military training of foreign personnel when the country from which the trainee originates severs diplomatic relations with our Nation. The situation which arose during the most recent Arab-Israel conflict must not be permitted to continue with regard to this particular conflict or any other that may explode in the future.

Presently, Mr. Speaker, our country is continuing to provide military training for eight Iraqi and 12 Sudanese military personnel. Both of these nations have severed diplomatic relations with the United States as a result of the Middle East war that erupted in June of this year. Both of these countries, curiously enough, have ordered their diplomats to return home, while allowing their military trainees to remain in the United States.

During the fiscal year 1967, 42 military personnel from Iraq, 24 from Sudan, and 11 from Syria received military training in the United States. Within the last 4 years the United States has given military training to 331 foreign nationals from five Arab nations that severed diplomatic relations with the United States as a result of the recent Arab-Israel confrontation. I believe that if we allow this military training to continue we will establish a paradox that is inconsistent with our Nation's role in international affairs. I see no reason why this country should continue training military personnel who return home to undertake military actions against the interests of this country or those of our allies.

Upon the eruption of hostilities in the Middle East our State Department chose to permit students of countries which have severed diplomatic relations with us, and who were then in this country receiving military training, to complete their training program. Some of these students, on their own initiative, returned home, perhaps to pilot Soviet-built jets to be used against Israel. As of July 28, eight Iraqi and 12 Sudanese military students were still receiving training in the United States.

The State Department defends these military assistance programs on the theory that to train the country's military personnel will be to increase our Na-

tion's effective presence in their diplomatic arena. But these are nations which have unilaterally chosen to sever diplomatic relations. When such relations are resumed there will be an opportunity to consider whether such training should be continued.

While it is true that the military plays a key role in many underdeveloped societies, and by training the future military leaders of these nations we have provided exposure to the U.S. military doctrine as well as to life in the United States, this exposure does not seem to have the result the State Department contends for it.

The bill I am introducing today provides that when diplomatic relations between the United States and a foreign country are severed, no national of such foreign country shall be eligible to receive or continue military training until such time as diplomatic relations between our country and the foreign nation are resumed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the import of the legislation I am introducing today. If we fail to bring to a halt military training programs custom tailored to suit the military needs of nations which have declared to the world that they are our adversaries, we are simply encouraging an anomalous situation that is clearly contrary to our Nation's security.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to clarify two questions with respect to the so-called minority staffing section of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967. First, does this section give the minority an advantage of committee staff at the expense of the majority? Second, would I favor this provision if I were a member of the majority party?

The answer to the first question is "No"; to the second, "Yes."

Let me point out that section 301 of S. 355 provides for a number of the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the Organization of the Congress, including those for an overall increase in the number of professional staff members assigned to the standing committees, for the hiring of consultants, for specialized training for professional staff, equalization of pay, and other matters.

On the question of staff specifically for the minority, the bill provides simply that in the event minority members are not receiving adequate assistance on a particular committee, they may ask the committee to hire one or two additional professional staff members to serve them.

S. 355 ASSURES MINORITY STAFFING

If minority members of a committee are satisfied with existing staff arrangements—as appears to be the case on many committees—the status quo obtains. However, in the event minority members of a committee are not receiving adequate assistance in connection with committee business, S. 355 amends existing law to provide that they may select for appointment one or two professional staff members. The committee would be required upon request by a majority of the minority members to appoint the person or persons selected by such members.

If there is no vacancy on the staff at the time of such appointment, the bill provides for a temporary increase in the overall number of professional staff members until such vacancy occurs. So this is not taking any staff positions from the majority. The new appointee is paid from the contingent fund of the House until a vacancy occurs.

THE COST—IN PERSPECTIVE

As to the cost of the provision, I have no idea what it might come to, because I have no idea how many of these positions will be requested. Whatever it is, the cost will be negligible. As Senator MONRONEY has pointed out in the other body, the entire cost of running House and Senate together is less than the cost of operating the office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the executive branch.

I think it would be helpful in clarifying this question to quote from the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. I would again like to remind my colleagues that all of the committee's recommendations carry the bipartisan, unanimous endorsement of the committee.

From the final report:

> It was the intent of the 1946 act that committee staff should be professional and nonpartisan . . . Most standing committees of both Houses have observed this requirement. Staff vacancies on these committees have been filled on a nonpartisan basis and the staff has served the needs of both majority and minorty members. Many committees have staff members who have served through several changes of party control.
>
> Unfortunately, on other committees the minority has been denied access to adequate staff. It is fundamental to our legislative system that the opposition have adequate resources to prepare informed dissent or alternative courses of action. All sides of an issue need to be forcefully presented.
>
> The majority has responsibility for the administration of the committee's business and for providing staff that will assist in the presentation of party or individual political viewpoint. In seeking to provide protection for the minority, it would be an error to divide the entire staff of each committee along partisan lines. . . . However, the minority should be entitled to appoint two professional staff positions and one clerical position as a safeguard for their rights.

MINORITY STAFFING IMPORTANT

The whole point of the minority staffing provision is that the minority party should have at least a minimum guarantee of professional staff assistance on congressional committees. It is not a question of numbers per se, or of ratios, or of trying to lessen the effectiveness of the majority. As I tried to explain in "The Need for Increased Staffing" in "We Propose: A Modern Congress":

> The needs of congressional committees go beyond the question of sheer size of a staff and reach to the problem of making possible an effective distinction between majority and minority positions in order to facilitate meaningful floor debate and responsible problem solving. As long as Congress is organized on the basis of a differentiation between majority and minority roles, even at the committee level, it is not realistic to expect adequate legislation to evolve from a "nonpartisan" staff arrangement.

In response to the question, "Would I favor the minority staffing provision if I were a member of the majority party?" I conclude by quoting the final paragraph of my chapter, mentioned above:

> This concern on my part does not stem entirely from the fact that I am a member of the current minortiy party. Although it is true we feel the brunt of this staff deprivation at the moment, I expect to feel no differently when my party is in the majority. Effective criticism from the loyal opposition is essential to good government regardless of which party is in control.

HALPERN BILL WOULD ESTABLISH GREAT WHITE FLEET TO FIGHT HUNGER AND DISEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have again introduced legislation to establish a Great White Fleet designed to tender assistance and aid on a continuing basis to people of other nations for the purpose of combating hunger and disease. This fleet would also be available to render emergency aid in the event of any disaster.

This idea was first conceived in 1959 by Navy Comdr. Frank Manson, and was widely acclaimed then. Captain Manson envisioned a group of ships centered around various areas of concentration, such as medical and public health aid and training and education, and electrical power and construction.

These ships would be free to travel extensively to carry out concrete, specific, and immediate programs in areas with limited overland and air access. They would operate on a basis of mutual participation and self-help, demonstrating honest American desire to help struggling people without forcing ourselves upon them in any way; without making them feel an unwelcome sense of obligation for outright handouts.

Senator HUMPHREY and others introduced a Senate resolution in 1959 which was passed, but on which no further action was taken or planned. I have repeatedly submitted legislation in this House to implement this idea, and have urged others to join me.

We can no longer afford to allow this imaginative project to remain unimplemented and unproductive. We need only the will and the vision to put our intelligence and commonsense to work toward realizing a practical and surefooted way to bring modern medical care, education, technology, and productivity to those who so desperately need them.

The White Fleet is a practical, economical, and sensitive approach to our "nation-building" efforts.

Today, I am again introducing legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to establish a fleet of presently mothballed Navy vessels. These would be outfitted with Government and privately donated funds and equipment.

Although the fleet would be administered by the Agency for International Development, the bill authorizes the cooperation and participation of knowledgeable private groups. Interagency coordination is also urged, with AID acting as a contractor to the Navy, the Army, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, and so on.

In order to establish a trial fleet of three LST's, AID would require an initial appropriation of $6 to $7.5 million to pull the ships out of mothballs and to outfit them. This estimate would be subject to change, depending on the initial size of the fleet, which could be easily adjusted. Refurbishing and outfitting costs would not require duplication in subsequent appropriations.

A large part of the necessary supplies and equipment would be procured at no cost from surplus stores and private donations. We are presently spending money to keep many Navy ships in mothballs. Instead of lying dormant and useless they could be performing a very worthwhile and needed service. The Government's financial responsibility would be substantially discharged with the reconditioning and would be minimal for maintenance costs.

This legislation would also provide an opportunity to utilize the counterpart funds, the foreign currencies owned by the United States, which cannot be converted into dollars and which are presently resting in overseas vaults while effective means of channeling them are sought.

The Great White Fleet may sound like unrestrained idealism, but, in fact, the practicality of this concept has already been unequivocally demonstrated by the tremendously successful career of the medical ship, *Hope*, which has been voyaging around the world for 7 years.

The Navy donated a mothballed hospital ship to the project, which is otherwise privately administered and funded. As of 1965 more than $6 million worth of equipment, drugs, and supplies had been donated by business firms.

The Saturday Review of July 15, 1967, stated:

> The ship is so popular within the medical profession that it has a waiting list of doctors (they serve in 2-month shifts—for free).

Since 1960 the *Hope* has traveled to Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, Guinea, Nicaragua, and now Colombia, treating sufferers, and training people in the medical and paramedical fields. By 1965 more than 30 countries had invited visits, and 3,000 people had received training through Project Hope.

The particular success of *Hope* may be explained in large part by the fact that it is a ship. The flexibility, mobility, and autonomy of a ship make it especially well suited to foreign aid.

Because it is a mobile, self-administered, and organized community, it imposes no obligation on the nations it visits but is at all times fully responsible for its own maintenance and existence. Tensions and resentments are far less likely to arise than from comparable stationary foreign aid programs which may necessitate long-range and perhaps uncomfortable commitments on the part of the host country.

Ships have access to remote undeveloped areas where aid programs often cannot enter. The construction ship of the fleet could make the first efforts toward road and transportation developments in such areas.

The excellent response to the Peace Corps and to *Hope* attests to the success and practicality of volunteer support to staff such imaginative humanitarian causes.

The White Fleet would support a small permanent core of employees paid minimal wages, but would be largely manned by volunteers. Retired people, military reserves trained in engineering and technical fields, medical personnel, and ex-Peace Corpsmen are all promising sources of volunteers.

The White Fleet would be in an excellent position to coordinate diverse small-scale private aid groups such as *Hope*, Medico, and Care, and the Navy's efforts in the area of civic action, such as the Seabees technical assistance teams, Operation Handclasp, and the naval medical research units.

The Great White Fleet unifies a certain form of foreign aid into an organized, appealing, and identifiable force which easily symbolizes constructive action and sincere desire to help alleviate poverty, disease, and ignorance wherever they prevent people from fulfilling themselves.

The Saturday Review pointed out that—

> In an insane world of idiotic spending for fratricidal wars and "defense," the comparatively small expenditures for S.S. *Hope* have lighted a tiny, inexpensive candle in the darkness. Imagine America's image, to say nothing of the world's health, if a thousand ships of *Hope* moved upon the waters of the earth for the alleviation of the ills of mankind. The possibilities for peace in a healthy world stagger the imagination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Congress act on my bill proposing this unique but effective instrument for enhancing international development and understanding. This will do more good for the U.S. image abroad than many more expensive aid programs.

We are a great nation of enormous wealth and knowledge. In a spirit of both generosity and enlightened self-interest in the future of our Nation and the world, let us help those who are deprived, sick, and hungry. And let us do so intelligently and sensitively, with creative programs such as a White Fleet, that can mobilize American support, and render service quietly, effectively, and efficiently.

We should act immediately and appropriate the necessary funds—probably not exceeding $500,000—for a comprehensive study of the proposed Great White Fleet, by a task force which will investigate the most efficient and productive means of implementing the fleet. It will determine its final makeup, mode of operation, administration and management structures, the estimated costs, and the extent to which private support may be generated.

DISORDERLY CONDUCT IN THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the present state of the law applicable to disorderly or other offensive conduct within the Capitol is best understood by an examination of the historical development of such laws.

In 1892 Congress provided the District of Columbia with an act for "the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property . . ." (act of July 29, 1892, 27 Stat. 322, ch. 320). In section 6 of that act it was declared unlawful for persons to congregate and assemble and engage in loud and boisterous talking in the Capitol and certain other buildings. A maximum fine of $25 was imposed. Section 15 of that act provided that persons guilty of such disorderly and unlawful conduct in or about public buildings belonging to the United States shall be liable for a maximum fine of $50.

In section 18 Congress provided that prosecutions for violations of that act were to be conducted by the District of Columbia—Corporation Counsel. Section 18 was codified in title 22, District of Columbia Code, section 109.

Section 6 was amended July 8, 1898. The effect of this amendment was not substantive but merely unified sections 5 and 6 of the act of 1892 into one section. This section was then codified into 22 District of Columbia Code 1107.

However, section 15 was not amended in 1898 and has not been amended to the present date. Section 15 was codified into 22 District of Columbia Code 3111 and also into 40 United States Code 101. Its proscription of conduct in U.S. buildings and the $50 fine remain unchanged.

In 1946, Congress enacted a statute to regulate the use of the U.S. Capitol Grounds (act of July 31, 1946, 60 Stat. 718, ch. 707). That act is codified in 9 District of Columbia Code 118 and the following. Section 6 proscribed haranguing or orating or uttering loud, threatening, or abusive language in the U.S. Capitol Grounds. The 1948 act provided a maximum of $100 and/or 60 days' punishment (9 D.C. Code 125). But section 16(a) (9 D.C. Code 132) specifically excluded conduct within the Capitol Building. Section 16(b) provided that section 3111—section 15 of the act of 1892 relating to the $50 fine for conduct inside the Capitol—was to remain unaffected by the act of 1946.

Thus, the Congress left us with the anomaly of a maximum $50 fine for conduct within the Capitol Building and a maximum fine of $100 for enumerated but similar conduct on the Capitol Grounds.

In 1953 the Congress again amended section 6 of the act of 1892 (22 D.C. Code 1107) and raised the maximum fine from

$25 to $250 and/or 90 days, and created a new disorderly conduct statute subsequently codified in 22 District of Columbia Code 1121. The new law read in part as follows:

Whoever, with the intent to provoke a breach of the peace or under circumstances that a breach of the peace may be organized thereby—

(1) acts in such a manner as to annoy, disturb, interfere with, obstruct, or be offensive to others;

(2) congregates with others on a public street and refuses to move on when ordered by the police;

(3) shouts or makes a noise either inside or outside a building during the nighttime to the annoyance or disturbance of any considerable number of persons;

Section 1121 does not specify any particular geographical location for the disorderly conduct under subsection (1), thus allowing for application of the statute anywhere in the District of Columbia. However, section 1107—section 6 of the act of 1892—specifies particular places.

It is significant that the 1953 amendment neglected any mention of 22 District of Columbia Code 3111—section 15 of the act of 1892. Thus, while the penalties for disorderly conduct in places other than the Capitol building were increased to $250 and/or 90 days, no increase was made and in fact no reference was made to conduct within or about the Capitol as proscribed in 22 District of Columbia Code 3111. The immediate apparent conclusion to be drawn from that anomalous circumstance is that Congress inadvertently neglected to consider amending section 3111. But in 1946 Congress did remember that particular provision and specifically chose not to alter or amend it when Congress enacted legislation for the Capitol Grounds—16(b) act of 1946.

In view of Congress failure to increase the $50 penalty for disorderly conduct within or about the Capitol in 1946, and Congress silence as to the $50 provision in 1953, section 3111—section 15 of the act of 1892—continues to control the punishment for disorderly conduct in or about the Capitol Building, notwithstanding the greater penalties under 22 District of Columbia Code 1121 or 1107.

This curious state of the law came into focus 2 years ago when a large group of demonstrators converged on the Capitol Grounds and began chanting and orating. The police repeatedly ordered them to disperse and leave the Capitol Grounds, but they refused and were finally arrested. The defendants were charged and prosecuted under both 22 District of Columbia Code 1107 and 1121. In that case, *Feeley* v. *District of Columbia* (220 A. 2d 325 (1966)), — U.S. App. D.C. —, — F. 2d — (No. 20275 (1967)), the District of Columbia Court of Appeals held that although prosecutions for disorderly conduct in or about the U.S. Capitol may be brought under 22 District of Columbia Code 1121 or 1107, for purposes of sentence 22 District of Columbia Code 3111 applies, and the maximum sentence for such disorderly conduct is $50. The court arrived at this conclusion by reading 22 District of Columbia Code 1121, 1107, and section 16 (b) of the act of 1946 together and concluded that a "clear legislative pattern" is discernible requiring the application of section 3111 for sentencing.

Although the act of 1946 provided new and higher penalties—$100 and/or 60 days—for certain specified kinds of disorderly conduct—harangues, loud, threatening, or abusive language, and so forth—in the Capitol Grounds, by excepting section 3111—section 15 of the act of 1892—the act made similar disorderly conduct—sections 1121 and 1107—in or about the Capitol punishable only up to $50 fine. To single out the enumerated 1946 act conduct for punishment up to $100 and/or 60 days and yet to punish sections 1121 and 1107 conduct with only $50 fine while punishing sections 1121 and 1107 conduct up to $250 and/or 90 days for offenses off the Capitol Grounds and in other non-Federal public buildings is illogical. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals, in Feeley, supra, calls this state of the law the result of a clear legislative pattern. The U.S. Court of Appeals in *Smith, et al.* v. *District of Columbia* (219 A. 2d 841 (1966)), — U.S. App. D.C. —, F. 2d — (No. 20279 (July 29, 1967)) calls the reason for this situation "not readily apparent." The corporation counsel calls it, in the appellee's brief in Smith, supra, "obviously due to a congressional oversight." I leave the proper conclusion to the omniscient.

PROSECUTION

The next problem arising under this subject is which sovereign, the United States or the District of Columbia, is the proper prosecutor. Here again confusion exists. To understand this perplexing question, it is necessary to keep in mind 23 District of Columbia Code 101 which follows:

CONDUCT OF PROSECUTIONS—PARTY PLAINTIFF

The attorney for the District of Columbia shall be known as the Corporation Counsel.

Prosecutions for violations for all police or municipal ordinances or regulations and for violations of all penal statutes in the nature of police or municipal regulations, where the maximum punishment is a fine only, or imprisonment not exceeding one year shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia and by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants. All other criminal prosecutions shall be conducted in the name of the United States and by the attorney of the United States for the District of Columbia or his assistants.

It is well settled that where the maximum punishment is both a fine and imprisonment the District of Columbia has no authority to prosecute. *District of Columbia* v. *Simpson* (40 App. D.C. 498 (1913)). This old rule was reaffirmed in Smith, supra.

In section 18 of the act of 1892 (22 D.C. Code 109), the District of Columbia was specifically authorized to prosecute disorderly conduct thereunder (22 D.C. Code 1107 and 3111 disorderly conduct), even though that act provided for a fine only. Since 23 District of Columbia Code 101 the general prosecutorial authorization was not enacted into law until 1901 (March 3, 1901, 31 Stat. 1340, ch. 854), the specific prosecutorial authorization provided in section 18 of the act of 1892 was codified in 22 District of Columbia Code 109. In 1953 the punishment for 1107 disorderly conduct—section 6 of the act of 1892—was increased to a fine and imprisonment. By the same amendment, a new statute, 22 District of Columbia Code 1121, proscribing disorderly conduct, with both a fine of $250 and imprisonment for 90 days, was created. Yet, in this new statute, providing both fine and imprisonment, it was declared that the District of Columbia should prosecute violations thereunder, thus amending 22 District of Columbia Code 109. This particular authorization for prosecution by the District of Columbia supervened that prohibition set out in 23 District of Columbia Code 101 which prohibited such prosecution by the Corporation Counsel.

Section 109—section 18 of the act of 1892—was in 1953 amended and now provides in part as follows:

All prosecutions for violation of Section 22-1121 or any of the provisions of any of the laws or ordinances provided for by this Act shall be conducted in the name of and for the benefit of the District of Columbia, and in the same manner as provided by the law for the prosecution of offenses against the laws and ordinances of the said District * * *.

"This Act" refers to the act of 1892. Thus it is clear that prosecutions for section 1107, disorderly conduct—section 6 of the act of 1892—are to be conducted by the District of Columbia even though the 1953 amendment increased the punishment to fine and imprisonment. But the U.S. Court of Appeals misses that point in Smith, supra, where it said on page 4 of the slip opinion:

So far as we are advised, there is no specific exemption of this section from the requirements of 23-101, such as was provided in respect to section 1121.

The court was there referring to section 1107 when it said, by way of dicta, that there was no statutory exemption from 23 District of Columbia Code 101 for section 1107 to permit the corporation counsel to prosecute under section 1107. That conclusion ignores the statutory derivation of 1107 section 6 of the act of 1892. The court implies by that comment that the District of Columbia is not the proper party prosecutor for 1107 disorderly conduct and yet it holds in the opinion that the District of Columbia is the proper party prosecutor for 1121 disorderly conduct. That conclusion seems to ignore the plain meaning of the language in 22 District of Columbia Code 109. Even the U.S. Court of Appeals is confused by the uncertain meaning of the present applicable statutes with respect to disorderly conduct.

This confusion is compounded when we look at the judicial interpretation of the question of which sovereign properly prosecutes under 22 District of Columbia Code 3112—prohibits destroying or defacing certain property. Section 3112 is the sister section to 3111 as both sections derive directly from the act of 1892. Section 3112 is derived from section 1 of the act of 1892 and section 3111 is derived from section 15 of the act of 1892. The act of 1892 provided that the District of Columbia is the proper party prosecutor for violations arising thereunder. That authority is codified in 22 District of Columbia Code 109.

Section 3112, which provided a $50 fine only, was amended in 1906 to provide the greater punishment of up to $100 and/or 6 months. As noted earlier, sister section

3111 has not been amended. Notwithstanding the clear mandate of section 109—section 18 of the act of 1892—but because 3112 provides for both fine and imprisonment—as do 1107 and 1121—the court said in *District of Columbia* v. *Moody* (175 A. 2d 782, 113 U.S. App. D.C. 67, 304 F. 2d 943 (1962)) that prosecutions were to be by the U.S. attorney and not by the District of Columbia. The court came to that dubious conclusion by relying solely on 23 District of Columbia Code 101. This per curiam opinion ignores the section 109 exemption and its evolution from the act of 1892. This District of Columbia Court of Appeals could not explain this curious result and glossed over the apparent inconsistency between 109 and Moody by way of a footnote in Feeley.

Further paradox is seen in the fact that disorderly conduct on the Capitol Grounds prohibited by the 1946 act (9 D.C. Code 123, 40 U.S.C. 193f) is patently required to be prosecuted by the U.S. attorney (9 D.C. Code 125, 40 U.S.C. 193s). It is also significant to note that such disorderly conduct—including the loud, threatening, or abusive language, and so forth—is prohibited only on the Capitol Grounds and not in the actual Capitol Building (9 D.C. Code 132, 40 U.S.C. 193m).

One other provision of law comes to mind as of possible application to occasions of disorderly conduct within the Capitol. That provision is the so-called unlawful entry statute (22 D.C. Code 3102), set out as follows:

UNLAWFUL ENTRY ON PROPERTY

Any person who, without lawful authority, shall enter, or attempt to enter, any public or private dwelling, building or other property, or part of such dwelling, building, or other property, against the will of the lawful occupant or the person lawfully in charge thereof, or being therein or thereon, without lawful authority to remain therein or thereon shall refuse to quit the same on the demand of the lawful occupant or of the person lawfully in charge thereof, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or imprisonment in the jail for not more than 6 months, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Although this statute can be applied to entry into the Capitol or House gallery, the problems of prosecution thereunder are serious. The question of entry "without lawful authority" is one of some gravity, especially in view of the policy of permitting visitors into the gallery without knowing their prior intentions. Conversely, the question of demanding persons to "quit" the premises raises the problem of who is the person lawfully in charge. It would appear that the proper person lawfully in charge in the House of Representatives is the Speaker. The difficulty of applying his personal request for persons to quit the gallery is formidable. Also, compounding the problem as to use of this statute is that the Speaker then must be the complaining witness for the purpose of prosecution. Without some more flexible arrangement such as delegation of authority by the Speaker to a person "lawfully in charge of the premises," this statute is of questionable value under which to prosecute conduct within the Capitol or House gallery.

In light of the foregoing analysis of the various potentially applicable statutes, it is understandable that those persons who were arrested for intruding into the gallery of the House on Monday, August 7, were arrested by the Capitol Police for "disorderly conduct"—presumably 22 District of Columbia Code 1107 or 1121. The police do not select the particular statute under which persons are to be prosecuted. They merely "book" arrested persons at the proper precinct under the general heading of "disorderly conduct." It remains to the prosecutor, in this case the corporation counsel, to determine under which statute to charge the defendants. This prosecution falls to the corporation counsel since the disorderly conduct laws generally used by the police are sections 1107 and 1121 of the District of Columbia Code. Prosecutions under those two sections are brought in the District of Columbia branch of the court of general sessions where the corporation counsel is the prosecutor. Smith, supra, implies, however, that the corporation counsel is not the proper prosecutor under section 1107.

In the case of the recent gallery demonstrators, the nine persons arrested were taken by the police to No. 1 precinct where they were "booked" for disorderly conduct. The minimum required collateral for violations of the general disorderly statutes is set by the court of general sessions board of judges. Persons "booked" in the precinct are permitted to post the minimum required collateral and gain their freedom. At the time of posting collateral persons arrested may elect to notify the precinct officer whether they wish to "forfeit" the collateral or stand trial on the charge. The usual course followed in forfeiture elections is that the prosecutor does not subsequently bring a formal charge against the defendant requiring appearance in court, although the prosecutor may subsequently demand the appearance of the defendant even though he has "elected to forfeit."

In cases where the defendant elects to stand trial, a date is set by the prosecuting officer, usually the officer's next court date. In this case the nine persons arrested in the gallery have elected to stand trial and are appearing in the court of general sessions on September 15, 1967.

Many Members have raised the complaint that $10 collaterals are not commensurate with the gravity of the conduct herein involved. Others have criticized the court of general sessions for permitting release with only $10 posted. These comments fail to recognize that there is in existence an order by the board of judges—promulgated April 19, 1965—which permits, in cases for which minimum collateral may be posted, the chief officer of the precinct to have a judge of the court of general sessions pass on the sufficiency of the minimum collateral. Under this order the officer may call, by telephone, any judge of that court when in the officer's opinion special facts or serious extenuating circumstances exist. That judge may then set such collateral or bond as he deems reasonably necessary to assure the protection of the community and to assure the defendant's return. This special provision was not utilized by the officer in charge of No. 1 precinct when these nine arrested persons were booked. They, therefore, were released on the minimum required collateral.

From the foregoing review of the confused and questionable state of the present applicable law to the question of conduct in the House gallery or Capitol Building, it appears that the only practicable method of proceeding against persons such as those recently arrested is under the general disorderly conduct laws—22 District of Columbia Code 1107 and 1121. But it is apparent that, notwithstanding the $250 and/or 90 days' penalties provided thereunder, the only penalty that can be assessed against defendants convicted for disorderly conduct in or about the Capitol is a maximum fine of $50. This is clearly the holding in the Feeley case, and in the companion case, Jalbert against District of Columbia (221 A. 2d 94 (1966)).

The incredible disparity between punishments for disorderly conduct that occurs elsewhere in the District, including public buildings, and that for disorderly conduct within or about the Capitol, coupled with the dubious applicability of the statutes herein previously discussed, dramatizes the need for clear, precise, and effective legislation.

H.R. 9837—HOUSE MEMBERS' TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to me that the House approved H.R. 9837, to permit reimbursement for a maximum of 12 trips per year to his district for each Member of Congress. I have great respect for the House Committee on Administration and I realize that the bill is offered in an effort to relieve the Members of some of the heavy burden of the cost of holding office which confronts each of us. I realize also that in all the Government it is only Members of Congress who are not reimbursed for all official travel. Nevertheless, it appears to me that we have a responsibility and an opportunity to demonstrate leadership by holding down the costs of Government, and this should be paramount in our thoughts. Particularly is this true when the Nation is confronted with a huge deficit, when costs of Government are going up on every side, and when the President is asking for an increase in taxes. We in Congress should be first to tighten our belts and seek to point the way to reduced costs of Government, not to higher costs.

ALEWIFE CONTROL IN THE GREAT LAKES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to aid in the restoration of a favorable ecology in the Great Lakes. The bill relates specifically to the alewife, an anadromous marine fish which by some method reached the fresh waters of the Great Lakes. Although present in Lake Ontario in 1873, it was not noted in Lake Erie until 1931. By 1954 it had reached Lake Superior. Within the last few years the species has become a major problem to many communities along the Great Lakes as a result of the massive die-offs which occur. So abundant is the alewife that schools of the fish at times clog water intakes of municipalities and industries. Tons of the fish are washed ashore where they constitute a nuisance and a threat to public health.

My bill calls for an appropriation of $5 million to be used in studying both the life history of the alewife and of control measures, and in developing and carrying out control methods and developing commercial uses of the alewife. Matching funds would be provided by the States involved.

Fortunately the situation within my district at the western end of Lake Erie is not so critical as that in other parts of the Great Lakes. It is my understanding that the most severe occurrences are in Lake Michigan and that the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries office in Ann Arbor, Mich., is currently studying the problem. The complexity of the problem, coupled with its wide geographic distribution, demands a greater effort on our part to provide the means of restoring an ecological balance.

It is essential that the idea of restoring an ecological balance be stressed rather than any attempt to eliminate the alewife. For the species does possess economic potential. Moreover there have been too many instances in the past where attempts to completely remove a life form have resulted in expensive and biologically disruptive failures.

What is needed, beyond this immediate legislation, is a consideration of the sequential disasters which have plagued the Great Lakes, as a large, complex but interrelated problem, rather than as a series of isolated incidents.

There are doubtless many of my colleagues from all sections of the Nation who are familiar with the ravages caused by the sea lampreys upon the Great Lakes trout population. The near extinction of the trout and the recent apparently successful control of the lampreys are classic examples of species interaction and wildlife management. The further studies envisioned by the bill I am introducing may reveal a substantial connection between the previous lamprey problem and development of the current alewife crisis.

The alewife population explosion and resultant problems are of concern not only to those elected to represent the Great Lakes constituencies, and agencies of the National and State governments working in the area, but to the scientific community at large. Therefore, I urge prompt congressional action to provide control of the alewife and other fish and aquatic animals in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the ecological balance of the Great Lakes.

UNITED STATES MUST WIN OTHER WAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, quite recently one of my constituents—an energetic and dedicated American—was privileged to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation attending the 43d session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council in Geneva.

This man, Mr. Philip I. Berman, is a transportation executive and civic leader in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania. His record of service to community, State, and Nation is long and manyfaceted.

On this occasion, Mr. Berman was one of four private citizens serving on the delegation. His role was that of adviser and his primary interest was the United National Institute for Training and Research.

Although much of the work of the Economic and Social Council during its Geneva session was obscured in publicity surrounding a Russian effort to have the Council condemn Israel role in the recent Middle East crisis, Mr. Berman has recounted many of the achievements in a newspaper interview.

I respectfully include this interview, as reported by Mr. Curt Yeske in the Allentown Morning Call, in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

MUST WIN "OTHER WAR," BERMAN SAYS—RETURNS FROM U.N. SESSION IN GENEVA

(By Curt Yeske)

Most of the eye-catching news from Vietnam concerns the military war. News of that "other war," the effort at economic and social development, is not near as plentiful because it is far less dramatic and, therefore, holds little public interest.

And unfortunately, the United Nations is confronted with the same situation around the world. That is the view of Philip I. Berman.

Berman, Lehigh Valley transportation executive and civic leader, is back home in Allentown after spending nearly a month in Geneva, Switzerland, as an adviser on the United States delegation to the 43rd session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC.)

He was one of four private citizens who, along with 10 career government officers and workers, comprised the delegation.

Berman's primary interest was the United National Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR.) His address before the 27-member nation council included remarks about a pioneering UNITAR effort to determine what type of news and opinion concerning the United Nations is reaching the public via mass media.

The need for the research was emphasized by the session which opened July 11.

For the first two weeks, the meetings were bogged down by the Soviet Union's misplaced and unsuccessful attempts to have Israel condemned for its confrontation with the Arab nations.

Although the resolution should have gone before the U.N.'s Security Council at New York, it was the major news story emerging from ECOSOC's meeting, originally called to consider world social and economic issues.

ECOSOC holds the same status on the U.N. organizational chart as the Security Council. But world attention was focused on the "jawing" and verbal battles in the Security Council while the constructive work of ECOSOC went nearly unnoticed by a large part of the world, Berman contended.

ECOSOC's general agenda in the field of economics covered multilateral food aid including production and use of protein; financial assistance for less developed nations; flow of public and private capital to the developing countries; and a 10-year plan to succeed the first U.N. Development Decade launched in 1960.

Berman, a national leader among U.N. advocates, said he was concerned these programs and proposals are too frequently overlooked by the public, and, therefore, fail to win deserved, widespread understanding and support.

"We need all people raised to respectable social and economic levels of our own welfare from the viewpoint of world security," Berman asserted.

He referred to a quote from an address to the council by Ambassador Arthur E. Goldschmidt, U.S. representative on ECOSOC. He said:

"There is nothing inevitable about a world food crisis. There does not need to be a shortage of necessary food on this planet."

He said mankind has the technical knowledge to overcome the problem through food production and population control. The only thing needed is application of the knowledge, the ambassador added.

Berman expanded on the human and economic implications of an underfed nation.

"A man must be healthy to be able to work. If he can work then he can produce and you have production. But if you don't have food, you don't have a healthy worker and there is no production.

"But you must also have a healthy mother in order to have a healthy child who someday, in one way or another, will be contributing to the country's development."

One of the problems in the area of food aid, Berman observed, is national pride. He said some nations object to certain stipulations which come with U.S. or U.N. assistance.

But despite the volume, U.S. aid to the underdeveloped countries is much less in ratio of the gross national product than that of most smaller European nations, he said.

An extensive world traveler in his own right, Berman came back from this trip with a high regard for the U.S. representatives and the State Department.

"The delegation was led by brilliant people who are honest and sincere in their work for peace and world welfare. They are very able, excellent and capable people in whom United States citizens can be proud.

"Individually and collectively, they have the respect of most countries of the world. We found that the countries that criticize us the most are the ones that respect us the most."

The sessions began at 8:30 a.m. daily with a briefing of the U.S. delegation. The council convened in the morning and worked into the afternoon. Business was continued in the evening and into the night at social functions.

And it was at the social gatherings that much of the rapport was established among the representatives from tthe member nations that ranged from the Soviet Union to Gabon.

Although the schedule was strenuous, Berman drew delight in recalling how he and his wife Muriel became acquainted and fell easily into warm conversation with their counterparts from other countries including Russia.

The socials proved an expeditious influence for creating understanding around the conference table, Berman said.

The couple was accompanied by their children, Steven, 16, Nancy, a June Wellesley graduate, and Nina, a Connecticut College student.

Steven attended every daytime session with his father and joined his parents at the evening dinners and social gatherings.

The mission obviously revitalized Berman's already deep faith in the United Nations.

"It is a place for our differences to be expressed and likened, not to be expanded. This is where the United Nations is serving.

"If we keep talking and become friendlier there's no question we can live better together in this very important time."

Berman's work with UNITAR has been primarily in the area of trade development. One of the major tasks of the agency is to ease the shortage of competent representatives in the newly emerging nations.

Lack of experienced or trained leaders able to function in international economics and trade frequently impedes the efforts by the United Nations to help certain underdeveloped countries, Berman said.

He said the world body's programs to upgrade human resources also has been indirectly hampered by the "brain drain" to the United States. Ways must be found to encourage foreign students at American schools and native professionals to add to their countries' development by remaining or returning to their homelands.

VA APPROACHES NURSING CARE GOAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in the 88th Congress it was my honor and privilege to conduct the hearings which led to the enactment of Public Law 88–450, authorizing, for the first time, nursing care in the Veterans' Administration. This program has worked extremely well and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas, OLIN E. TEAGUE, has done me the honor to again name me chairman of the Subcommittee on Intermediate Care. Our subcommittee is in the process, at the present time, of conducting hearings which constitute a review of this vital program. The members of this subcommittee, in addition to myself, are the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SATTERFIELD], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT]. In a short time the subcommittee will recommend to the full committee changes in the nursing program which we believe will further help the veterans of this country in this particular field. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent release from the Veterans' Administration entitled "VA Approaches Nursing Care Goal":

VA APPROACHES NURSING CARE GOAL

An expanded program of nursing home care has freed thousands of beds for acutely ill veterans and has already provided more than 3.7 million patient-days of nursing home care for sick and disabled veterans, according to figures released by Administrator of Veterans Affairs William J. Driver. The statistics were part of a report to the White House covering the progress of the three-prong nursing home program, approved by President Johnson in August 1964.

VA now has 4,000 nursing care beds available at 62 of its facilities, and contracts have been signed between VA and 2,270 community nursing homes which provide a potential of 161,000 beds. Both steps were part of the three-point program authorized by Congress which included (1) the creation and operation of 4,000 nursing home care beds within VA's 165 hospital complex; (2) authorization for the VA to place veterans in approved private nursing homes; and (3) a grant-in-aid plan to help States build and operate nursing home care facilities for veterans.

Dr. H. Martin Engle, Chief Medical Director of VA, explained that veterans transferred from the hospitals to nursing home care facilities were mostly older, chronically ill veterans who have received maximum hospital benefits, but still require skilled nursing care.

Costs of the program, excluding the grants-in-aid, ranged from $14.5 million in fiscal years 1966 to $30.7 million in FY 1967. The budget request for FY 1968 is $38.2 million.

The grants-in-aid program has expanded similarly. In FY 1966, $2.5 million was appropriated for construction assistance to states. Four million dollars has been requested for such grants in both 1967 and 1968.

The nursing care program reflects changes in the function of the hospital which have been brought on by advancement in medical techniques, Dr. Engle explained. While the hospital generally was the permanent residence of the chronically ill, it is now utilized primarily during the acute phases of the illness. Long-term supportive treatment and rehabilitation are increasingly carried out with the veteran on an outpatient status while he resumes his normal pattern of community living to the extent his disability will permit.

"We have given much of the actual workload to professional nurses and ancillary health manpower without decreasing the responsibilities of our medical staff for professional attention on an as-needed basis," Dr. Engle added. "More than 1,400 skilled persons are employed in VA nursing homes. This has allowed VA to concentrate its doctors in its general and psychiatric hospitals where such scarce medical manpower can be utilized more fully," Dr. Engle explained.

The following State homes have been approved by VA for nursing care:

	Number of beds
California: Napa County	428
Colorado: Homelake	20
Illinois: Quincy	357
Indiana: Lafayette	152
Kansas: Fort Dodge	22
Massachusetts: Chelsea	241
Michigan: Grand Rapids	427
Missouri: St. James	93
New Hampshire: Tilton	40
New Jersey: Menlo Park	88
New York: Oxford	7
Oklahoma:	
Ardmore	38
Sulphur	68
Rhode Island: Bristol	135
South Dakota: Hot Springs	42
Vermont: Bennington	22
Washington:	
Orting	50
Retsil	80

Construction grants have been approved for these States:

[Dollar amounts in thousands

State	Number of beds	VA participation (estimate)	Total project (estimate)
Georgia, Augusta	192	$982	$2,065
Iowa, Marshalltown	80	532	1,070
Kansas, Fort Dodge	88	400	800
Nebraska, Grand Island	100	744	2,012
New Jersey:			
Menlo Park	100	571	1,175
Vineland	100	555	1,215
Rhode Island, Bristol	30	299	599
Vermont, Bennington	22	123	252
Wisconsin, King	200	1,181	2,881
Total	912	5,387	12,069

Number of beds in operation as of June 22, 1967:

Station:	Total
Albany	40
Alexandria	95
American Lake	76
Aspinwall	208
Augusta	40
Bath	40
Battle Creek	65
Beckley	42
Biloxi	71
Bonham	38
Brockton	51
Brecksville	50
Buffalo	36
Butler	64
Canandaigua	47
Castle Point	100
Cheyenne	47
Chicago (WS)	40
Chillicothe	99
Cincinnati	201
Columbia	72
Danville	58
Dayton	84
Dearborn	36
Dublin	56
Fargo	50
Fayetteville, N.C.	39
Fort Lyon	37
Grand Junction	42
Hampton	41
Houston	78
Indianapolis	46
Jefferson Barracks	68
Kerrville	37
Knoxville, Iowa	50
Lebanon	37
Lexington	51
Livermore	36
Los Angeles	229
Manchester	38
Marion	69
Montrose	75
Mountain Home	58
Murfreesboro	51
North Little Rock	100
Palo Alto	89
Poplar Bluff	49
Reno	22
Roseburg	35
St. Cloud	44
Salisbury	100
Salt Lake City	46
San Fernando	36
Sepulveda	45
Sioux Falls	75
Togus	60
Tomah, Wis	53
Tuskegee	68
Waco	100
Wadsworth	45
Wilmington	39
Wood	106

KEEP THE OEO

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and illuminating things about the irresponsible black power extremists who embrace the philosophy of violence and destruction is their attitude toward the war on poverty. They are absolutely against it. They hate it. They want to destroy it, and one of the resolutions adopted in totalitarian fashion at the recent black power conference in Newark called for violent opposition to it. The war on poverty is anathema to black power extremists, just as all forms of responsible, effective, and progressive social reform are anathema to anarchists and revolutionaries of the extreme left.

Equally significant, Mr. Speaker, is the position of moderate, responsible Negro leaders and groups in regard to the war on poverty. They are wholeheartedly for it. They see it as absolutely essential to the preservation of our political and social order, and only ask that it receive from the Congress the degree of financial support needed to make it effective and successful. This has been the gist of testimony given in recent days by such distinguished Negro leaders as Whitney Young, Jr., and Roy Wilkins.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot ask these leaders and the vast majority of Negro citizens for whom they speak to protect our cities and our social fabric from the desperate and irresponsible few, and at the same time deny to impoverished, blighted communities and neighborhoods the capacity to effectively fight and win the war on poverty. We cannot have it both ways—a tranquil society and a balanced budget, respect for law and order and an order which is inherently shameful and unbearable. In order to preserve the American way of life, we must act to open it up to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, two editorials which recently appeared in the New York Amsterdam News and the Washington, D.C., Afro-American give what I consider rather eloquent expressions to the views of responsible Negro spokesmen on the war on poverty. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert these editorials at this point in the RECORD, with the hope that my distinguished colleagues will pay them close heed:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, June 17, 1967]

KEEP THE OEO

But while we deplore the terror in the streets, the looting and the senseless beatings, we will never ignore, nor fail to point out the inequities that inevitably spawn these current racial problems.

The economic, political and social structure of this country is as A. Philip Randolph has put it, "more fragile than it has ever been."

Unemployed, untrained Afro-Americans are still growing in numbers in spite of the efforts of the Johnson Administration to decrease their numbers. At the same moment the summer violence everyone has been talking about begins to explode, the battle starts in Washington to maintain the Office of Economic Opportunity as a vital agency "that serves as a spokesman for the poor."

There are those who would wipe out this agency and scatter its program among other established departments. We support OEO and the work it is striving to do and the work it has done in the past.

Through the efforts of OEO, for the first time the poor of the country are having a say and being heard on matters affecting their future. There is now hope where there was only despair before. To do away with the agency providing this hope will only lead to more resentment and anger—not despair.

Today's Afro-American does not spend his time despairing about how things are. He believes in action. He does not stand still. Not for long.

Congress should be aware of this by now.

[From the Washington Afro-American, July 29, 1967]

MAKING POLITICAL HAY

Events of the past week make it evident that conservative Republicans and reactionary Democrats intend to use the recent riots to mount savage attacks against the efforts of the Administration to solve the long smoldering problems of the ghettos. Their primary target will be the Anti-Poverty program which neither force has ever supported, and would now joyfully bury.

For the Republicans it will be a cynical exercise in partisan politics aimed at capitalizing on the fears that have arisen in the white community as it has viewed the depth of the anger and frustration that exists in the slums.

They will seek to link community action with community disorder, charging in effect that if the poverty program had not encouraged poor black people to organize to improve their own neighborhoods, the ghettos would still be peaceful.

Such a simplistic view conveniently ignores the obvious fact that the problems causing the riots existed long before the poverty program came into being. Also conveniently ignored is evidence that where poverty programs have been in operation, they have been a stabilizing influence on the community and have actually been prime factors in cooling tempers and allaying frustrations.

For the reactionary Democrats, the attack on the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administers the anti-poverty program will be a chance to even the score with Sargent Shriver, who on numerous occasions has gone contrary to their wishes in his attempt to help the people who need help the most.

Together, these two forces form a powerful coalition that has already indicated its strength by virtually strangling the Model Cities Program, and with Macabre humor, refusing even to consider a modest rat control program.

The basic theme of the attack against the War on Poverty will be that since it did not prevent riots in Detroit, Newark and other cities, it has therefore failed and should be abolished as fitting punishment for the "ungrateful" poverty residents, who bit the hand that was trying to help them.

Sadly enough, this will not be difficult to sell to the American people, who unfortunately seek simple answers to complex problems. In their ignorance of just what people think and feel in the ghetto, they may be persuaded that the way to stop riots is to punish everyone who lives there, including the innocent.

The vast majority of the people who live in the riot areas, took no part in the disturbance, yet in the reckless haste to make political capital of a national tragedy, the foes of the poverty program are not concerned with who is hurt, or if America's first real attempt to come to grips with the problems of the slums is washed down the drain.

If there was ever a time when the poverty program needs all the support it can muster, that time is now. Strong voices must be raised in defense of the program. Congress must know that the nation does not want the poverty program ended, or the Office of Economic Opportunity dismantled.

There is too much at stake for anything less than an all out effort by every concerned individual and group to block this dastardly attempt to end the program that marks the nation's first real coming to grips with the problem of poverty.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker we have heard much partisan criticism recently of programs established pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. But if we look closely we will find that the vast majority of the antipoverty programs are of immeasurable assistance to the poor and of everlasting value to our society.

One inspiring example of victory in the war on poverty has been Trenton, N.J., work experience program for unemployed heads of families, started 2 years ago under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. I should like to submit the following material as testimony to this program's brilliant success:

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Sunday Times Advertiser, July 23, 1967]

GAINFULLY EMPLOYED

The success of anti-poverty programs and the effectiveness of the federal and local tax dollars poured into them are sometimes hard to measure. For this reason, the report of Arthur L. Finkle, who directed Trenton's federally-aided work experience program, is a heartening document.

Started two years ago under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the project has literally worked itself out of business. It gave training, experience and employment to over 180 "hardcore" unemployed heads of families representing a total of 935 adults and dependents. In addition, a number who started in the program as trainees found suitable employment on their own. All the trainees had either been receiving welfare assistance or were potentially in need of it. Those placed by the program are now earning an average of $3,600 a year.

The program brought about a decrease in the city's welfare expenditures, both by giving recipients and potential recipients gainful employment and by shifting the welfare costs of those undergoing training and work experience from the city to the federal government.

Better than these savings, however, says Finkle, are the "related savings in human potential, family solidarity and individual pride. The trainee no longer faces inevitable daily failure; he works productively and his dependents respect him for it. Before he was only nominally the head of a household; now he is truly the leader and supporter of his family, and a model for his children, who will be the heads of future families."

Mercer County will provide the training and work experience for Trenton heads of families who need it in the future. And Finkle—a job well done behind him—has become a consultant in the planning division of the State Transportation Department.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times, July 20, 1967]

CITY WORK EXPERIENCE PROJECT SEEN SUCCESS

(By Al Drake)

The director of Trenton's two year old work experience program for family heads says the federally aided anti-poverty project has been a success and has some impressive statistics to back the claim.

Arthur L. Finkle's final report as program director also includes recommendations that Mercer County play a larger role in providing relief assistance for cases the city is saddled with.

The county has taken over the work experience program and Finkle next week will begin work as a consultant in the planning division of the State Transportation Department.

SAVED $460,392

Finkle's 15-page report filed yesterday includes his contention that the city saved $460,392 during the two years of operation.

He bases the claim on the fact that 185 unemployed heads of families—representing 935 adults and dependents—were employed as a direct result of the program. Without the program, the trainees would have applied for and received public assistance, he says.

Direct savings from 500 city welfare cases amounted to $144,000, Finkle reported.

Finkle said that while welfare costs increased by 9 percent throughout the state, during 1960, they decreased in Trenton by 22 percent or $73,000.

AVERAGE OF $3,600 A YEAR

Finkle said a number of the trainees who left the program before finishing it found employment on their own. He says the 185 family heads who finished training were given permanent employment now earn an average of $3,600 a year.

At the peak of the program, Finkle reported, no unemployed male heads of families able to work were receiving welfare payments.

In addition, he noted that the program provided for the disadvantaged services in job placement, family counseling, vocational training and money management as well as work experience.

"The mere existence of a welfare agency providing services has shifted the emphasis of public welfare in the city from merely providing financial assistance to rehabilative services," Finkle said. "However great the financial savings . . . they are far exceeded by the related savings in human potential, family solidarity and individual pride."

Finkle said he was recommending that the city welfare division continue training unemployed family heads.

He said the city should recommend that jurisdiction over cases involved these family heads become the responsibility of the County Welfare Board. There is a bill before the Legislature that would provide the shift in jurisdiction.

Finkle's third recommendation was that female family heads awaiting admission to the county's Aid to Dependent Children program be a part of the county run work experience program.

The women, he said, should be "granted this opportunity before they fall into the grinding impersonal system of dependency on public welfare."

LET'S WAGE PEACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the world cries out again for peace, I thought it would be of interest to my colleagues and those who read this RECORD to read a very able and eloquent address delivered at the University of Florida in 1948 by Mr. Earl Faircloth, attorney general of Florida, on the ever timely subject, "Let's Wage Peace" I submit the attorney general's remarks herewith for the RECORD:

LET'S WAGE PEACE

(By Earl Faircloth, University of Florida, 1948)

Time is of the essence. We must begin at once to do something constructive for world peace. We must wage the battle for peace with all the calculated fury used in waging war if civilization is to be saved. In the recent world conflict the American people showed that they had a unique capacity for achievement in the arts of making war. They were quickly aroused to fighting fervor and gave unstintingly of their very best efforts to win. During the years of the actual fighting an opinion poll showed that 83 percent of the people felt that they were doing something to help fight the war. But it was easy then to find something to do—give a pint of blood, act as a fire warden, or roll bandages for shipment overseas.

Today, unfortunately, there is no such abundance of enthusiasm for preserving the peace. Instead, bleak pessimism pervades the world as the common people sit uneasily on the edge of the world arena and fearfully watch the grim battle rage between the ideological gladiators. Most of us cannot see how anything but open conflict can issue from this cold war between our country and the Soviet Union. The average man understands very little of the complexities of world power politics, but he realizes that if the dogs of war again are unleased there would be little left for him even if they were conquered before civilization was completely destroyed. According to a recent poll of public opinion, only 36 percent of the people feel that they can do something to prevent war. But remember that 83 percent felt that they contributed something directly to the waging of the war. This leaves a large majority of 64 percent who are contributing only to the general attitude of hopelessness and despair. The absence of any constructive thing they can do which would help to preserve the peace adds to the feeling of the inevitability of the terrifying blast of atomic war.

We may draw from the academic debate question this year [Resolved, that there should be established a Federal World Government] the conclusion that it is impossible to legislate human nature; that world unity will come only when the people of the world believe in unity. From the pages of history we have learned that all changes have been wrought by ideas as a starting point. Preceding all of the moves that humanity has ever made, for progress or for the degradation of mankind, there has been the idea, the thinker. The formation of more lasting governments emanated from the ideas propounded by great political thinkers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. James Watt conceived the idea of the steam engine to climax the Industrial Revolution because the necessity for more production drove men to think in terms of better machines. Today man finds himself in the precarious position of having so far outdistanced his moral progress in mechanical creation, that necessity demands that moral progress be permitted to catch up before he is destroyed. Therefore, since all progress is preceded by thinking and ideas, it is of utmost importance that men begin to think in the direction of world unity. We can exert a tremendous influence here in our own country for peace by helping to bring about a trend of constructive thinking about the problems that face us.

A logical place to begin is at the beginning; with the children of our schools and with college students. There are so many ideas that we desperately need to create in our youth if there is to be hope for the future.

First, young people should be taught to judge another person as an individual, rather than classify the individuals of a group as having the same characteristics that are attributed to the whole group. Today it is unnecessary for us to think about these things because someone else has already conveniently placed people in categories for us. For example, we know, without ever having seen one, that Italians are irresponsible, that Japanese are treacherous, that Germans are mechanical automatons, that English are too dense to see the point of a joke, and so on. The chain is endless. We must teach our youth to realize that these generalizations are not necessarily true—to cut through these stereotypes and judge men as individuals who have a brain and a heart just as we have. When this is accomplished, we will have cleared the ground for more construction. We will have learned something of the human equation.

Second, we must be sure that the youth of our country learn with us to think in wider terms with regard to domestic and international affairs. Only with understanding can we hope for world unity, and if our youth, who will soon be making the decisions about these matters do not have a broad grasp of national and international affairs, we cannot hope that they will deal with these problems intelligently. The sense of world community must be developed.

Third, we must teach them quite frankly the cost and consequences of war. Its horrors and its aftermath of misery and sorrow should be made crystal clear. This will be the strongest incentive to the youth of our nation to wage vigorously the battle for peace.

As citizens we must study hard the problems of peace, because it is our duty to cope with them. We have learned well the arts of war. Let us strive to become equally skilled in the more durable arts of peace and thereby save our civilization. This will not mean too great a sacrifice. It may mean giving up a game of bridge in the evening in order to attend a meeting of your committee on foreign affairs. It may mean staying home to plow through a difficult book on international relations when you might rather go to a movie. It might mean that you will have to buy bread for starving people when you would like to buy someone a bouquet of roses. In short, we must sacrifice some of our leisure time in order to think our problems out clearly and influence others to join in the gigantic effort to preserve the peace.

More than 90 million people will be eligible to vote in the elections this year. Yet it is estimated that little more than half of them will go to the polls and do their duty. We should not only consider the platforms of office-seekers very carefully, but we should look long and perceptively into their records and their characters to determine whether they are isolationists, and if so, to what extent. We should determine to what extent they sense the significance of Willkie's One World. In this manner new ideas will get into circulation. Once people are started thinking seriously about those problems, the solution will follow as a matter of course.

We have ample warning now. Horrible pictures haunt the mind. Suspicion is breed-

ing hatred and bitterness. We know that world peace cannot prevail in such a stifing climate, because history has taught us so. But we cannot wait for peace to come, weakly wished for and unbought by conscientious and persevering effort. We must wage the battle for peace with the same grim determination and firm resolution with which we fight wars. I believe in the ability of humanity to solve our common problem of saving the world. I believe that here in our country where free thought and free expression are unshackled we can lead the way to lasting peace if only we can be aroused from our notorious intellectual lethargy.

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, at a most precarious speed our world swings down the ringing grooves of change. The hour has come to propagandize the ideal of peace. Tonight it is not kings or dictators or presidents who rule the world. It is the power of ideas. Ideas and principles that must be framed into immortal words and sent ringing around the world. These are invincible weapons with which we must wage peace.

FHA COOPERATIVE HOUSING PASSES $1.5 BILLION MARK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the eminently successful FHA section 213 cooperative housing program has just reached a total of $1.5 billion of mortgages insured. Thousands of families have been able to undertake homeownership with the favorable financing terms of the Section 213 program.

At a recent meeting celebrating this achievement our distinguished colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, joined with Senator SPARKMAN in praising the accomplishments of this outstanding program.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include his remarks in the RECORD for the information of our colleagues:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE INSURANCE OF $1½ BILLION COOPERATIVE HOUSING BY THE FHA AUGUST 18, 1967

My friend and colleague, Senator John Sparkman has talked eloquently about our cooperative housing program under Section 213. This is a very fine program—and I'm proud to have played a part in bringing it into being. Since I'm so much younger!! I'd like to take a few minutes to talk about a newer program. One that John Sparkman and Congressman Barrett and others of us see as the best program that exists today to meet the crisis of our cities.

This new program 221(d)(3) wasn't enacted until 1961—six years ago. Like most new programs it had a long start-up period. In the fall of '64 when the interest rates were jumping around like crazy (always *up*) I asked the public interest groups what the interest rate should be. Since nobody would risk an answer I said "How about 3%".

My colleagues on the House Committee agreed with me. The Senate agreed. And, so we now have a 3% forty-year program. And authority from the Congress to build 40,000 units a year.

Here is a program that really works for people that would otherwise be in that "forgotten family" gap . . . Too well off or too independent for Public Housing; too poor to buy a decent home in the normal market. The initials BMIR in FHA lingo 221(d)(3) BMIR means Below Market Interest Rate. This rate saves the average BMIR family about $23 per month for his home. If you are making $100 a week and feeding a family of four, $23 a month difference on your housing charges makes a decent home possible.

The beauty about 221(d)(3) cooperatives is that if a family's income goes up, it isn't evicted and forced to live in a different and maybe less desirable place. The interest rate for the family goes back to the market rate and the family can stay in its home.

The latest figures are a good beginning. As of June 30, the FHA reported mortgages insured (at no cost) to $190 million. This was for 140 cooperative projects serving 13,500 families. Commitments were outstanding for 26 projects with 1,691 units valued at $25 million. Ninety-eight more projects for 6,500 families were in application stage. On completion this would be $400 million more. It is interesting to note that 33% of these projects are co-ops. They are providing home ownership for the poor, or the nearly poor.

This leads me to three specific points I would like to make as we celebrate and as we look ahead.

1. When the 221(d)(3) program was faced with rising interest rates due to increases in the rates on Federal borrowings, I took the initiative to recommend a fixed interest rate of 3% for this program. I am pleased that the Congress adopted that amendment. The favorable experience with this program confirms the wisdom of that Congressional action, because the 3% interest rate was an essential ingredient in assuring the continued success of this program in meeting the needs of moderate income families. Now, I think the time has come to accept the recommendation of many of the public-interest organizations that we allow a graduated interest rate down to zero in order to provide housing for families whose incomes are lower than those who can now afford the 3% rate. These are families who are not eligible for public housing or rent supplements, so that they are in a gap between existing programs. We should fill that gap, particularly to help bring cooperative ownership to more families who are in the lower income group.

2. The cooperative program under 221(d)(3) has achieved a remarkable record. Almost a third of the (d)(3) housing program provides cooperative home-ownership. *There has not been a single default in any cooperative mortgage under this program.* This shows that moderate income families will assume responsibility when they are afforded the opportunity to own their homes through a cooperative. Moreover, the cooperative communities have been better maintained and have produced a better environment than rental projects. This is due to the sense of pride and responsibility that cooperative ownership inspires. It is also due to the involvement and participation by the people in their own community affairs.

3. We are all dismayed by the recent riots in our cities which erupted from social unrest and discontent among the underprivileged living in slum areas. Everyone agrees that bad housing is one of the causes of the social unrest and discontent. We should act now to take more vigorous action in providing good homes and neighborhoods in our cities. The 21(d)(3) program can materially help. The Administration should accelerate the rate of production of housing under this program and speed up its operations in order to meet the critical needs. This includes the full use of all of the money which the Congress has made available.

I have heard very disturbing reports from many parts of the country that projects are being delayed because funds are not being allocated for them, even though the Congress has authorized the funds and the President's Budget contemplates a program this year of $500 million for 221(d)(3) projects. I am advised that only $200 million has been made available and that allocations are being cut back and delayed. This should be corrected immediately. I see no justification for slowing down a program which is so important in meeting the critical problems of our cities. I urge that immediate action be taken to assure the full use of the money authorized by the Congress. Allocations should be made now based upon the full amount of money which has been authorized.

INDIA ANSWERS

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

The SPEAKER prc tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a reply has been submitted by the Embassy of India to an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee newspaper on June 14, and which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 19.

For the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from P. K. Banerjee, Minister, Embassy of India, and a letter from the press attaché which was printed in the July 12 edition of the McClatchy newspapers:

EMBASSY OF INDIA,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1967.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: I have seen from the Congressional Record that sometime back you were pleased to introduce an editorial from the newspaper "Sacramento Bee" of June 14, 1967, entitled "India Speaks from an almost fatal madness." This editorial seems to have been based, as some others in the American press, on the erroneous rendering of the Indian Prime Minister's remarks by some press agencies. In the interest of Indo-American understanding, which we all cherish, we sent a letter to "Sacramento Bee" clarifying the position. The newspaper was good enough to publish our reply, a copy of which I am enclosing herewith for your kind perusal. As you have an abiding and sympathetic interest in India, may I venture to request you to introduce my letter to you along with our reply to "Sacramento Bee" in the Congressional Record, as I feel we owe a clarification to numerous readers of Congressional Record.

With kind regards,
Yours sincerely,

P. K. BANERJEE,
Minister.

INDIA ANSWERS

EMBASSY OF INDIA,
Washington, D.C.

EDITOR OF THE BEE.

SIR: I have had the occasion to read the editorial about India in The Sacramento Bee on June 14. It is unfortunate that the speech of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi was reported in this country in a slipshod manner and conveyed an erroneous

impression in regard to certain vital matters. In fact, most of the remarks attributed to her were not in the speech but were reported out of context from a casual conversation with newsmen aboard the plane carrying her back from Ambikapur to New Delhi. I am sure you realize very well how the perspective can get distorted in such circumstances. For instance, news reports of her remarks that the Egyptian president "is a force for progress", to which you have also alluded, do not state the significant fact that this remark was made in the context of efforts being made by some countries in the Middle East to form an Islamic bloc. I am sure you would agree that formation of a bloc based on religion and the ideology of "Muslim Brotherhood" is a medieval concept and would be harmful for peace and understanding among nations. India stands for a secular, progressive society and not a theocratic society.

The Prime Minister in her remarks did criticize the United States for giving military aid to Pakistan. It is a well-known fact that US-supplied arms and ammunition went to Pakistan worth $1.5 to $2 billion with the objective of fighting communism. It is also a well-known fact that this military equipment was used against India first in April 1965 in Rann-of-Kutch and then in September 1965 in Kashmir. It is also a fact that despite the assurances given to India earlier by President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles and others to the effect that Pakistan will not be permitted to use those arms against India, the US government either did not or could not do anything to stop their use against friendly India. As mentioned earlier, arms were given to Pakistan to fight communism but ironically today Pakistan is the staunchest ally of People's China. In fact, at the time Pakistan was attacking India with American supplied arms, China was threatening to attack India on the northern borders. Their collusion is no more a secret.

In regard to seeking peaceful solutions to our problems with Pakistan or for that matter with China, nobody would be happier than ourselves. We want this. We hope for this. And we have been working for this. This was the spirit of Tashkent meeting and we continue to abide by this.

AQIL AHMAD,
Press Attache.

THE MESCALERO RESERVATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nex Mexico [Mr. WALKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the Mescalero Reservation, located within Otero County in south-central New Mexico, is the home of approximately 1,500 Indian descendants of three of the leading aboriginal Apache tribes of the Southwest, the Mescalero Apache Tribe, the Chiricahua Apache Tribe, and the Lipan Apache Tribe. The reservation covers approximately 460,000 acres.

The Indians of the reservation are organized under a constitution and bylaws adopted pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act. The official name of the present-day organized tribe is the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation. The president of the tribe is Wendell Chino, who is a college graduate and an ordained minister. The governing body of the tribe is the Mescalero Tribal Council, comprised of eight members, elected at large from the membership of the tribe.

Pursuant to the act of Congress known as the Indian Claims Commission Act, suits were filed against the United States on behalf of each of the three aboriginal tribes claiming fair compensation for the taking of their respective original tribal homelands, as well as making claims for damage for other wrongs committed against the tribes.

On April 27, 1967, the first of these suits was brought to a conclusion. On that date, the Indian Claims Commission made a final award of $8,500,000 as compensation primarily for approximately 18,800,000 acres of tribal land in New Mexico which were taken away nearly 100 years ago from the aboriginal Mescalero Apache Tribe. Congress has appropriated the money to pay this final award, and the money has been deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Mescalero Apache Tribe.

Other suits claiming compensation for the taking of the tribal lands of the Chiricahua Apache Tribe and of the Lipan Apache Tribe, as well as claiming damage for other wrongs against the tribes, are still being litigated before the Indian Claims Commission.

As noted, descendants of the three aboriginal tribes, the Mescalero Apache Tribe, the Lipan Apache Tribe, and a part of the Chiricahua Apache Tribe are now organized as the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and have a common home on the Mescalero Reservation. Also, there is a substantial degree of intermarriage among these descendants of the three aboriginal tribes, and all the descendants have a common interest in the development of the reservation and the enhancement of the welfare of the members of the present-day organized tribe as a whole. By reason of these factors, under the wise and able leadership of Wendell Chino, the president of the tribe, the members of the tribe have agreed that the aforesaid award already made for the original tribal lands of the aboriginal Mescalero Apache Tribe, as well as any future awards in the claims suits which may be made for the benefit of any of the constituent groups of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, should be consolidated into a common fund and used for the benefit of the entire tribe and all its members.

To accomplish this worthy purpose, Congressman THOMAS G. MORRIS and I have joined to introduce this bill, which provides that all funds deposited in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Mescalero Apache Tribe, the portion of the Chiricahua Apache Tribe on the Mescalero Reservation, and the Lipan Apache Tribe, to pay awards on their claims against the United States, shall be consolidated and credited to the account of the present-day Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and may be used for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Under the leadership of the tribal officers and members of the tribal council, the general membership of the tribe has approved a program for the beneficent use of the funds of the abovementioned award for various purposes, including scholarships for students, home improvements, promotion of industry on the reservation so as to provide employment opportunities, and land acquisition.

DESERVED PRAISE FOR THE PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's performance last week during his televised news conference has drawn strong praise from the Baltimore News American.

The paper notes that the conference "was remarkable for his clear, calm, carefully considered assessment of the Nation's problems."

The editorial continues:

Despite the efforts to draw him into an argument with his critics, the President for 34 minutes reiterated his policies and once again voiced his unswerving dedication to carry them out to the best of his ability.

And, the editorial concludes:

In essence, the President emerged as a leadership figure whose ordeal is being faced with patient determination and a quiet optimism that better days lie ahead. He set a fine example for Congress—and for the nation itself.

I proudly share these sentiments, and insert into the RECORD an editorial tribute to President Johnson's sound leadership during these difficult days.

The editorial follows:

WHITE HOUSE PERSPECTIVE

President Johnson's televised press conference on Friday—the first since March 9—was remarkable for his clear, calm, carefully-considered assessment of the nation's problems.

There was little new in what he had to say about such disparate subjects as Vietnam, national finances, trouble in the cities and the woes of farmers.

It was the way he said it and the mood he established which were most important. His words and his demeanor reflected assurance that a strong hand is still at the nation's helm, unshaken by the storms of controversy raging about him.

Despite efforts to draw him into argument with his critics, the President for 34 minutes reiterated his policies and once again voiced his unswerving dedication to carry them out to the best of his ability. Critics, he noted with a smile, always abound in a Democratic society.

In essence, the President emerged as a leadership figure whose ordeal is being faced with patient determination and a quiet optimism that better days lie ahead. He set a fine example for Congress—and for the nation itself.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA HELICOPTER SERVICE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, developments aimed at providing the Washington metropolitan area with scheduled helicopter service have led to proposals with definite shape.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is considering certification of such a transportation system presently, and I would urge that their recommendation be set forth as soon as possible for several reasons.

Certainly, there is a definite need for such a service from the transportation standpoint. But also as important is the need to shift airline flights from Washington's National Airport to Dulles and Friendship for reasons of safety.

A scheduled helicopter link between Dulles and Friendship could relieve the overcrowding of National without undue hardship to the traveling public.

I do not think we should allow the present conditions at National to exist until a major air accident forces such steps to correct the situation.

Certification of a scheduled helicopter service will do much to relieve congestion at National and at the same time make more use of the ultramodern facilities at Dulles.

I was pleased to note that the Washington Star in its Sunday edition went on record as favoring the immediate certification of a scheduled helicopter service.

The Star's editorial is succinct and germane to this topic and I would like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

COMMUTER COPTERS

For some years, in the absence of a regional rail-transit system, the obvious means of providing fast service between Washington and its airports has been the helicopter. Obvious—but unconscionably ignored.

Now, however, the Civil Aeronautics Board suddenly finds not one attractive helicopter proposition on its doorstep, but two.

The ice was broken last week in a spurt of welcome initiative by the 10 major airlines. Their joint request for certification promises at least 24 round trips daily linking National, Dulles and Friendship Airports—and eventually central Washington—at fares which are not exhorbant. Nor can anyone construe this as a play for a fast buck. Actually, it envisions a deficit operation, of about $1.4 million a year at the outset, which the airlines propose to absorb.

The second deal, advanced by a Washington-Baltimore business syndicate, proposes more trips, broader service, lower fares and a much lower deficit—also to be absorbed at no cost to the government.

Indeed, the discrepancies between the two proposals on all these counts are so sharp that one of the groups quite obviously is off base in its figuring. But it should be no great chore for the CAB, with its technical expertise in these matters, to determine which of the two offers the best possibilities for serving the public interest. The important thing now is that the agency should do so.

The apparent need for a federal subsidy has been the deterrent which primarily has cooled the government's interest in such schemes in the past. With that factor eliminated, however, the CAB would seem to have no valid reason to delay a go-ahead now. Our only concern is that the agency authorize routes for the whirlybirds which do not add further to the residential noise nuisance from above.

THE 1967 PAY BILL FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Compensation Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service completed work today on a 1967 pay bill for Federal employees. I am not sure that this bill is going to make anyone overjoyed. In the present period, with our severe budgetary problems, there is only so much that can be done. But I believe the bill our subcommittee has worked out is sound and reasonable and equitable.

Today's action by the Compensation Subcommittee is the culmination of many months of discontent, frustration, and general unhappiness on the part of nearly everyone associated with this perennial tug of war. I am happy that my subcommittee has finally resolved the myriad of problems associated with Federal civilian salaries and produced what I regard as a fair, equitable, and, I believe, "vetoproof" bill.

It is not often noted, but salaries for the people who do the work of our Federal departments and agencies constitute a sizable part of our total Federal budget. Out of this year's $135 billion budget more than $36 billion will go for civilian and military salaries. This is a very big item, and the Congress has a high responsibility, I believe, to see that all interests are given proper weight and consideration when any change is contemplated.

In these annual struggles, the members of our subcommittee are forced to render decisions amid many, usually conflicting, pressures. These can be reduced to three sources:

First, there are the 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees who have families to clothe and feed, children to educate, and all the problems and expenses of other Americans.

Second, there is the administration in power, which necessarily views Federal salary problems as but one aspect of its total budget problem, involving fiscal policy, inflation, conflicting demands for available funds, the financing of a war, and other factors. While the administration wants and needs top people to do its important work, its approach to matters of compensation is bound to differ somewhat from that of its employees and potential employees.

Finally, there are the taxpayers of this country, who must pay the costs of any increase in Federal salaries.

In my years in Congress, I have never worked on a salary bill that fully pleased all three of these groups. To paraphrase Lincoln, it may be possible to please some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time—I am not sure.

But this year in this matter I have the sad feeling we may please none of the people none of the time. If this is so, it will not be because we of the Compensation Subcommittee have not tried. In the history of my subcommittee, I am proud to say that I have never had a more independent, intelligent, fair-minded membership and the decision reached today was a result of the careful study and attention given to these problems by the members of my subcommittee and their diligent efforts to produce a bill which would be fair and equitable to all concerned.

In meeting my responsibilities on this subcommittee, I have tried to listen fairly and sympathetically to the arguments of the administration and Federal employee groups, while keeping in mind the interests of the taxpayers. In connection with the action of the subcommittee taken today, I would like to get several things off my chest.

To President Johnson, I would like to say that I understand and sympathize with the heavy burdens of your office. I know of your extremely difficult budget problems in the current fiscal year. I understand your concern about inflation, and I am listening to your arguments for a tax surcharge to put income and outgo more in balance. But in a friendly spirit, I must tell you that I regard the position your administration has taken in regard to Federal employees as not entirely fair.

Recall that in 1962 the Congress and the Kennedy-Johnson administration joined in adopting as law the principle of comparability between the salaries of private enterprise and those of the Federal Government. The cold fact is that you are now $2 billion in arrears on this promissory note. Yet this promise has been renewed and reaffirmed in each of the last 5 years. I must tell you that for many Federal employees that promise is losing its credibility and is taking on the qualities of a mirage.

In 1965, we in the Congress wanted to enact a pay bill moving toward comparability, but we were told that 3.6 percent was the absolute, final limit. Even one-tenth of 1 percent above that figure, we were told, would bring inflation crashing down on our heads. Even though increases in the private economy averaged more than 5 percent that year, we had to tell Federal employees, "Wait 'til next year."

For those who listened to that promise, 1966 was "next year." But again it could not be fulfilled. Your administration told us that 3.2 percent was all the budget would allow, including fringe benefits. "Next year" was again the promise.

Mr. President, I fully recognize that the administration has every right to make its recommendations on Federal salary adjustments. But Congress has a role to play, too, and we of the pay subcommittee of the House share with the employee groups some resentment that you can draw an arbitrary line each year and dare us to go beyond it.

I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that your priorities are out of focus. Certainly our cities need more money, and

there are problems of education and health which ought to be met. But I do not believe these and other programs ought to ride on the backs of Federal employees. If they are worth doing, they ought to be paid for by all citizens through the normal processes of taxation and not merely by those citizens who happen to work for you.

In the judgment of my subcommittee, part of the $2 billion deficiency I have cited can be found this year, and the rest can be found next year. The compromise bill I have offered does what you have asked—it holds the pay line for the third year in a row. It requires the Federal employees to subsidize the remaining taxpayers of this country for another 9 months. But it then proceeds to make good on that promissory note, so long delayed. It provides that our obligation to make Federal pay comparable to private industry pay will be met in full, automatically, without further legislation, next year.

Mr. President, I hope you will not mistake the mood of your Federal employees. For the first time this year, the White House itself has been picketed by Federal workers. Post offices in major cities have seen marches for higher pay. Your second veto has inflamed passions. The mood of Federal workers is one of great frustration. They are tired of the plea to "wait 'til next year." They want comparability now. In the compromise I offered today we do not give it to them, but we guarantee it 9 months from now. I hope and believe that this kind of compromise, which meets your immediate problems but ultimately redeems our long-postponed pledge, will meet with your approval.

Now let me say a word to Federal employees. You have fine and democratic organizations headed by effective and vigorous leaders. I understand their problems, and I think I understand and am sympathetic with yours. I believe over the years I have been a friend, and as a friend I have to tell you frankly that you are partly wrong, too.

If I were a Federal employee, I think I would share your feelings of frustration, and I think I might well have written some of the thousands of letters reaching Capitol Hill containing expressions like "fed up," "our backs to the wall," and so forth. I, too, might be demanding immediate enactment of legislation to achieve full comparability with private industry.

Yet, as your friend, in all sympathy and candor, I must tell you not to expect this Congress and this President now in this fiscal year to right all wrongs that exist in the Federal salary system. A government with a prospective $30 billion deficit and a Congress trying to cut expenditures in every category cannot be expected, realistically, to add to this budget $2 billion more for Federal salaries. We do not always have the choices we would like, and it seems to me your choice is between two alternatives. Either you can choose an all-out, bitter, divisive, and prolonged fight that will yield nothing but frayed tempers and a veto, or you can choose this compromise bill, which offers a partial loaf now and a full loaf in less than a year. As a friend, I urge you and your leaders to put your support behind the latter alternative. I think you will be a lot better off with a new pay law, albeit a compromise, than a new and glorious, but fruitless, pay fight.

Finally, I want to say a word to the taxpayers of this country—and I am a hard-pressed taxpayer myself. It is agreed by every impartial observer that most Federal salaries are less than those for the same jobs in private enterprise. Your Congress and two of your Presidents have promised, repeatedly, over the last 5 years that these differences would be wiped out. As taxpayers, we are underpaying our fellow citizens who work for the Federal Government about $2 billion a year. This is not fair, and it should not be allowed to continue. If we are going to fight inflation by holding down salary increases, let us make the burden a little more equal. In the end we can only benefit by being fair to the people who work for us.

In conclusion, I would make this point. These annual pay battles are senseless. I have proposed in the past and continue to favor adoption of machinery to provide orderly pay increases in keeping with the cost of living and increased productivity. With comparability established at the outset, we could be done with the months of infighting that have characterized this process through the years. And the time of the House and Senate committees could be spent, instead, on the many other problems, now largely ignored for lack of time, besetting the Federal service.

Short of that ideal, the pay bill I have proposed today is about the best possible in what is admittedly less than the best of all possible worlds.

Under unanimous consent, I am including the following summary of the major provisions of the reported bill:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE PRINT NO. 6 FEDERAL SALARY BILL, AUGUST 22, 1967

The key policies in Committee Print No. 6 are:

(1) The present 20-level Postal Field Service salary schedule will be changed to a 21-level schedule, and all employees subject to the present schedule will be advanced by one numerical salary level. The advancement in salary level will give each employee a 6 percent increase effective the first pay period beginning on or after October 1, 1967 (Postal Field Service Schedule I, on page 8).

(2) A second-phase increase of 5 percent across-the-board is added by Postal Field Service Schedule II, also on page 8.

(3) Rural carriers will receive the same increases as are granted city carriers (Rural Carrier Schedules I and II, page 9).

(4) Employees subject to the General Schedule (classified), Foreign Service Officer and Foreign Service Staff Schedules, Veterans' Administration Medical and Surgical salary ranges, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committee pay schedule, Judicial Branch pay rates or ranges, and Legislative Branch pay rates, all will receive 4½ percent pay raises effective in October, 1967.

(5) The "comparability" lag remaining after the two-phase postal employee increases will be finally closed out by a further adjustment, made by the President the first pay period in April of 1969, under paragraph (2) of section 12 of the bill. The "comparability" lag for other employees will be closed by two further adjustments, made by the President the first pay period in July of 1968 and the first pay period of April 1969, under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 12.

(6) Salaries of Executive Levels III, IV, and V are increased from $28,500, $27,000, and $26,000, to $29,500, $28,750, and $28,000, respectively, in order to accommodate the general salary increases proposed for career employees.

(7) A "Quadrennial Commission" is established by section 16 to determine proper levels for executive, congressional, and judicial salaries once every four years. Each Commission will make a study for a full fiscal year every four years (beginning with the 1969 fiscal year) and must submit its recommendations to the President by the end of the calendar year in which the study is completed. The President shall include, in the next budget he transmits to the Congress after receiving the Commission's report, his recommendations for the exact rates of pay and the kinds and amounts of expenses and allowances, for Federal executives, Members of Congress, and judges. The recommendations transmitted to the Congress by the President in his budget will become effective the first pay period beginning more than 30 days after transmittal of the budget, unless the Congress has enacted a statute fixing specific rates of pay and amounts and kinds of expenses and allowances or unless one House or the other has specifically disapproved any or all of the President's recommendations.

SOUTHEAST ASIA: PROGRESS LIES IN REGIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. PRYOR. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a civil war rages out of control in Southeast Asia, it can not but be in our interest to be well apprized of the geopolitical aspects of the region. The war is spreading daily. Laos has become a bombing target, Cambodia a sanctuary, and Thailand a participant in the Vietnamese civil war.

The whole of Southeast Asia is far from stable; and the prospects for the future do not appear too hopeful. Boundary disputes abound, provincialism challenges governments centered hundreds of miles away in gaily-lit cities—more a product of the colonial past than a reflection of the majority of indigenous peoples. Indeed, one wonders about the very viability of these small nation-states.

In my opinion, the future of these peoples would seem to lie in some type of regional cooperation. Imagine the great good that could come from, let us say, the development of the vast and mighty Mekong River. Dams for power and irrigation projects could benefit millions of people.

But regional cooperation implies mutuality of interests and, more importantly, it demands the elimination of existing border conflicts. This is especially so, if these countries expect to match the productive capacity of the more-developed nations. The go-it-alone attitude is contrary to their interests, it is an anachronism fed by shortsighted nationalism.

When reading about the various disputes centering around such geopolitical differences, I am reminded of the words of Carlos Romulo, the great statesman and former President of the Philippines, who said, "The nation no longer suffices." He was directing his words primarily to the less-developed, struggling areas of our globe; directing his message to those people in those areas that have not the *essential resources* for an industrial or self-sufficient agricultural society. For these millions of people, progress lies in cooperation.

And may I stress, Mr. Speaker, that this regional cooperation is, hopefully, but a beginning toward a broader international cooperation, as yet but a dream in the minds of many. Let us hope that the current trend toward regionalism is but another phase in the movement toward mutuality of interests. The world is too small, the resources too few, the hazards too precarious to discontinue or reverse this trend.

Even if the last shot were to be fired in Vietnam tomorrow, there would still remain in that area of the world exacerbating questions regarding frontiers, as well as other difficulties springing from the root of nationalism. I offer for the perusal of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, one example of the latent questions to be resolved in Southeast Asia. The following article appeared in the July 28, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

CAMBODIAN PRINCE GIVES HIS VIEWS: SIHANOUK JEALOUS OF BORDERS

(By Mario Rossi)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—In a world racked by convulsions through its southern perimeter, few countries manage to escape controversy. Cambodia is definitely among those which do not.

The small Asian kingdom without a king happens to have a most uncomfortable geography. To the west, Thailand, which claims some of its territory; to the north, Laos for years in the throes of civil war; to the east, Vietnam, where violence has been an everyday occurrence since World War II.

Under the leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia feels it has adhered strictly to the policy of nonalignment, whereas Thailand and South Vietnam are military allies of the United States and that part of Laos controlled by the government is under strong United States influence.

From nonalignment to being suspected by all its neighbors, and by the United States too, is a very small step. Cambodia has been accused by some United States officials of following the Peking line in foreign policy, of being anti-American, of assisting North Vietnam in its war effort.

Such attempts to color Cambodia in the worst possible light have caused concern in Washington. A number of those in a position to know, say the alternative to a neutral Sihanouk would be an unfriendly Sihanouk, and the alternative to a Sihanouk regime probably a Communist regime.

There has been concern that too little is known about Cambodia. This lack of knowledge does not help one understand what is happening in Southeast Asia. In the long run, stability founded upon popular acceptance, it is argued, is far preferable to governments whose pro-American stance is often a way of shielding internal instability.

In an effort to contribute to a greater understanding the writer asked Prince Sihanouk to speak about his country and its problems. He graciously consented to answer a number of written questions.

How does the Cambodian political regime function? According to which plan and by what means are the economics and social development of the country ensured?

Cambodia is a monarchy without king since the passing in 1960 of my lamented father, His Majesty Norodom Suramarit. Her Majesty the Queen Mother does not rule. Venerated by everyone, she is the guardian of the throne and the symbol of the permanence of the monarchy.

Our regime is a parliamentary democracy directly controlled by the people. Our National Assembly, freely elected by secret ballot at universal suffrage, is entirely composed of members of the Sangkum Reastr Niyum (Popular Socialist Community), vast nationalist and "Buddhist Socialist" alignment created by me in 1955 and which I still lead. Only one party remains at the opposition, the Preacheachon (People's Group) of Communist obedience, which no longer dares present candidates at the elections after its resounding defeats in 1955 and 1958.

The government, the Assembly, and the administration are controlled by the people through national congresses held twice a year in Pnompenh. All Khmers (Cambodians) without exception can speak, denounce mistakes and abuses, question the highest personalities. Congress decisions are being fully respected by the responsible authorities.

Finally, the Head of State holds, from time to time, "popular audiences" in which he listens to complaints and helps gain justice when required.

The country's development is ensured through five-year plans which establish the targets, their financing, their priority. In fact, we are not the slaves of a plan and we know how to draw the lessons of our mistakes.

Our principle is that Cambodia must help itself, relying as little as possible upon its friends. We have rejected in 1963 all American assistance. Since that date we accept no financial help—which breeds corruption—and we request those of our friends who wish to present us with a factory or a hospital to build them for us. We immediately reject all forms of assistance with strings attached. We are poor but free. And we realize that sacrifices must be made in the name of independence.

Which are, on a regional level, the foreign-policy problems which most seriously concern the Cambodian Government? I think in particular of the problems arising from Cambodia's relations with Bangkok and Saigon.

Our main problem is to protect the present borders of our country, now reduced to a minimum after having been a great empire. Our Thai and South Vietnamese neighbors occupy vast tracts of a land which was once ours and where still live, for the most part still faithful to the motherland, 3 to 4 millions of Khmers. We are not claiming these territories taken away from us through ruse or violence. But we are determined to preserve whatever land is left to us.

Now the authorities in Saigon claim all our coastal isles—those commanding access to our ports of Kampot, Kep, Ream, Sihanoukville—while the Bangkok authorities claim our border temple of Preah Vihear, illegally occupied by them in 1955 and returned to Cambodia following an International Court decision.

I found myself compelled, consequently, to ask all states with which we have diplomatic relations to address us a declaration stating that they "respect Cambodia's territorial integrity within its present borders," that is, its sovereignty over the territories administered by its government.

Our old and faithful friend, France, was the first to make the declaration last year followed by Singapore and the [East] German Democratic Republic. In June of this year a number of other countries have replied in the affirmative: Soviet Union, Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam, People's Republic of China, Cuba, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Other declarations are being awaited.

What counts before anything else for us is that the "true" Vietnam [National Liberation Front and North Vietnam] have declared that they will not only "respect" but also "recognize" our present borders even though they had been drawn by the French when they were the masters of Indochina. Thailand has refused to sign with Cambodia a declaration to respect their mutual borders, thus showing that it does not renounce its policy of annexations vis-a-vis our country.

I wish to point out that I have tried for years to regulate our relations with the Saigon and Bangkok governments. The only "answer" by these governments was hundreds of border aggressions and plots against the unity and security of Cambodia.

Should these problems eventually find a peaceful solution, how do you see the political future of the countries which once composed Indochina, and how do you conceive their mutual relations?

Personally, I have long advocated a "neutralized" Indochina guaranteed by the great powers and which could serve as buffer between East and West—each country having the regime of its choice and establishing with the others friendly economic and cultural relations.

That might be an ideal solution. Are you not concerned, nevertheless, lest the Vietnam conflict will threaten the very existence of Cambodia? The United Nations Security Council has some time ago published alarming information on the subject.

In fact, the United States charges my country, without the shadow of a proof, with being a "sanctuary" for the Communist forces of North and South Vietnam, of furnishing the Viet Cong with arms and supplies, etc., and threatens to penetrate our territory to encircle the Viet Cong or else to occupy our northeastern provinces where the "Ho Chi Minh and Sihanouk trails" for supplying the Viet Cong are, according to them, located.

I have done all that I could to dispel these legends. Diplomats, members of the International Control Commission, observers, well-known Western newspapermen have crossed our border provinces by jeep, helicopter, plane, and sometimes on foot. They found no trace of Viet Cong units, nor Viet Cong "bases." They are aware that our border troops have received the order to fire on all armed foreigners trying to penetrate our territory.

What more could we have done?

Is it to be feared that the sharpening of the Vietnam conflict has already irreparably compromised the relations among the three countries of former Indochina, between the latter and Communist China, and between Southeast Asia and the great powers?

It is certain that the massive military intervention by the United States in Vietnam has seriously compromised relations between the nations of Southeast Asia and the West. It seems to us equally certain that the West has miscalculated badly when it fenced off China and prevented it from exercising its rights as a great power. Mistrusts and hates were produced which will take long to disappear once peace has returned.

May I ask you, Monseigneur, what is the state of your relations with the United States?

As you know, since 1965 we have no longer diplomatic relations with the United States, following repeated acts of border aggression which have caused loss of life and which are clearly the responsibility of American forces.

I had proposed to Mr. Dean Rusk the establishment here of an American consulate-general. He refused. Since that time the United States has sounded me out several times with a view to an eventual reestablishment of diplomatic relations.

Our position is very simple. We have no ideological hostility toward the United States. We do not hate it. We simply want, should the Americans wish once again to become our friends, that they should treat us decently, that is, that they forever stop border aggressions and that they pledge to respect, as others have done or will do, our present borders.

That, it seems to me, is not too much to ask. To have diplomatic relations with a country means to recognize that there are established borders and to engage not to kill its inhabitants. Unfortunately, the United States is so tied to Saigon and Bangkok that it does not dare to disassociate itself from their territorial claims. And the United States is so intoxicated by American, South Vietnamese and Thai intelligence reports that it more or less accepts the fable of a Cambodia "accomplice of and giving sanctuary to the Viet Cong."

I note that in recent months American forces have abstained from attacking our border posts and villages. If they kept this up—and they could if they wanted—there would be at least a détente between us. And if they convinced their allies of Saigon and Bangkok to leave us also alone, to stop their daily harassment, their laying of mines on our territory, they would have our sincere gratitude.

As to our borders, the day will come—certainly not before the end of the American engagement in Vietnam—when the United States, which has no special problems with us, will pledge to respect them. At that time it will give me great pleasure to welcome an American ambassador at Pnompenh. But so long as we represent, for the United States, a state whose borders are "vague, badly drawn, contested, etc.," that will not be possible.

To prepare the future I wish the United States would abstain from violating or attacking our borders and that it be understood that we are truly neutral and that we wish to live in peace in order to lift our country from its underdevelopment. We already have done much in this respect and want to do even better.

This is the message I am asking you to transmit to the American people.

TAXES BUT CREATE TAXES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the renewed call for raising taxes from our working and productive citizens prompts me to place in the RECORD for our colleagues a letter from Dr. William Douglass of Sarasota, Fla., addressed to Mr. Henry Fowler, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury:

SARASOTA, FLA.,
April 15, 1966.

Mr. HENRY FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Never before in the history of any nation has there been such tolerance and accommodation of treason as now exists in the United States—history shows no parallel. Because the United States Government is now, for all practical purposes, controlled by the Communist conspiracy, I must for moral, religious and Constitutional reasons refuse to pay any further federal income tax. Cicero said in 54 B.C.. "We are taxed in our bread and our wine, in our income and our investments, in our land and on our property, not only for base creatures who do not deserve the name of men, but for foreign nations. . . ." Cicero could have been speaking for us as well.

Many high officials in the United States Government, both elected and un-elected, are guilty of violating multiple sections of the United States Criminal Code including Sections 241, 371, 1001, 2382, 2384 and 2385. They are also guilty of violating Section 4.21 of the Internal Revenue Agents Training Manual and Sections 7214 and 7623, Title 26, Internal Revenue Code. These same officials are guilty of violating the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 14th and 16th Amendments of the United States Constitution.

As a result of these multiple criminal acts, many billions of dollars of income taxes have been used to further a Communist state in the United States. Over a million industrial, labor, education, trade and other types of organizations and corporations have functioned under a system of administrative law which is identical to Communist law as practiced in Russia and its satellites. These organizations have evaded billions and billions of dollars in Federal income taxes and these unpaid taxes have been made up by the docile serfs in this nation known as the middle class taxpayer, the taxes collected from America's working citizens have been the basic well-spring from which Communist and Communist collaborators have worked to destroy completely the free enterprise system in the United States and to set up a Communist government in the United States. The domestic Communist conspiracy and the International Communist conspiracy are financed almost completely, and of course involuntarily, by the American taxpayer. The United States Government has allowed foundations, labor unions, tax-exempt organizations and others, through the use of tax-free money, to destroy the very fabric of our nation and set up what is essentially a Communist police state varying little from that in Russia today or that of Hitler's Socialist dictatorship.

As young American soldiers die in Viet Nam, the tax money of the American people is being used to supply food, guns and ammunition to the enemies of these American sons. Recently Yugoslavia, for instance received five million dollars worth of copper scrap which is essential to the Communist conquest of America. Yugoslavia also received three million dollars worth of raw material needed to manufacture rayon cord which is used for military truck tires. Communist countries, dedicated to the burial of the United States, have received two and one-half million dollars worth of grinding machines necessary for the manufacture of rocket launchers, bazookas, rifles and cannon barrels. Wheat in vast quantities has been sold to all Communist countries, including Soviet Russia, for the manufacture of industrial alcohol which is necessary for the manufacture of ammunition and fuels for rockets and jet aircraft. How can any Christian allow the Federal Government to force him into committing murder against fellow Americans through this treasonous supplying of war material to the enemy? (See Article 3, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.)

In giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States, the United States Government is committing treason against the American people. Those who control the levers of governmental power cannot and will not force me to commit treason against my country, my family, my friends and myself.

The 10th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." It follows then that all foreign aid is unconstitutional as the Federal Government does not have the legal right to make gifts of American tax money to foreigners. Foreign aid to our enemies is not only unconstitutional; it is immoral and treasonous. I offer the following documentation as evidence that elected and non-elected representatives of the Federal Government are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of these United States and are therefore guilty of treason:

1. Communist Indonesia (under the leadership of Sukarno, the Japanese collaborator and the vicious Communist murderer of tens of thousands): nine hundred and thirty-eight million dollars in aid which has enabled Sukarno to keep one hundred million Indonesians under slavery.

2. Communist Yugoslavia (under the iron rule of the vicious Communist beast Tito): two billion, five hundred eighty-six million dollars in American tax money to enable Tito to keep 19 million Yugoslavians under slavery.

3. Communist Russia (the fountainhead of the Anti-Christ which is about to take over the entire world in the process of which 60 million Americans are to be murdered—they have openly admitted this): one hundred eighty-six million dollars. This, of course does not include the billions of dollars given to them in World War II.

4. Communist Poland (under the iron-fisted rule of Communist puppet Gomulka): five hundred and forty-eight million American tax dollars to enable Gomulka and his henchmen to keep 30 million Poles under Communist slavery.

5. Communist Cuba (under the rule of one of the most vicious assassins in all history, Fidel Castro): fifty-two million dollars has been received in aid and, as recently as 1965, two hundred and thirty thousand dollars in American tax dollars were given to Castro through a Communist-front known as UNICEF. Americans have even been forced into paying the lion's share of the Communist spy school in Cuba (documentation supplied on request). Seven million Cubans are being held in slavery and under subhuman living conditions partially with the help of American tax dollars.

6. Algeria (under the rule of Ben Bella until he was replaced by another Communist): one hundred forty-nine million tax dollars which have been and are being used to keep eleven million Algerians in slavery.

7. Communist satellite Burma: one hundred and ten million dollars.

8. Communist Ghana (under the dictatorship of the Communist Kwame Nkrumah): one hundred and sixty-three million tax dollars which are used by the Russians to further communize Africa. Even the Marxist-oriented, but ostensibly anti-Communist Senator Dodd, said that Ghana was Russia's first satellite in Africa. Yet, the American people who are looked upon by arrogant bureaucrats as stupid and servile worms, are expected to take this treason indefinitely. This citizen will take it no longer.

The 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution is being administered unconstitutionally because the tax is not levied equally on all citizens. The Constitution of the United States specifically states that all taxes must be levied equally (see United States Constitution Article 1, Section 8). The 16th Amendment was not passed to enable the Internal Revenue Service to set up a gestapo that grants tax favoritism to enemies of the people. It was not set up to be a collection agency for Soviet Russia. The Internal Revenue Service has become an internation revenue service primarily for the benefit of the enemies of these United States. It is now obvious that there is an interlocking conspiracy between the Internal Revenue Service, the various departments of government, large corporations, tax exempt foundations and unions to harass and destroy those American citizens who obstruct the progress of the Bolshevik state in America. These

various groups and agencies use the IRS to blacklist, boycott, harass, intimidate, persecute and destroy many Americans who only wish to be left alone and abide by the Constitution of the United States as it was written and intended to be enforced. No American who loves his country and is concerned about the welfare of his family can any longer allow his tax monies to be used to finance this intragovernmental conspiracy which is liquidating the Constitution of the United States, disarming us before our common enemies, while at the same time arming our enemies through the use of tax monies, subverting morality and decency of the people, openly condoning and often encouraging sedition and treason, and very rapidly confiscating all of the assets of the American people. I was born a Christian and raised a Christian and I therefore adhere to the Christian tenet that it is a sin to commit suicide. Financing my own enemies is suicide. I cannot allow the Federal Government to force me to pay taxes in order to take my own life.

The Federal Government and the IRS have been viciously unfair in the administration of the tax laws. The favored few have paid little or no taxes while the majority have been ground down and oppressed with their own money. The following tax evaders, for instance, have never been brought to justice: Adam Clayton Powell, Vice President Alben Barclay, (he didn't even bother to file), Dwight David Eisenhower, (a tax evader on a ground scale), and Billy Sol Estes.

Tax exempt subversive organizations, hiding behind the protective mantle of the Federal Government, are riding herd on the American people. Through the device of tax exemption, the American people are being forced indirectly to subsidize organizations dedicated to the destruction of the United States. The Tax Exempt Division of the Internal Revenue Service has issued tens of thousands of *non-audited and non-supervised* letters of exemption to various tax exempt organizations that are working assiduously to brainwash the American people into accepting Bolshevism and hating Americanism. This insidious cabal has reached gigantic proportions and tens of thousands of organizations are affiliated with this conspiracy.

One example of this treason by tax exempt foundations is the Institute of Pacific Relations. The Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, (which is actually a very war-like organization in *spite of its* name), and the Rockefeller Foundation contributed millions of dollars to this organization. The Institute of Pacific Relations was proven, *by the government itself*, to be a vast and highly effective and very lethal Communist espionage ring. The extent to which the Marxist tax-exempt foundations in the United States are financing the Communist conspiracy is not known because it has never been satisfactorily investigated. The Reece Committee investigated tax exempt foundations, but they were only able to scratch the surface because of pro-Communists within the government not allowing them to have enough funds to properly investigate this conspiracy.

Another example of blatant government support of subversive organizations is the Metropolitan Music School Incorporated. This organization is a *government-cited Communist organization* yet it has tax exemption. Another is the Highlander Folk School, now called the Highlander Center. This is a purely Communist race-hating organization and its parent organization, the Highlander Folk Center, has been *officially cited by the government* as a Communist Organization. The NAACP, CORE, SNCC and all the other race-hating, Communist dominated organizations pay no income tax and are therefore indirectly subsidized by the long-suffering American taxpayer.

The National Science Foundation gave forty-nine hundred dollars to Gaylord Guy King who is head of the Indiana University Chapter of the W. E. B. DuBois Club—*a government cited Communist organization*. (See Attorney General's list of subversive organizations). The National Science Foundation of Indiana University has been guilty of other treasonable activities, (see report of Congressman Roudebush).

Many departments of our Federal Government are now openly or covertly controlled by the Communist conspiracy. An example is the United States Post Office, which cooperates very closely with the Central Intelligence Agency and the IRS in harassing and intimidating American citizens. As evidence of the fact that the United States Post Office is now basically Communist-controlled, one needs only look at the distribution in the United States of tons and tons of Communist propaganda from Soviet countries at no cost to the Soviets. All of this subversive material is paid for, through force, by the American taxpayer.

Another example of essential Communist-control is the U.S. Commerce Department. While our forces in Viet Nam are fighting with defective ammunition and other worn out equipment, the Commerce Department of the United States is encouraging American businessmen to ship billions and billions of dollars of war material to our enemies. Copper, Polystyrene, wheat, entire manufacturing plants such as steel mills, fertilizer plants, various chemicals needed in the production of war materials, and spare parts for their war machinery are all shipped to our enemy through the connivance and encouragement of the United States Department of Commerce. Certainly paying taxes to such a government is morally indefensible.

The Central Intelligence Agency has now become, if it was not always, the American arm of the Russian NKVD. Even Khrushchev himself has bragged that he knows what is going on in the CIA almost before it is planned. Castro was put in power in Cuba through the connivance of the CIA and the only strong anti-Communist leader of the Dominican Republic, General Wesson Y Wesson, was kidnapped by our Central Intelligence Agency. Castro is kept in power by the CIA which keeps the Cuban Freedom Fighters in South Florida constantly off balance, harassed, and confused. Not even the American Congress is allowed to know how many tax dollars are poured into this subversive organization. Even Admiral Hillenkoeter, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, has admitted that the CIA is full of Communist spies—and he was not able to do anything about it.

Another example of blatant Communism in action in the United States is Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. This is truly a war against private property and against the middle class American citizen. Teachers, who have taken part in this program have been brainwashed with Communist books by such noted Communists as Woody Guthrie, Howard Fast, W. E. D. DuBois, Ann Braden and Herbert Aptheker. Many of these so named are top functionaries in the Communist party which is dedicated to the overthrow of the United States. Yet, their works are recommended by Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty Commissars. Poverty funds have been given to Bolshevik racists fanatics in New York City; funds have been used to support prostitution and in many other ways the money is being used to subvert the morals and the morale of America's youth.

The Department of State has become, for all practical purposes, a branch of the Russian Embassy taking its orders primarily from New York City, (the United Nations). The United States State Department is today entirely under the direction of our Bolshevik enemy. This is true beyond a shadow of a doubt and in evidence I offer the following documentation to wit:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is himself a very serious security risk. Rusk has been a Communist collaborator for all of his adult life. By 1946 Mr. Rusk had a very active file with our Intelligence Services due to his strong pro-Communist sympathies and activities. In spite of this, in 1946 he was appointed Chief of Internal Security Affairs of the Department of State. In March of 1947 he replaced the spy Alger Hiss as Director of Special Political Affairs. Rusk continued the policies of the spy Alger Hiss in cooperating closely with the Communist conspiracy by keeping known Communists and other security risks in the State Department and filling jobs in the United Nations with these traitors. Alger Hiss and Dean Rusk were responsible for at least 26 American Communists getting key jobs in the United Nations. There can be no question that Spy Hiss, and his Communist collaborator Rusk, knew that these men were Communist espionage agents as their files, containing this information, were in the State Department at the time they were hired. Although Mao Tse Tung had murdered tens of millions of Chinese, Dean Rusk called him "The George Washington of China." Dean Rusk was responsible for the United States rejecting Chiang Kai-shek's offer of troops in Korea and so Rusk was indirectly responsible for the death of many Americans in the Korean war. It was Dean Rusk who formulated the plan to not win in Korea, who tied General MacArthur's hands and who finally was responsible for General MacArthur's being removed from Command. Dean Rusk recommended a two million dollar grant to the Institute of Pacific Relations from the pro-Communist institution known as the Rockefeller Foundation. As reported above, the Institute of Pacific Relations was found to be a Communist espionage ring. (Mr. Rusk was an officer in this Communist espionage ring). This is only a brief sketch of the Communist collaborator Dean Rusk. More information and documentation will be supplied on request.

James Harland Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizational Affairs: This man has a long history of Communist associations. He has written for a number of Communist magazines. Cleveland recently tried to slip the traitor Alger Hiss back into the government. Mr. Cleveland's record is long and sordid and documentation and witnesses will be supplied on request.

Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Long history of association with Communists and Communist sympathizers. Wilbur Cohen has many Communist affiliations—documentation supplied on request.

Harry Conover, Councilor U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires: A long and involved Communist record—documentation supplied on request.

Daniel Margolies, Supervisor of International Relations Office: This man has associated with many known Communists and has a number of Communist front affiliations—documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

Livingston Merchant: A long and notorious record of association with Communists and Communist agents. He was reported reliably as being a member of a group in the State Department completely under the control of the Soviet Intelligence.

Alexander L. Peaslee, Chief of the Asian Communist Areas Division in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State: This man and his wife have been reported by our Intelligence Services as being a contact of Soviet Intelligence who were supplying confidential and secret information to the enemy. Documentation supplied on request.

David H. Popper, Director, Office of Atlantic Political and Military Affairs, Department of State: A friend of many Communist agents and on the editorial board of the subversive magazine Amerasia—documentation supplied on request.

Hugh C. Reichard, formerly in the Intelligence Research Division of the State Department, now in International Relations Office: Many Communist associations and a draft dodger—documentation supplied on request.

J. J. Reinstein, U.S. Embassy, Paris: Close friend of identified Communist agent Donald Hiss (brother of Alger Hiss now working for former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson—himself a Communist collaborator).

Walt Whitman Rostow: This man is such a serious security risk that when he was considered for a high post in the United States Air Force he was rejected. Documentation supplied on request.

Abba Schwartz, Administrator Bureau of Security and Councilor Affairs: A friend of a number of Communists, Soviet agents and homosexuals. This man is responsible for many Communist spies coming from Red China and Cuba into the United States at the expense of the American taxpayer. He was responsible for the return of one Lee Harvey Oswald to Russia where he trained to kill the President of the United States. Abba Schwartz stole the file on Lee Harvey Oswald after Oswald shot the President. No action has been taken against him for this malfeasance in office.

John Stewart Service: Reported as an espionage agent. He was given a loyalty clearance by a personnel board in the State Department consisting of Selden Chapman, Nelson Rockefeller, Dean Acheson, Julius Holmes. This case has been suppressed according to an affidavit by a court reporter—documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

Julian Singman, known to live with homosexuals and also a close friend of Adlai Stevenson and Abba Schwartz. A serious security risk.

Charles N. Spinks, State Department employee detached to U.S. Information Agency: Spinks was a dues-paying member of the espionage ring known as the Institute of Pacific Relations and wrote for their Communist magazine Pacific Affairs. Spinks has many Communist friends including espionage agent Thomas A. Bission, Communist collaborator Michael Greenberg, Andrew Roth, and Emmanuel S. Larson. In spite of this highly subversive background, Spinks has been assigned to top secret intelligence work. Documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

Edward A. Symans, now retired at taxpayers' expense: Named by Soviet defector as a Soviet espionage agent for 18 years while in government service. In spite of this, Symans was allowed to resign. He was then rehired and pensioned off at taxpayers' expense. The name Symans is an alias. His real name is Symanski.

Dr. Phillip Talbot, Assistant Secretary of State: This man has a long history of association with Communists and Communist-sympathizers and Soviet agents. He was a dues-paying member of the espionage ring known as the Institute of Pacific Relations—documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

Leonard Unger, U.S. Ambassador to Laos: Unger is one of the group in the State Department constituting a suspected espionage ring. Security officer Scott McCloud considered Unger a security risk as far back as 1956. Unger has a long list of Communist associations and affiliations— documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

William Wieland, alias Montenegro: A key figure in the downfall of Cuba and its takeover by Communist Castro. Wieland has long been known as a serious security risk and he is now helping to subvert Australia at the expense of the American taxpayer. Documentation and witnesses supplied on request.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense: Yarmolinsky and his family have had a long association with Communists, Communist agents and other subverters of the American way. His sordid background is too long and involved to document here but documentation and witnesses will be supplied on request.

This is a very brief sample of the spies and traitors in the Department of State at the present time. There are hundreds of others and documentation and witnesses will be supplied on request.

The following persons and departments are also involved in the conspiracy:

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor: Mrs. Peterson and her husband have been long time security risks and were close friends and contacts with identified Communist John Abt, identified Communist Charles Krivitsky, identified Communist Victor Perlo and identified Communist Lee Pressman. The pro-Communist background of this Assistant Secretary of Labor is long and involved and documentation and witnesses will be supplied on request.

The President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson: The Communist Party, under the direction of Mr. Gus Hall, openly endorsed Lyndon Baines Johnson and the Democratic Party for re-election in 1964. Communists the world over went all out for the re-election of Lyndon B. Johnson for the Presidency. Hubert Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, has also shown himself to be completely acceptable to the international Communist conspiracy.

The United States Supreme Court: The United States Supreme Court has become one of the most important instruments of Communist global conquest. On November 15, 1965, the United States Supreme Court gave domestic Communists complete constitutional protection by ruling that members of the Communist Party no longer have to register as agents of a foreign power. The Communists themselves have openly admitted that this is the greatest victory in their history. The Supreme Court has handicapped the police and the FBI. It has usurped the powers of Congress and destroyed the security of these United States.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, a close friend of the Communist butcher Tito, has gone all out for complete surrender of American sovereignty to a world body. This is a direct violation of his oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. (See also Public Law 85766, Section 1602). He votes consistently for the Communists in cases before the Supreme Court.

Hugo Black, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court: Mr. Black, a former member of the Ku Klux Klan, has been associated with Communist front organizations (see HCUA appendix 9, page 1581). His voting record is 100% pro-Communist.

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice: Justice Douglas has a long line of Communist affiliations. He has voted 97% pro-Communist.

Justice Brennan has close to a 100% pro-Communist voting record.

Abe Fortas, Associate Justice: A defender of Communists and a member of many Communist front organizations including the National Lawyers Guild and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

A convicted traitor, George J. Gessner, has been set free on a fantastically asinine technicality. In any country with the government responsible to the welfare and safety of the citizenry, Gessner would have been executed. The Federal Judge in this case is still receiving a paycheck from the American taxpayer.

Many members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives have records of Communist affiliations and Communist associations. The list is too long and involved to enumerate here but details will be supplied on request. Examples of members of the United States Senate with Communist affiliations and associations are Senators Gruening, Javits, Douglas, and Saltonstall. The records of Gruening, Douglas and Saltonstall can be found in the investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of 1944 (Appendix 9).

Certain Senators, who are supporting Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32 are in violation of their oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. This Concurrent Resolution calls for the establishing of an international police force and a disarmament organization through a new United Nations treaty. The Resolution also calls for financial support of this disarmament organization and international police force. Any one who supports disarmament of the United States cannot at this same time claim to be fulfilling his oath to support and defend the United States.

These Senators are also in violation of Public Law 85766, Section 1602 which states: "No part of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be used to pay . . . any person, firm or corporation, or any combination of persons, firms or corporations, to conduct a study or plan when or how or in what circumstances the Government of the United States should surrender this country and its people to any foreign power . . ."

The following Senators, whose salaries are paid by the U.S. taxpayers, are supporting the above mentioned treasonous Concurrent Resolution No. 32: Senators McGovern, Bayh, Church, Bartlett, Burdick, Brewster, Mondale, Hart, Inouye, Javits, Long (Mo.), McGee, Morse, Moss, Newberger, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Tydings, Williams (N.J.), Young (Ohio).

The United Nations: Section 109, Public Law 471 states: "It is illegal to use funds for any project that promotes One World Government or One World Citizenship." The United Nations, designed by Communist Alger Hiss and other traitors, is the Communist instrument by which the sovereignty of the United States is being transferred to an internation Communist-controlled government. It is therefore natural that most of the Americans in key positions in the United Nations would be Americans in name only.

The American Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg has a long history of Communist collaboration and Communist sympathies.

Mr. Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary General of the United Nations and therefore one of the three most influential men in that organization is a dedicated world Marxist. Mr. Bunche has been declared a serious security risk on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. His pro-Communist record is long and easily documented and this documentation will be supplied on request.

Mr. Philip Jessup: "Our" Representative on the World Court, was considered such a serious security risk by the United States Senate that he was disapproved as United States delegate to the United Nations in 1951.

The United States taxpayers pay the lion share of the expenses of the United Nations which is being used to destroy our nation and kill off all of our youth in foreign wars. It is now well known that both sides of the Korean War were controlled from the United Nations by Russian General Constantine Zinchenko. The present bloodletting operation in Vietnam is also controlled by the Communists through the United Nations. General Westmoreland, the figurehead commander of our troops, (and himself a member of the Communist-collaborating Council on Foreign Relations), is under command of Russian General Vladimir Suslove from the U.N. It is, of course, impossible for America to win a war when its troops are commanded by the enemy. This undoubtedly will go down in history as the most colossal fraud and sham of all time. No American who does not classify himself as a Communist-collaborator can allow his money to be spent on this mass murder of young American citizens.

The Solicitor General of the U.S., *Thurgood*

Marshall, the top trial lawyer in these United States, is sympathetic to the Communist cause and was an *officer* in a Communist organization (see HCUA appendix 9, page 795). This pro-Communist racist fanatic once said, "I want you to understand that when the colored people take over, every time a white man draws a breath he will have to pay a fine." I cannot, with a clear conscience, pay one infinitesimal portion of this creature's salary and I refuse to do so.

Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, has a shameful record of cooperation with the Communist enemy. His pro-Communist and Communist associations are: Negro Peoples Committee (see HCUA Appendix 9, Page 184), and Washington Book Shop (see letter by Attorney General Clark, December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948). I will not be forced to pay one penny of tribute to a government that promotes rather than hangs collaborators such as Robert C. Weaver.

Treason, anarchy and sedition have become rampant within these United States. Herbert Aptheker, Communist; Staughton Lynd, Marxist fanatic and Thomas Hayden, anti-American revolutionary, have all been in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Acts of 1952. For conniving with the enemy they are each subject to a $5,000 fine and 5 years in a Federal penitentiary. They are also in violation of the Logan Act. These three traitors travelled to North Vietnam, without benefit of passports, to deal with the Red butcher of North Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh. What instructions did these enemies of America receive from their master in Hanoi? Were their instructions similar to those received by one Lee Harvey Oswald when he made his sojourn to Mexico? The President of the United States, the Attorney General and the State Department, apparently in collusion with these traitors, remain silent. I will not pay the salaries of men who collaborate with my country's enemies. Many other examples of sedition and treason, carried on with the tacit approval of the Johnson administration, will be supplied on request.

If you wish further evidence that the United States is controlled, for all practical purposes, by the Communist enemy, or if you wish the names of more individuals who have avoided millions of dollars in taxes, I will supply them on request.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM CAMPBELL DOUGLASS, M.D.

PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN DAIRY FARMER

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, we are all painfully aware of the tragic plight of the American dairy farmer. The recent milk dumpings, the withholding of farm produce from the marketplace, the bitter cries against the economic injustices of falling prices and rising costs are all evidence of the struggle by the American farmer to reverse what have become economic facts of life—that the American dairy farmer cannot make a living on the farm, that he cannot even maintain the economic status quo, and that, in effect, he is trying to walk up an economic "down" escalator.

One means of helping the dairy farmer is to strengthen the import controls on foreign-produced dairy products. The present quotas which were first invoked in 1953 have been continually enlarged and eroded, to the point where they are no longer effective, and rapid remedial legislation is required.

I have today introduced a bill to stop the flood of dairy imports on the domestic market—the dairy import act of 1967—and I strongly urge my colleagues to join in support of this vital measure to help our Nation's dairy farmers.

HON. HERBERT TENZER TESTIFIES ON TAX SURCHARGE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TENZER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, on the President's 10-percent tax surcharge proposal. I also outlined my own suggestion, as contained in H.R. 12445 a bill to impose a minimum income tax on certain individuals and corporations.

Because my own income is partly sheltered by real estate depreciation and capital gains taxes, I will be required to pay considerably more in income taxes under my bill than under the President's tax surcharge proposal.

The distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and its members appear to be searching for specifics. Specific proposals for budgetary cuts rather than vague generalities—specific proposals for sources of revenue rather than a general increase in rates.

The answer to the committee's search for specifics will not come from those who enjoy special privileges or from the organizations which represent them. If it comes at all, it will come from the Ways and Means Committee or from other Members of the House who are conscientiously representing those who are already carrying their just and equitable share of the tax burden.

My statement at the Ways and Means Committee hearing follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT TENZER BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 22, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear and testify before you and the other distinguished Members of the Ways and Means Committee, on the President's 10 percent tax surcharge proposal. I will also outline my own suggestion for an alternative to raise the same amount of revenue or should you so decide, to raise twice the amount sought by the Administration without costing most taxpayers any more than the President proposed.

At the outset let me say that I oppose the President's proposal for a surcharge in its present form. I will continue to oppose it unless it includes provisions *to tax the untaxed.* By that I mean, the surcharge or equivalent should apply to those whose income is derived from depletion, depreciation, capital gains and other loophole and tax sheltered income, so long as the surcharge remains in effect.

By this suggestion I am not proposing a broad change in our tax laws at this time. While a comprehensive reform of our tax laws is long overdue, I realize that this desirable result will require separate study by this Committee. To accomplish this I have introduced in the House, H.J. Res. 454 to establish a Commission on Unequal Taxation. The Commission would be charged with the responsibility to review the entire tax structure—the existing inequities—the tax loopholes—and would make recommendations to the Congress designed to equitably distribute the tax burden.

Prior to my election to the Congress in November 1964, I was the senior partner of a New York law firm. I have been a practicing attorney for 38 years. During this period I served as chairman and a director of a number of business corporations and of three commercial banks. I have also had extensive experience and investments in real estate.

While I have had a wide experience in law, business, banking and real estate, I am not a tax expert or an economist.

I do know that the generally accepted theory of taxation in America is that money to be used in the service of all the citizens is justly raised by taxation; that a tax which does not apply equitably upon all or which, applying equitably upon all, is used only for the benefit of a few, is unjust.

In his 1st annual message to the Congress on December 2, 1817 President James Monroe said 'To impose taxes when the public exigencies require them is an obligation of the most sacred character, especially with a free people".

If "taxation without representation is tyranny", then representation without taxation is scandalous.

Let me cite examples of what I consider as scandalous. The Internal Revenue Service has informed me that in calendar 1964, there were 35 individual returns filed with adjusted gross incomes of $500,000 and over, and on which no Federal income tax was paid. These returns represented a total adjusted gross income of $75.2 million.

The Internal Revenue Service also informed me that in the same year, 24,084 individuals *filed tax returns* with adjusted gross incomes in excess of $10,000 and paid no taxes. The combined adjusted gross income of these individuals was $523,515,000.

It is equally scandalous that certain corporations enjoy *unusual* special privileges under our tax laws, while most corporations pay at the rate of 48%.

One example of the special privileges to which I refer, is that extended to the oil companies.

In 1964 the U.S. income taxes of the 22 largest oil companies when taken together reveal these interesting statistics.

Year 1964 (combined)

Gross profit	$5,179,036,000
Federal tax (4 percent of gross)	240,529,000
Foreign, some state tax (20 percent of gross)	1,064,383,000
Income after tax (74 percent of gross)	3,873,836,000

It is shocking that the largest oil companies pay a smaller percentage of their net incomes in taxes than small businessmen, workers and farmers. The man in the lowest tax bracket pays 14 percent of his net income in taxes.

I have read the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler; of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Stanley S. Surrey; and of Chairman Gardner Ackley, Council of Economic Advisors and others who testified last week before this Committee. They presented the problem of a $29 billion deficit facing the Administration. They explained how they plan to *borrow 50%—cut 25%*—and *tax 25%*—to meet the deficit.

I have read their analyses of the needs for additional tax revenues. I may even agree with their fears about inflation. However, I cannot understand why they have overlooked, as a source of revenue, those who pay no taxes at all and those who do not pay an equitable share of the tax burden.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony on page 37 of his prepared statement said as follows:

"I want to make quite clear that the choice of the surcharge form to meet a temporary need by no means implies a turning away from the need for achieving important permanent structural changes in the tax system.

"Indeed, as the President stated in his Economic Message, he will be sending a Message proposing comprehensive tax reform later in this Session.

"Both in timing and objectives, however, tax reform should be distinguished from the present temporary surcharge recommendation. The surcharge is needed now for revenue. Expeditious action is essential if it is to achieve its purpose. It is a temporary measure and not a permanent part of our revenue structure. The central issues for Congressional concern are the size of the needed increase and its timing.

"The Tax Reform Message will require more deliberate consideration since it involves proposals for permanent structural changes and some redistribution of tax burdens in the interest of a fairer sharing of the load. Its basic objective is not to raise revenue but to correct a number of inequities and abuses in our tax system. Tax reform is a job that very much needs to be done. I hope your Committee will be giving its consideration to the President's reform recommendations in the months ahead."

However, I am not speaking now of overall tax reform. I am addressing myself to the present needs and how best to meet them.

I do not agree with the Secretary of the Treasury that we must wait for a tax reform message until after the tax surcharge is disposed of. We have had promises of tax reform before.

The Democratic Platform of 1940 contained the following declaration: "To encourage investment in productive enterprise, the tax-exempt privileges of future Federal, state and local bonds should be removed." The Democratic Platform of 1948—"We shall endeavor to remove tax inequities and to continue to reduce the public debt." The Republican Platform of 1952—"A thorough revision and codification of the present hodge-podge of internal revenue laws."

And finally, the late President John F. Kennedy in his Special Message to the Congress on Taxation, April 20, 1961, said: "While it is essential that the Congress receive at this time this Administration's proposals for urgent and obvious tax adjustments needed to fulfill the aims listed above, time has not permitted the comprehensive review necessary for a tax structure which is so complicated and so critically important to so many people. This message is but a first though urgent step along the road to constructive reform." . . .

"Moreover, special provisions have developed into an increasing source of preferential treatment to various groups. Whenever one taxpayer is permitted to pay less, someone else must be asked to pay more." . . .

"It will be a major aim of our tax reform program to reverse this process, by broadening the tax base and reconsidering the rate structure. The result should be a tax system that is more equitable, more efficient and more conducive to economic growth." . . .

I would urge the President not to wait with his tax reform message. The taxpayers who are already paying their share want to know what this Administration intends to do about those who by *tax avoidance procedures*, do not pay their equitable share of the tax burdens.

They want to know now.

The President should send his tax reform proposal to the Congress without delay. Such action will create an air of confidence in the minds of the taxpayers. It will serve to encourage them in giving objective consideration to the Nation's budgetary needs. They will better understand what the President's advisors are saying.

The proposal which I am making today stems from the fact that I want everyone to share in the Nation's mounting tax burden. I want everyone to contribute to the Nation's obligations at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, last Thursday I introduced H.R. 12445, a bill to impose a minimum income tax on certain individuals and corporations with substantial incomes. My proposed bill has the following features:

1) Taxpayers with less than $10,000 in actual income will be exempt.

2) A minimum income tax to apply across the board so as to reach all tax loophole and tax-sheltered income, income from tax exempt securities, non-taxed capital gains, excess of percentage over cost depletion and real estate depreciation income.

The thrust of my proposal is to tax the untaxed by having them pay a minimum income tax of 10 percent, to remain in effect only so long as the President's surcharge tax remains in effect.

I have carefully considered this proposal to establish fairness and equitable treatment among all individuals and corporations.

I am not wedded to the text of my bill but to the equity behind the principle. If the principle is accepted, then I am certain that the distinguished Chairman and Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and their tax experts will amend the bill to correct its deficiencies and omissions.

One of the individuals who paid no tax in 1964 had an adjusted gross income of $5,000,000. Under the President's proposal he would not contribute to the cost of running the government.

No matter how you look at it, 10 percent of zero is still zero.

I want those with substantial incomes who pay no taxes to contribute their just share of fighting the war in Vietnam; fighting the war on poverty, and the battle to clean up and rid the riot potential cities of slum areas. I want them to pay an equitable share of the burden of providing education, medical facilities, and building our highways, the benefits from which they share with their fellow citizens.

H.R. 12445 (Tenzer Bill) is not a tax reform measure. It does not single out any particular tax loophole for reform. It simply requires a minimum contribution to the Nation's tax burden through a minimum income tax applied to *all income*—without regard to exemptions, deductions or other special privileges set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.

I fully realize that tax reform cannot be accomplished overnight—however, the time to start is now. A complete overhaul of our tax laws is urgently needed and will be of long-term benefit to our Nation.

With the President's tax surcharge proposal intended to raise only 25 percent of the $29 billion deficit, it seems only fair, reasonable and equitable that every taxpayer, individual or corporate, should pay something toward the tax revenue needed to prevent unbridled inflation.

Unofficial Treasury Department estimates confirm that my proposal will produce about $7 billion in additional revenue. By spreading the tax burden to those who were previously untaxed, other taxpayers will be assured that the surcharge is only temporary.

My proposal can be used as an alternative or as an amendment to the President's surcharge proposal.

Under the President's tax surcharge proposal the low and fixed income taxpayer, one who earns less than $5,000 is exempt. He may however be adversely affected if the budgetary cuts of $7½ billion extend to the basic human needs which he requires to sustain himself and his family.

The additional tax revenues which my proposal will produce, together with the President's surcharge, will provide sufficient funds to safeguard against budgetary cuts in the areas of human needs such as health, education and housing.

I have already stated to the President, in person and in writing, that I will oppose the surcharge in the absence of some sharing of the tax burden by the untaxed and those who have taken advantage of various tax shelters.

For the long term a complete overhaul of our tax laws is necessary. My proposal will answer the question for the short term and indicate to the taxpayer who will be called upon to pay the surcharge that others of their fellow citizens are not escaping their proportionate share of running the government.

Let the tax and economic experts of this distinguished Committee draft a proposal which will equitably distribute the tax burden required by the fiscal 1968 budget.

If a just and equitable revenue proposal is desired, then our policy should be:

"Everybody pays or nobody pays."

[From the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Jan. 13, 1967]

NONTAXED INCOMES OF MORE THAN $500,000

The Internal Revenue Service has informed us that in calendar 1964, there were 35 individual returns filed with adjusted gross incomes of $500,000 and over, and on which no Federal income tax was paid. These returns represented a total adjusted gross income of $75.2 million. A breakdown of the income characteristics of these returns follows:

	Number of returns	Amount (thousands)
Salaries and wages	19	$1,145
Business or profession income:		
Net profit	12	14
Loss	8	3,050
Farm income:		
Net profit	1	27
Loss	8	838
Partnership income:		
Net profit	4	24
Loss	17	2,625
Sales of capital assets:		
Gain	29	21,063
Loss	0	0
Sales of depreciable property:		
Gain	6	24
Loss	0	0
Sales of other property:		
Gain	0	0
Loss	3	72
Dividends	32	57,609
Interest	33	2,577
Pensions and annuities	6	74
Net income from rents	8	59
Net loss from rents	13	193
Royalties:		
Gain	3	7
Loss	1	8
Net income from other sources	0	1,430

Source: Statistics Division, Internal Revenue Service.

IRS indicated that, in general, the most probable factors accounting for this income being non-taxable are tax credits and itemized deductions, especially large contributions.

For greater detail on this issue, a copy of Philip Stern's, *The Great Treasury Raid*, is also enclosed. See especially Chapter 1.

PAUL F. PRESTON,
Analyst in Public Finance.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TENZER: In reply to your request for information pertaining to the number of non-taxable income tax returns showing adjusted gross incomes in excess of $10,000, I am providing the information you requested for the year 1964, which is the most recent year for which statistics are available.

In 1964, 24,084 non-taxable tax returns

with adjusted gross incomes over $10,000 were filed with the Internal Revenue Service. The total adjusted gross income of these non-taxable returns was $523,515,000.

A table explaining the above is attached.

Very truly yours,

SAMUEL M. JONES,
Deputy Assistant to the Secretary.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS FOR 1964

Adjusted gross income	All returns		Taxable		Nontaxable difference	
	Number of returns	Adjusted gross income (thousands)	Number of returns	Adjusted gross income (thousands)	Number of returns	Adjusted gross income (thousands)
$10,000 to $15,000	6,609,927	$78,290,817	6,593,499	$78,094,242	16,428	$196,575
$15,000 to $20,000	1,460,198	24,832,960	1,456,670	24,772,473	3,528	60,487
$20,000 to $50,000	1,211,761	34,505,018	1,208,517	34,407,979	3,244	97,039
$50,000 to $100,000	159,229	10,463,142	158,700	10,429,137	529	34,005
$100,000 to $500,000	34,946	5,707,258	34,626	5,649,031	320	58,227
$500,000 to $1,000,000	1,073	710,407	1,057	700,283	16	10,124
$1,000,000 or more	482	1,019,230	463	952,174	19	67,056
Total	9,477,616	155,528,832	9,453,532	155,005,319	24,084	523,515

H.R. 3803 SEEKS TO REDUCE THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE, JANUARY 26, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1967, I introduced H.R. 3803, a bill to reduce the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent at the rate of 2½ percent annually over a 3-year period.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the tax allowance by an additional 50 percent whenever he finds that a substantial part of the tax savings has been used to finance mergers with or to purchase companies in unrelated fields.

Our Federal budget is increasing and our local village, town, city, county, and State budgets are likewise increasing—often to an even greater degree. Plugging the tax loopholes is our way to equalize the tax burdens among the Nation's taxpayers, corporate as well as individuals.

The special privileges under our present tax laws to the oil companies are inequitable and require all other corporations and individuals to carry a greater share of the tax burden than they should be carrying.

It is shocking that the largest oil companies pay a smaller percentage of their net incomes in taxes than small businessmen, workers, and farmers. The man in the lowest tax bracket pays 14 percent of his net income in taxes while in 1965 the 20 largest oil companies paid an average of 6.3 percent of their net incomes in Federal taxes. These companies had a combined net income of more than $5.7 billion, yet paid only $360 million in taxes.

U.S. INCOME TAXES OF 22 LARGEST OIL REFINERS (1962, 1963, 1964)[1]

Rank in size	Year	Gross profit	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States tax	Percent	Income after tax	Percent of gross
Standard (New Jersey)	1962	1,271,903,000	8,000,000	0.6	423,000,000	33	804,903,000	66
	1963	1,584,469,000	69,000,000	4.3	496,000,000	31	1,019,469,000	64
	1964	1,628,555,000	29,000,000	1.7	549,000,000	33	1,050,555,000	64
Texaco	1962	546,371,000	13,000,000	2.3	51,700,000	9	481,671,000	88
	1963	615,768,000	10,250,000	1.6	58,850,000	12	545,668,000	88
	1964	660,761,000	5,500,000	.8	77,900,000	11	577,361,000	87
Gulf	1962	488,351,000	19,389,000	3.9	128,871,000	26	340,091,000	70
	1963	540,065,000	30,870,000	5.7	137,842,000	25	371,353,000	68
	1964	607,343,000	52,443,000	8.6	159,781,000	26	395,118,000	65
Socony Mobil	1962	379,339,000	8,300,000	2.1	128,700,000	33	242,339,000	63
	1963	437,352,000	23,000,000	5.2	142,500,000	32	271,852,000	62
	1964	464,660,000	27,700,000	5.9	142,800,000	30	294,160,000	63
Standard (California)	1962	348,181,000	5,800,000	1.6	28,600,000	8	313,781,000	90
	1963	356,568,000	2,900,000	.8	31,600,000	8	322,068,000	97
	1964	393,188,000	8,300,000	2.1	39,600,000	10	345,288,000	80
Shell	1962	173,555,000	7,200,000	4.1	8,680,000	5	157,675,000	91
	1963	211,575,000	19,100,000	9.0	12,623,000	5	179,852,000	85
	1964	213,575,000	2,800,000	1.3	12,585,000	5	198,190,000	92
Standard (Indiana)	1962	168,843,000	3,105,000	1.8	3,381,000	2	162,420,000	96
	1963	208,022,000	22,182,000	10.6	2,748,000	1	183,092,000	88
	1964	204,817,000	8,486,000	4.1	1,480,000	.7	194,851,000	95
Phillips	1962	158,320,000	48,000,000	30.3	3,365,000	2	106,955,000	67
	1963	160,954,000	52,000,000	26.2	3,491,000	2	105,463,000	65
	1964	152,197,000	32,229,000	22.2	4,950,000	3	115,018,000	74
Cities Service	1962	84,143,000	20,773,000	24.7	3,185,000	3	60,185,000	71
	1963	101,976,000	20,188,000	21.4	4,283,000	4	77,505,000	74
	1964	113,405,000	27,925,000	24.7	967,000	.8	84,513,000	74
Continental	1962	73,477,000	1,065,000	1.4	3,335,000	5	69,077,000	94
	1963	99,665,000	9,143,000	9.2	3,157,000	3	87,365,000	88
	1964	112,009,000	8,725,000	7.7	3,175,000	2	100,109,000	89
Sun	1962	66,395,000	[2] 200,000	0	13,400,000	20	53,195,000	80
	1963	79,976,000	1,300,000	1.9	17,460,000	22	61,216,000	77
	1964	88,577,000	2,400,000	2.7	17,670,000	20	68,507,000	77
Union	1962	59,421,000	8,000,000	13.5	5,500,000	9	45,921,000	77
	1963	73,028,000	13,100,000	17.7	6,000,000	8	53,928,000	74
	1964	87,564,000	13,300,000	15.2	7,200,000	8	67,064,000	77
Standard (Ohio)	1962	37,235,000	9,275,000	25.0	3,738,000	10	24,222,000	65
	1963	54,008,000	15,225,000	28.1	4,896,000	9	33,887,000	62
	1964	70,252,000	21,150,000	30.2	5,334,000	7	43,768,000	62
Sinclair	1962	57,936,000	0	0	10,586,000	18	47,350,000	83
	1963	71,036,000	1,200,000	0	9,532,000	13	62,704,000	88
	1964	66,444,000	[2] 3,119,000	0	10,531,000	15	58,736,000	88
Marathon	1962	35,894,000	[2] 2,200,000	0	205,000	.5	37,889,000	105
	1963	50,058,000	([3])	0	933,000	1.8	49,125,000	98
	1964	63,220,000	([3])	0	2,844,000	4.4	60,376,000	95
Atlantic	1962	61,110,000	0	0	14,844,000	24	46,266,000	75
	1963	56,747,000	0	0	12,734,000	22	44,013,000	78
	1964	61,081,000	0	0	14,005,000	22	47,076,000	77
Tidewater	1962	35,191,000	228,000	.6	2,387,000	6	32,576,000	93
	1963	42,795,000	[2] 63,000	0	3,384,000	8	39,474,000	92
	1964	40,508,000	377,000	13.7	4,426,000	11	35,705,000	----------
Ashland	1962	24,324,000	6,201,000	25.8	2,799,000	11	15,324,000	63
	1963	28,769,000	10,556,000	37.7	104,000	.3	18,109,000	64
	1964	36,385,000	9,672,000	26.8	2,977,000	8	23,735,000	65
Sunray	1962	41,203,000	3,850,000	9.3	1,152,000	2.8	36,201,000	88
	1963	49,727,000	6,533,000	13.3	1,328,000	2.7	41,866,000	85
	1964	29,357,000	[2] 7,115,000	0	1,290,000	3.6	35,182,000	100
Pure	1962	27,680,000	[2] 2,546,000	0	1,276,000	4	28,950,000	107
	1963	28,582,000	[2] 1,212,000	0	27,000	.01	29,767,000	106
	1964	32,282,000	600,000	.01	164,000	.5	31,518,000	98
Skelly	1962	22,674,000	1,260,000	5.7	250,000	1	21,164,000	96
	1963	27,479,000	3,025,000	7.7	275,000	4	24,179,000	89
	1964	26,601,000	785,000	1.2	275,000	2	25,551,000	98
Richfield	1962	36,615,000	6,000,000	16.6	0	0	30,615,000	83
	1963	29,767,000	1,300,000	4.4	773,000	2.6	27,894,000	94
	1964	26,255,000	[2] 629,000	0	5,429,000	20.8	21,455,000	82
Total	1962	4,198,161,000	164,500,000	4	838,891,000	20	3,194,770,000	76
	1963	4,908,386,000	246,660,000	5	950,540,000	19	3,649,849,000	74
	1964	5,179,036,000	240,529,000	4	1,064,383,000	20	3,873,836,000	74

[1] Compiled from records of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission by the staff of the Gasoline Letter. Warning—this table is part of the Mar. 21, 1966, issue of the Gasoline Letter and may not be reproduced by any means—including office copying equipment—without prior written permission of the publisher. Violation of copyright is a Federal offense carrying penalties from $500 to $2,500.

[2] Cr.

[3] Marathon is the only large oil company that has been able to conceal its domestic income taxes in the Securities and Exchange Commission files. We phoned Girard Jetton, Marathon's tax chief, and asked the U.S. figure, but he said it's a secret. Since the firm probably doesn't want to keep secret the smallness of its foreign taxes, it's assumed the U.S. tax is small and all of Marathon's income taxes are listed here as foreign.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is complex. There is no easy solution. I invite my colleagues to comment on my statement in the hope that from the dialogue, discussion and debate, a solution may evolve which may be acceptable to the majority.

CONGRATULATIONS FOR AVONDALE SHIPYARDS, INC., OF JEFFERSON PARISH, LA.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the leading shipbuilding company in our Nation, Avondale Shipyards Inc., in Jefferson Parish, La., in my district, for the magnificent contributions it is making to the economy of our area and our Nation and for the benefit of our national defense and merchant marine.

Today, Avondale has a construction backlog totaling some $450 million. Included in this massive total are the construction of three large tankers for Humble Oil & Refining Co. at $50 million; 27 destroyer escort vessels for the U.S. Navy at about $300 million; five cargo vessels for States Steamship Co. of San Francisco at $75 million; and miscellaneous work such as construction of chemical barges and huge oil rigs and conversion and repair work totaling some $25 million.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, it was announced that Avondale is the low bidder for building 11 lash modern cargo vessels for the Prudential & the Pacific Far East Lines at almost $240 million. There is little doubt that Avondale will be awarded this contract under the Maritime Administration's subsidy program. With this latest contract, the construction backlog at the yard would be almost $700 million.

Furthermore, in the past 6 years, under the able leadership of Henry Zac Carter as its president, Avondale has completed contracts totaling more than $550 million for the construction, conversion and repair of all kinds of ships, both for private shipping lines, for oil companies such as Humble, for the Navy and the Coast Guard and other agencies and organizations.

Since Mr. Carter assumed the presidency at the yard in mid-1961, full-time employment at Avondale has climbed from 2,000 to 7,000. By virtue of the $1 billion in completed work, or work under contract, south Louisiana area firms have realized subcontracts totaling more than half that sum, or over $500 million.

This subcontract work has meant—and continues to mean, thousands of jobs for the citizens of Jefferson Parish, where the yard is located, and of New Orleans and other neighboring parishes in south Louisiana.

As an example of the subcontract work provided for area firms, Mr. Carter told me that for the lash cargo ships, approximately $140 million in contracts will be assigned to companies to provide needed materials of all kinds.

Since Mr. Carter became president of Avondale, Mr. Speaker, the yard has completed 21 modern cargo vessels for Lykes Brothers Steamship Co. and its subsidiaries. The yard also has constructed ships for Delta Steamship Lines and oil rigs for Humble and other petroleum companies in our area.

Avondale also is the Nation's largest shipbuilder for the repair and renovation of inland waterways boats and barges; and its contract for building three barges for Humble Oil will be the largest barges ever constructed in our country for regular coastwise service and the largest ever built in the Gulf South.

One of the principal features which has made Avondale a tremendous success in the past 6 years has been the far-sighted and progressive team assembled and directed by Mr. Carter and other company officers. They believe that the company should not, and it does not, stand on its past achievements and laurels. As an example, the shipyard is investing some $10 million of its own private capital to enlarge and improve its facilities. Part of this expansion program includes the construction of a huge dry dock next year.

All of these facts, coupled with the philosophy of Mr. Carter and his coworkers, points up that Avondale is leading the way among our Nation's shipbuilders.

Mr. Carter and his coworkers believe that business and industry in our country have a responsibility to participate actively and fully in the civic and governmental affairs of the communities in which they are located.

They subscribe to the conviction that the advancement of our cities and our rural areas should not be left to Government alone, that business and industry should join hands with Government to attain the maximum progress and prosperity for our great Nation. I, too, subscribe to this philosophy, and I am proud to salute Mr. Carter and his fellow officers and employees for the splendid contributions they are making to advance my area and the shipbuilding industry of the United States. I am also pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the magnificent leadership Avondale is providing for the benefit of our country.

OUR FIRST GREAT WAR CORRESPONDENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of an old friend of mine, Comdr. Robert W. Collins who is a retired commander in the Naval Reserve now living at Yazoo City in my native State of Mississippi, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article by Tom Mahoney entitled "Our First Great War Correspondent." This article appeared in the American Legion magazine.

It is particularly appropriate that we note and read Mr. Mahoney's article today for today the 22d of August is the birthday of George Wilkins Kendall whose wonderful career provided the material for Mr. Mahoney's tribute to America's first great war correspondent. Mr. Kendall and Francis Asbury Lumsden founded the Picayune in New Orleans in 1837, a predecessor to one of America's truly great newspapers the Times-Picayune. Mr. Kendall won his reputation for his outstanding reporting of the war with Mexico with ingenuity and meticulous hard work. Many of his dispatches were signed simply "GWK." It was a hallmark of outstanding reporting.

As we render this birthday salute to George Wilkins Kendall on the 158th anniversary of his birth in 1809 it is a genuine pleasure to note that his paper of today the Times-Picayune carries on her masthead "Serving America's International Gateway Since 1837." And what is more, her legions of readers read and rely upon the Times-Picayune as an institution of integrity. Mr. Mahoney's article follows:

OUR FIRST GREAT WAR CORRESPONDENT

(By Tom Mahoney)

One of the most enduringly glamorous figures is the war correspondent who shares the hazards of fighting men to report their battles. The names of Ernie Pyle, Raymond Clapper, Webb Miller and a score of others killed in that role during World War 2 and the years since are mourned on a wall of the Overseas Press Club in New York. In World War 1, Floyd Gibbons survived a torpedoing and took a machinegun bullet in the eye at Belleau Wood. Richard Harding Davis was a national figure earlier.

If you visit the cryt of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, you can find an inscription: "The First and Greatest of War Correspondents." This marks the grave of Sir William Howard Russell whose dispatches to The Times of London revealing the bungling of the Crimean War toppled a British Cabinet.

But, while the British may think him the greatest, Sir William was not the first war correspondent. Without delving into other claims, he must yield precedence to an enterprising American named George Wilkins Kendall.

Eight years before Sir William went to the Crimea, Kendall reported our Mexican War and achieved about every triumph possible for a correspondent. He was our first great war correspondent.

A bullet struck Kendall in the knee as he accompanied his friend. Gen. W. J. Worth, in the storming of Chapultepec fortress at Mexico City on the last day of fighting in September 1847. Lying on a cot with his knee bandaged, Kendall next day reported the end of the war in 1,200 words for the New Orleans Picayune. Even after 11 decades, with their vaster wars, the pulse is still quickened by his dispatch:

"CITY OF MEXICO, September 14.—Another victory, glorious in its results and which has thrown additional luster upon the American arms, has been achieved today by the army under General Scott—the proud capital of Mexico has fallen into the power of a mere handful of men compared with the immense odds arrayed against them, and Santa Anna, instead of shedding his blood as he had promised, is wandering with the remnant of his army no one knows whithe-.

"The apparently impregnable works on Chapultepec, after a desperate struggle, were triumphantly carried; Generals Bravo and Mouterde, besides a host of officers of different grades, taken prisoners; over 1000 noncommissioned officers and privates, all their cannon and ammunition, are in our hands. . . .

"General Quitman, supported by General Smith's brigade, took the road by the Chapultepec aqueduct toward the Belen gate and the Ciudadela; General Worth, supported by General Cadwalder's brigade, advanced by San Cosme aqueduct. . . .

"At a little after midnight Major Palacios, accompanied by . . . members of the municipal council of the city, arrived at General Worth's headquarters, and in great trepidation informed him that Santa Anna and his grand army had fled, and that they wished to surrender the capital. . . .

"At seven o'clock this morning General Scott, with his staff, rode in and took quarters in the national palace, on the top of which the Stars and Stripes was already flying. . . ."

Kendall handed his dispatch, along with lists of dead and wounded, not to a government courier but to his own dispatch rider, "Mr. Kendall's express," as the Army called the arrangement. Relays of horses and riders rushed it to Veracruz and a steamer took it to New Orleans in time for the Picayune to publish it signed "G.W.K." under large headlines on October 14, 1847. Another steamer took copies of this issue of the Picayune to Mobile and a stage line via Montgomery, Charleston, Richmond and Washington bore them to the Baltimore Sun and other newspapers of the north and east with which the Picayune exchanged news. At Washington, the dispatch moved over the three-year-old telegraph line to Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York.

While Kendall was often ahead with important news, official dispatches and some letters to other newspapers reached New Orleans by the same steamer as his account of the capture of Mexico City. But his was the most complete, the best written and the one that first gave the news of victory to most of the country. It is included in many histories and also in "A Treasury of Great Reporting." Prof. John Hohenberg of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism lauded it recently in a book on great foreign correspondents.

Kendall had 38 adventurous years behind him and many ahead when he wrote it. He was born, the eldest of five children, on August 22, 1809, in Mont Vernon, a tiny village three miles northwest of Amherst, N.H. His father was a poor storekeeper at Mont Vernon and several other places, including Montreal. When 7, George was sent back from Montreal to the farm of his maternal grandfather, Deacon Samuel Wilkins of Amherst, for schooling, and did not see his parents for many years.

Wilkins, who had lost two sons in the Revolution, treated the boy well, encouraged his reading and imparted to him his own patriotic ideals. George was grateful and always included "Wilkins" when he signed his name. Deacon Wilkins was disappointed, however, when at 17, George decided to become a printer. He started his apprenticeship in a local shop and continued it in Boston and then across the country.

Working usually in print shops, but sometimes as a harvest hand and once as an actor, George followed the Erie Canal west through New York. In 1828, he worked in Sandusky, Columbus and several other Ohio cities. He continued west, traveling through Indiana and Illinois, and then worked south *by way of* Iowa, Missouri and Tennessee to New Orleans. He next worked in Mobile, Ala., Augusta, Ga., and Charleston, S.C.

When he was 21, and by now a self-reliant young man and competent typesetter, he visited his parents, who were then running a boarding house for university students in Burlington, Vt. He was soon off again, this time to Washington, D.C., to set type, first on the United States Telegraph and then the National Intelligencer, both famous newspapers of the time. By 1832, he was in New York working for Horace Greeley in the printing shop that this New Englander operated before founding the New York Tribune. In that year an epidemic of cholera hit the city.

"What's your hurry, George?" demanded a friend, seeing him rushing down Broadway.

"I'm off to New Orleans," he answered. "You'll die of the cholera if you stay here."

He went by ship and found work in the job printing department of the True American. A little later Francis Lumsden, a North Carolinian with whom Kendall had worked in Washington, became shop foreman on another New Orleans paper. They renewed their friendship, saved their money and started The Picayune, so called because it sold for a picayune, the smallest coin in circulation in New Orleans. Now obsolete, the silver picayune was a Spanish half real, about the size of the present dime and worth six and a fourth cents.

New Orleans, then a city of 70,000, had ten newspapers when the first issue of The Picayune appeared January 25, 1837, and eight more were started during that difficult year. There was a national business panic that closed many banks and in New Orleans there was a printers' strike and an epidemic of yellow fever. But the sprightly, small-page Picayune proved more readable than its rivals and attracted attention with a campaign against dueling.

By 1841, its position was secure enough for Kendall to join an expedition of Texans to New Mexico, then still a Mexican province. This was a project of Gen. Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, President of the Republic of Texas. Outwardly it was a good-will excursion to initiate commerce between Sante Fe and Texas. At the same time the expedition was to suggest to the inhabitants of the remote and badly governed province that they revolt from Mexico and join the Republic of Texas. Printed appeals for such action were brought along, though some marchers did not know about this part of the project until they were on their way. "It was looked upon as nothing more than a pleasant hunting excursion," Kendall noted, and the Picayune said his trip would be "full of novelty and delight, unmingled with opposing inconveniences."

The adventure was fraught with bad luck from the start. Kendall hurt his ankle in a fall three days before the expedition left Austin on June 18, 1841, and for a time had to ride in one of the 42 wagons carrying supplies and trade goods. There were 320 men commanded by Brig. Gen. Hugh McLeod of Texas, but they were slow in getting away. By the time they had, many water sources were dry. They thought the distance from Austin to New Mexico was 500 miles, but it was actually 1,000. They lost their way, wandered north of the Red River, and struggled on for 1,300 miles. When they separated to seek food and water, soldiers of Manuel Armijo, the Mexican governor, captured and disarmed all as they approached Santa Fe on September 15. Kendall had a passport signed by the Mexican Consul at New Orleans and protested that he was an American newspaper correspondent, but was held with the others. Two who tried to escape were blindfolded and shot.

The prisoners then were tied together with lariats and marched southward. In crossing the 90-mile desert section of New Mexico known as *La Jornado del Muerto* (The Journey of Death), two captives died and three who faltered were shot by their guards. The guards cut off and kept the ears of the five dead to prove that they had not escaped. A century later, *La Jornado del Muerto* was still so lonely and desolate that it was chosen for the first atom bomb explosion.

Being a prisoner did not keep the observant Kendall from appreciating a pretty girl when he saw one. In a diary he kept, he wrote of an Albuquerque beauty: "She could not be more than fifteen; yet her loose and flowing dress, but half concealing a bust of surpassing beauty and loveliness, plainly disclosed that she was just entering womanhood. Her figure was faultless, and even the chisel of Praxiteles himself never modeled ankles of such pure and classic elegance. . . . I linger to take a last look."

In El Paso, the captives were allowed to rest three days and the local residents, especially the women, did everything possible to make them comfortbale. They fed them all the meat, eggs and bread that they could eat. Kinder guards took over but the march south continued, with the prisoners trudging through Carrizal—a Mexican village where some men of the Pershing Expedition were to meet death in June 1916—to Chihuahua City, Zacatecas, San Luis Potosi, Guanajuato, Querétaro, San Juan del Rio and, after three months and nearly 2,000 miles, into Mexico City.

Some were confined in Santiago prison. Madame Calderon de la Barca, Scottish wife of the Spanish minister visited them and mentioned their plight in her famous memoirs. Kendall was ill with cold and fever and he and 18 smallpox patients were separated from the other prisoners and sent to the hospital of San Lazaro. This was a hospital for lepers and Kendall penned a vivid description of its horrors in his later writings.

Word of Kendall's plight reached New Orleans on February 2, 1842, when a letter that he had written from Chihuahua City on November 27 was received. His partner, Lumsden, and others appealed to Washington and Sec'y of State Daniel Webster demanded that Mexico release Kendall. The British had obtained the release of an Englishman with the expedition. When Gen. Waddy Thompson of South Carolina, the new U.S. Minister, arrived in Mexico City in April, he called at once on Kendall in San Lazaro. Kendall and seven others claiming American citizenship were freed a few days later, but the remainder were chained and forced to repair roads until June 16. Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, the Mexican dictator, then freed them as an act of clemency on his saint's day—the birthday of Saint Antonio. Fourteen died of yellow fever on their way home.

Kendall meanwhile recovered his health, left Mexico by way of Veracruz and returned to New Orleans on May 19. His experience, serialized in the Picayune during 1842, made him a national figure. To his displeasure, he found some of his account copied by Capt. Frederick Marryat, the English writer, in his novel "Narrative of the Travels and Adventures of Monsieur Violet," published the following year. In 1844, Kendall rewrote his experiences in a 243,000-word work "The Narrative of the Texan Santa Fe Expedition." Harper & Brothers published this in two volumes. In the preface to his book, Kendall wrote critically of Marryat's use of material that had originally appeared in a series of rough sketches written by Kendall for the New Orleans Picayune of 1842.

On one of his visits to Harpers', Kendall found James Harper elected Mayor of New York and entertaining officers of a woman's temperance society. The newspaperman, who enjoyed the pleasures of life, pulled out his watch. "Come, Harper," he said, "Let's go out and get another drink, it's eleven o'clock. Ain't you dry again, I am!"

Despite this strain on their relations, Harper published seven editions of Kendall's book and sold more than 40,000 copies before the plates were destroyed in a fire at the pub-

lishing house. Bogue and Co. brought out a British edition. Originally priced by Harper at $2.50, a first edition is now valued by collectors at $35 to $50 and is the cornerstone of any library of books on the Southwest.

The book and the influence of the Picayune, which by then was a full-sized newspaper of wide circulation, were important factors in the annexation of Texas by the United States and the consequent war with Mexico. The book has been called "The Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the Mexican War.

When warfare began in 1846, Kendall was in Texas sending news of Indians to the Picayune and looking over 4,000 acres of frontier land granted him by Anson Jones, last President of Texas. He rushed to the Rio Grande to cover the war.

The battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma had been fought before Kendall reached the border on June 14, 1846, and the Picayune had news of them no sooner than anybody else. Upon his arrival, Kendall arranged for shipment of his dispatches to New Orleans from Point Isabel, Gen. Zachary Taylor's base, and appointed agents there and at Matamoros. He then attached himself to Capt. Ben McCulloch's Texas Rangers who scouted far into Mexico.

He rode, ate and slept with the soldiers. At Camargo, he joined former President Lamar of Texas, and other officers "to drink warm champagne together out of a tin cup." Near Saltillo, his troop clashed with a detachment of Mexican lancers. With the memory of Mexican dungeons still fresh in his mind from his 1842 experiences, Kendall plunged into the fray and came out with the flag of the enemy.

There were other correspondents with Taylor's army and the Picayune sent C. M. Haile, a Rhode Island man who had been a West Point cadet for a year before turning to journalism, to assist Kendall. He and Haile were both with General Worth's column when Taylor's army stormed Monterrey, September 20–23, in the first big battle of the Mexican War. They wrote 9,000 words of eyewitness material during and after the fighting. A courier galloped away with it, rushing through Marin, Cerralvo, Mier, Camargo and Matamoros to Point Isabel and a waiting steamer. She reached New Orleans the night of October 3. The Picayune had highlights of the victory in its regular Sunday morning edition and at 10 a.m. issued an "extra" with details that printers had spent the night putting into type. Crowds jammed Camp Street to buy copies and these carried the news to the North and East.

"If we were able to lay before the citizens of New Orleans and the country at large full particulars of the three glorious days at Monterrey in advance of our contemporaries," boasted the Picayune, "it was owing to no happy chance, but was due entirely to the foresight and prudence of our associate, now with the Army . . . Mr. Kendall determined to forward the despatches of our correspondents by express, cost what it would. Circumstances favored his design, and our packages reached us by private hands in eight days from Monterrey."

There was an armistice in northern Mexico after the battle of Monterrey. The war and the correspondents shifted first to Tampico and then Veracruz on the Gulf of Mexico. But before leaving Taylor's army, Kendall asked his officer friends to send the Picayune anything of importance. A Lt. J. J. Bibb at Matamoros received news of the bloody battle of Buena Vista in which both Zachary Taylor and Jefferson Davis distinguished themselves. Bibb relayed it to the newspaper two days ahead of official dispatches. The paper's "extra" gave the news of Buena Vista to the country on March 22, 1847, and helped make General Taylor President of the United States and Jefferson Davis President of the Confederacy.

Lumsden, who traveled from New Orleans, and Haile as well as Kendall arrived at Veracruz that month with Gen. Winfield Scott's army. But Lumsden suffered a broken leg when thrown from a horse and Haile, because of his West Point experience, was commissioned a first lieutenant of infantry. Kendall now faced a multitude of problems but he had great advantages. He was his own boss. If he wanted to charter a ship, buy a horse, entertain an officer or bribe a native, he could do so without having to obtain approval of an expense account. More important, he was with a victorious army and censorship had not yet been invented.

He got off a dispatch signed "G.W.K." as soon as the guns of San Juan de Ulloa had been silenced. He then marched inland with General Worth's staff, organizing a costly and ever-lengthening pony express service to take his dispatches to Veracruz. Three of his riders were captured. One was killed. "Mr. Kendall's express" also carried personal messages for his friends and opened new sources for him. To speed handling of his dispatches, the Picayune sent steamers carrying typesetting equipment to meet those coming from Mexico. By the time the steamers returned to New Orleans, the dispatches were in type and an "extra" was out in a matter of minutes.

Ill for a time with fever, Kendall toiled with Scott's army through the summer of 1847 along the route by which Cortez had invaded Mexico three centuries earlier. Battles were fought and won at Cerro Gordo, Jalapa, Puebla and Churubusco. The army included Robert E. Lee, Franklin Pierce, George B. McClellan, T. J. (later Stonewall) Jackson, U. S. Grant, and many others who were to find high places, some of them because of the national fame Kendall's reports gave them.

He soon recovered from the wound received at Chapultepec in the September fighting. In his official report, General Worth said: "Major Borland and G. W. Kendall, volunteer aides-de-camp, the latter wounded, each exhibited habitual gallantry, intelligence and devotion." On October 29, Worth wrote Kendall: "If it does you no good the commendation of an old soldier can do you no harm. . . . I cannot part with you without an expression of my high and grateful appreciation of the value of your services on my staff in several . . . of the conflicts with the enemy in this campaign—Churubusco, El Molino del Rey & in the final attack upon and capture of the City."

Kendall realized there was a story of greater importance still to come—the peace treaty. Before returning to New Orleans, he made plans for this. This Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, ceding California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah and New Mexico to the United States, and affecting millions yet unborn, was signed February 2, 1848, on the altar of the cathedral there. Escorted by U.S. Cavalry, the Government courier left Mexico City on February 3 for the coast with a copy. Right behind him pounded a Picayune rider. Both reached Veracruz in three days. There the Government man sailed at once for Mobile on the steamer *Iris*.

The steamer *New Orleans* was waiting for the Picayune's dispatch but the local army commander, thinking to assure priority to the Government, delayed her departure two days. Furious over this, her captain pushed the *New Orleans* at top speed and overtook the rival steamer off Louisiana. He delivered the treaty to the Picayune on February 12, about the time the Government courier, James L. Freaner, a former war correspondent for the New Orleans Delta, landed at Mobile.

Freaner left there 48 hours ahead of the Picayune rider, who carried copies of the February 13 Picayune with details of the treaty. Between Mobile and Montgomery, the Picayune man made up 24 hours. The Charleston Courier published the Picayune's story on February 18 and said both it and Freaner had arrived the day before. Neck and neck, the two riders sped north without rest and without sleep. Next day they passed through Petersburg, Va., to which the telegraph had been extended and a summary of the Picayune story clicked ahead. The paper's courier and Freaner arrived together in Washington. Dirty and ragged because of his 17-day dash from Mexico, Freaner, the Government's man, had trouble seeing Secretary of War Marcy, and the February 21 issues of both the Baltimore Sun and Washington Union were out with the Picayune story before there was any Government announcement.

Home again, with the Picayune the best known paper in the South and his captured flag on display in its office, Kendall relaxed a bit. He liked wine, especially Vieux Ceps, bought fine Havana cigars 2,000 at a time and attended the opera at every opportunity. He pursued two personal projects, a history of the Mexican War and a ranch in Texas. The land granted him by the Republic of Texas wasn't suitable for ranching, but he bought a tract to his liking 25 miles northwest of San Antonio and stocked it with sheep, including fine Merinos from Rambouillet, France.

On the book project, he took in Carl Nebel, a succesful French artist, as a partner. Nebel promptly painted the 12 major clashes of the war from information obtained by visits to the battlefields and from participants. Kendall took these to Europe for lithographing and planned to finish his text there. Two things interfered. He felt obliged to report the European revolution of 1848 for the Picayune and he fell in love.

She was Adeline de Valcourt, pretty blonde daughter of a French officer who had retreated from Moscow with Napoleon. They were married in 1849 when she was 19 and Kendall was 40. They lived first in a Paris apartment and then in a house in the suburb of Chaville. Their daughter, Georgiana, was born the next year. Two months later, Kendall returned to America with enough of his history written to describe the paintings of Nebel. The text, on pages 18 by 24 inches, was printed in the Picayune shop. Kendall and Nebel shared all costs and D. Appleton bound and marketed the work. "The War Between the United States and Mexico. Illustrated," for a commission of $5 a volume. It sold at $36 to $48, depending on binding. Few were printed and some were destroyed in a fire at the Picayune. A copy was auctioned for $260 in 1960.

Because his wife was a Catholic and his mother an ardent Presbyterian, Kendall did not bring his wife and children to America until the latter's death in 1856. By then there were two daughters and two sons. Kendall built a little Catholic Church in Boerne, Tex., for his wife. He also gave her the first piano in the area.

As he was popular and well-known, especially with veterans of the war, Kendall was urged to run for governor of Texas. He preferred to farm and to write a few articles for the Picayune and the Texas Almanac. He was past 50 when the Civil War began and took no part in it. He owned a few slaves but opposed secession. He remained on his ranch helping defend his neighbors from Indians. Because of this, he was honored in 1862 by having his name applied to the new 613-square-mile county then created in the area.

After the Civil War, Kendall traveled to New Orleans and found the equipment of the Picayune badly damaged. His partner, Lumsden, had perished with his family in a storm on the Great Lakes in 1860. Kendall went to New York to buy new machinery and took advantage of the trip to visit scenes of his New Hampshire childhood; his

friend, Horace Greeley; and also Franklin Pierce, who had served a term as President.

Kendall returned to Texas and continued writing sporadically for the Picayune, though he no longer maintained a controlling interest in it. He died of pneumonia at his ranch home, Post Oak Springs, on October 21, 1867. At the time of his death his only failure was his Mexican War book project. It still lacked a chapter. His son Henry Fletcher, a West Point graduate who became a major, wrote a final chapter but was unable to find a publisher for the manuscript. Adeline Kendall, who outlived her sons as well as two husbands, had no better luck with it. Mrs. Georgiana Fellows, the equally sturdy eldest daughter of the Kendalls, lived until World War 2 and helped Prof. Fayette Copeland of the University of Oklahoma write a scholarly biography of her father, but could do nothing with the history. She finally gave the manuscript to the University of Texas. It is still unpublished.

"He loved Texas with absolute devotion," said the issue of the Texas Almanac that appeared shortly after Kendall's demise. "He never tired of writing or singing its praise. He loved its vast expanse of solitude, its majestic plains, its noble rivers, the green hills of the county named after him." Above his grave in nearby Boerne, his family placed a marker: "George Wilkins Kendall, Poet, Journalist, Author and Farmer; Eminent in All." In 1924, 57 years after his death, his wife Adeline died. Schools and stores in Boerne closed down when she was buried at Kendall's side.

In a 1937 centennial history of the Times-Picayune, Thomas Ewing Dabney wrote: "Considering the difficulties under which Kendall worked, and the fact that he was blazing new trails, he might be called the greatest war correspondent our country has known. He not only reported, he helped to shape events; he organized his own communications system and kept it functioning in daily changing conditions. He consistently scooped the field. The only measure of excellence is the extent of accomplishment in proportion to the facilities at hand; and by this measure, Kendall's work is without an equal."

AID AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the President's foreign aid program is basic to our national security. It sustains the hopes of all men for world peace and stability. It is a bill that we as individuals and as representatives of our Government cannot, in good conscience, fail to pass.

And we can approve the foreign aid bill without adversely affecting our continuing efforts to correct a situation of concern to us all—this country's balance-of-payments deficit.

Contrary to some charges made in the past, foreign aid now plays only a minor role in creating the deficit. The reason is that the major share of commodities financed by the AID program are purchased from U.S. firms. The dollars never leave this country. During the current fiscal year AID estimates that 97 percent of the equipment and materials which developing countries purchase with U.S. aid will be supplied from within the United States or bought abroad with what amounts to bartered U.S. goods.

A small amount of foreign aid expenditures are made abroad. These include salaries of AID overseas employees, this country's contributions to various international organizations and so forth. These amounts, however, are largely offset by loan repayments under the foreign aid program.

For instance, overseas expenses for fiscal 1967 probably will come to $378 million, only 16 percent of AID's estimated total expenditures for the year. This expense will be offset by an expected $203 million in loan repayments, leaving only a $175 million net adverse impact on our balance of payments.

During the current fiscal year the impact of the foreign aid program will be even further reduced. Out-of-country expenses are anticipated to run $319 million, only 13 percent of the budget. An estimated $212 million in repayments will flow into this country. The net adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments is estimated, therefore, at only $107 million for fiscal year 1968.

These facts make it clear that we can easily continue U.S. assistance to the developing countries of the world without hampering our own economic progress. The Congress must indeed be concerned about balance of payments. However, our concern on this score need not be directed toward the foreign aid bill. Its adverse effect is negligible.

JUNGLE ROAD FINANCED BY UNITED STATES TO HELP GUYANA OPEN INTERIOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1966, British Guiana became Guyana, the third British colony in the Western Hemisphere to achieve independence peaceably, and despite the many obstacles in the path of development, it is progressing day by day toward self-sufficiency.

This is of great historical significance because only a few years ago, British Guiana was threatened with a Communist takeover at the time of the British withdrawal.

Our interest has been to help Guyana become self-sufficient and to assure that its freedom of choice was not lost by the imposition of Communist control. Britain, Canada, the United Nations, and the United States have provided aid in an effort to help Guyanese development.

The immediate U.S. strategy in Guyana is to provide an assistance program which will produce tangible results in a short period of time. The United States is concentrating on three major areas of assistance—agriculture, road construction, and internal security—while the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United Nations are heavily involved in technical assistance activities in the educational and other fields.

The New York Times recently published an article on one U.S. endeavor in Guyana—a roadbuilding project to provide access to rich mineral deposits in the country's interior. I would like to include the Times article of July 18 entitled "Jungle Road Financed by United States To Help Guyana Open Interior" in the RECORD.

The article follows:

JUNGLE ROAD FINANCED BY UNITED STATES TO HELP GUYANA OPEN INTERIOR—HIGHWAY, TO BE COMPLETED IN 1968, WILL PROVIDE ACCESS TO RICH MINERAL DEPOSITS

(By Edward C. Burks)

A new "wilderness road," financed mainly by the United States, is being cut 50 miles through the jungle of Guyana.

When completed next year, the two-lane, paved highway will open up an important part of the long-isolated interior, rich in minerals.

The bauxite mining center of Mackenzie on the Demerara River, fastest-growing city in the country, will be linked by road for the first time with Georgetown, the capital, and with the coastal highway.

Although this year-old nation, formerly a British colony, is almost as large in area as New York and Pennsylvania combined, it has only about 800 miles of improved roads. Less than half of that mileage is paved.

Of $21-million in United States loans and grants in the last two years to this fast-growing nation of 700,000, half has been set aside for the highway program. The United States provided more than $1-million worth of road construction equipment as a grant.

FIRST JOB OF THE PROGRAM

The first job tackled was repairing and paving the most important road, the 180-mile-long coastal highway, of which only 30 miles was paved as late as 1964. That road extends from the Surinam border westward past the Georgetown area to the Pomeroon River.

Ninety per cent of the multi-racial Guyanese population lives along the narrow coastal strip not far from the coastal highway.

Guyana claims fourth place among the world's producers of bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is extracted, and Mackenzie is her main mining city.

The Demerara Bauxite Company (Demba), a fully-owned subsidiary of Alcan Aluminum Limited, of Canada, has the country's largest industrial complex in the Mackenzie area.

Despite continuing racial tensions in Guyana between East Indians and Negroes, both Demba and the smaller American-owned bauxite mining operations of Reynolds Metals on the Berbice River are making major expansions. Guyana bauxite production is increasing toward the 3-million-ton mark, and Demba is also processing some of its bauxite into alumina, the fine powder from which aluminum is made.

The country has an eye on the spectacular gain in export earnings accomplished by neighboring Dutch Surinam after the completion of a dam to produce the power for an aluminum smelter.

A United Nations survey of hydroelectric development possibilities in Guyana is to be ready in the fall. At present there is no aluminum smelter here.

Bauxite and alumina shipments from Mackenzie go down the river by small boat for transshipment in Trinidad.

Mackenzie, with a population of 20,000, is about 90 miles up the river. At present a

road leads from Georgetown to Atkinson Field, the international airport 27 miles upstream, and the new road goes on from there to Mackenzie.

Other major American aid projects in Guyana include:

"Sea defense" rehabilitation work to protect widespread coastal areas that are below sea level at high tide.

Improved runways and a new terminal building at the international airport.

A food-for-peace program.

Health programs, technical assistance and encouragement to small industries.

The United States, in supporting the Government of Prime Minister Forbes Burnham, is giving increasing attention to the modernization of agriculture. In particular this means assistance to rice farmers, who have been harassed by spoilage and a poor distribution system. An expensive system of silos is proposed.

EXTENSION HOMEMAKERS CLUBS PROVIDE UNTOLD WOMAN POWER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, last week, at its annual conference at South Dakota State University in Brookings, the National Extension Homemakers Council awarded the first prize in its national feature article writing contest to Mrs. Walter Alves, of Wayne, Okla.

Mrs. Alves' winning article, "Extension Homemakers Clubs Provide Untold Woman Power," is a fine and deserved tribute to these hard-working women in every section of our country. By continuously striving to improve their communities, its members have proven to be one of our Nation's most valuable resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the text of this excellent essay:

WAYNE AREA WOMAN'S PRIZE-WINNING ARTICLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the feature article written by Mrs. Walter Alves, route one, Wayne, that was chosen as No. 1 in the nation at the annual conference of the National Extension Homemakers Council this week in Brookings, S.D.)

(By Mrs. Walter Alves)

Today "power" seems to be the phrase very commonly used, mostly in the wrong direction. According to the dictionary "power" is strength or energy. Both can be applied to woman power when used to describe Extension Homemaker groups.

In 1944 Be-Square Home Demonstration club was formed. Demonstrations? Yes, they are given, never against anything, but for the sole purpose of making our homes a better place in which to live. Soon after the club was organized, the farm women saw the need to help their community. A first aid kit which contained sheets, pillow cases, towels, wash cloths, blankets, hot water bottles, ice bags and medical supplies were placed in readiness for any emergency.

In other activities, these same women assisted the health nurse in giving eye and ear tests to pre-school children; helped in the drive to stamp out polio by cleaning and sterilizing needles, making cookies and punch; and assisting the many nurses who gave of their time to this vital health program.

Red Cross was soon to learn the value of this group of women. Be-Square club made 200 dresses and many other garments for premature infants in Crippled Children's Hospital.

Sewing and good grooming are a part of the many lessons taught. Charm, proper makeup, poise and assurance as well as attractive and well-made clothes, have made this group of farm women some of the best dressed women in the community. No longer is she the farm woman of yesteryear.

Once a year the Extension Homemakers, as they are now called, attend Homemakers Conference at OSU, and attend classes on the changing times. New materials, better gardens, care of appliances, driver education, and safety are among some of the lectures.

At home in their local groups, Extension Homemakers extend an invitation to anyone to come and share their learning experiences in all areas of home and family life. They work with 4-H boys and girls, for they realize that this group are tomorrow's citizens. The boys and girls are taught better farm and home practices through project work; to know values; and be good Americans.

Health being always foremost in the minds of these clubwomen, cancer films were shown to all interested adults and high school girls in the community. In cooperation with the school, the club sponsored a community civil defense program. As a result of the program which included a series of films and lectures, everyone felt better informed and realized more than ever the need to be prepared for disaster. A survey has been made to determine the number of storm shelters in Wayne and surrounding communities.

Eager to know more about their state, the EH groups take an educational tour each year to such places as art and cultural centers, manufacturing plants, military centers, and other places to develop a sense of awareness of the state's present facilities.

Fun? Yes, they indulge in this too, with family picnics, visits with other groups, and a camp day with a neighboring county.

A busy group of women who live close to God and family, have helped to make Wayne one of the big little towns; always ready to assist where needed. These women have used their energy and given many hours to make their homes, their community, McClain county, and Oklahoma a better place in which to live.

Power? Yes, Extension Homemakers have it. In McClain county there are 13 groups with 170 members. For added energy they can reach out to the 26,000 members in Oklahoma and the many thousands in the nation which would provide untold "womanpower."

RACES AGREE ON GHETTO ABOLITION AND NEED FOR WPA-TYPE PROJECTS

Mr. PRYOR. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in all the furor which has been raised over the riots, much of it justified, other simply nonsense, little note has been given to the views of the American people concerning the causes of the violence and what should be done regarding them.

The most revealing information which has come to my attention on this subject is the Harris poll, which appeared in the August 14 edition of the Washington Post.

If the findings of the poll are any measure, then it is clear that, while the vast majority of Americans deplore the rioting, a heavy majority of them also, both white and Negro, favor positive governmental action to eliminate the economic and social problems which feed the fires of discontent in our urban ghettos.

I insert the poll in the RECORD at this point and commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 14, 1967]

RACES AGREE ON GHETTO ABOLITION AND NEED FOR WPA-TYPE PROJECTS

(By Louis Harris)

In the wake of the recent riots in Detroit, Newark and other cities, big majorities of both Negroes and whites agree that new Federal programs to eliminate rats in slums, to tear down ghettos, to set up summer camps and to undertake large-scale work projects for the unemployed would be effective measures to prevent future racial outbreaks.

Both races also agree that the riots have hurt the Negro cause, that Negroes suffered the most from the riots and have more to lose than to gain by resorting to violence.

Negroes as well as whites condemn looting and fire-bombings. Whites as well as Negroes believe by substantial majorities that only a minority of Negroes support riots.

DISAGREEMENT ON CAUSES

But Negroes and whites sharply disagree over what triggered the riots. Negroes believe that merchants who gouged their customers and charged exorbitant prices must take some blame. Whites are largely unaware of such practices.

Negroes feel that police have engaged in brutality; whites flatly disagree. Negroes tend to see lack of real progress in housing, jobs for young people and education for Negroes as a fundamental cause of the riots. Whites recognize the need for more effort in these areas, but see them far less as reasons behind the violence.

As a result of a deep feeling that the plight of the Northern black ghetto dweller has been neglected, Negroes tend to say that their riots were mainly spontaneous, stemming from conditions of injustice. Largely removed from the Negro view of life in the slum areas, whites are convinced by a large majority that the riots were organized.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS URGED

One of the major effects of this summer's racial rioting is a widespread recognition on the part of both whites and Negroes that large-scale Federal programs should be undertaken to improve conditions in the cities.

The in-depth Harris Survey of a cross-section of both Negroes and whites across the Nation asked this series of questions:

"Several new laws and programs have been proposed to help resolve the race problem in America and prevent racial outbreaks in the future. For each, tell me if you think it would be effective or not very effective:"

FEDERAL PROGRAMS TO PREVENT RIOTS

1. Setting up large-scale Federal work projects to give jobs to all the unemployed:

	Percent
Effective:	
Public	69
Whites	66
Negroes	91
Not effective:	
Public	24
Whites	26
Negroes	5
Not sure:	
Public	7
Whites	8
Negroes	4

2. A Federal program to tear down ghettos in the cities:

	Percent
Effective:	
Public	65
Whites	63
Negroes	84
Not effective:	
Public	26
Whites	28
Negroes	7
Not sure:	
Public	9
Whites	9
Negroes	9

3. A Federal program to exterminate rats in slums:

	Percent
Effective:	
Public	60
Whites	59
Negroes	72
Not effective:	
Public	33
Whites	34
Negroes	19
Not sure:	
Public	7
Whites	7
Negroes	9

4. Setting up massive summer camps:

	Percent
Effective:	
Public	57
Whites	55
Negroes	78
Not effective:	
Public	32
Whites	34
Negroes	10
Not sure:	
Public	11
Whites	11
Negroes	12

The most popular programs would be public works projects to provide employment in blighted urban areas where Negroes and other minority groups live. But a clear indication of the drastic mood of the country is in the support given to the proposition that ghettos be torn down.

The controversial "rat control" legislation, turned down recently by Congress, is seen as an effective measure for controlling future riots by six out of ten citizens.

In addition to recognition that such legislation might be helpful in averting future racial outbreaks, white people also showed a greater willingness than they did a year ago to lower the bars against Negroes in public eating places, movie theaters, public restrooms, clothing stores and in other areas.

Along with the Negro-white consensus on what ought to be done to prevent future outbreaks, there is remarkable agreement between the races on the consequences of the recent violence.

Whites and Negroes both agree that those who suffered most from the riots were Negroes themselves. The survey of a carefully drawn cross-section of whites and Negroes across the country shows that 58 per cent of all Negroes and 49 per cent of whites believe Negroes were the chief victims of the riots.

Both races also agree that property owners were next on the scale of suffering, followed by white shopkeepers and the cities themselves.

Negroes and whites agree that the outbreaks and violence have hurt the civil rights cause. This view is held by 60 per cent of Negroes and a much higher percentage of whites (89 per cent).

A similar question, whether Negroes have more to gain or to lose by resorting to violence, revealed that 68 per cent of Negroes and 94 per cent of whites feel Negroes have more to lose.

LOOTERS "SHOULD BE SHOT"

Only 10 per cent of the Negroes and 11 per cent of the white believe that most Negroes support the rioting.

By overwhelming margins, whites believe that looters are criminals and "should be shot." And 68 per cent of the Negroes also classify looters as criminals. Over two thirds of the Negroes in the survey disagreed with the statement that "looting isn't as bad as stealing, because things in stores are going to be taken or burned anyway during a riot."

It is therefore fair to conclude that a large majority of Negroes are opposed to action that violates laws. In fact, by 47 to 42 per cent, Negroes feel that people who throw fire bombs in riots deserve to be shot.

FEARS FOR SAFETY RISE

A majority of both Negroes and whites do not believe that a lack of firmness by local mayors and governors was a major cause of the rioting, although whites tend to be more critical than Negroes on this score.

Personal uneasiness on the streets has risen as a result of the riots, with 51 per cent of whites expressing fear for their own safety. However, an even larger percentage of Negroes—65 per cent—say they have fears for their safety.

Despite the large areas of agreement between the two races on the consequences of riots and effective steps to prevent such violence in the future, whites and Negroes are poles apart on what sparked the rioting.

When asked the main reasons the riots broke out, 45 per cent of all white people volunteered that they were provoked by "outside agitators," "minority radicals," or "Communist backing."

NEGRO PLIGHT RECOGNIZED

An additional 40 per cent of the whites, however, attributed the riots to the "way Negroes have been treated in the slums and ghettos of the big cities" and "the failure of white society to keep its promises to the Negroes." Other reasons cited by whites were "teen-agers and other uneducated people just looking for trouble."

Educated whites tend to give more recognition to the plight of Negroes in ghetto communities as reasons for the explosions. But both Negroes and whites agree that Negro hatred for whites was less a cause of the outbreaks than Negro frustrations over lack of progress on jobs, education and housing.

Among Negroes, 7 per cent volunteered that the riots were organized, compared with 93 per cent who said Negro frustration over lack of progress was the prime cause.

NEGROES CRITICIZE POLICE

By better than 2 to 1, Negroes believe that police brutality was a major cause of the rioting. Whites disagree by 8 to 1, with only one white person in six expressing the view that police ever engage in brutality against Negroes.

Seven in every ten Negroes say that lack of decent housing contributed to the riots. In the riot areas themselves, 59 per cent of the Negroes say they know someone who lives in rat-infested housing, 57 per cent report holes in ceilings, 49 per cent overcrowding, 56 per cent faulty plumbing and 68 per cent cockroaches.

But no more than 39 per cent of whites believe deficiencies in Negro housing were a major cause of the rioting.

WHITES CHARGE ORGANIZATION

On jobs for young Negroes, 34 per cent of the white people see lack of employment opportunities as a major reason for the riots, compared with 67 per cent of the Negroes. Three in every ten whites believe failure to give Negroes equality is behind racial violence, compared with over seven out of every ten Negroes.

Mainly because of different estimates of just how bad living conditions are in Negro slum areas, whites and Negroes therefore sharply disagree over whether the riots were organized or spontaneous. By 71 to 23 per cent, whites believe the riots were "mainly organized." By 47 to 37 per cent, Negroes think the outbreaks were "mainly spontaneous."

All in all, the desire among both whites and Negroes is to exert every effort to avoid a repetition of this past summer's rioting. But 15 percent of Negroes testify that they support the riots, and most of these are in the younger age group.

This minority segment, pushed over the line of lawful response by their frustrations with ghetto conditions, are ample cause for future anxiety by whites and Negroes alike.

GEORGIA BOY, WYCHE FOWLER, JR., GETS YOUNG CITIZENS INTERESTED

Mr. PRYOR. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some of the brightest, most capable, and most promising young men in Washington are often those who, from time to time, are employed in congressional offices as staff assistants. During my time in the Congress, I have been privileged to observe a number of these young men and must say that none has impressed me more in a shorter time than Mr. Wyche Fowler, Jr., who served as administration assistant to our former colleague, Charles L. Weltner, of Atlanta.

When Mr. Weltner left the Congress in 1966, he took a position with the Democratic National Committee. At that time, Mr. Fowler followed him and, as always, working quietly and efficiently in the background, has done an excellent job. When Mr. Weltner recently left the national committee, Mr. Fowler was named director of the Young Americans Division.

In regard to his activities in that position, the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, on Sunday, August 6, 1967, ran an article by Wayne Kelley, entitled "A Washington Happening, Georgia Boy, Wyche Fowler, Jr., Gets Young Citizens Interested."

I include Mr. Kelley's article in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

GEORGIA BOY, WYCHE FOWLER, JR., GETS YOUNG CITIZENS INTERESTED

(By Wayne Kelley)

WASHINGTON.—The ballroom of the Sheraton Park Hotel was filled with row after row of modest miniskirts and paisley ties. There was nothing more alcoholic than Coke in sight and everyone was having a fine time waiting for the trio to arrive.

Actually, one musician had flaked out on the trio and it was now advertised as a duo. When it finally showed up, no one was surprised to see that it was actually a quartet.

A spotlight from the balcony cut through the dim vastness of the room, focusing on a small stage up front. Into the blinding glare stepped Wyche Fowler Jr., 26, director of the

Young Americans Division of the Democratic National Committee, and a good Georgia boy.

Mr. Fowler, a splendid fellow with curly blond hair and boyish good looks, was wearing his conservative uniform—gray suit and pink shirt highlighted by a raspberry tie. He kind of glowed under the spotlight.

"We are not going to try to sell you on anything," Mr. Fowler assured several thousand clean-cut American youths who are participating in the Capitol's summer intern program.

"No slogans, no party labels," he said in a well modulated but casual voice. "We found that salesmanship often backfires."

Wyche Fowler, Jr. kept his word. There were no long speeches, and the trio—or quartet—twanged joyously on after the chairs were stacked to provide a dance floor.

There was even a happening. Vice President Hubert Humphrey appeared. Wyche Fowler had selectively leaked advance word of the happening to perhaps one or two thousand interns. When anything comes off as planned in Washington, that is a happening. And everyone was happy when the vice president appeared.

The dance and the Cokes and the chance to rub elbows with the vice president were just one small part of the big scene. Defined in its simplest terms, the goal of the DNC Young Americans Division is to get youthful citizens interested in politics.

Once interested, it is hoped, the young men and women will fight each other to join your party. But no one has really planned that far ahead, and it remains to be seen how it works.

In the meantime, many of the 10,000 summer interns in Washington are participating in programs like breakfast seminars to meet cabinet officials and top government executives.

The questions tossed out at these seminars are tough and intelligent, and show that the new generation of Americans is not satisfied with pat political answers, Mr. Fowler says.

"The young people today want to be in on plotting the strategy," he said. "They want their ideas heard in the highest councils of government.

"Right now they feel excluded from the channels of access to leaders of the country and the community," he added. "I think in many cases they are justified in this feeling."

Perhaps the DNC will open up some new vistas of communication. Send your suggestions to Washington, and be sure to address them to Wyche.

TWO-YEAR FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION IS NEEDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the question of a 2-year authorization for foreign aid funds is once again before the House. There are several good reasons to support a 2-year authorization.

First, a 2-year authorization would result in more efficient planning of aid programs. It would be a partial recognition of the fact that many of the problems faced by under-developed areas are long range ones and need to be coped with by projects lasting more than a year. The administrators of our aid programs would have more flexibility in their work. Recipient nations would feel more confident about our commitment to long-range development projects and about our willingness to support them.

Second, by holding the usual 9 weeks of hearings only every other year, the House Foreign Affairs Committee would have more time to consider substantive changes in the aid programs. Consideration of new concepts and evaluation of old ones could be accomplished in a far more systematic manner.

Third, there would be less politics involved in the consideration of foreign aid. The authorizations could be decided upon in the nonelection years.

Finally, there would not be a lessening of the powers of Congress. There would still be annual appropriations. Experience with the Alliance for Progress and development loan funds which have had longer authorizations, has shown that there is no lessening of authority. As pointed out earlier, longer authorizations would enable the Congress to give more careful consideration to long-term needs and new concepts. In this manner, Congress could take the initiative in foreign aid.

Last year we voted for a 2-year authorization of aid funds—except the Alliance for Progress and development loan funds where we supported 5-year authorizations. The House-Senate conference committee reduced this to 3 years for the Alliance and development loan funds and 1 year for all other programs. This year, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has again proposed 2-year authorizations. I support the committee recommendation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES SUPPORTS FOREIGN AID

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I think that the following letter from the National Council of Churches quite clearly makes the point that our aid programs must be preserved. This organization, which includes many of the major U.S. religious groups, has been an active supporter of numerous progressive ideas, and I agree wholeheartedly with their stand on foreign aid.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert their letter:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., August 21, 1967.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: Since World War II our foreign aid program has represented one of our most enlightened attempts to use our vast economic resources in a responsible manner. This year in particular, however, there are signs of some erosion in terms of both priority and support for foreign economic assistance, evidently stemming in some cases more from frustration over other matters than from evaluation of the foreign aid program per se. The result so far has been passage of a badly crippled Senate bill which is most inadequate from the standpoint of both the national interest and the most critical needs of those we seek to help.

As the House considers its bill this week, it is imperative that there be no further reductions in the already meager funds allocated for economic aid and that no increase in the interest rate for loans be added to the Committee bill. It is also necessary for effective planning that approval be given to the two-year authorization period, and that any attempts to impose arbitrary limits on the number of aid recipients be resisted.

We urge you to consider the foreign aid bill on its own merits and to give your support to the Committee bill which, as it was reported out, represents a barely adequate though relatively acceptable continuation of our long-term endeavor to use our resources to help create conditions for a more stable world.

Sincerely yours,
R. H. EDWIN ESPY,
General Secretary.
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President.

AFL–CIO SUPPORT OF FOREIGN AID IS BASED ON EXPERIENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the AFL–CIO is an outspoken supporter of this foreign aid bill. They are a group vitally interested in the social organization of developing countries. Their interest and support reflect the projects and programs which they have developed.

Two programs of AFL–CIO deserve special mention. The American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), since 1961 has supported several thousand educational courses in trade unionism—more than 6,000 trade unionists have graduated from AIFLD centers in Latin America. In 5 years, 7,500 housing units have been completed with a total financing of over $34 million. AIFLD has plans for 6,000 more units in nine Latin American countries.

In Africa, the AFL–CIO established the African American Labor Center. Only 2 years old, AALC projects already include job training courses and education for workers, medical clinics, cooperatives, and housing.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a partial text of the AFL–CIO statement supporting this foreign aid bill. It specifically spells out their support for the 2-year authorization and an increase in aid to 1 percent of our gross national product, and the self-help nature of our aid program.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON OVERSEAS AID, FEBRUARY 26, 1967, BAL HARBOUR, FLA.

In the present international situation, overseas aid is an indispensable part of our nation's foreign policy for preserving world peace, promoting freedom and fostering economic progress based on social justice.

In this recognition, the AFL-CIO urges Congress to give prompt and overwhelming support to President Johnson's proposal for $3.1 billion in new funds for 1968 foreign aid.

The President reflects the viewpoint of the overwhelming majority of the American people in calling on the countries devoted to peace, democracy and human well-being for maximum cooperation in helping the developing nations achieve freedom from hunger, tyranny and war. Such concerted efforts would be a boon to all mankind and additionally they would strengthen the recipient nations' social base against subversion by Communists and other reactionary forces and thus tend to discourage aggressive adventures endangering world peace.

The Executive Council rejects the notion that the Foreign Aid program is a wasteful give-away or policy of futile philanthropy. Though comparatively prosperous, our own country has a better chance of attaining broadly-based stable prosperity in a peaceful world not weighed down by impoverishment, ignorance, illness and dictatorship.

The Executive Council has often called for an annual foreign aid authorization at least equal to one percent of the gross national product. We reaffirm this proposal. An authorization of one percent of GNP would be a realistic response to the President's admonition that "in the long run, the wealthy nations cannot survive on islands of abundance in a world of hunger, sickness and despair."

It is in our own national interest to do everything to reduce the gap between the richer and the poor nations by aiding the latter's industrial development and enhancing their prosperity.

The net outflow of dollars attributable to AID has hardly affected our balance of payments deficit and was far more than compensated for by the AID program's stimulus to exports and jobs.

Over the years, some mistakes have been made in conceiving AID programs and administering them. Experience has to be gained and errors have to be corrected. The AID program now proposed by the President has the advantage of two decades of experience behind it—experience under Republican and Democratic administrations.

On this basis, the Executive Council welcomes the President's proposal "to provide the continuity needed for sound management" by requesting "authorizations covering two years."

We likewise support the President in his emphasis that "the development job is primarily the responsibility of the developing countries themselves." AID will be increasingly geared to helping nations help themselves.

Thus, every nation aided by the United States would be required to provide the major portion of the resources required for the development. Today, India and Turkey finance more than 75% of their development programs from their own resources. Recipient countries would be required to show that they are improving their own agricultural output before they can be eligible for American aid.

We are proud of the role the AFL-CIO and organizations like the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the African-American Labor Center have played in this work and we intend that it shall be continued and expanded.

We have persistently sought to have U.S. AID efforts geared to improving the living standards of the people, no less than to advancing their rate of national economic growth. In this spirit, American labor has actively championed agricultural reforms, better working conditions, higher educational levels, improved health and social projects.

The Executive Council rejects as baseless the notion that "we give to conquer." We likewise repudiate as outright slander the contention of those who brand our country's AID effort merely as "an instrument of cold war" or "national charity."

Between 1945–1960, our country pumped in about $22 billion as aid to developing nations. In the past 12 years, the U.S. has distributed $15.5 billion in surplus food around the world. Our country has given thirty times as much aid to other countries as all the Communist nations put together. Here is no "arrogance of power."

America has neither sought nor acquired a foot of foreign soil in return. The American people can be justly proud that no other nation in history has done as much for safeguarding and strengthening freedom and assisting economic progress based on social justice.

NEED FOR LIMITED EXTENSION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture to discuss in connection with H.R. 11930 the need for limited extension of the Commodity Exchange Act to cover deficiencies in the present regulatory powers of the commodity exchange authority. Mr. Mehren cited a few examples of practices found in the commodity futures markets which should be corrected in the interest of the markets and the public.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the following two items which appeared on the Commodity News Service ticker on August 18:

NEW YORK MERCANTILE OFFICIAL REPLIES TO MEHREN STATEMENT

NEW YORK, August 18.—Llewellyn Watts, Jr., chairman of the board of the New York Mercantile Exchange, wired Secretary of Agriculture Freeman that "Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Mehren's statement before the House Agriculture Committee of August 17 is so exaggerated, intemperate, and insulting to responsible business and to Exchange officials, that the damage to this important part of the agricultural economy is serious and merits immediate remedial action."

CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE PRESIDENT TERMS MEHREN'S STATEMENT IRRESPONSIBLE

CHICAGO, August 18.—Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren yesterday, in urging congressional approval for a commodity trading bill, said, in effect that the public's interest needed protection in dealing with the Nation's commodity exchanges, where there was "documented abuses by the score—from petty thievery, to operations of confidence men, to swindling."

Henry H. Wilson, president of the Chicago Board of Trade, in commenting today on that testimony by Mehren, said:

"It is disturbing that Mr. Mehren in his zeal should have used phrases which could create in the mind of the casual reader a grotesque misrepresentation of the functions and practices of an institution such as the Chicago Board of Trade and of its members.

"There is in his statement no recognition of the service rendered daily to consumers, producers, and processors by the remarkable mechanics of the futures market.

"There is no recognition of the intensive and expanded efforts at self-policing in search of the occasional offender and of the continuing cooperation by the exchange with governmental authorities.

"There is reflected no awareness of the probity and of the concern for the public's needs and interests exhibited constantly by the officials and members of this institution.

"This is disturbing because Mr. Mehren is charged with governmental responsibility in this important area of the national economy. Even though he obviously did not compose his statement with the Chicago Board of Trade in mind, by omission, at least, he has gravely distorted the picture. And this amounts to irresponsibility."

Mr. Speaker, despite these rather violent reactions by officials of two large commodity exchanges, Mr. Mehren's statement was moderate and supported by facts contained in the record of some 150 documented disciplinary proceedings instituted under the Commodity Exchange Act. Mr. Mehren carefully used these documented cases to demonstrate the need for regulation, not for a basis for an attack on the usefulness of the commodity exchanges. As Mr. Mehren stated:

> These examples are not simply horror stories. They are offered not as means of showing how to get clipped in commodities—nor as generalized disparagement of futures trading. They are offered to show with cold, hard, costly and often dirty cases that regulation is still inadequate.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD Mr. Mehren's statement so that Members can decide for themselves if it deserves to be described as "exaggerated, intemperate and insulting to responsible business."

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. MEHREN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND CONSUMER SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON AUGUST 16, 1967

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am here today to urge the Congress to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide the minimal authorities necessary to assure honest, open and efficient futures trading in regulated agricultural commodities. The Department has frequently submitted amendatory bills for this purpose. This bill—H.R. 11930—does not include all we have requested in earlier bills, but does provide proper and necessary instruments to carry out the original intent of the Congress in regulating commodity trading under conditions which prevail today.

We are requesting specific—and thus limited—authority to disapprove exchange bylaws and rules of exchanges which are contrary to the Commodity Exchange Act; to issue cease and desist orders; to require minimum financial requirements for commission merchants. We ask that four commodities, now totally unregulated, be brought under this Act. We ask that the courts be given injunctive power under carefully specified requirements to halt violations in process. We ask for several provisions intended to protect customer funds held by traders. These and other provisions are intended to achieve the intent of Congress to adequately regulate commodity markets.

We do not ask—as we did before the 89th Congress—to give the Secretary authority to designate new commodities or to prescribe margins or trading rules. Nor do we ask to eliminate the Commodity Exchange Commission or to define the term "manipulate."

This statute, if unamended, will provide an inadequate basis to govern the 17 million transactions involving $75 billions in annual volume now done by commodity exchanges in regulated commodities alone. The great

bulk of trading is done by people motivated solely by wish for speculative profit.

I do not make this statement as a judgment between good and evil. This is not my purpose. Futures trading is neither evil nor bereft of economic sense—although a grain corporation president once described it as "like a roulette wheel with elbow, wrist and knee control." Neither is it a model of perfect, honest, fully competitive activity in the absence of which the economy would be crippled.

I am not here, however, to debate the propriety or usefulness of futures trading. This point is not at issue. We seek only to close some major, and glaring loopholes which now render the present statute less effective than we believe the Congress intended. But the cold facts are that in these generally useful and honest operations there is a long history of manipulation, fraud, and dishonesty inimical to the exchanges and to those who use them—and quite clearly hostile to the interest of the public.

And I am not here to ask to limit speculation. Speculation may not be evil, but neither is it "a thing of beauty and a joy forever" as one academician last year testified. Speculators are doing no more than arbitraging—the nontechnical word is betting—on which of different expectations of future prices will be right. But that is not at issue here. Every competent person knows what speculation is, and why it is needed.

We ask only for the minimal regulatory instruments necessary to insure that futures trading be honest, open and efficient.

The regulations now prevailing have had no adverse impact on trading. That is clear. Trading volume has peaked at record level for five straight years. So, with full respect, I say again that we are not here to argue the general philosophy of market regulations. We are here to ask for specific, and limited, authority to protect the public of this nation against the continuing threat of serious offense to its interest.

There have been pleas that the exchanges can and have regulated themselves. That plea is unfounded. There are documented abuses by the score—from petty thievery, to operations of confidence men, to swindling—like paying a "sucker" high and fictional "dividends" for a few weeks to encourage larger deposits which then are embezzled.

Many such violations do not involve market members. Many do involve market members. One of the largest speculators in history operated by persuading eight prominent brokerage houses knowingly to falsify their records in order cooperatively to conceal his speculations. This speculator stated when apprehended that due to "harassment and interference" by Federal Government, he would sell out his long grain position and go back to Canada. He had no long position. He had a short, a *very large* short position. His threat was false, but not foolish. Its purpose was to depress the market so he could buy in his short position at a profit.

A large company once sold oat futures heavily at Chicago with offsetting purchases on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Then they moved actual oats from Winnipeg to Chicago to depress Chicago prices in relation to Winnipeg.

Abuses in spot and futures markets are often interrelated and we need authority to inquire into both. One prominent speculator once lost heavily in a manipulative attempt partly financed by warehouse receipts on soybeans—yet the elevators were empty when his creditors tried to redeem the receipts.

Thus where cash trading is merely an adjunct to futures operations, it too should be observed. Cash handling has in fact been used to protect and promote large manipulative and speculative futures activities instead of using futures to protect actual commodity transactions.

I cannot believe in this regard that the DeAngelis scandal—a $150 million swindle—can be distorted to prove there is no need for further regulation; that harassment and interference must be avoided, and that this trade can, does, and always will regulate itself. The New York Stock Exchange—whose member firms contributed some $12 million to prevent loss to the customers of one member firm—is not quite so pious. It imposes and enforces special requirements on members who also deal in commodity futures.

These examples are not simply horror stories. They are offered not as a means of showing how to get clipped in commodities—nor as a generalized disparagement of futures trading. They are offered to show with cold, hard, costly, and often dirty cases that regulation is still inadequate.

We propose no regulations that will impair the market liquidity necessary both to hedging and price determination. But neither of these functions is served by massive speculation in which powerful interests slug it out to make the market go the way that best will serve their own speculative positions.

We know that a balance must be struck in regulation to contain erratic or artificial price gyrations, yet not to dry up trading so as to limit efficient hedging. Pleas that the provisions of this bill would dry up trading, or commissions, are unfounded.

Some exchanges have long had business conduct committees intended to assure financial integrity and prevent abuses. As in all trading, longs and shorts compete. Accordingly, the CEA and exchanges—a fact that is also of record—have generally functioned by persuasion, not force. There were predictions in 1922, 1936, and at every other attempt by the Department to plug open holes that these somehow "sinister" efforts would destroy these markets. The Committee knows that trading today is at its highest volume in history.

CEA has operated responsibly, soberly—even cautiously—and wherever it could, in cooperation with those exchanges that have and actually enforce rules of conduct and standards of responsibility. The courts generally have shared the view of CEA that market power can be used to manipulate price, to cheat, defraud and impair the efficiency of a market which cannot be considered the private domain of those who are members. Every American has a direct stake in the honesty, the efficiency and the competitive natures of these activities.

INCLUSION OF UNREGULATED COMMODITIES

There often is heavy if sporadic trading in coffee, sugar, livestock, and livestock products now utterly unregulated or even observed. Regulation has been and is needed. About coffee, the Federal Trade Commission reported in 1954 that "Sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations intrinsic in a 'thin' market are amplified by the failure of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange to institute proper safeguards followed by regulated exchanges and to prevent trading abuses and irregularities." The Commission also stated, "Furthermore, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has failed adequately to police its members and enforce established trading rules and procedures . . ."

The Department of Agriculture reported after study that excessive and totally unregulated speculation in sugar futures stimulated the price explosions of 1963. The Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency also studied the sugar situation. Mrs. Leonor K. Sullivan, the Subcommittee Chairman, later testified her Committee found "a great deal of important information to show that trading in sugar on this exchange (the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange) should be brought into regulation." Mrs. Sullivan also testified that "frantic buying and selling of futures by amateurs not connected in any way with the trade—coupled with a tremendous amount of speculation, also, as well as hedging by regular traders—caused chaos in the marketing of these commodities (coffee and sugar)—resulting in wild swings in prices which were reflected in quick order in much higher consumer prices. Both of these episodes (the coffee market in 1953 and 1954 and the sugar market in 1963) could have been prevented, or at least sharply contained, by effective Federal regulation."

Traders and exchanges have argued, in their own self-interest, that imported commodities should not be regulated—and cannot be. Both are major items of commerce and consumption. Sixty percent of our sugar is domestic and the rest is imported under Federal program. Nearly all of our coffee is imported, but it is a major item of commerce and consumption in this country. There is nothing inherent in these two markets that would preclude effective regulation of noncompetitive or dishonest activities.

Contracts for pork bellies—as one livestock product—spiralled from 400 contracts in 1961 to 727,000 in 1966, and now run about 950,000 to 1,000,000 contracts per year. Of 72 trading days in 1965, price fluctuation limits were hit on 21 days. Of 20 trading days, November 22 through December 20, 1965, limits were hit on 12 days. On 7 trading days between December 6 and December 14, the market hit the top limit the first three days, the bottom the next two days, and the top again on the last two days. These are violent fluctuations not often seen, and are generated by speculation alone. On December 17, 1965, there were 3,121 speculators trading frozen pork bellies and only 68 hedgers. Speculators held some 12,000 long contracts and 13,000 short contracts. Hedges totaled only 2,000 long and 1,000 short contracts. This was no hedging market. Two percent of the traders were hedgers. Ninety-eight percent were speculators.

CEA has no authority over livestock products, and the trade knows this. Yet a large part of the complaints sent to CEA involve these products. We can do nothing about them.

The need for stability and fair, open and honest practice is no different for these four commodities than for any others. Regulation would not limit activity that is legitimate; witness the volume of trade in regulated commodities.

PROTECTION OF CUSTOMERS

Many customers trading in regulated commodities entrust funds and orders to a brokerage firm registered, he believes, to be reputable and responsible, and to have met statutory standards of financial security as a condition of registration.

This is not true.

The Act says nothing about an applicant's fitness or his solvency. We are required to register people who are insolvent, or who are crooks, provided they pay the registration fee. The Act sets no financial requirements for the registrant. This deficiency of the present Act opens the gates wide for persons inadequately financed, and even confidence men, to obtain Federal brokerage licenses and handle customer's funds and trades.

A few years ago a Las Vegas, Nevada, resident, operating under various assumed names and who had been charged both with operating a "bookie" establishment and with grand theft, registered as a futures commission merchant. At the same time, he applied for and obtained membership in a leading commodity exchange under one of his assumed names. Shortly thereafter he defrauded his commodity customers under pretense of making profits in nonexistent future trades and lost the customers' funds in trading for his own account in unregulated sugar futures. He hurriedly left the country and for several years was a fugitive from justice. Recently he was apprehended. He is now serving a term in a Federal penitentiary—which is small consolation to the

customers who lost approximately $60,000 in the brief operation of his firm.

More recently, a corporation without assets applied for registration as a futures commission merchant. It was registered by CEA mainly because we had no authority to deny the application. It filed a financial statement showing substantial cash in the bank and an equivalent amount in capital and surplus. It appears that the financial statement was false. This firm also obtained membership on a leading exchange. It went bankrupt as a result of the firm's activities. The customers of the firm will lose more than $22,000 because the firm diverted customers' funds to finance the general operations of the business. The corporation and its principal officers have been indicted by a Federal grand jury and are currently awaiting trial.

In the public interest, neither of the firms should have been registered and permitted to handle customers' trades.

The proposed bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to deny—under careful requirements of due process—registration to persons of this character who are unfit to engage in the brokerage business. It would also give the Secretary authority to establish minimum financial standards which would help to insure that firms handling customers' trades and funds are adequately financed for this purpose.

There are other situations in which a registrant is completely honest, but just does not have adequate financial resources to operate as a futures commission merchant. A one or two day rise or drop in a market, and a single customer's failure to supply margin requirements, can seriously jeopardize the funds of other customers of the firm. For example, a Chicago registrant recently filed a statement showing total assets of approximately $440. It did not include any cash in bank or on hand. In another example, a New York firm had total assets of $450, almost half of which was machinery and fixtures. The danger of loss of customers' funds under these conditions is abundantly clear.

INJUNCTIVE POWER

Many of these documented abuses—and virtually every market investigation ever made discloses violations—also manifests the need for injunctive power. This is the most vital of the amendments we are submitting for your consideration. It would enable the Secretary to move in a timely fashion, under stringent conditions of law and equity, to terminate violations. Now we must undertake protracted administrative or criminal proceedings before a final order can be issued or a conviction obtained. Often irreparable damage is done, especially where continued fraud or manipulation is occurring. We can cite cases, large and small.

If injunctive authority were granted under the Commodity Exchange Act, a Federal court would have the power—if a satisfactory showing were made—to enter a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction to put an immediate stop to the violation.

This provision would carry ample safeguards for the public. First, the Secretary would have to determine that a violation is occurring. He would then have to convince the Attorney General who, in turn, would have to go into Federal court and convince a judge. The American judicial system provides full and effective safeguards in the use of injunctive power. The use of injunctions has been commonplace with regulatory agencies for many years. There is no basis to fear that it would be, or in fact could be, abused in commodity market regulation.

Nor are there special attributes of commodity traders or markets which give them license not given to others for continued violations. The volatility and fast action in these markets do not endow them with unique status, but in fact argue with unique logic that prompt corrective measures should be available.

One example of the need for injunctive authority occurred late in 1963. A new company was organized in New York and registered as a futures commission merchant to handle customers' trades in regulated commodities. The firm did not hold a membership in any exchange. It had no apparent source of income. It was later learned that the firm was being financed by "under the table" kickbacks from two firms which were exchange members and through which its trades were cleared. The company's three major officers had been associated with Anthony DeAngelis prior to his bankruptcy in November 1963 in the so-called "salad oil scandal". Two of the firm's salesmen were former securities broker-dealers whose registrations had been revoked. They had pleaded guilty to securities fraud in another case and were awaiting sentence, and also were named in a land fraud case the previous year.

In view of the individuals involved in the firm, the CEA placed it under close observation. Numerous violations of the law were found including the over-trading or "churning" of customers' accounts. It was found that the secretary-treasurer of the company actually controlled the trading in 44 customers' accounts through powers of attorney issued to him or to other officers or employees of the firm. The practice was to get these customers into and out of the market as rapidly as possible in order to build up commissions for the firm. During an eight-month period, the 44 customers who had a net investment of $55,300 were charged a total of $43,500 in commissions. In one month the total commissions were 150 percent of the average daily equity in these accounts.

It was obvious that the customers were being systematically defrauded, but we had no authority to require the company to stop this type of trading or to discontinue handling customers' accounts. The CEA took the only course of action open. It developed evidence to support administrative and criminal action against the company and its principals. Through an administrative complaint, the firm and two of its officers have been denied trading privileges on contract markets for long periods of time. One officer and three employees pleaded guilty to criminal charges. Two have been sentenced and two are awaiting sentence. A criminal indictment against another officer is pending.

Effective action ultimately was taken. But the company, of necessity, was permitted to continue operation and to handle customers' accounts long after it became apparent that it was defrauding its customers. If the Secretary of Agriculture had had the authority to go into the courts through the Attorney General to seek an injunction as provided by the proposed legislation, in all probability the illegal activities of the company could have been stopped and customers' losses substantially reduced. Again, there appears to be no reason for people dealing in commodity futures to enjoy special license to defraud or to violate the law free of restraint.

WILLFUL AIDING OR ABETTING VIOLATION

There seems no argument at all against finding that a person who willfully aids or abets another person in violation of the Act should also be prosecuted. It has been argued that some attributes—generally undefined—of futures trading prevail here also. We disagree unequivocally.

CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS

We ask for cease and desist orders because we feel the penalties now provided by the Act are too severe for certain types of minor violations. Cease and desist authority would permit the Secretary to stop minor violations without imposing a penalty which could put some firms or individuals out of business. For example, suspending the registration of a large brokerage firm would mean closing its regulated commodity business for the period of the suspension. Obviously, this would be too severe a penalty if the violation had been minor. The proposal actually is a relaxation of the present penalty provisions of the law. Ample protection would be afforded all parties since the provision would require that the respondent be given an opportunity for a hearing on the charges and an opportunity to appeal the Secretary's decision to the courts.

CHEATING AND FRAUD

The cheating and fraud provisions of the Act now apply only to members of contract markets, their employees, correspondents or agents. We ask that this provision be extended to cover all persons who handle customers' orders or funds. There is need for this change. As an example, in Chicago, a man who was neither an exchange member nor associated with any exchange member, established a company to handle commodity futures trading for others. His advertising material spoke of "a new concept in account supervision" through which an agile trader could reap sizeable profits in the futures market. Some 40 persons opened accounts and gave the firm or its president authority to make futures trades for them. The president traded both for his customers and for his own account. After the trades were made, he would put the "good" trades in his own account and the "poor" trades in the accounts of his customers. In five weeks he made a profit of about $4,500 while the customers lost approximately $26,000.

This was a clear case of cheating customers. However, since neither the company nor its president was a member of an exchange or a correspondent, agent, or employee of a member, we had no jurisdiction under the Commodity Exchange Act and no charges could be brought against the management company or its president. The proposed legislation would correct this situation and give customers who deal in commodity futures with nonmembers the full protection of the law.

OFFENSES AND SANCTIONS

Classifying embezzlement and certain other serious offenses as felonies rather than misdemeanors is a needed change. The Las Vegas and California cases described above are excellent examples of situations which would be covered by the proposed amendment. Embezzlement resulting in major losses to customers should not be brushed off as a minor violation. Heavier penalties for these specific violations would be an effective deterrent to would-be violators.

REPORTS AND RECORDS

Members of a contract market must now keep a record of cash or spot transactions made only on the market. The bill would require record of cash or spot transactions made subject to the rules of the exchange, even though not physically made on the exchange. It would also require persons holding positions of a reportable size in commodities to keep a record of all cash or spot transactions and inventories in those commodities. Cash or spot and futures operations in the futures market are often so interrelated that it is almost impossible to determine whether violations have occurred without investigating both types of operations. The absence of adequate records regarding cash or spot transactions makes it difficult for the Department to investigate alleged or suspected violations, or to determine whether futures positions reported as hedges actually qualify as such. The bill seeks to correct this deficiency.

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

The Commodity Exchange Act provides that certain administrative actions shall be sustained upon judicial review if supported by the "weight of the evidence." This is not the standard usually provided in regulatory

statutes. It raises question as to the proper scope of review. The proposed legislation would provide that the administrative action would be sustained if supported by "substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole." Most of the existing provisions for judicial review of administrative actions under regulatory statutes specify "substantial evidence" as the standard. Such provisions are applicable to administrative actions of many officials, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Reserve Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

BYLAWS AND RULES

The proposal would give the Secretary authority to disapprove bylaws and rules of contract markets relating to terms of contracts or other trading requirements. He must find that such rules or bylaws violate or will violate any provision of the Act, or the regulations or orders of the Secretary issued pursuant to the Act. It seems obvious that when there is a conflict between an exchange rule and the law, or regulations, or orders issued pursuant to authority granted by the law, the exchange rule should be revoked or so changed as to bring it into compliance.

The proposal would also require exchanges to enforce all of their bylaws and rules which relate to contract terms and other trading requirements. At first glance, a provision of this type would seem redundant. When an exchange adopts a bylaw or rule, it is logical to expect enforcement, especially in light of the plea of self-regulation. In a number of instances, however, exchanges are extremely lax in enforcing important trading rules.

For example, regulations of the Act prohibit the matching of buying and selling orders of different customers unless this is done under an established procdure set forth in an exchange rule. A number of exchanges have adopted such a rule, designed to protect the customers in such situations.

A recent CEA trade practice investigation revealed the absence of enforcement. Although the exchange in question had a rule of this type, and there was a considerable amount of matching customers' orders, it was not enforced. For that matter, neither the exchange officials nor the employees who were charged with supervision and approval of the trades under the rule were even aware of the provisions of the rule. This kind of "self-regulation" cannot assure honest, open, and efficient trading.

CUSTOMERS' FUNDS

Under the proposal, futures commission merchants would no longer be permitted to invest customers' funds in "investment securities," as defined in Section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or to lend customers' funds on the collateral of warehouse receipts. The provision for investment in "investment securities" is difficult for commission merchants to interpret, and we have found instances in which firms have inadvertently violated the law by investing customers' funds in securities which were not approved for this purpose. The Department has also encountered difficulty in administering this provision and feels that it is unnecessary because investment of customers' funds would still be permitted in Federal, State or other governmental securities. So far as we know, the provision for loaning customers' funds on the collateral of warehouse receipts has never been used. It does, however, create a potential danger. It is obvious that if customers' funds had been loaned by a futures commission merchant on the collateral of the false warehouse receipts issued by Anthony DeAngelis during the "salad oil scandal," the customers' funds would have been lost.

BOOKS AND RECORDS

The law now requires a contract market to permit representatives of the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Justice to examine the books, records, minutes and journals of proceedings of the market, its governing board and all committees. The proposed legislation would merely require that these books and records be kept in a manner that will clearly describe all matters discussed and action taken by the market or its various committees.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Presently, futures commission merchants are required by the Act to segregate customers' funds in separate accounts. However, the Act does not specify how such funds are to be handled by banks and clearing associations which serve as depositories for the funds. Under the proposed legislation, depositories would be prohibited from treating the funds as belonging to the futures commission merchant or any person other than the customers, and would thus be prevented from using such funds to offset any liabilities of the futures commission merchant.

The bill would make it a violation of the Act for anyone against whom an order denying trading privileges has been issued to in any manner exercise such privileges during the effective period of such order. Heretofore, the restraint was only on persons extending the privileges without any affirmative restraint on the person against whom the order was issued.

Under the bill, all persons executing orders for others would be required to be registered as floor brokers. At present, certain traders who trade actively for their own accounts can also fill orders for others without being subjected to the provisions covering registered floor brokers.

Instances of unfortunate activity in the futures market which have been mentioned are carefully documented, along with many others of the same type.

SUMMARY

We have sought to exclude issues not relevant to consideration of this bill. We have stated:

(1) the provisions we see as minimal necessities under present conditions to assure that we meet the intent of the Congress expressed earlier;

(2) why these amendments are needed; and

(3) specific examples of abuses now prevalent that could be mitigated or eliminated through these amendments.

My colleagues and I will be happy to answer any questions directed to us by the Committee.

We thank you for this opportunity to present this statement to you.

Mr. Speaker, such sensitivity to a suggestion for improvement, enhancing the dignity and usefulness of the markets is probably only the routine resistance to any extension of regulatory procedure. It is not a new attitude. In 1922 when the first legislation affecting the grain futures markets was enacted, predictions were made that the markets would be ruined. Similar objections were voiced in 1936 when the law was substantially strengthened. Despite these dire predictions the futures markets, after 45 years of regulation, have enjoyed steadily increasing prosperity with a current volume of some $75 billion per year.

Improvements brought about by regulation, such as daily disclosures of volume of trading and open contracts, safeguarding of customers' funds, and curbing unduly large operations by powerful speculators are now accepted by responsible persons in the trade as being in the public interest and of benefit to the markets. In light of the history of 45 years of regulation, it might have been hoped that this time the exchange officials would have welcomed the present conservative and moderate proposals and cooperated in their speedy enactment.

Despite the present expressions of adamant resistance, it safely may be predicted that if H.R. 11930 is enacted, such further steps toward better market practices as more expeditious handling of law violations, realistically severe penalties for serious criminal offenses, and the establishment of adequate financial requirements for all commodity brokerage concerns doing business for the public, will also be accepted and recognized as beneficial to the markets and to all who use them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. WATSON), for 15 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR), for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON (at the request of the Mr. EVINS of Tennessee) to revise and extend his remarks during debate on the NASA appropriation bill, and to include tables and extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. WATSON) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. HARSHA.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 304. An act relating to the Indian revolving loan fund and the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 778. An act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1727. An act to authorize the consolida-

tion and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1933. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2531. An act to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek Judgment Fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs.

H.R. 4809. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley.

H.R. 5967. An act for the relief of Albert P. Morell.

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of John E. Coplin.

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1282. To provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax when rendered unfit for beverage use, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2470. To provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments and apparatus for the use of Tufts University, Mount Holyoke College, and the Massachusetts Division of the American Cancer Society;

H.R. 2531. To provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek Judgment Fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs;

H.R. 4809. For the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley;

H.R. 5967. For the relief of Albert P. Morell;

H.R. 6056. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated;

H.R. 6452. For the relief of John E. Coplin;

H.R. 7362. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 23, 1967, 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:

1012. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the present limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1013. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of claims paid during fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2732 and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1014. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1657. An act to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10673. A bill to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 913. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10409, a bill to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 838. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 163. An act for the relief of CWO Charles M. Bickart, U.S. Marine Corps (retired) (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Virgile Posfay (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1963. A bill for the relief of employees of General Services Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3498. A bill for the relief of D. M. Dew & Sons, Inc., and Dewey Campbell (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5199. A bill for the relief of James E. Denman; with amendment (Rept. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophie Michalowska (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6325. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Allan L. Schooler; with amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8088. A bill for the relief of Willard Herndon Rusk (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10655. A bill for the relief of Arthur Anderson (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 508. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 1734, entitled "A bill for the relief of Frances von Wedel" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 493. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 9326) entitled "A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Ruchwarger" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12504. A bill to guarantee productive employment opportunities for those who are unemployed or underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12505. A bill to provide that a District of Columbia public school teacher may retire on a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service or at age 60 after 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 12506. A bill to authorize the Com-

missioners of the District of Columbia to fix and collect rents for the occupancy of space in, on, under, or over the streets of the District of Columbia, to authorize the closing of unused or unsafe vaults under said streets and the correction of dangerous conditions of vaults in or vault openings on public space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12507. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12508. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into leases for the rental of, or to use or permit the use of, public space in, on, over, and under the streets and alleys under their jurisdiction, other than freeways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12509. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, so as to provide for the establishment of a White Fleet designed to give assistance and aid on a continuing basis to people of other nations for the purpose of combating hunger or disease of a persistent nature, and to render emergency assistance in the event of national disaster; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 12510. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 12511. A bill to amend the income limitation provisions applicable to veterans and widows of veterans receiving non-service-connected disability pensions under chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12512. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 12513. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12514. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 12515. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12516. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 12517. A bill to provide for the control or elimination of the alewife and other such pests in the waters of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12518. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12519. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to first-class letter mail sent by certain persons to members of the U.S. Armed Forces in combat areas overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12520. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 12522. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 12523. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12524. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 12525. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 12526. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to encourage the adoption of legal service programs which permit maximum opportunity for clients to freely choose their own attorneys; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself and Mr. MORRIS):

H.R. 12527. A bill to authorize the consolidation and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 12528. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12529. A bill to provide training opportunities for persons employed in the legislative branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12530. A bill to repeal section 1523 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to the effect of posthumous commissions and warrants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 12531. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 12532. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to restrict the training of certain foreign nationals under that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 12533. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 12534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12535. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes," so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 12536. A bill to establish an effective date for the provisions of Public Law 87-140; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 12537. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 801. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 802. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 914. Resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Res. 915. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to set aside a portion of the gallery for the use of scholars engaged in studies of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

282. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a plant for the production of a fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

283. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to registration and regulation of firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 12538. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Nunoz-Amezquita (also known as Tony Ruiz Castro); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 12539. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Wasson Coal Mining Corp. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.