

## RECESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to; and the Chair announces that he will be available, and that as soon as possible after 1 p.m., the Senate will reconvene.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL rose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California desire to address the Senate?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do, Mr. President.

After consulting with my colleague the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. PROXMIRE], and by telephone with both the majority leader and the minority leader, it is the plan of the leadership in the Senate for the Senate to adjourn from today until Friday and from Friday until Monday next, by which time all Senators will have been placed on notice that the conference report on the foreign aid bill then will be considered, and presumably passed.

Under those circumstances, I say to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin, if there is no objection among those faithful colleagues who are present today to consider the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 880, at the desk, I suggest that we proceed with that business and then adjourn until Friday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree.

## DATE FOR CONVENING OF 2D SESSION OF 88TH CONGRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880), establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

## ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 23, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college topics.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address on automation in industry, delivered by the Secretary of Labor on December 19, 1963.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, AT 9 A.M.; AND FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to reconvene on Friday, December 27, at 9 a.m., and that when it adjourns on Friday it adjourn to reconvene at 10 a.m. on Monday, December 30, and that the business to be laid before the Senate at that time be the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, H.R. 9499.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to inquire whether it is the intention of the acting majority leader that the Senate not transact any business on Friday?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is certainly the intention of the acting majority leader. That was certainly the intention of the majority leader and of the minority leader when this request was agreed to.

The session of the Senate on Friday will be merely a pro forma session. The Senate will come in at 9 o'clock a.m. and go out shortly after that, and no business will be transacted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made by our able friend from Wisconsin, I wonder if the Senator is willing to revise the unanimous-consent request so that the consent agreement will include the fact that there will be no business transacted on Friday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Surely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be included in the unanimous-consent request.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the orders are entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. Friday, December 27, 1963; that immediately after convening on that day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. Monday, December 30, 1963, at which time the Senate

shall proceed to the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 9499, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. (December 24, 1963.)

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1963

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate will now adjourn.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, December 27, 1963, at 9 o'clock a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1963

The House met at 7 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 72: 11: *Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him, and all nations shall serve Him.*

Almighty God, our Father, in Thy divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days and years.

Grant that these words of Thy servant, whom Thou hast richly endowed with insight and inspiration, may be completely realized by all the members of the human family:

"Many merry Christmases. Many happy New Years. Unbroken friendships. Great accumulation of cheerful recollections. Affection on earth. And heaven at last for all of us."

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord whom the ancient prophet proclaimed that His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## WAIVING OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9499

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and that during the consideration of the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, a motion by the chairman of the managers on the part of the House to recede and concur in said Senate amendment numbered 20 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] 30 minutes, and I would like to inquire if the gentleman from New York would wish to use some of the time?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I will use some of the time, yes, sir. Do you want me to use it now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that we all understand what this is about. In the interests of proceeding more rapidly, I wish the gentleman would go first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this resolution. I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I believe everybody knows what we are going to talk about today, and I hope we will talk about it very briefly. Certainly everybody knows what has been going on here for the last couple of weeks. We deplore it, and it probably is the greatest argument for changes in certain rules of the House. I must, however, call the attention of the House to one thing: Some of us have been told that the Committee on Rules was rather a useless appendage; that it was quite useless and that nobody really thought very much of it. I note, however, Mr. Speaker, that it has been necessary to have recourse to the Committee on Rules to get this bill on the floor, so maybe there is some use to it after all—not that I am for the bill.

We all have the privilege of revising and extending our remarks.

For that reason it is to be hoped we will all do that this morning. Then our words will go down to posterity. Everyone will be able to read them. Future generations yet unborn will be able to see them. But those of us who are here on this Christmas Eve need not listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take 5 minutes. I think we should be certain about the procedure, especially on our side of the aisle. You will recall the last time—I will not say the first or the second time, but the last time we voted on this issue the conference report itself was in disagreement and therefore the principal vote on this side occurred on a motion to recommit the conference report. This morning the circumstance is, as I understand the procedure, that the conference report is not in disagreement. The language in disagreement is to a Senate amendment, No. 20, to the conference report. So, said another way, I assume that the conference report will be approved when it comes before the House.

There is one technical amendment, amendment No. 14, which I understand is not in dispute. The next Senate amendment, No. 20, is in dispute and I presume the gentleman from Louisiana will move to recede from the House position and concur in that amendment with

an amendment. It is at that point, may I say to my colleagues on our side of the aisle, that the principal vote will occur this morning.

I might add further, if we prevail on this side of the aisle, and in justice certainly we should, it is assumed that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized to move that the House conferees insist on the House position.

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use 5 minutes, but as one of you who has been disturbed in these last days at the reputation we have made for ourselves in the country and in the world, it seems a very great pity that at this time of year particularly we should have been fighting each other and doing things for which, as the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has said, future generations will not be proud.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members who are here this morning—and I congratulate those who came back under such very difficult conditions—will do their voting this morning in the spirit of Christmas, not in the spirit of battle. This is so important to the whole world. Unless we can demonstrate peace within our own frontiers how can we expect to be of any moment at all in the decisions of the world?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, day after day the Soviet Union spends \$1 million a day in Cuba to defy us and destroy liberty and freedom to the Cuban people. Today we are asked to open the door that American taxpayers finance sale of products to the Soviet Union.

Shall we endorse the Soviet Union's note at the expense of the American taxpayer? Shall we extend further credit to a nation that now is in default to us over \$10 billion?

Shall we now begin to finance both sides of the cold war?

#### TO SELL OR NOT SELL WHEAT IS NOT THE QUESTION

Mr. Speaker, there have been some who have tried to lead us down the primrose path into confusion from the real issue. It is not shall we or shall we not sell wheat to the Soviets. When this issue was first discussed with the American people we were told the wheat sale would be for dollars or gold. That it would help our balance of payments. This is not the issue today.

This is not a proposal which involves the question whether we should trade wheat, corn, cotton, or tobacco. The amendment deals with all products and for all countries. It involves the question whether we want to do business with Communist dictators helping them to import the things they need to shore up the staggering economy in Communist countries by means of the credit extended by the American taxpayers.

What has happened to the wheat deal for dollars or gold?

Again I point out this amendment is not for wheat but for products.

Webster's dictionary defines "product" as: "Product—anything produced as by generation, growth, labor, or thought."

Shall we delegate this great power, shall we grant this unlimited authority? I hope not.

We have spoken twice. Twice before this issue has been settled by a majority vote of this House.

It is an open secret, of course, that the President wants this power. He has used his influence, prestige, and skill to overturn the will of this House.

Are we in the future to expect the power of the Executive to dictate and overturn the action of Congress except through his constitutional veto?

I would hope not.

Less than 1 month ago, on November 27, 1963, in an address by the President before a joint session of Congress he said—

As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously, and speedily when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, I too have served here some years. I believe in the independence and integrity of this House. In the past few days and nights I have fought to protect that integrity and independence. The opposition has been great and not all of it has come from within the House.

#### THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT AND OF THE HOUSE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that under the Constitution the sole power in foreign affairs rests with the President. I challenge anyone in this House or elsewhere to find any such language in the Constitution. But the authority of the Congress in appropriations is well settled. Let us look at history.

#### HOW THE FOUNDING FATHERS FELT

It is clear that many of the men who assembled in Philadelphia in 1787 to frame a constitution for the newly independent colonies favored an Executive with limited powers. Madison notes in his journal of Friday, June 1, 1787, that one of the delegates, Mr. Sherman, echoed the feelings of others present when he said that he considered the Executive office as nothing more than an institution for carrying into effect the will of the legislature. Sherman went so far as to say that the Executive ought to be appointed by the legislature and accountable to that body since Congress would be the depository of the supreme will of the society. Sherman considered the legislators as the best judges of the business which ought to be done by the executive department. Madison notes that another delegate, Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, considered the execution of the laws and the appointing of officers the only strictly Executive functions.

These comments proved typical of the sentiment evoked by Charles Pinckney's

preliminary plan for Executive powers introduced before the delegates only 3 days before, on Tuesday, May 29:

He shall receive public ministers from foreign nations, and may correspond with the executives of the different States. He shall have power to grant pardons and reprieves except in impeachments. He shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States.

Opinion was so divided and strong over the powers of the executive branch that the Convention resolved on July 23, 1787, to refer to a committee the drafting of a report of the powers of the Executive conformable to the major resolutions already passed by the Convention. The committee, composed of Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts; James Wilson, of Pennsylvania; Edmund Randolph, of Virginia; John Rutledge, of South Carolina; and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, was thus justified to enumerate a more complete definition of the powers of the future President. The only powers thus far conferred by the Convention had been the veto, appointment—but not of judges—and the execution of laws. Madison's original idea had been to leave the unenumerated powers to the will of the legislature as expressed through legislative enactments. Now the committee faced a question of enormous importance: Shall control of the military and foreign relations be left with one Executive? Should the powers be enumerated?

Of the 12 listed powers of the Executive only the 10th in the draft of the proposal which Randolph drew up was connected with foreign relations: "receiving ambassadors." Up to this point, the Convention, as far as the records show, gave the subject of international affairs no attention. The only recorded reference to this area of potential Executive action had been in the provisions of a sketch Alexander Hamilton had drawn up whereby treaties would be made and ambassadors named by the Executive with the advice and consent of the Senate.

One member of the committee, Ellsworth, was decidedly for a strong, independent head of government. Rutledge and Randolph favored a weak Chief of State. Randolph regarded foreign affairs essentially as a matter to be decided by the Legislature as a body or by the Senate alone.

Randolph's original proposals were amended so that the committee later gave the power "to be Commander in Chief of the land and naval power of the Union and of the Militia of the Several States." Changes were also made in the direction of making the Senate the sole organ of foreign affairs. Finally, Wilson drew on Randolph's amended draft, Charles Pinckney's plan of May 29, and certain provisions of the New York constitution to draft a final plan of Executive powers. No other powers relating to foreign affairs were added. The chief feature of the Wilson plan was the independent possession by the executive department of its powers by direct grant of the people. Unfortunately, there is

no indication or evidence in the records whether Wilson intended the enumerated powers to be an exhaustive description of that general Executive power which the President held as the executor of the Nation's laws. The construction of many State constitutions of the time already realized the importance of unenumerated Executive power for more responsive, flexible leadership.

On August 20, 1787, Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, and Charles Pinckney submitted a plan before the delegates for the complete constitutional organization of the executive department of the National Government. There were to be five departments of the executive branch, each headed by a secretary. Together with the Chief Justice they were to be a council of state to assist the President in conducting public affairs. This plan confirms the fact that the delegates generally regarded the President as a sort of chief administrator. This belief is reinforced by the fact that the duties of these heads of department were enumerated, the secretary of each department responsible to the President. The Secretary of Foreign Affairs had for his functions: "to correspond with all foreign ministers, prepare plans for treaties, and consider such as may be transmitted from abroad, and generally to attend to the interests of the United States in their connection with foreign powers."

Those duties for which the subordinate secretaries became responsible became an integral part of the Presidential power. The recognition that the President, although granted little real power—except as Commander in Chief—in the Constitution in the field of foreign affairs, was generally taken by the Founding Fathers as the single constitutional representative of the people in this area can be seen in the terms of the Foreign Department bill; the sole purpose of the Foreign Department was to carry out the will of the President. Only the Treasury Department was created solely to carry out the acts of Congress. As one political scientist has put it:

Where by the terms of the Constitution, the National Government is vested with control over a certain sphere of action, that portion of the field's is the President's which is executive in character. Thus the Constitution makes the National Government the sole organ in foreign affairs. Since many powers are not enumerated, they are the President's as of constitutional right, being of an executive character (Charles Thatch, "The Creation of the Presidency, 1775-89," Baltimore, 1922).

Today the President undoubtedly acts more arbitrarily and independently than the framers of the Constitution ever intended him to act. Custom, law, court decisions, and the practice of foreign nations have placed the President in a prominent position in the formation and execution of foreign policy. Certainly secrecy, unity of operation, continuity, and access to information are characteristics of his office. These necessary elements are peculiar to the President. Congress, by nature, possess none of them. It was felt by one of the most articulate delegates at the Convention

that even the Senate could not properly deal with international relations:

To have entrusted the power of making treaties to the Senate alone, would have been to relinquish the benefits of the constitutional agency of the President in the conduct of foreign relations (Alexander Hamilton, "The Federalist," LXXV).

This same intellectual forcefully explained the few enumerated powers directly granted to the President in the Constitution by describing the important implications of a broad interpretation of Executive power:

The enumeration (of Executive powers in the Constitution) ought therefore to be considered as intended merely to specify the principal articles in the definition of Executive power, having the rest to flow from the general grant of that power, interpreted in conformity with other parts of the Constitution, and with the principles of free government.

The general doctrine of our Constitution, then, is that the Executive power of the Nation is rested in the President, subject only to the exceptions and qualifications which are expressed in the instrument. (Alexander Hamilton in the Philadelphia Gazette, June 29, 1793.)

Jefferson himself referred to the transaction of business with foreign nations as "executive altogether" and John Marshall declared in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1800, that "the President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." The Senate itself early enough recognized that all powers claimed by the President in the field of foreign affairs not specifically named in the Constitution must nevertheless be considered as emanating from the Constitution:

The President is the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. (S. Doc. 231, 56th Cong., 2d sess.)

Thus, aside from the chief provisions of the Constitution relating to foreign affairs—

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States \* \* \*. He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur \* \* \* appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls \* \* \* receive ambassadors and other public ministers—

Presidential power in this area has grown chiefly from necessity and the demands of executive leadership in a field requiring secrecy and unity of command.

But the nature of foreign affairs and the characteristics of the Executive Office which fit the President to the task are merely one side of the coin. On the other side is the rightful role of Congress in foreign relations, and in a rather ironic sense, the part played by the Appropriations Committee. Congress and the President were bound to cross swords early over the financial support of foreign policy flowing from the Executive Office, and interestingly, even though Congress historically has followed Presidential recommendations for appropriations for crucial policies, the House of

Representatives has made clear its rightful, constitutional position with reference to money matters. When a bill was introduced into the House for appropriations for the Jay Treaty during Washington's administration, opposition developed and the view was quickly advanced that the House really was free to grant or withhold the required funds on its own view of the merits of the treaty. A majority of the House sanctioned this position, even though the appropriations were finally granted. But to the authorization was attached the following resolution:

When a treaty stipulates regulations on any of the subjects submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, it must depend, for its execution, as to such stipulations, on a law or laws to be passed by Congress. And it is the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives, in all such cases, to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect, and to determine and act thereon, as, in their judgment, may be most conducive to the public good.

In the matter of the Jay Treaty, the House was not constitutionally bound to appropriate the necessary funds. In voting the money to carry out the treaty, however, the House certainly was exercising its part of the "whole legislative power" and had, accordingly, its right to exercise its full constitutional discretion in the matter.—Noted by Edward S. Corbin in "The President's Control of Foreign Relations," Cambridge, 1917.

If the Jay Treaty established congressional opinion regarding the appropriation of money, it also fixed the Presidential prerogative of wide discretion in foreign affairs. When the House of Representatives asked George Washington to lay before it the instructions, correspondence, and documents relating to the treaty he said:

The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy, and even when brought to a conclusion, a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic, for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers.

Thus, at the same time both congressional rights with respect to appropriations and the Presidential power of single command in foreign affairs was fixed. Even the modern notion of foreign policy decisions in the vital interests of U.S. security find precedent in the first important foreign policy legislation in this country: the Embargo Act of 1794 authorized the President to lay the embargo "whenever, in his opinion, the public safety shall so require," and "to continue or revoke the same whenever he shall think proper." By the more recent lend-lease proposal, action could have been taken when the President deemed it "in the interest of national defense," and the benefits of the statute were extended to "the government of any country whose defense the President—deemed—vital to the defense of the United States."

We now see that the volatile question of wide discretionary powers available to

the President is one founded on precedents set by the first Executive of the United States, agreed to by both Houses of the National Legislature, and followed up by later Presidents and Congresses. Perhaps the wording of an 1860 court decision defines even today the peculiar position which the President occupies:

As the Executive head of the Nation, the President is made the only legitimate organ of the General Government to open or carry on correspondence or negotiations with foreign nations in matters concerning the interests of the country or of its citizens (*Durand v. Holland*, 8 Fed. Cas. No. 4186).

The Supreme Court in 1936 officially awarded to the President legal claim in the exercising of discretionary powers as sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of foreign affairs. In the important Curtiss-Wright case, the Court recognized this power as exclusive and plenary—a power in international relations which "does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress."

The decision in the Curtiss-Wright case sustained the constitutionality of a joint resolution of Congress of 1934 authorizing the President to forbid the sale of arms to the participants in the Chaco dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay "if the President finds that the prohibition may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries."

The Curtiss-Wright Export Co. was charged with having violated the resolution by selling machineguns to Bolivia. A demurrer to indictment was filed on the ground that the resolution was unconstitutional, as it amounted to an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the President. The demurrer was sustained in a district court but was reversed in the Supreme Court.

Justice Sutherland in his opinion for the Court seemed in effect to withdraw virtually all constitutional limitation upon the scope of congressional delegation of power to the President to act in the field of international relations. Sutherland's reasoning in the case rested on what he named as the difference between the powers of the Federal Government with respect to foreign and external affairs and those having to do with internal or domestic affairs. The difference, according to Sutherland related both to origin and nature. He wrote as follows:

The very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution. It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations embarrassment is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved \* \* \* he, not Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries. He has the confidential sources of information. He has his agents in the form of diplomatic, consular, and

other officials. Secrecy in respect of information gathered by them may be highly necessary and the premature disclosure of it productive of harmful results. \* \* \* Powers of external sovereignty of the Federal Government, including the power to declare war and conclude peace, to make treaties and maintain diplomatic relations, are not dependent on affirmative grants of the Constitution.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

It has long been recognized by Presidents, Members of Congress, and political scientists that the appropriating of public money often has a far greater impact on the formation of foreign policy than the substantive decisions coming from the White House. The House is at liberty to insert provisos or instructions in appropriations bills which have the effect of determining or modifying policy. Of course, Congress may withhold funds altogether and thus completely cancel an executive policy. To the extent that funds are withheld or the terms and conditions set for the expenditure of Treasury money, Congress may prescribe its own policy. But this is as it should be. According to the Constitution, article I, section 9, clause 7:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditure of public money shall be published from time to time.

That Congress may check the desire of the President to give Communists further financial assistance is clearly drawn from the provisions of the Constitution. Indeed, perhaps the President should possess wide discretion in the matter of deciding what is in the vital interest of national security. The wisdom of possessing such power apparently goes unchallenged. But in the matter of spending public money Congress alone may declare for what purpose the funds may be used, the terms of expenditure, and the conditions under which the taxpayers' dollars may be sent overseas. The Constitution grants this power directly. An important court decision of 1945 confirms Congress unique position. During the Second World War certain subcontractors sought action in the courts for a declaratory judgment that the Renegotiation Act (50 U.S.C.A. App. 1191) was unconstitutional and therefore did not authorize the War Department to recapture alleged excessive profits. The court said the action presented no justifiable controversy because Congress, in making an appropriation, has the power not only to designate the purpose of an appropriation, but also the conditions under which an executive department of the Government could expend the appropriation.

The purpose of appropriations and terms and conditions under which they are made is a matter solely in the hands of Congress, and it is the explicit duty of the executive branch to comply therewith, and any attempt by the judicial branch to interfere therewith would be a plain invasion of the constitutional powers of Congress. (*Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft Co.*, D.C. Cal., 60 F. Supp. 985.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FINDLEY.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, every one of us would prefer to be elsewhere at this moment. This is Christmas eve.

Christmas is in your mind—a personal Christmas, a family Christmas. Many of you were already at home—a thousand, 2,000 or more miles from here—when summoned back to Capitol Hill.

And rightly you probably feel sorry for yourself at having to be here. With airlines clogged this holiday week, you may have trouble getting back home in time for Christmas, even if the issue before us is resolved quickly.

Let us give a little thought to how other American citizens will spend Christmas.

What kind of a Christmas will it be for the families of the men who died last week fighting communism in South Vietnam?

What kind of a Christmas will it be for the families of the thousands and thousands of American men who died fighting communism in South Korea just a decade ago?

Eight American divisions are in Europe. Thousands of American men who will not be home for Christmas. Other thousands of American men in uniform will be away from home on Christmas because they are in South Vietnam, on the high seas, in South Korea—in a thousand military duty stations overseas.

What kind of a Christmas will they have? It will not be a family Christmas. They will be away from home, away from family, away from the joy of a family Christmas. Why? Because they are a part of the military might of this Nation, a military machine created because of communism and arrayed against communism.

Were it not for the existence of powerful Communist governments—principally the Soviet Union—these thousands of American men could safely be released from official duty to spend Christmas at home with their families.

But the Soviet Union does exist. It is a powerful Communist government, allied with other powerful Communist governments. Because of this fact thousands and thousands of American men will not be home for Christmas.

They will be scattered all over the world manning the ramparts against communism.

It is entirely fitting and proper that we, too, as their elected representatives, be willing to be on duty this Christmas and do our bit against communism.

Were it not for the existence of powerful Communist governments, in Russia, and elsewhere, the House of Representatives would not be in session today. We could all be home this very moment.

We were called back to duty to resolve one question and one alone, an amendment that goes to the heart of our efforts against communism. Only one item in the foreign aid appropriation bill is in dispute—the amendment to prohibit

financing the Communists. It would keep American tax dollars from giving aid and comfort to Communist governments. It is as simple as that.

On this vote, you cannot hide behind President Johnson's coattails. The President is already on record—yes, even on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as plain as day in favor of subsidized credit for the Communists through the Export-Import Bank. So for all practical purposes, if you vote to give the President discretion, you vote to help finance the Communists. The President has announced how he will go, so you cannot get by trying to pass the buck to him.

Yes, it is Christmas week, and we all want to be home. And it may seem that the easy way to get there is to reject the motion to recommit the conference report—and thus OK financing the Communists.

But, is it really the easy way out?

How will you explain your vote—a vote to aid Communist governments—to your constituents who are in American uniform in Europe, in South Vietnam, or any of a thousand other foreign places—American men who are away from home on Christmas in order to meet the threat posed by these same Communist governments?

How will you explain voting to finance the Communists to your constituents who lost sons, brothers, and fathers fighting communism in Korea and South Vietnam?

How will you explain your vote to any constituent for that matter? Every constituent is digging deep in his pocketbook to help finance our billion-a-week outlay for defense against communism.

Yes, it seems easy to cave in on this issue. Let the Senate have its way. Let the President go ahead with his announced determination to help finance the Communists. That way, we can all hurry home to the Christmas tree.

But how will you explain it to yourself when, in the glow of the Christmas tree lights, you look into the eyes of your own trusting family?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership by making the prestige of President Johnson the issue may finally in a third effort defeat the provision banning Government guarantees of credit on grain sales, and sales of other products to Russia and other Communist countries.

The basic issue of whether it is morally or legally right to guarantee Communist countries credit has been glossed over. Statements that indicate adoption of the "anti-Red credit ban" would prevent sale of wheat, or other commodities, to Communist countries are erroneous for in fact the provision would firm up what our late President, John F. Kennedy, stated on October 9 in approving sales to

Russia and other countries for cash or gold. The "Red credit ban" is referred to as the "wheat amendment," but in fact Russia wants to buy industrial alcohol, fertilizer plants and many other products. The "credit ban" provision requires cash or gold in payment instead of credit and has no bearing on the sales of wheat, otherwise. It may still be sold for cash or gold. The following facts are completely ignored in frantic Yuletide efforts to "bail out" the administration.

First. Present Russian obligation from World War I—with interest totals over \$620 million.

Second. So-called pipeline lend-lease in World War II—that is material ordered by Russia and delivered at end of war. The amount agreed to was over \$222 million—but nearly \$206 million remains unpaid.

Third. The \$11 billion lend-lease shipped to Russia during World War II—we agreed to settle for \$800 million—Russia offered \$300 million in full settlement.

Fourth. Russia now owes the United Nations nearly \$43 million for unpaid special assessments.

Fifth. That just 2 weeks ago J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director said—

We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Sixth. That in the same bill containing the "Red credit ban," American taxpayers are asked to "shell out" nearly \$3 billion for foreign aid for what? Why, to protect us from communism.

Seventh. That guarantee of Russian credit is a new departure for the Export-Import Bank, in fact since its inception in 1934 the Bank has never insured a credit risk or extended credit to Russia, Hungary, Red China, or any Communist country except Yugoslavia which has been treated "specially," for some reason.

Eighth. That defense appropriations this year exceeded \$51 billion—all—we are told—to protect us from communism.

These are but a few indisputable facts. Most significant is the fact some 14,000 Americans are now in Vietnam fighting communism and that 158 Americans have made the supreme sacrifice—all—we are told—to protect the free world from communism.

No doubt President Johnson and the Democratic leadership will win when the vote is taken but do not forget what were to be cash or gold may now become credit transactions. Commercial bankers and grain exporters are relieved from any financial risk as this will be assumed by the Export-Import Bank in the event of default by any Communist country. As usual the only possible loser will be the American taxpayer as the Export-Import Bank is a Government-chartered institution and every dollar it has, or loses, belongs to the taxpayers.

If we yield to political pressures today are we not strengthening the hand of the enemy? Is there any real indication "relaxing of tensions" will become a bilateral undertaking?

If Russia, or some other Communist country can buy on credit of 18

months, which I trust will be the minimum, they can strengthen themselves in some other area of their economy or increase the pressures in other spots in the world, such as Cuba or Berlin.

I doubt my banker, or any banker, would lend or guarantee a nickel's worth of Russian credit—not even on the eve of Christmas—something, incidentally and unfortunately not recognized in Communist Russia. To go down fighting for principle is certainly honorable so when you vote "remember the Alamo."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely strange that we are engaged here in debate again today on a feature of the foreign aid appropriation, the end result of which can only harm more segments of the American economy. And I also find it strange to reconcile the concern the executive branch of the Government has for furthering the world Communist movement, that has sworn to bury us, and at the same time exhibit so little concern toward a segment of our domestic economy.

I have reference to the livestock industry of the United States that at the present time is in an extremely precarious position as a result of imports. And although this effect of imports on the livestock industry has been brought to the attention of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, the Tariff Commission, and President Johnson, nothing has been done, although the corrective measures are seemingly contained in section 301 of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. I also find it difficult to account for the concern for Communist nations and the seeming unconcern for sections of the U.S. economy other than livestock. For instance, the administration has said that grain farmers will stand to lose \$600 million this year unless some type of a wheat program is put into effect; yet this administration has shown a distinct reluctance to come to the aid of the grain farmer unless he was willing to put his neck in a yoke and submit to farming under full Government control. At the same time we are asked to grant the President carte blanche as far as the Communist nations are concerned, and are not nearly so concerned with qualifying that need.

Now let us take a good hard close look at what many of you and President Johnson are asking us to do today. The administration has forecast a \$600 million loss to just one segment of agriculture and since many Members have said right on this floor that \$1 in agriculture is multiplied seven times, by simple arithmetic you are hurting our national economy in the national interest—some \$4,200 million worth to say nothing of the millions of dollars being lost daily in the livestock industry and the textile industry.

To summarize: What we are being asked to do today is to pass a \$3 billion foreign aid appropriation bill carrying an amendment authorizing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee payment for the sale of products to Communist countries, while at the same time the administration is ignoring domestic situations costing many times more, although the suffering industries are being forced to pay their share of foreign aid.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the Christmas present the President of the United States wants from this House.

What he wants is as absolute and total freedom and flexibility for the executive branch in the field of foreign policy as he is able to wring from elected representatives of the American people who have twice recorded on a bipartisan basis their opposition to such a grant of power.

What he wants is a rubberstamp gift-wrapped in a blank check.

The issue is no longer merely wheat for Russia. The issue is no longer merely the right of Congress to forbid financing credit for the wheat transaction.

The issue is simply and inescapably whether the House of Representatives is to retain any meaningful controls on the tax-supported fiscal policy aspects of our foreign relations.

It may well be some time before the full significance of the issue now before this House dawns upon the American people.

But that realization will come—and with it will come a day of reckoning for the leadership which, at this moment, is employing every pressure tactic in the book to force a reversal of the twice-declared will of this House.

I noted over the weekend a statement in the press attributed to an unidentified White House source to the effect that the resistance to the administration in this matter is an attempt by "midwestern isolationists" to gain power over foreign policy.

The administration must be desperate indeed if it feels compelled to resurrect this "bogymen."

Back in 1949, a proposal was made in connection with a foreign aid appropriation bill to grant the executive branch a completely free hand in the allocation of appropriated foreign aid funds among recipient nations.

It was no midwestern isolationist, but a convert to internationalism and a staunch supporter of foreign aid—the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg of my own State of Michigan—who rose in the other body to denounce the suggestion as "a proposal for the virtual creation of a total, worldwide, war-lord power for the White House."

And that was the end of the matter—for then.

We have gone a long way down the road of legislative abdication since that courageous outburst by Senator Vandenberg.

It was in connection with the 1957 foreign aid authorization bill that Chairman Richards of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs declared:

Here you find the greatest flexibility power ever given to any President of the United

States. He can move funds all over the place from one side of the world to the other.

During the debate on this bill in June 1956, I said on the floor of this House:

I do not detract one iota from my very great respect for the present President of the United States when I say that I am unwilling to bestow this power upon any President.

I was not accused of partisan politics when I made that statement. I could not be so accused. I am a Republican and the occupant of the White House when I made that statement was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I am no more partisan when I say today that I am unwilling to bestow total freedom and flexibility of action of the type demanded upon the present occupant of the White House.

There can be no more justification for the Congress or this House to abdicate its right to impose restrictions on fiscal policy when that policy relates to foreign affairs than when it relates to domestic affairs. In either instance, it is abdication.

And when that abdication grants to any President complete discretionary authority to extend credit or financial assistance to Communist governments, it is a doubly repugnant and intolerable abdication.

It is an abdication to which I will never knowingly be a party.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we should not be considering this resolution today. Twice before the House has gone on record as opposed to extending credit to the Communists.

Now it seems the debate centers around whether or not credit will be extended through the Export-Import Bank. I want the record to show that at least one Member, this Member, although certainly there must be many more who do not believe we should do any business with the Communists, not in food, not in any product. This resolution would permit the President to do business with Russians in any product.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate on this issue has made much of the position of the President in the field of foreign policy.

Some Members have contended that the President is uniquely and exclusively responsible in our dealings with foreign nations. But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution vests in the Congress very clear-cut responsibilities.

It is true that the President makes treaties by and with the advice of the Senate. The Constitution also directs that he receive ambassadors and other public ministers.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution also vests in Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and the issue now before us lies four-square within that congressional responsibility.

The Constitution also vests in the Congress the determination of the expenditure of public money in the area of foreign relations.

The Congress should be as jealous to exercise its constitutional responsibilities as it is willing to implement the constitutional responsibilities of the other two branches of Government.

Senate Amendment No. 20, as revised by the conferees, delegates to the President the determination of what is in the national interest. The Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities here.

We, as the representatives of the American people, should ourselves determine the national interest, and, for myself, I believe it would be against our national interest to guarantee the credit of the Soviet Union or any other Communist country.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body who votes to authorize the President to give credit to Communist countries to buy goods is voting to aid communism. The only possible effect of such credit is a net plus for communism and a net minus for Americans, whether the goods the Communist nations buy are wheat or corn or ball bearings.

Such a vote is, in truth, a Christmas credit card for Khrushchev to be paid for by the American taxpayer. It is a credit card that will make the Communist bloc stronger. It is something the House has no business doing—no business yielding on to the other body—no business substituting for what we were once told by the Democrat administration was to be a hard cash transaction for gold to help our balance-of-payments deficit.

Every pressure in the book has been brought to bear upon the membership on the other side of the aisle to vote for this credit card to communism. And thanks to the voters of America there are a sufficient number of Democrats in this body to assure that when we vote today in all probability the vote will be to charge more Christmas gifts for Communist nations to the already overburdened American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of the House who votes "no" today will take the message of the full significance of an unwise vote of "Yes" to the people of his district again and again from now until our people can express their will at the polls next November.

Never has there been a more clear-cut abdication of congressional responsibility to the American people. Never will there be presented a more glaring example of political pressure for sheer power at the expense of the national security. Never will there be shown a more crass and blatant steamroller in disregard of fiscal responsibility by an organized and determined Democrat leadership both in this House and from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is said by some of the more experienced among the opposition that this is just another vote and that it will soon be forgotten. The suggestion is made that it is not the vote but the personality of incumbents that determines their reelection. Well, it is time the American voter paid some real attention to how the incumbent candidate has voted. Today's vote to aid communism to the tune of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars in a bill appropriating \$3 billion to fight communism is something no candidate should ever be allowed to forget, nor should the voters when he seeks reelection. It cannot be explained away against any competent

opponent. Such a vote is a monument to infamy.

What are a few simple unvarnished facts in the situation we face today?

First. Any financial aid we give to Communist nations frees an equal amount to these nations to devote to other purposes in the cold war, be they propaganda leaflets, military salaries or the manufacture of bombs.

Second. Without the extension of Export-Import Bank credit to back up Communist promises to pay American exporters, there is little likelihood that any exporter would sell to Communist buyers without having dollars on the line in advance.

Third. Communist nations already owe us hundreds of millions of dollars that they have promised to pay but have not paid, ranging from U.N. assessments to lend-lease. This is no time for Christmas presents. We should stand firm and collect what is due us before there is even talk of credit.

Fourth. Agricultural products that may be purchased with such Eximbank credit are already subsidized for export in an amount of roughly 60 cents per bushel. This subsidy should never be paid by the American taxpayer for shipments to Communist nations, let alone giving a credit card to Communists to purchase such products, adding insult to injury.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to stand firm for America and the free world today and to vote against this credit to the enemy. This is not only a matter of fundamental principle—it is commonsense as well. The American people do not want tax money collected from them to be given away to friendly foreign nations unless it is urgently in the national interest. Under no circumstances do they want their taxes used to help unfriendly Communist nations.

A vote to give a credit card to Khrushchev is just that. The good people who sent us here know better than to do this. So should we.

I urge you to vote against allowing any U.S. agency to be a guarantor of loans to any Communist nation. It is morally and practically wrong.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished majority leader.

#### SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JAMES JARRELL PICKLE, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I just wanted to observe that I have checked with our Texas peo-

ple on this side and they tell me there is no contest about the gentleman's election.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how he is going to vote today. I rather assume he will vote against us. But I hope, with the indulgence of the Members on our side, if he has come up here from Texas to be here the day before Christmas, I think we ought to let him vote.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I observe that the charity of our beloved minority leader becomes not only himself but the season.

Mr. PICKLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

#### WAIVING OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL H.R. 9499

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE] stated, you really are not interested in listening to speeches. But there has been the inference on the floor of this House and in the press that anyone who opposes the administration is showing a distrust of President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I want this House and I want everyone to know that I will take great issue with anyone who distrusts Lyndon B. Johnson. I would also take great issue with anyone who challenges his ability to fill this high office that he now holds.

But, Members of the House, I want to refresh your memory to this effect: This proposal that we will vote on today is tied in with an amendment which was placed in the authorization bill last year, section 620(f) of the authorization bill which I happened to initiate and which you saw fit to adopt, after amending it. It was amended, if you will recall, to require some reporting to the Congress.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was naive enough to think that the report would be in such form that I would know about it, also being a Member of Congress. The report was made, as required by law, but I had no knowledge of it, and I am sure most of you did not either, until the report of the hearings of the subcommittee of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] were released on the 1st of October. They were marked "secret" when they were reported. They were marked "secret" with a class 4, I believe it is—group 4, downgraded at 3-year intervals, declassified after 12 years.

I do not blame President Kennedy for that. I doubt if he knew that someone got happy with a rubber stamp and stamped this thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have faith in this Congress and in this House, and I take issue with anyone who says that this Congress and this House does not have a right to say something about how our money is going to be spent.

If you will recall, one of our ambassadors retired a while back and called us

"provincial" and stated that we had no business meddling with the country's foreign affairs, that domestic affairs and activities were getting superior to our State Department affairs. He proposed a Secretary of State similar to a prime minister.

You recall I took issue with him on the floor of this House on that.

Do not vote today on a distrust of Lyndon B. Johnson, because if this House sees fit to give him that authority I think he will carry it out better than anyone has ever fulfilled the obligations of that office. But I want it clearly understood that my vote today is cast on my conviction, my conscience of the duty of the office I have been elected to uphold. I do not agree with the delaying tactics that have been going on on this side of the aisle one bit. We are going to have to face the issue. I would rather have faced it 2 or 3 days ago than have gone through what I have been going through, being torn up about having to oppose my beloved President. Vote your conscience, but by all means bear in mind that the man who holds the office of President will fulfill that duty better than anyone, in my opinion, has ever fulfilled it before.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this situation that has prevailed here the last few days will be written into the history of the country and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of what has happened this morning will probably be used as a precedent for this sort of issue. I do not think we ought to vote on this resolution until there is at least some statement here of what the real issue is on the part of those who are voting to sustain the House conferees; that is, voting for the amendment put on by the House and voted on twice and successfully carried twice.

There is a lot of politics hanging around all this. I do not think politics ought to be considered. The issue is too basic. I think we ought to be voting on what our consciences dictate on the particular issue, and the particular issue with some of us is this, and I will have to be right plain spoken about it—we do not want to extend credit to the Soviet Union.

Why do we not want to do that? I doubt that there is a Member of the House that, notwithstanding all the past history of our relations with that country and our present situation of relationship to it, I doubt if there is a man or woman in this House who, if the Russian people were starving and did not have any money or resources, would refuse to give them the wheat. That is the history of this country. But the Russians are buying wheat all over the world, and we are told that they are selling their gold and paying for it. But they apparently do not want to pay cash to us—we are still "Uncle Sap."

When this situation first arose I was one that announced that I was willing to sell Russia some wheat if they needed it, but I wanted it "cash on the barrelhead," and I still want it cash on the barrel. Why should not some of us

be hardhearted and businesslike and demand cash on the barrel? History again. What is the status of the obligations of the Russians to this country? We loaned them \$11 billion worth of goods and services in World War II under the lend-lease policy—\$11 billion. Have they paid it? Not one plugged nickel.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

These Members on the left who are yelling "Vote!" "Vote!" are carrying out their usual conduct; they do not want anybody else to do any talking when they do not agree with what is being said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, you on the left can yell "Vote" some more. As I was saying when interrupted, they still owe \$11 billion that we advanced to them when they were with their backs to the wall. Subsequent to that we advanced them in goods and services \$230-odd more millions. Have they showed any disposition to pay that? No.

I wonder if they have paid their dues to the United Nations which have been in default for years. Now let us just be frank about this thing and let us not be afraid to lay the cards on the table. We have been running from potential enemies for the last 15 years and I am getting tired of running away.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Will not the gentleman agree with me, it is most basic that if we advance credit to the Russians and Communists, we improve their capacity to cause trouble all around the world and that includes trouble in Cuba. But if we make them pay cash on the barrelhead for whatever they need whether it be wheat or anything else then that diminishes their capacity for causing trouble.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I think it is a good policy to make them pay anyway.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say one word about this matter. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Virginia has been so helpful in bringing this matter to a final disposition. But when the issue is put solely on the basis which he mentions I think some refutation must be in order.

The real issue here is the image and authority of our new President around the world. Are we going to give Communist and free nations alike the impression that he does not have, in the performance of his responsibilities as the repository of American foreign policy, the complete confidence of the Congress and the American people? President Johnson succeeded to office by succession after a base assassination, and the

question in all nations is, do the American people have a leader? Would the Congress want to convey the impression that we would want to tie the President's hands or to limit his authority when we did not do this to either of his predecessors, President Eisenhower or President Kennedy? Any such action would weaken the President's authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence would weaken the United States.

The issue never has been whether or not we are going to help the Communists. This Congress is united as always in its fight to strengthen the free world as against the Communist world.

The issue never has been the extension of credits to Communist nations. The Export-Import Bank is only going to extend credit in the usual way to private shippers who are selling non-strategic materials. We are helping Americans sell surplus American commodities to buyers of their own choice, and this is certainly in the national interest.

We cannot tie the hands of our new President in his first battle on foreign affairs. World reaction to this would be lasting and detrimental to the interests of all Americans and of all the people of the free world.

I would like to insert into the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a paper which I received today from the Department of State. It outlines the thinking of administration officials on the central issues involved in the argument over authorization of Export-Import Bank guarantee credits. I believe it does much to clarify the issues.

1. We accept the conference report which requires a Presidential decision before any Export-Import Bank guarantee of payment could be made on transactions with the Soviet Union or Eastern European countries.

2. We do not know whether a wheat sale will be concluded by the Soviet traders and American wheat dealers. If agreement is reached, we do not know whether the Soviets will ask for a deferred payment rather than a cash transaction. If the issue does arise, the President would make a decision as to the national interest on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Treasury.

3. On its wheat purchases from Canada the Soviet Union is paying cash and it may do so here. However, the Soviet Union will refuse to deal with the United States if it is the object of discrimination by law with respect to credit terms.

4. The wheat sale to the Soviet Union, if it materializes, will be in the national interest, bringing in needed gold and foreign exchange, reducing our expensive surpluses, saving storage charges and interest for the U.S. taxpayer and benefiting farmers and traders.

5. Such sales are consistent with long-standing U.S. policy. The United States has never had a policy of refusing to sell non-strategic goods to Soviet bloc countries. As a corollary of this policy, normal financing facilities should be available to U.S. exporters. Such facilities are available to American competitors abroad.

6. The extension of guarantees of payment on commodity sales and other export transactions is a normal Export-Import Bank function. Such guarantees are ordinarily used in connection with sales of commodities and other products to foreign countries



where deferred payment terms are extended. The Export-Import Bank has had this authority since its creation in 1934, including authority to guarantee payment on commercial exports to Communist bloc countries.

7. Sales like the wheat sale will use up scarce Soviet and Communist bloc gold reserves on consumption expenditures so that they cannot be used for military purposes or investment in heavy industry.

8. The Soviet Union is in the process of making important decisions concerning the allocation of its resources and the handling of its quarrel with Communist China. Soviet officials will be watching carefully any moves by the U.S. Government to see whether, under the new President, the United States is going to change its policy of seeking to reduce the dangers of war and to strengthen peace. The Soviet Government will doubtless consider the proposed amendment to the aid bill as such a change.

9. The Soviet people would regard this action as an attempt to exploit their difficulties and as an indication of the implacable hostility of the American people. This would also be a blow to our efforts toward peace.

10. Americans should not be fooled into believing that by depriving the Russian people of better quality bread we are reducing the threat of communism. The present Russian regime will be able to survive even without our wheat, and it will be able to divert the blame for short bread rations in the Soviet Union to us.

11. This bill would affect not only the Soviet Union, but other Eastern European countries as well. Some of the Communist countries of Eastern Europe are showing signs of wanting to reduce their economic dependence on the Soviet Union. They would like to use their foreign exchange to purchase products of the free world. By trading with these countries on commercial terms and in nonstrategic items, we can encourage this growing tendency toward independence.

12. The Export-Import Bank guarantees do not provide aid to the Soviet Union. They afford financial facilities to United States exporters to enable them to engage in ordinary commercial competition with other Western exporters. Valiant and successful efforts have been made by the Export-Import Bank to place our exporters in a position of equality with their competitors abroad. It is essential that this position be maintained when it is in our own country's interest to do so.

13. The bill does not provide funds for Export-Import Bank loans or guarantees.

These are derived from Treasury borrowing authority under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Thus, the rider in the aid appropriation bill is wholly inappropriate. It is unacceptable for the House to extort this elimination of longstanding Presidential discretion as a condition for achieving an aid appropriation.

14. The Senate has twice rejected the proposal after full hearings before the appropriate committee and after extensive debate.

15. The argument has unfortunately become highly partisan. If the sales now contemplated are made, all Americans will benefit. Democrats and Republicans alike. Partisanship is especially inappropriate where, as here, there has not been the fullest exploration in the House of Representatives of the underlying United States national interest. The House Republican leadership is playing partisan politics with the national interest.

16. The rider affects not only wheat sales but all other potential commercial sales of agricultural or other products to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

17. It is of utmost and urgent importance that the House accept the conference report, to which the President has agreed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hope we may adopt this resolution unanimously and get through with this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1091)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 13, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$116,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$687,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$92,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 20, 22, 25, and 26.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve  
on amendment No. 20),  
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve  
on amendment No. 20),

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
MIKE MONRONEY,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

##### *Economic Assistance*

Amendment No. 1, Development grants: Appropriates \$155,000,000 instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$175,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the malaria control program.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3, American hospitals and schools abroad: Insert language proposed by the Senate and delete language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4, International organizations and programs: Appropriates \$116,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$130,903,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the Children's Fund.

Amendment No. 5, Supporting assistance: Appropriates \$330,000,000 instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, Contingency fund: Appropriates \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$32,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8, Inter-American social and economic cooperation program: Insert language proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$135,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9, Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates \$375,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$425,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10, Alliance for Progress, development grants: Appropriates \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11, Development loans: Appropriates \$687,300,000 instead of \$600,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12, Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of deobligated funds.

Amendment No. 13, Military assistance: Appropriates \$1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$977,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16, Peace Corps: Appropriate \$92,100,000 instead of \$89,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$98,100,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that not to exceed \$19,900,000 shall be available for administrative expenses instead of \$19,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, Ryukyu Islands: Provides that not to exceed \$2,300,000 shall be available for administrative and information expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18, Assistance to refugees in the United States: Appropriates \$39,717,137 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$56,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19, Investment in Inter-American Bank: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Amendment No. 20, reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 21, Senate: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22, reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Insert heading and appropriate \$190,000 for miscellaneous items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26, reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### *New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission*

Amendment No. 27, deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$150,000 for the Commission as there is no authorization for this appropriation.

#### TITLE VI—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 28-33: Insert section numbers.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve on  
amendment No. 20),  
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve on  
amendment No. 20),  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to make a comment about an article which appeared in the Sunday morning papers to the effect that the opposition to the administration on this issue was headed by so-called midwestern isolationists. I have been here 15 years, and from the very outset I have supported the foreign aid program. There is ample evidence to that effect in the recorded votes every

year in this Congress. I have supported the late President, John F. Kennedy, when the going was fairly tough, against my chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], and I supported former President Eisenhower and, as a relatively new Member, I supported Mr. Truman when this program was virtually started. So any comment to the effect that people who oppose it are "midwestern isolationists" is clearly inaccurate.

Now let us get down to the nub of the issue. The problem is whether or not we will authorize the Export-Import Bank, an agency of the Federal Government, to guarantee credit for Communist countries. Those Communist countries are those that would qualify under section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Now, who are they? They are the Peoples Republic of Albania, the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, the Peoples Republic of China, the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic, the German Democrat Republic—East Germany, Estonia, the Hungarian Peoples Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, the North Korean Peoples Republic, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia—Mongolian Peoples Republic, the Polish Peoples Republic, the Rumanian Peoples Republic, Tibet, the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, Cuba, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a total of 18 countries who would be authorized to receive credit from an agency of the Federal Government.

Let us get down to just how this might work. I am going to oversimplify it, but here is, to be frank, the guts of the issue. This is a typical banking transaction. I have borrowed money. I suspect there have been others in the House of Representatives who have likewise taken advantage of that opportunity to borrow money from one of the local Washington banks. What happens on such a transaction is similar, to a degree, to what will transpire on these deals with Communist countries.

As I understand the proposed transaction, there will be certain exporters in the United States who will buy grain from the Commodity Credit Corporation. They will buy grain on the basis that they have a commitment from the Soviet Union or from any one of the other 17 listed Communist countries who qualify under 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. You will find on this note the name of the exporter. The person who signs the note will be the Soviet Union or any one of the 17 other Communist countries.

But then on the back of the note, when our credit—yours or mine—is not too good, you always have an endorser. That endorser, by placing his name on the back of the note, helps your credit. I have had that experience. I have used the Federal Government under the GI bill to buy a house. In fact, I am still paying on the mortgage. But I got a better rate of interest, did I not? I got 4 percent because the Federal Government guaranteed it.

Now, this is exactly why under this legislation the Soviet Union and 17 other countries can get a better rate of interest in paying for the grain they buy from

an exporter who previously had bought it from the Commodity Credit Corporation. You will have the exporter's name as the payee, you will have the Soviet Union as the payor, and on the back, if this legislation goes through, you will have the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. Government. Now, I seriously question whether the taxpayers of this country want an agency of the Federal Government to be a guarantor for a loan to a Communist country. I just do not believe my constituents want me to authorize an amendment that will tell the Export-Import Bank, a bank which has been funded by their tax money, that they should guarantee a loan for 18 Communist-dominated countries.

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

Mr. FORD. I certainly will.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that this amendment, instead of authorizing the bank to make these loans, prevents the bank from making the loans?

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is correct as far as the first five or six lines of the amendment are concerned. It does ban those loans to Communist-dominated countries. Those first five or six lines were the lines that were in the House bill under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] and in the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. However the conference, over my objection, has added four or five other lines. Those lines are the lines which would permit the President to make a determination that if in his judgment it is in the best interest of our country, then, on this note, 18 countries will be the beneficiaries of a guarantee by the U.S. taxpayers' banking agency of the Government.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has confined his remarks to wheat. Is it not true that the amendment deals with the sale of any product to the Communists?

Mr. FORD. Of course it does. It can deal with any product. The language of the amendment so provides.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is it not also true that the President already has publicly made his determination on this issue? In a letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week he made it clear that he believes that these sales to Communist countries are in the public interest, are in the national interest. So the determination is already made and what we are voting on is squarely the issue whether we are going to help the Communists. We cannot cling to President Johnson's coattails on this issue. We cannot pass the buck to him. He has already said how he would act.

Mr. FORD. He has indicated in a tentative way that he would take such action.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Michigan for putting this issue in proper focus. It seems clear to me that to extend credit and guarantee loans is to extend aid. It is inconceivable to me that within the four corners of one bill we could request our taxpayers, our constituents, to finance both sides of the cold war. It seems to me that we ought to get on one side or the other. Therefore, I commend my colleague, and I urge that we insist on the House position in this regard.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments about the charge that this was an effort by the isolationist Midwest to take over the policy of the Nation. As a member of the Committee on NATO Unity, a committee of which the gentleman in the well is also a member, I think I can state with some pride that the Republican side of this House has taken strong initiative in behalf of the international institutions to strengthen the free world. The only thing we are trying to isolate is Communists from the American tax dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3½ minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, under section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 there are 18 countries that qualify or would qualify for credit under this provision if you adopt it. I have 18 blank notes in my hand.

There is a possibility that the Soviet Union would have an Export-Import Bank endorsement on the back of its note. Cuba also qualifies under this section of the authorization act.

There is a possibility that they would have the Export-Import Bank endorsement. Also, the Rumanian People's Republic could qualify for a note. The Outer Mongolian People's Republic could qualify, North Vietnam could qualify, the Hungarian People's Republic could qualify, and you can go right down the list, 18 in all.

Mr. Speaker, as for myself, I do not intend to support an amendment that would permit the Export-Import Bank to endorse and guarantee such loans where the beneficiary will be a Communist country, in the form of lower interest rates.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. This in no way prohibits the sale of wheat to any country, does it?

Mr. FORD. It does not.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, it only prohibits the giving of our credit to Communist and pro-Communist countries.

Mr. FORD. Any one of these countries, if the administration wants to

make a deal, can pay cash on the barrelhead and the sale can be made.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in commending our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for his excellent statement this morning.

Mr. Speaker, do we want the Export-Import Bank, financed by our Federal funds, to insure payment by the Soviet Union of any surplus wheat it purchases in the United States?

That, in essence, is the choice we have before us today in this amendment.

There are a number of reasons why I oppose this amendment and why I will vote against it. Strangely enough, most of the reasons for my position were presented by the majority in its arguments in favor of this amendment.

The first was the statement that the President might not need to ever invoke the provisions of this bill. If this amendment is not considered absolutely necessary, if it is not an integral part of the agreement for the sale of surplus grain to the Soviet Union, then what are we doing here?

I, for one, cannot buy this argument that the right of the President to determine foreign policy and to implement such policy is on the line with this amendment.

This issue is primarily a question of foreign trade, clearly under the Constitution a jurisdiction of this Congress. Its foreign policy impact is secondary.

The Congress is being asked to give away another portion of its power and to turn over this power to the executive branch, a path we have followed on far too many occasions in the past.

If there were good and sufficient reasons why this amendment should be made law, if they were presented to Congress, then, in an emergency situation, the Congress might see fit to grant such discretionary powers for a limited period of time.

But, as far as I have been able to determine from the debate on these issues over the past few days, there is no such real emergency, although there appear to be attempts to manufacture one.

Further, there is no time limit on this discretionary power. It would remain a permanent additional power of the executive branch.

Next, there is nothing in the wording of the amendment we are considering which would limit these additional powers simply to this one deal with Russia for surplus grain.

It could be used in similar deals with Red China or Albania, or any other Communist bloc country, and they need not be limited to wheat.

The second argument is that, through some peculiar alchemy known only to Madison Avenue public relations experts, the President will suffer a loss in something called prestige if this amendment is defeated.

I do not think so. The President is far too capable, far too efficient a man to suffer a loss of stature because of this

one vote on an amendment to a foreign aid appropriation bill.

His integrity and his position of respect in the eyes of the American people and the world are too high to be threatened, much less damaged, by what happens here today on this amendment.

However, I have my doubts about the amount of respect the Congress will be able to command if it slices off another large hunk of its responsibility and hands it over to the executive branch with the comment: "Here, this is too hot for me to handle."

We have done little enough these past 11½ months which could be called constructive. A great many of us here in the House realize that. Let us not end this seemingly endless session by throwing away another piece of our duty.

As I understand from the debate, a tentative deal has been made with the Russians for a downpayment of one-fourth, and the payment of an additional one-fourth every 6 months until the balance is paid.

My question is: Why?

Has the Soviet Union pleaded poverty? Has the Government of the U.S.S.R. stated that it does not have the money to pay for its purchases and needs credit terms? If so, that fact most certainly has not been brought out in the thousands of words which have been spoken and written on this topic during the past few weeks.

In fact, we have every reason to believe that the Soviet Union has the means to pay cash on the barrelhead for our wheat if its government so desires.

Before we start guaranteeing the loans of those who have vowed to bury us, either literally or figuratively depending upon your interpretation of Premier Khrushchev's words, we ought to take a look at what sort of credit risk is offered.

I am afraid the record is rather dismal. The Soviet has not paid us for World War I debts, much less World War II debts, and only partial payment has been made for those goods received after V-J Day.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been a constant supporter of a sound, firm foreign policy. I have been an advocate of an efficient, economical foreign aid program.

Because I believe in both of these, I cannot vote for this amendment. It would be a divorce by Congress of its constitutional responsibility and another example where dollars might be substituted for brains in carrying out those actions necessary to the security of the United States.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think it should be pointed out that the Russians deal with private exporters in this country. That is the way we do business in this country. If there is wheat for sale, Cuba can buy it in that way. We do not have government-to-government transactions. In order to prohibit it, we should also be opposed to the granting of credit. We

look at this as aid to the Russians, but in this country you have to deal with private exporters and not the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the statement of the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Michigan for the stand which he has taken on this issue. I want the record to show that on this day before Christmas that I as one Member of Congress do not intend to participate in any Christmas present to Mr. Khrushchev.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. It has been said by some that this is only normal relations between the countries. Would this be the first time in history that our Government has given a credit guarantee to a Communist country?

Mr. FORD. I am not certain about that, but I am certain of this: We have never granted credit to a debtor who owed the United States almost \$11 billion.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every question. We have heard one side so far this morning that we are either voting for communism or against communism. The United States today is committed to other countries around this world. We are voting more than \$50 billion yearly, to wage the cold war. Our boys are stationed at bases ranging from Germany down into India, and South Korea and in South Vietnam. Some of our boys are being killed. We are waging a total war. The Communists have said they would bury us, and we as a Nation and a people are committed to the destruction and obliteration of the Communist ideology.

Now, this question in my opinion boils down to this: We are either going to trust the Commander in Chief of the greatest and the best equipped military force in the world to wage total war against communism, or we are not going to trust him. I am against communism and every American in this House is against it. Anyone who suggests that is not true and impugns the motives of any man on either side of the aisle is not speaking the truth. That is just how plain it is, because communism is repulsive, it is repugnant, it is revolting to any freethinking American citizen, or any free citizen around the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is this: We will be saying to the world we do not trust the President of the United States to do his sworn duty. We are hitting at him. Why do we not question and attack some of his larger responsibilities? He is the Commander in Chief of the greatest army in the world.

He has the power to push the button to determine life or death for civilization. Why do we not say: We do not trust you in anything?

The amendment says he cannot extend this credit unless it is in the national interest. Then, we say: "No, we are not going to let him determine what is the national interest." But we say we do not trust him. This amendment is simple. The way it is written it says he cannot extend credit unless it is in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I say any man who votes against the compromise conference report is not voting to uphold the arm of the President of the United States to wage all-out total war against communism.

President Johnson, on the day after Pearl Harbor, left this body and enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States. How many other Members of Congress did that? How many today, if we went to war, would enlist? But he did just that. Yet there are others who get up and say we do not impugn his motives, we just do not trust him.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman explain to me how you wage total war against communism by giving them aid?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is your theory. That is what you say, not me. You are just evading the issue. This amendment says he cannot extend credit—unless it is in the national interest.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, How is it in the national interest to give your potential enemy credit?

Mr. STAGGERS. You are still evading the issue, I am against helping the Communist cause in any and every way. They are dedicated to the overthrow of our Government and we are just as dedicated to the destruction of the Communist ideology.

This is a war being waged on social, economic, and religious fronts while the instruments of death stand waiting or are being used infrequently. In fact at this stage it is a battle for the minds of men.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thought World War II was also a battle of the minds.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, World War II was a battle of the minds, but it also was a war waged with the most destructive weapons known to man. Millions lost their lives.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You explain the theory.

Mr. STAGGERS. I cannot explain the theory of communism. I do know it is anti-God and against everything you and I stand for. This war will be engaged to the bitter end. The United States and her allies will win, if we stay prepared physically, mentally, and morally for we are religious people. Almighty God will be on our side as long as we stay prepared and do right—in His eyes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan deserves a factual reply.

It is a fact that this amendment establishes no precedent. Under President Eisenhower nonmilitary loans were made to Communist countries, including Poland, because it was felt they were in the national interest. It obviously was not then and is not now in the national interest to establish a policy of never having anything to do with a Communist country. The nuclear test ban treaty amply proves this point.

It is a fact that our national policy is to reduce, if possible, cold war tensions, and prove to nonaligned countries the sincerity of our humanitarian principles. This is doubly important now that there is a rift within the Communist camp. The President, not the Congress, must have the tools to use every opportunity to help our interest. This amendment tells the President that the Congress believes wheat and other commodity sales should not be aided or permitted unless he finds and reports that our interest will be advanced. This responsibility constitutionally, historically, and rightly belongs to the President. And that is all this amendment does.

It is a fact that the gentleman from Michigan admits that the guarantees permitted by the amendment through the Export-Import Bank are financially sound. The private American businessman or exporter takes the primary risk and if there should be nonpayment it is primarily the private American who would get hurt. The Export-Import Bank only gives him some insurance. This does not advance him, any country, or anybody else one red American cent. And the Export-Import Bank collects, properly, a premium for their insurance policy. All of our allies, England, France, Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia all do just this today. Do they want to advance or help communism? Of course not. They think in the long run this shows and proves the failure of communism to the world and to its own people and forces Communists to help the capitalists make a profit. We would be a little daft to let our Republican friends, for the sake of politics, lead us up such a blind alley.

Lastly, it is a fact that the Russians do owe us billions on World War II aid. So does England and others. But Russia has not defaulted on any commercial obligations and will not because she cannot afford to. This is a commercial not a Government transaction.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment should be adopted if our United States is not made to look foolish to the outside world. The only persons who get a Christmas present from our action today are the American people. They deserve a merry Christmas. May we help them and ourselves to have it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the anonymous spokesmen referred to earlier today who say that this is some sort of a plot by Midwest isolationists to make our American foreign policy. I believe that the difference in this issue is an honest disagreement among honest men. I think we have a fundamental difference in views on this matter and it is unfair to assail those who disagree with us. One understands it one way, another understands it another way. This divergence is the essence of our democracy. But to suggest that anybody who votes for this amendment, or votes to sustain the conferees, is voting for communism is equally wrong.

I do not trust the Communists any more than I could throw this building. However, I also believe the Export-Import Bank does not trust them any more than I do.

My colleague knows that before the Export-Import Bank could guarantee any credit on loans for sale of wheat to Russia, it must first get a premium from the American grain dealer who wants to sell this wheat. Then, Mr. Speaker, and this is the key we must consider in making a final judgment, before the Export-Import Bank can guarantee one penny of credit to anyone, it must first obtain collateral redeemable in gold from the nation which would benefit from the credit. Therefore, those who say we are using taxpayers' money to feed the Communists are making strangers of the truth. The Export-Import Bank follows normal practices of international business relationships established as early as 1934. There is not an iota of evidence before this Congress that the Soviet Union has indicated it wants any credit. Our late President Kennedy said this is going to be a cash-on-the-barrel deal. As far as we know, the Soviet Union is paying cash to Canada today. It is paying cash simply because it does not want to pay the additional 5-percent premium which it would have to pay if it bought this wheat on any kind of credit from American grain dealers. We have no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, if this wheat deal is consummated between this country and the Soviet Union, is going to pay anything but cash on delivery either in dollars or gold. The Soviet Union apparently has sufficient gold to back up these cash payments.

We have been following this procedure in international commerce since 1934.

We have given the Export-Import Bank this authority. This is nothing more than a guarantee to American grain dealers, who are a segment of our free enterprise, private enterprise, that get into the stream of private international commerce instead of foreign aid. This program has been established for many years. It was conducted under previous administrations. The Export-Import Bank is one of the most conservative institutions in the world. As a matter of fact, the directors of that Bank are good, solid Republicans. I doubt very much whether this Export-Import Bank would guarantee or underwrite any

kind of credit unless they knew very well that every single penny will be paid back, because that is the record of the Export-Import Bank.

So for anyone here today to suggest that we are using taxpayers money to feed the Communists is an assault on the truth. There just is no substance to a charge like that. What we are doing here is helping American businessmen, by underwriting their credit, get into the stream of international commerce. This whole Export-Import Bank was created to encourage Americans to seek foreign business without jeopardizing their investment in foreign nations.

Let us take an example. This sale of wheat to Russia will be a cash-on-the-barrel deal, but there may be 30 or 60 days involved in the payment of the money to the American grain dealer. Such a delay in payment is a normal delay in all transactions. Incidentally, I want you to remember that this amendment cuts across the board. This is not just a matter involving the wheat sale to Russia. This will affect the economy of the agricultural community of our Nation across the board. I think you gentlemen from the rural areas ought to think about this, too.

Let us assume an American businessman enters into a deal to sell wheat to the Soviet Union on a cash-and-carry basis. It is going to take 60 days or more to consummate that transaction. He needs money to purchase the wheat from American farmers of the Commodity Credit Corporation for resale to the Soviet Union. He goes to the Export-Import Bank and gets a guarantee on his contract with the Soviet Union for 60 days, and he must pay a premium for the guarantee. He does not get it for nothing. With the guarantee from the Export-Import Bank, he can borrow from his own bank to purchase the wheat for resale to Russia. The Export-Import Bank has been a model institution. It has operated at a profit, and as far as I know it has not lost a penny. So for anyone here to argue that we are underwriting or subsidizing or using American taxpayers' money to feed the Communists is just torturing the truth.

Mr. Speaker, my record here in Congress of fighting communism is crystal clear; I need never apologize for my contributions to expose the full ugliness of communism. But I would not be fair with myself and my constituents if I failed to point out there are many ways to fight communism. One way is to sell them our surplus wheat which is rotting in our bins. I said previously, every grain of wheat we send to Russia carries with it a message of the total failure of Communist despotism and the ultimate triumph of American capitalism. How does Mr. Khrushchev explain to his people that Russia must send millions of dollars worth of its gold to America to buy our surplus stocks of wheat?

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment will be adopted because in its present form, we clearly state we are opposed to any credit to the Soviets unless and until the President informs Congress such sales are in the public interest.

I, for one, have sufficient trust in my President to let him make that final determination.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to propound a parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the first vote which will occur will be on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And amendment No. 20 which is the so-called wheat amendment is not part of the conference report?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. That will be considered by the House separately.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I may inquire further, Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 20 will be brought up in disagreement and on proper motion by the gentleman from Louisiana, a separate vote will occur at that time on amendment No. 20.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that a motion will be made with respect to that amendment which is in disagreement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. After all, if we guarantee payment of a loan, there is a presupposition that perhaps somebody will not pay the loan and if the loan is not paid, then the guarantee will be made good. And who will make it good? The American taxpayer will make it good. There is not any doubt about that. This is a contingent liability. We hope it will not become necessary for the taxpayers to pick it up, but the mere fact that there is so much agitation for this type of legislation, it certainly indicates at least that the commercial bankers of this country would not have made this loan, if they did not feel the guarantee was necessary. These are prudent people. They certainly would not be asking for the guarantee if they did not feel they needed it. So do not let anybody have any doubt in their minds but what possibly this will be a real liability which will be brought up and which will be collected from the American taxpayers.

It has not been said either that the wheat which will be sold to the Communist nations—credit given—guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank—will be sold for less than the American Government paid for it.

I have heard this deal called several things. I have heard it called bushels for Bolsheviks and I imagine there will be some other names attached to it from time to time. But let me say this. I think the gentleman from Virginia was absolutely right when he said that this issue is really an issue whether or not we think it is a good thing for the United States of America to make this kind of a sale.

Now we have heard the charge of partisanship made. You know, to me there is a difference between partisanship and honest conviction. I would agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]; I think there are very definite honest convictions on both sides of this aisle. I certainly defy anyone to say that when the Republican side voted—all but three votes—for their position the other night that this was partisanship. You do not get that kind of consensus from partisanship. You get it from conviction. And the people on this side of the aisle are convinced that this is not a good thing for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority leader saw fit to try to define the standards under which Lyndon Johnson will be declared to be either a strong President or a weak President. In my opinion, whatever he may be called by history will be decided by what he does, and not by what the House of Representatives does. In my opinion, he has the capacity to be a strong President and he will be a strong President, but he does not get to be a strong President because the legislative body rolls over and plays dead for him. He does not get to be a strong President because the legislative branch votes against its own convictions and refuses to stand up to tell him that in this instance we think he is wrong. This is all that we are trying to do, and so help me if I thought that my vote today would blacken the escutcheon of Lyndon Johnson as a strong President of the United States, then I would not vote the way I am going to vote. I do not believe it—I think he is a much stronger man, perhaps, than those who have set what I think is a false standard for presidential strength.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I like what the gentleman has just said. It is in line with what the gentleman from Texas said. There are those who seek to make disagreement the equivalent of distrust. If we must agree with everything that the President says or else be disloyal or weaken our country, I think that is a very dangerous doctrine.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the President. Does the gentleman have any knowledge as to whether President Johnson, having cracked his whip over the House, is going to stay in Washington until final action has been taken on this bill by the Senate?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no such knowledge.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to delay the vote that I know we are all eagerly waiting for, but I do think something should be said to put this discussion into a slightly different perspective. It is true that we are waging a cold war against communism, and

this bill is a major weapon of that war. But on the eve of the birthday of the Prince of Peace, it does seem to me we ought also to remember that both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower before him were making a very valiant effort to try to ease this cold war and to restore a condition of more stable peace in this world.

President Kennedy as part of that effort, got through the nuclear test ban treaty by an overwhelming vote in the other body. And some weeks before his tragic assassination President Kennedy also decided that this wheat transaction we are discussing here today might be another major weapon in trying to bring about eased relations in this long-standing cold war. President Johnson has now made the very same determination. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that what we are being asked to vote on here this morning is simply whether we, on Christmas Eve, also support the view that this country ought to make an earnest effort to ease the cold war and to restore real peace.

I think when we vote on this measure in a few minutes we ought to keep in mind the eloquent words of President Johnson as he addressed us yesterday informally at the White House when, despite the bitterness of the past few days, he invited every one of us down there and reminded us, each one, that after all our basic and overriding duty in these difficult days is still to promote "peace on earth, good will among men."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on questions of foreign policy of major significance it is impossible to determine foreign policy on the floor of the House of Representatives. The President of the United States, under the U.S. Constitution, has rightly affirmed this strategic and security power. I respect the Office of the President of the United States and believe that we should give full faith and credit to President Lyndon Johnson at this time in our history. We Members of Congress must rise above partisanship and the next election for the good of our country, and the standing of our Nation among the nations of the world.

This Nation of ours in foreign affairs must, when the decisions are made, speak with one voice, and that voice at this time is the voice of the new President of the United States, our friend who formerly served with us in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, the competent Lyndon Johnson.

It is unthinkable that the President of the United States should adopt one foreign policy among the major power nations, and the U.S. House of Representatives by a disputed vote, should adopt another and different policy antagonistic and in opposition to the President. We must agree among ourselves as to the method of implementing policies, but the determination of the policy itself must be left to the President of the United States, often with necessary instructions or recommendations from the Congress of the United States as to their views on the exercise of the fundamental powers. But the power itself must and should be exercised by the President in

his judgment and discretion, based upon the broad background and necessary information to which the House of Representatives has neither access nor opportunity for evaluation.

We, in Congress, must choose somebody to trust and I place my trust on this currently hotly disputed question of foreign policy as to the sale of U.S. surplus wheat and grains to foreign countries upon a strategic basis, a business basis, and a basis of existence itself of U.S. farmers through sale of surplus agricultural products that now depress our markets at home and cost millions of dollars a year to store.

I, therefore, have placed my full faith and confidence in the decision of the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, with the policy stated by Congress that he make the decision when he finds in his judgment this to be in the best interests of the United States.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are in great danger today of losing sight of the issue which has deadlocked the Congress. Politics, emotion, frustration, the imminence of Christmas, personal misunderstandings, even the weather, have all conspired to introduce a host of irrelevant considerations which have obscured the limit and well-defined issue before us. Members of both parties must share the responsibility for the impasse and for the destructive heat which the impasse has generated.

The issue, as I see it, is this: Should Congress, which created the Export-Import Bank for specific public policy purposes, now consent to the use of this device to facilitate other purposes, that is, the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, which have never been considered part of the Bank's responsibility?

The issue is not whether the Government shall permit the commercial sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. Whether we agree with the decision or not, this issue has already been settled by the President acting under the authority of his office.

The issue is not isolationism or the fate of the foreign aid appropriation bill. Despite serious questions about certain aspects of our foreign-aid program, Congress has once again approved the program, and conferees from the House and Senate have agreed on the amount of money needed to finance the program during the current fiscal year.

The issue is not obstructionism or an attempt to tie the President's hands in the conduct of American foreign policy. The Export-Import Bank is a creature of the Congress. Congress has endowed it with its authority, defined its purposes, and provided it with the funds necessary to accomplish those purposes. Congress, therefore, has every right to clarify the Bank's authority or to supplement the definition of its purposes in the face of changing circumstances.

In the statement of purposes, approved by the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, which appears in the current issue of the U.S. Government Organization Manual, congressional policy is clearly indicated to be the controlling factor in the Bank's operations. The President has no authority to set

the policy of the Export-Import Bank as he does, for example, that of the State Department. The two agencies occupy significantly different positions with respect to the President's general authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States.

In carrying out its responsibility to establish policy governing the Export-Import Bank, Congress is very much aware, and properly so, of several important factors bearing on the issue of guaranteeing the credit of Soviet Russia.

First. The Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries are engaged in massive economic competition with the United States and its free world allies. Under his own definition of peaceful co-existence, Premier Khrushchev has publicly committed his nation to this competition between economic systems. We have welcomed this competition—as a safer form of conflict than the arms race, as a way of reducing the kind of tensions that could lead to nuclear war, and as a means of demonstrating the superiority of our own economic system. We mean to win this competition, or at least to stay ahead.

Second. The Soviet Union has no credit standing in the United States. Commercial bankers do not consider the Soviet Government a reasonable risk nor, on the record, can our own Government accept their credit as good. According to the State Department, the Soviet Union has continued to refuse even to negotiate the question of the debt it owes the United States—a debt we have several times reduced in a spirit of compromise, a debt incurred not for materials used to fight World War II but for articles and equipment used by Soviet Russia after the war for peacetime purposes.

Third. The authority of the Export-Import Bank has been increased and broadened by Congress to enable it to play a major role in our postwar policy of expanding international trade among free world countries so as to strengthen the economies of those countries, as well as our own, and enable the free world cooperatively to resist the economic pressures of Communist governments and to extend the influence of freedom throughout the uncommitted world.

Each of these three factors, Mr. Speaker, militates strongly against the use of Export-Import Bank facilities to guarantee American exporters against possible Soviet default in paying for the wheat it presumably wishes to purchase. Under existing congressional policy—which has assigned an important role to the Bank in the East-West economic struggle and which requires the Bank to limit its assistance to acceptable risks—there is no justification for bringing the Bank into this Soviet wheat deal. Conversely, there is every justification for Congress to spell out once again its policy in this regard in unmistakable terms—the more so since on a number of occasions the administration has chosen to interpret related congressional declarations as not binding. There would be no question about the binding character of the provision now in dispute in the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Those of us who wish to impose this policy restriction on the Export-Import Bank are seeking to accomplish this objective in a completely valid way. The present bill is the logical vehicle—because it is the only one that could be effective—to carry this prohibition. The means we are using are entirely consistent with the rules and procedures of the House. We are not blocking foreign aid, since the program is already being financed through the end of next month under a continuing resolution appropriating the necessary funds. We are not getting tough with Russia since we are simply denying our opponents in this economic competition a special advantage we have hitherto always reserved for our friends. We are not interfering with the President's constitutional prerogatives—unless it has become unconstitutional for Congress to differ with the President on a matter of policy—since Export-Import Bank policy is and always has been a question for Congress to decide.

So long as a majority of the Members of the House agree with this position, Mr. Speaker, then we have no alternative but to abide by our convictions. They are bipartisan convictions, shared by Democrats and Republicans alike, in and out of Congress, and in my judgment these convictions are in complete harmony with the national interest which we are sworn to uphold and defend.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today's action on the foreign aid appropriations bill clears the way for us to get on with the vital work of foreign aid. The amount finally appropriated is, I believe, disappointingly small in relation to the magnitude of the task and the needs of U.S. foreign policy.

I have long stated—and fought for—my belief in the importance of an adequate foreign aid program. Clearly foreign aid is not perfect—but equally clear is the fact that foreign aid is the best instrument we have to serve our foreign policy needs in the underdeveloped world—and to live up to the humanitarian principles that have made America great.

Foreign aid's bitterest critics have been unable to offer any sensible alternative to this program. Mr. Speaker, there is none. I trust that in the coming session of Congress, we will give careful consideration to, and provide adequate resources for, a sound foreign aid effort.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been absorbed in arduous, acrimonious debate on the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and satellites. I would like to set out the background and facts concerning the sale, since they may not be clear from the rhetoric of the past few days.

The Soviet Union and various Eastern European countries have expressed a willingness to buy from our private grain dealers at the regular world price several million tons of surplus American wheat or wheat flour for shipment during the next several months. They may also wish to purchase from us surplus feed grains and other agricultural commodities.

After consultation in the National Security Council, the administration informed appropriate leaders of the Congress, and concluded that such sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms, should not be prohibited by the Government. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements, and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only.

An added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by ships of other countries as required. Arrangements will also be made by the Department of Commerce to prevent any single American dealer from receiving an excessive share of these sales.

Basically, the Soviet Union will be treated like any other cash customer in the world market who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants. While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price, which is the only way it could be sold, there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser; only a savings to the American taxpayer on wheat the Government has already purchased and stored at the higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers.

Today's action by the House in accepting conference agreement on the foreign aid bill will permit American grain dealers to bid successfully with grain suppliers of other free world nations for this business. It is clear that if our dealers are to obtain this business, they must be competitive and one of the most important competition factors involves terms of financing.

It should be noted in this connection that the Soviet Union and its wheat have generally received from Canada, for example, terms which provide for cash payment of 25 percent prior to shipment of commodities, with the balance payable in equal semiannual installments over an 18-month period. These are now the customary commercial terms for sales of wheat to bloc countries.

Eighteen-month terms are sound and justified. In sales to non-Communist countries, we have offered Government credit of up to 3 years on tobacco, cotton and feed grains, and up to 2 years on wheat. American grain dealers will probably find it necessary to offer reasonably equivalent commercial credit in order to compete successfully for the Soviet trade. However, it is clear that U.S. commercial banks are not prepared by themselves to grant commercial credits to the bloc for agricultural commodities in the quantity and time required. Therefore, if advantageous U.S. sales to the bloc are to be made, with the consequent boon to our balance of payments, our financial institutions will probably need assistance from our own export credit institution, the Export-Import

Bank of Washington. The Export-Import Bank could guarantee commercial credits extended to cover purchase of American grain by the Soviet bloc. Credit would probably carry an interest rate of 5 percent per year with a small part going to the Export-Import Bank as a fee. In terms of the risk involved, two points should be made:

First. Soviet Union has consistently met all commercial credit obligations it has undertaken fully and promptly.

Second. The loss record of the Export-Import Bank is extraordinarily good.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has retained for the President the necessary flexibility to successfully conclude the wheat sale.

This transaction has obvious benefit for the United States. The sale of 4 million metric tons of wheat, for example, for an estimated \$250 million, and additional sums from the use of American shipping, will benefit our balance of payments and gold reserves by that amount and substantially strengthen the economic outlook for those employed in producing, transporting, handling, and loading farm products.

Wheat, moreover, is our No. 1 farm surplus today, to the extent of about 1 billion unsold bushels. The sale of around 150 million bushels of wheat would be worth over \$200 million to the American taxpayer in reduced budget expenditures. Our country has always responded to requests for food from governments of people who needed it, so long as we were certain that the people would actually get it and know where it came from.

The Russian people will know they are receiving American wheat. The United States has never had a policy against selling consumer goods, including agricultural commodities, to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. On the contrary, we have been doing exactly that for a number of years, and to the extent that their limited supplies of gold, dollars, and foreign exchange must be used for food, they cannot be used to purchase military or other equipment.

Our allies have long been engaged in extensive sales of wheat and other farm products to the Communist bloc, and in fact, it would be foolish to halt the sales of wheat when other countries can buy wheat from us today and then sell this flour to the Communists. Recently, Australia and NATO Allies have agreed to sell 10 to 15 million tons of wheat and wheat flour to the Communist bloc.

This transaction advertises to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture. It demonstrates our willingness to relieve food shortages, to reduce tensions, and to improve relations with all countries, and it shows that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course than a course of isolation and hostility.

For this Government to tell our grain traders that they cannot accept these offers, on the other hand, would accomplish little or nothing. The Soviets would continue to buy wheat and flour elsewhere, including wheat flour, from

those nations which buy our wheat. Moreover, having for many years sold them farm products which are not in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those products on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage. In short, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy. That must await the settlement of many matters. But it does represent one more hopeful sign that a more peaceful world is both possible and beneficial to us all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would not wish the record of this session to be written without expressing once again, as I did on yesterday, my profound distaste at the course on which the Johnson administration has so determinedly embarked. I repeat what I said then. It is incredible that only 14 months after Khrushchev brought the world to the brink of war we want to aid him in solving the problems of his failing economy—to resuscitate him so that he can renew his assault on us at a more convenient hour.

No one during all the debate on this issue has been able to even come close to demonstrating how guaranteeing credit to the Soviet Union by an instrumentality of the U.S. Government is in the interest of the American people. It is the height of folly to pretend that a \$300 million loan to the U.S.S.R. when piled on top of billions in defaulted obligations dating back as far as the old czarist regime can strengthen our own country economically, politically, or militarily.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has been accused of partisanship in taking the negative side of this issue. Yet it is the Democratic leadership in this House with its specious and empty arguments that "we must in any event uphold the wishes of the President" would have made this a matter of party loyalty rather than principle as it should be. We do not live under a monarchy. The cry of former ages that "the king can do no wrong" is no part of our vocabulary. President Johnson deserves our wholehearted support when he is right; when he is wrong we owe a higher loyalty to our own conscience and the will of the people who sent us to sit here in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of West Germany of which mention has been made during this debate does not guarantee the commercial loans that are attendant upon transactions between West German businessmen and the Soviet Government. Neither does the Government of France. Why then should the proponents of this wheat deal with Russia seek to cite either of these countries as examples for us to follow?

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Democratic majority in this Congress apparently will succeed on this Christmas Eve in their efforts to dispatch a Christmas present to Chairman Khrushchev or as one member has said: "a credit card for the

Kremlin." I think this gift will come back to haunt them because out of some misbegotten desire to assert Presidential authority in the field of foreign affairs they are making a deal that is bad for the American people. Oh they are not doing this out of any conscious desire to aid and abet communism as such. However, I think that historians of the future will wonder at their naivete and their inability to apprehend the constancy of our foe. The record of Soviet treachery and perfidy and callous disregard of past promises is there for all to see. The philosopher put it very well indeed in these words:

Those who fail to learn the lessons that history teaches are condemned to relive them.

I hope that this administration still young in office may yet see fit to ponder that admonition and alter the course that it presently seems determined to pursue because it has become obsessed with prestige and lost sight of principle.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the Members of this honorable body for recognizing the importance of the foreign aid bill and their concern over trade with Communist countries. Many Congressmen remained in Washington and others returned for a Christmas Eve debate on these questions. I think it is a fine commentary on their devotion to duty.

With the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that the decision we make here today is most crucial to the future of the world. We are in a major conflict between Christianity and godlessness. I pointed this out recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, at a recent prayer breakfast of the International Christian Leadership Conference honoring the President of Costa Rica. If we lose, the world would go through another "Dark Ages" of conflict and suspicion, without faith or brotherhood. If we win, Christian faith, charity and the Golden Rule will prevail. We must not lose this conflict.

The question before us now is whether we should use every tool at our disposal to win. Should we use the great economic strength we have built under Christian democracy to force the failure of godless communism and win a bloodless victory? Or should we give away or bargain away our economic advantage, which shows the success of our system, for the benefit of the Communists, whose economic plight shows the failure of their system?

To give away our economic advantage, Mr. Speaker, is to dispose of the strongest weapons we have to win a bloodless victory. And what would it leave? The obvious answer is either final surrender or a hot war. Since we all want peace, our economic advantage should be used toward easing the cold war, not just as a means to dispose of some of our farm surplus and make a small and inadequate adjustment in our gold outflow situation.

The question of U.S. trade in farm commodities with Russia and other Communist countries is a major case in point. To the Communists, any advancement in



this field is a major political gain. Despite this, we have agreed to sell farm commodities to Communist countries without commensurate political gains for us. We did not ask that Russia remove her troops from Cuba or tear down the Berlin wall or stop harassing Allied convoys on their way to West Berlin.

Second, in the wheat deal, we have agreed to sell wheat to Russia at the world price. The U.S. Government, with taxpayers' money, will pay the rest. Again, this concession was without any gain for us in return.

Third, the administration decided to relax the requirement that U.S. ships be used to carry the wheat to Russia. This will further increase the gold outflow to foreign shipowners. Meanwhile, our west coast lumbermen still are subsidizing the U.S. shipping industry under the Jones Act. They must use U.S. ships in trade with the east coast, and they are losing markets there because of the higher cost of U.S. shipping. Again, we ask no commensurate concession from Russia.

Now, as a final blow, we are being asked in this foreign aid bill to guarantee Russia's credit so that banks will lend her the money to buy the wheat. We are providing our wheat at a cutrate price. We are permitting the use of cheaper foreign shipping, and now we are asked to provide the credit.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for a foreign aid bill that provides \$2.8 billion of taxpayer money to help needy foreign countries. This bill would have restricted the President from guaranteeing Russia's credit. Now we are asked to approve a compromise providing two things: One is \$3 billion in foreign aid. I would agree to compromise and vote for this amount since it represents a major reduction from the \$4.9 billion originally requested. The other is that we underwrite Russia's credit so that she can buy U.S. wheat on time payments after she largely has paid cash for Canadian wheat.

Soviet Russia still owes us nearly \$11 billion for World War II lend-lease which she steadfastly has refused to pay. She still owes the United Nations millions in unpaid obligations. Under these conditions, I can have no faith in guaranteeing Russia's credit. It could result in the United States paying for its own wheat to send to Russia.

Another factor has been largely ignored in the weeks of debate over the wheat sale. The U.S. public has been permitted to develop the impression that, somehow, the sale of wheat to Russia is a great humanitarian gesture. Because we are a nation of great compassion, many of our citizens have endorsed the wheat sale under the mistaken impression that Russians are starving. Nothing is further from the truth. Russians are not starving. This is not a humanitarian gesture. It is purely for the economic and political gain of Soviet Russia. And it is draining us of one of our most powerful weapons in the cold war.

With the indulgence of the House, Mr. Chairman, may I quote briefly from a

paper written by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the research institute on Communist affairs and professor of public law and government at Columbia University. May I preface it by saying that this expert on Russia favors the wheat sale in its proper context.

Professor Brzezinski said, regarding the wheat deal:

The humanitarian argument can be dismissed quickly. First of all, there is no famine in Russia. The Soviet people are not starving, and the Government has not lost all of its ability to meet a food crisis. It could certainly divert some of its resources from heavy industry to better agricultural management, and it is still capable of providing the basic staples to meet Russian needs.

To the Soviet leaders, the wheat deal is political because two very vital Soviet political interests are involved:

The first is the stability of the collective agricultural system itself. Over many years, that system has failed to deliver the goods, at least in so far as the Soviet consumer is concerned. Yet to the political leadership, the collective system is essential. Collectivism was abandoned in Poland and Yugoslavia because the leaderships had no way out. By importing wheat the Soviet leadership sees a way out, and hence the wheat deal is necessary to Moscow, in order to maintain its domestic system of collectivization.

Secondly, the importation of wheat is necessary to the Soviet Union in order for it to meet its grain export commitments. These commitments are important to the Soviet leadership primarily for political reasons. Last year the Soviet Union exported approximately 7.8 million tons of grain, of which wheat constituted 4.7 million tons. The list of clients shows clearly the political importance of the exports: the largest consumer was East Germany, followed successively by Czechoslovakia, Poland, Brazil and Cuba.

The above comments should not be construed as an argument against an American-Soviet wheat deal. They are meant to suggest, however, that this wheat deal ought to be viewed in political perspective and that United States negotiators ought to seek political concessions from the Soviets in return.

For example, it would seem ironical for the United States to be helping the Soviet Union to maintain its collectivized agriculture and its politically motivated grain exports and at the same time for this country to endure continued Soviet harassment in its access to Berlin. At the very least, our negotiators could insist on a clear reciprocal understanding of the technical arrangements involved in Western access.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, many of us who have remained here in the Chambers have done so because of strong convictions. These convictions relate to a concern over the type of negotiations we will encourage by permitting the indiscriminate use of American credit to underwrite the sale of wheat to Communist countries.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the Soviet Union is shifting to the economic battleground in the conduct of their cold war against our free enterprise system. If the opportunity presents itself, they will just as quickly shift to the use of military hardware to advance their cause. Our history of dealing with the Soviets and all advocates of the Communist doctrine is very

clear—they will use deceit, deception, treachery, and trickery to win in their announced objective to "bury us."

Now with the emphasis placed on smooth talk and an unwarranted appeal to the humanitarian instinct to Americans, they have hoodwinked us into accepting another deal—again on terms satisfactory to their cause. In dealing with the Communist countries, the prudent bankers associated with the Export-Import Bank recognize the tremendous collateral risks involved. The risks are so great that commercial banks do not choose to participate at the rates of interest to be charged.

But here again, Uncle Sam, who is rapidly being recognized in hard business circles as "Uncle Sap," has intervened to set the stage for providing credit, I repeat, credit—not cash on the barrelhead—for the benefit of our political enemies, the Communists.

In this type of warfare, be it hot or cold, be it military or economic, we must keep our guard up. We must retain every available weapon in our arsenal. The chief weapon we have available to us is the economic strength of this Nation—whether it be for the support of our military effort or for the development of our own, long-overdue, ideological offensive.

The issue is clearly in focus by the vote we cast today. If we vote to support credit for Communist countries, we are voting to undercut the economic foundation of this country—the economic foundation upon which the leadership of the free world is dependent for its strength. With the history of unmet treaty obligations, as well as financial obligations with the Soviet Union, how can any thinking American expect a turnabout in present and future negotiations with our Government?

If they want the wheat on a cash basis, I say OK. But when the deal is considered on a credit basis, I say "Nyet." When is Uncle Sam going to wake up to the reality of the Communists announced objectives? They want to dominate the world, they want to substitute their system for ours, with the total loss of freedom that is inevitable. They want to guide our destinies and control our opportunities. In this, I refuse to participate. This is why I have chosen to stay here this Christmas Eve to vote against this proposal.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, three times we have been called upon to vote on this question. For the third time I intend to vote in support of the foreign aid conference report, in support of the bill, in support of congressional expedition, and in support of the constitutional powers of the Executive in the conduct of foreign policy. Others may consider this a party matter. I do not. This is a part of foreign policy and Congress must give the President sufficient flexibility in which to work. If he is wrong in his use of these powers he will answer for it to the country.

The issue has been pushed out of proportion. The Export-Import Bank may or may not extend credit in the course of

commercial transactions involving the sale of wheat for dollars. That is a decision that will be made by the President, reporting to Congress, and by the Bank exercising business judgment. It is important to remember that when President Eisenhower was in the White House the Export-Import Bank in 1957 guaranteed a \$30 million loan to Poland to buy a tinplate mill. Payments started to come in last year at 4½ percent interest. Again in 1958 the Bank guaranteed a \$25 million purchase of pharmaceutical products by Poland. In 1959 there was a \$6 million transaction. The losses of the Export-Import Bank have been infinitesimal. From a business point of view there should be no objection. From a policy point of view this country has everything to gain by not putting roadblocks in the way of the proposed wheat sale. We have more wheat on our hands than any other country. Our taxpayers pay \$400 million in storage charges alone. Direct subsidies are many hundreds of millions of dollars added to this. Canada, Australia, and now even West Germany are in the business of selling or proposing to sell wheat to Russia. The terms of all of these transactions are the usual business ones. So much is paid down—the U.S. proposal is 25 percent of the cost—and the balance is financed by bank loans. There is nothing unusual about it. I for one, too, am of the view that there is no better way to demonstrate the failures of the Soviet economy than by these wheat shipments. And in the course of it we unload some of our surplus and stand to gain upward of \$2 billion in gold.

I can see no objection to the language of the conference report. It states very clearly that the Export-Import Bank is not to guarantee any payment incurred by any communistic country in connection with the purchase of any product except when the President of the United States makes a determination that it is in the national interest to permit the Bank to extend credit, and a report must be made to the Congress within 30 days to that effect. That puts the onus squarely on the President.

Finally, this is an appropriations bill backing up a foreign policy decision. This is the wrong bill for a substantive policy issue of this kind. It is not germane to our task. But beyond this, let us remember that Congress and parties must act with restraint in the area of foreign policy. The founders of the country understood this when they wrote the Constitution. Let us not forget it.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the day before Christmas and all through the House my colleagues are handing out credit cards drawable upon and secured by the American taxpayer. This folly will bring us not one inch closer to peace on earth nor promote much good will among all men. As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I protest against the United States underwriting its own loans to the Soviet Union and some 18 of its satellites.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the so-called "sale" of grain to

Communist nations from its inception because I felt that it was ridiculous to be spending billions of dollars in foreign aid to contain communism and then turn around with the other hand and bail them out, nurture their suffering economy, with subsidized grain.

Furthermore, I felt it a great injustice to those American soldiers who were called upon to risk their lives to combat communism for this Government to enhance the Red economy by supplying it much-needed food products.

Mr. Speaker, there were many other reasons why I opposed this deal even under its original terms, but, Mr. Speaker, originally it was promised the American people that this deal would be for cash only and that it was a one-shot transaction that would be shipped in American vessels. Then, Americans were told only 50 percent of the shipments would be carried in American vessels; now, it is to be shipped American only if there are American ships available and instead of cash, it is to be for credit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even those people who supported the idea originally did so only on the basis that the sale would be for cash.

Russia has paid cash for all the grain she has purchased from Canada.

This year alone, Russia has placed on the market some 325 tons of gold worth \$365 million to raise cash to pay for wheat purchases. Yet, Russia wants to purchase American wheat on credit. Is it because she knows that ultimately she won't have to pay us?

According to the State Department, Russia owes the United States \$10.8 billion, yet Russia has the largest gold reserve in the world except for the United States. Congress certainly is playing Santa Claus to Khrushchev by extending further credit to Russia.

Now, it is obvious that the sale will be made on credit; otherwise there is no reason for the fight against the restriction prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from extending credit to Russia.

The American taxpayer has again been bamboozled.

The action of Congress in refusing to restrict credit to Communist countries is tantamount to issuing a credit card for communism.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the views of so many expressed on the floor of the House during debate on this matter, I believe a great majority of the American people would join with me in disagreement to doing any business with the Communists. As I pointed out earlier, it seems the debate centers around whether or not credit will be extended through the Export-Import Bank. I want the Record to show that at least one Member, this Member, although certainly there must be many more who do not believe we should do any business with the Communists—not in food, not in any product. This resolution would permit the President to do business with Russians in any product.

There are several other matters that should be mentioned at this point.

First. This legislation or any legislation should not be considered on any

basis but merit. As I see it, the majority leader was utterly wrong in saying that rejection of this resolution would be a "slap at the President." We must not, as the legislative branch, abdicate our responsibility. We represent the American people and I am convinced a majority of the American people are opposed to doing business with the Russians. However, whether I am right or wrong is not so important as the fact that each Member should vote his convictions in representing his district on the merits of the bill rather than whether this supports or rejects the President. President Johnson, himself, in his first address to Congress said that he did recognize and respect the "integrity and independence" of the legislative branch. Obviously his present conduct belies this statement. However, that was what he said.

Second. The best evidence that this administration may be soft on communism and, therefore, the House must reject this resolution can be found in Secretary of State Rusk's recent appeal to our friendly neighbors in the world that we must help Russia because Russia was having Communist ideological differences with China. Such a course, as I see it, for us would be suicidal since we will be aiding an enemy determined to enslave us by any means, fair or foul.

Third. We are by this resolution helping further to make Russia respectable in the world today. True, this conforms to the pattern we have followed since we recognized Russia in 1933 but is no less wrong. In fact, it is even more wrong today because Russia has shown us how dishonest and untrustworthy they are and is the Communist philosophy.

Fourth. There is no assurance of repayment as was pointed out in debate when the collateral was used. Of course, there will be no collateral except the Communist word and we know how little that means.

Fifth. Russia if needing financial help can arrange her own credit.

Sixth. We have no assurance that this legislation will be limited to food and will not be extended to any or all other products.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the conference report, I want to mention to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] that the wheat amendment is not in the conference report. That will come subsequent to the passage of the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. AVERY. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 11, line 14, insert:

"Sec. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any construction contract in

any foreign country where persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such contract, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work, or when the President finds that application of this provision would be contrary to the national interest."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated on or after April 30, 1964, for financing, in whole or in part, the direct costs of any contract for the construction of facilities and installations in any underdeveloped country, unless the President shall, on or before such date, have promulgated regulations designed to assure, to the maximum extent consistent with the national interest and the avoidance of excessive costs to the United States, that none of the funds made available by this Act and thereafter obligated shall be used to finance the direct costs under such contracts for construction work performed by persons other than qualified nationals of the recipient country or qualified citizens of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the President may waive the application of this amendment if it is important to the national interest."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 17, line 17, strike out: "None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House know my record for trying to save money in the foreign aid bill. The record speaks for itself.

I believe there are certain facts about this so-called wheat amendment that should be explained. It is my understanding that when you do business nation to nation under Public Law 480, it is customary either to make a grant or a sale in local currency on a long-term basis.

It is my further understanding that we have in excess of \$8.5 billion in surplus agricultural commodities. Those commodities are now being shipped into over 50 nations of the world either on a grant basis or for sale on a local currency basis. In some nations we are accumulating so much local currency that, in all probability, we will never be able to spend it. After checking into this matter I find that many other nations are doing business with the Soviet Union on the same basis as is proposed here. In October, West Germany shipped to the Soviet Union 450,000 tons of flour. It is also my understanding that when you do business on a government-to-government basis you may eventually negotiate or compromise and may not expect to get all your money, but the basis on which we are proposing here to do business with Russia is considered a cash basis; 25 percent cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. The only part that the Export-Import Bank plays is to guarantee the credit and for guaranteeing that credit the American taxpayer could receive a profit of over \$10 million. The agreement that is proposed here prevails in the case of other nations who are also extending credits to the Soviet Union. It is also my understanding that in many instances where the American businessman is doing export business with Soviet Russia, such terms are also extended.

While our allies are waxing fat, shipping commodities to the Soviet Union, we are continuing to build up our agricultural surpluses here in America. There is not one dime of cash involved in this transaction. It is only a guarantee by the Export-Import Bank for a period of 6 to 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to defend anything when you mention the Soviets. I am getting telegrams from my district, just as you are getting telegrams from your district. But, remember that the President must make a determination that it is in the interest of our country before he may permit the transaction to proceed. Under existing law, he does not have to make such a determination before proceeding. I am not afraid to say that in this one instance it is considered a cash deal. I am thoroughly convinced that we are going to get approximately \$2 billion in gold if we go through with this proposal. On the other hand, if we do not go through with this proposal, in all probability we are going to give, not sell, the same wheat to 54 other nations.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman refers only to wheat and other agricultural surpluses.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment is not confined to wheat or to agricultural surpluses. It provides for the sale of any product to the Communists. It can be roller bearings, or anything.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true. It could be used on such a basis, but the gentleman knows as well as I do—

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that.

Mr. PASSMAN. That the intent is to allow the sale of \$2 billion of surplus wheat to the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I think it also ought to be clear that if the Soviet Union paid enough interest to secure credit from commercial firms in this country, they could secure the credit. But the United States is actually putting up their collateral to enable the Soviet Union to secure credit at a lower interest rate in order to make the loan. That is the important thing here.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is a standard proposal of the kind that is entered into by any nation shipping products to other nations.

If the gentleman would check on the contracts with West Germany and the other countries who are selling to the Soviet Union you will find out that this is considered a cash transaction. I do not like it any better than you do. However, I think we have played politics with this amendment long enough. I do know this: I know that we may get rid of \$2 billion worth of surplus commodities and if we do, we will get in return \$2 billion in gold, as well as the Export-Import Bank earning approximately \$10 million in interest for its guarantee of the transaction.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members of the House that as chairman of this subcommittee I have faced up to my responsibility. I do not like foreign aid. But as far as I am concerned this is a cash transaction. We may get rid of \$2 billion of surplus commodities and, if we do, we will get in return \$2 billion in gold. The Export-Import Bank, representing the United States, will make approximately \$10 million as profit.

That is it, gentlemen. You can talk here until Santa comes at 12 o'clock tonight and you cannot change the facts.

We have brought this conference report back to you. All of the conferees agreed that this proposal was the very best thing that could be worked out.

I repeat that in my candid opinion you will get rid of \$2 billion worth of commodity surpluses, the same as many other countries are doing. We may get up to \$2 billion in gold and we will make \$10 million for guaranteeing the transaction.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, was it not the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend [Mr. GROSS], who in the debate the other day, pointed out that under existing law, with or without this amendment, the President of the United States has the power and has had the power for many years to make a finding that the national interest requires a transaction under which roller bearings or any other strategic materials could be sold to the Soviet Union? As a matter of fact are we not by this amendment simply enabling the President to use the credit of the Export-Import Bank, and in the exercise of the same discretion under which he can today approve the sale of strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; this is a normal procedure, the same procedure that all other nations use when they are doing business with other countries. Make no mistake about that. This is nothing new. You have had similar arrangements with Yugoslavia and Poland. You have given the President the same right as far as aid to Indonesia is concerned, and, as far as I am concerned, Indonesia is a Communist nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have carried this debate a little bit too far. I am willing to take a position and I know the Members of the House agree that I am against excessive foreign aid spending. I have worked untiringly to put some commonsense into this program. We have cut it to the extent of \$8 billion in the past 9 years. But so far as I am concerned I am not going to play politics with this proposal any longer. I am going to face up to my responsibility. I want to see the \$2 billion of gold coming into this country if it is possible and I want to see \$35 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities go out of this country. Further, I want to see my Government make \$10 million for guaranteeing the loan. This is a one-time proposition. It is considered a cash proposition. You will not get the cash except under these terms. Those are the terms for getting the cash. If you want to go home for Christmas let us approve this conference report and amendment No. 20.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is not this a fact, that this is strictly a business loan?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, not only that but they pay an insurance premium, the exporters do?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; that is right, and we make a \$10 million profit.

Mr. PATMAN. In order to guarantee these loans they pay an insurance premium and the loans will not be made unless the security is adequate?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, this is normal procedure used by this country and all other countries. We all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes. However, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit at a loss to know exactly how to talk about this deal because I do not know what the deal is. I have heard a lot of things said about it but I do not understand the explanation.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, that is why I tried to explain the deal for the benefit of the entire House. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana knows anything more about it than I do. All we know about it is what we read in the papers. I do know this: I have heard it rumored that this is to be 25 percent down. I do not know in what it is down, whether it is rubles down or dollars down, or peanuts down.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is dollars.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. But I do know this, that the rest of it is supposed to be on some sort of credit terms and is supposed to be guaranteed. I do not think this is the usual deal. I do not think every time grain is sold to France or Western Germany or any of the other nations of the West the Export-Import Bank is called on for a guarantee. The reason they are called on for a guarantee is because the sale is to be made to a nation which does not have credit. We are going to make that respectable. Why are we going to make that respectable? Are we going to make it respectable because their Premier says they would bury us? Is this why we should make them respectable? I do not think the people of the United States want to do anything like that.

What are the terms? People on this side of the aisle have said there is to be collateral, there is to be security. What security? What collateral? There is no such thing as this in dealings between nations.

The facts are these. We own some wheat. We were told that that wheat would be sold for gold. It is not going to be sold for gold. It is going to be sold for credit. We do not know what. The credit is so bad that the American taxpayer not only has to buy the wheat and sell it for less than he pays for it, but now he has to guarantee a loan for it. I ask you if this is any kind of deal that anybody should enter into. The answer is "No."

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman from Louisiana is making quite a point that we stand to make a considerable gain on our gold problem by providing this authority to the President. I would like to point out that to the extent that we lend credit to the Communist countries, to that very same extent we fail to make any gain on our balance-of-payments problem or our gold outflow problem. The best way to make sure we are going to have a gain on our gold problem is to insist on cash on the barrelhead.

I call the attention of the gentleman to an article which appeared in the Evening Star last month quoting diplomatic sources as follows:

Senate defeat earlier this week of a bill by Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to prohibit the Export-Import Bank finance the wheat deal left the Soviets unimpressed, diplomatic informants declared. They said Moscow was prepared to pay for the wheat in gold or hard currency anyway.

They were unconcerned about the Export-Import Bank issue.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think it also ought to be pointed out for the information of the gentleman from Louisiana that this could not be \$2 billion for wheat. This is talked of as being only \$300 million. That is the most anybody suggested. There will not be any wheat going into Soviet Russia in that amount. When Germany buys wheat from us it is because she has sufficient credit. If the Soviet Union had sufficient credit, she would be able to buy from commercial firms, but she does not. So we are asked for the United States to put up a guarantee for them, and it will not help our balance-of-payments stand until they pay for it.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma spoke of the statement I made in debate on this bill a few days ago. It is true that unconscionable authority has been delegated to the President. That is what I am protesting here today and protested then. I protested when the Agency for International Development was created. This is another demonstration on the part of the House of Representatives in giving to the President unwarranted and unholy delegated power. I refuse today to compound that felony.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This is no attempt to belittle anybody, certainly not the President of the United States. This is an honest disagreement. I would remind you that the President of the United States has spent most of his life on Capitol Hill. He knows what this sort of disagreement is. He knows nobody who opposes him on this is opposing him or the administration.

Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Members of the House, particularly my good colleague from Louisiana, for the type of cooperation, the type of good fellowship, really, which we have had through a very trying period, and to give to the Members of the House and particularly the Speaker my very best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, my votes on this piece of legislation over the past few days does not reflect my confirmed feeling that it is bad for the United States to continue to try to support 100 of the 110 duly recognized nations of the world. As I have previously stated in the debate on the authorization bill and during the debate on this appropriation bill—the U.S. Treasury and the American taxpayers cannot solve all of the economic problems of the world. Our gold supply has diminished to the point where we now have an insufficient amount to back the American dollar. As I have stated before—I hereby repeat—our Nation owes over \$300 billion in debts not including all those public debts that we as a nation have guaranteed.

The reason that I voted against recommitment of this bill, and for the rule, is due to the fact that I wanted to help uphold the hand of our great new President. Knowing something of the thinking of the European mind—I know that had President Johnson lost this fight on this bill it would have created in the minds of our oversea friends the idea that the Congress had repudiated our new President. They would have interpreted it as "a no confidence vote." Therefore, while basically I am opposed to this appropriation bill, I felt it my duty to my President, my country, and my party, to support them, especially since President Johnson has only been in office as our President for just about 30 days.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I wish all Members a very Merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table showing a breakdown of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on this day before Christmas we come face to face with the issue of an amendment that would permit the extension of some short-term credit to the Export-Import Bank to Russia for purchase of wheat. The issue has been fully debated, but now that the conference report provides that the final determination is left to the President as to whether the extension of credit is in the national interest, the real nub of the issue is whether or not the Congress has trust and confidence in the President. Under the Constitution, the Congress must trust the Chief Executive as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. He has the decision as to whether or not the terrible power of the mightiest military machine on earth shall be unleashed. This has been reposed in the Chief Executive by the Constitution. Surely, no one can say he should not be trusted with a matter of a few months credit for the sale of wheat. No money is involved, no cash is involved, only credit and even with this extension of credit some \$5 million will accrue to the United States from exporter premiums.

Aside from all emotional, economic and political implications the other free

world nations will go on trading with the Communists. If the United States forgoes such benefits it will do so without any appreciable injury to the Communist system. There is precious little the United States can do to prevent trade with Russia by the rest of the world.

On last Monday, December 16, an amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill, worded in rather legalistic and somewhat misleading language caught some of our Members by surprise. Although it is now clear that it was aimed at prohibiting the sale of wheat upon which we are now paying annual storage costs, the amendment did not even mention the word "wheat." There was and is the attempt to claim that it was a blow at communism. A look at the facts shows it may be just the opposite. Any gold they use to pay for wheat to eat cannot be used to pay for guns or war materials. Money we receive from the wheat can be used to help support our bases overseas and reduce our balance-of-payments deficit.

During the debate the gentleman from Iowa, NEAL SMITH, was one Member of the House of Representatives who immediately recognized the implications and spoke against the restrictive amendment. Since that time, President Johnson has vigorously opposed the amendment and it has been the subject of several skirmishes in both the Senate and the House.

The amendment would limit our sales of wheat on the world market, will give assurance to Canada and West Germany that they can go ahead to continue to make sales that we could have made, and provide the further assurance that our wheat will instead be left in storage at Government expense. In the month of October alone, West Germany sold 450,000 tons of flour to Russia. We have unemployed people who would like to have milled, packaged and transported that flour. If the restrictive amendment stands, everyone in the United States loses except perhaps the storage people who cannot be blamed if they prefer the Government to continue to pay them millions of dollars indefinitely to store the wheat and corn that we could have sold.

The gentleman from Iowa has called my attention to an editorial in the Des Moines Register of December 18 which in my opinion is very informative and enlightening on the issues underlying the amendment. I want to commend our colleague, NEAL SMITH, for his alertness and to commend him for calling our attention to the editorial from the Des Moines Register, as follows:

#### WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

Strong opposition to the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union continues in Congress. The House of Representatives voted 218 to 169 against permitting the U.S. Export-Import Bank to underwrite insurance on the deal, although the Senate had approved it by 57 to 35.

All Iowa Republicans in both House and Senate voted to stop the wheat sale. Only Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat, voted for it and spoke in its support.

Most opponents of sale of wheat to Russia recognize that the sale would benefit U.S.

agriculture. It would reduce the wheat surplus and make the choices in wheat policy much simpler next year. The American Farm Bureau Federation approved the sale as a good business proposition. The sale would reduce the cost of Government wheat support programs. Also, it would help the U.S. balance of payments.

The opponents declare that they are willing to permit private traders to sell wheat to Russia for cash. What they object to, they say, is (1) Government guarantee of the transaction, (2) special concessions or "subsidies" to the Russians, (3) changed terms for the bargain from those laid down by President Kennedy.

The conditions made by Mr. Kennedy are not sacrosanct just because of his tragic death. But the fact is that no violation of those conditions is involved. Mr. Kennedy said that private dealers could go ahead with negotiations on a sale for cash, gold or normal commercial credit.

The Russians accepted the same terms from the American export firms as they did from Canada—25 percent cash, the remainder to be paid in 18 months. The Russians actually paid 80 percent cash down to Canada, apparently because they didn't want to pay so much interest to the capitalists. Whether they would pay more than 25 percent in cash on a U.S. sale cannot be told in advance, but the face-saving-conscious Russians insisted on the same credit terms as they got from Canada.

Mr. Kennedy also said the wheat should be shipped in U.S. vessels as much as possible. This leaves room for negotiation and adjustment, which is necessary because U.S. ship rates are far above world levels. Whether an agreement can be reached on this is still uncertain. But the Russians appeared to be willing to pay a moderate differential on the U.S. ships used, which does not sound as though they were driving a cruel bargain and upping the terms.

The U.S. Government pays the U.S. exporters a subsidy to make it possible for them to buy wheat at the support level in this country and export it at the world price. The Soviet bargainers, of course, insisted on paying the going world price.

The proposed Export-Import Bank insurance of the wheat sale to Russia is not Government credit. It is coverage of political risk on the private bank loans, and is considered to be part of normal commercial financing of such large sales in foreign trade. At least 19 countries, including such big trading nations as Japan and Britain, have such insurance programs.

It was brought out in the Senate hearings that the record of the Communist bloc countries on payment of commercial debts is very good, and the Export-Import Bank considers the proposed Soviet deal a very safe risk. Similar insurance is extended on more liberal terms to many countries—for example, on a sale of cotton to Japan last summer.

Objections to the terms of the Russian sale obviously are window dressing for opposition to the whole idea of selling wheat to Communists. Those who believe wheat should not be sold logically should oppose trade in any commodity with Russia. They also should oppose the trade of U.S. allies with Russia and the Communist bloc—including the large volume of trade between West Germany and Communist East Germany.

This would be futile, because the United States cannot dictate the policies of other free world countries. It would only tend to isolate America as an implacable foe of any attempt to establish normal relations with the Russians. It would deny American farmers a nice piece of export business and would earn this country ridicule for allowing hate of Communist ideology to overrule sound business judgment.

Worst of all, such an Iron Curtain policy would be missing the chance to dramatize America's superiority in farming in a way no propaganda by words can ever do. And all because of an irrational fear that we might be helping communism.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, this issue is a disturbing one for all of us and in the heat of debate the issue is distorted and as a result we see some fancy footwork on the part of the members of the Republican Party. Within the past few years we have seen the Republican leadership agree to give to the President of the United States the authority to determine whether it is in the national interest to sell guns, and planes, and other strategic materials to certain Communist countries. Now we see them resisting the proposal that the President have the authority to authorize the extension of credit for the sale of—not arms—but food to Communist countries. The amendment prohibits the Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit to Communist countries wanting to buy wheat from us. But if the President believes it in the best interest of the United States to extend such credit he may authorize it.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "aye." I have always contended that we do nothing to further the cause of communism. If Russia is to use our wheat to further its political cause then we should not sell it to them. If by its sale we further our own cause by feeding the hungry people of the world then we should sell it. I have confidence in my President and am sure that he will serve the best interests of the United States.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said concerning the controversial Mundt-Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill that I feel clarification is in order. I realize full well that all sorts of clarifying statements have been made, but frankly, they missed the point.

By selling wheat and other commodities at subsidized prices to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries under conditions dictated by the Soviet Union and its puppet states, we are engaging in a tragic, self-defeating operation.

What the administration is demanding the Congress to do is to place the stamp of approval on direct support of an international bandit, the Soviet Union. We are directly aiding "Mother Russia," a totalitarian nation under czars with its vision of world domination extended and refined by Communist dictators.

At a time when the Soviet farm economy is completely collapsing, our subsidy and aid have the effect of saving them from self-destruction. Arms are being twisted, pressure of all sorts is brought to bear, the leadership on the Republican side is outmaneuvered by false promises and final approval of a completely watered-down, meaningless amendment is a victory for communism.

Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration has now completely clothed itself in the mantle of foreign policy of the last 3 years, which basically is coexistence with communism and a slow surrender to Red pressure in all parts of the world.

It is especially shocking that on the eve of Christmas the key issue before the

Congress is a demand by President Johnson and his leaders in the House and Senate that the tax dollars of American citizens be used to subsidize communism. What more disgraceful performance could be displayed before the public at a time of the birth of the Savior when we, as a Christian nation, rededicate ourselves to the virtues of Christianity, while the administration rededicates itself to the subsidy of the forces which aim at world domination.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the issues herein are so obviously apparent that it is amazing that the Democratic leadership and President Johnson would choose to make a fight for a position that is not supported by the American people, let alone commonsense.

The providing of credit guarantees through the Export-Import Bank to Russia, and some 19 other Communist nations, not only for wheat but for any other product, makes no sense and is against our best interests for the following reasons:

First. To provide credit guarantees for products sold to the Communist nations is to help the enemy.

Second. To provide such taxpayer supported guarantees in a \$3 billion foreign aid appropriation bill designed to strengthen our hand against the Communists in the cold war is to repudiate one laudable purpose with a directly opposed purpose—and all in the same bill.

Third. Russia should be the last country to whom we should extend taxpayer guaranteed credit, not only because Khrushchev has announced the intentions of the international Communist conspiracy, to bury us, but also because Russia has already defaulted on \$11.8 billion of credit through lend-lease heretofore issued by Uncle Sam at the expense of the taxpayers.

Fourth. Russia is in trouble in its agriculture program, clear proof that Communist subjugation of the farmer—and the people—will not work and this wheat deal will bail that Communist government out of one of its major weaknesses and failures.

Fifth. By extending guaranteed credit, the United States is aggravating, not improving the flow of gold problem, and is undercutting the chief argument used by the proponents of the wheat deal to Russia.

Sixth. The amendment as amended by the conferees gives the President discretion to extend such credit if he determines it is in the national interests and he has already made such a determination, so to vote such discretion is to vote for the extension of such credit.

Seventh. Congress is not tying the hands of the President but is stating policy of no credit to Russia consistent with the American people's beliefs and is following precedents established previously by Congress such as on the Latta amendment restricting Public Law 480 wheat surpluses from going to Communist countries.

Eighth. To argue that the Findley amendment would affect the image of President Johnson before the world is to argue that Congress must rubber-stamp all presidential proposals, espe-

cially in the field of foreign affairs, even though Congress disagrees with them and thus to abdicate the constitutional duty of Congress.

Ninth. To issue credit guarantee authority to Communist countries for trade of products is to make a sham and a farce of our announced trade ban on Cuba, threatening withdrawal of foreign aid to countries trading with Cuba and closing of U.S. ports to shipping companies trading with Cuba.

Tenth. To placate Russia and the Communist countries to this extent, realizing that some of this wheat and other products will undoubtedly end up even in Cuba, is to make a mockery of our entire anti-Communist position in the Western Hemisphere and makes such a policy the laughing stock of the Latin Nations.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, as one of five Members of the House who conferred with the Senate for many hours in search of a compromise on this appropriations bill, I urge the adoption of the conference report as the best agreement possible under the legislative circumstances that exist today. In my judgment your House conferees drove as hard a bargain as could be driven, and I feel our efforts deserve the support of this body.

We conferred over a period of 12 hours last Friday, beginning at 11 a.m. and ending in the vicinity of 11 p.m. At one point we walked out of the conference because of the adamant position of the Senate conferees. Finally, thanks in large part to a giving of ground on the part of the Senate, we were able to reach an agreement that has been a subject of controversy in this House since. As one who helped work out that agreement, I intend to support it.

Let me make myself clear. I have always maintained that any sale of wheat to Communist countries should be a cash-on-the-line transaction. We have a surplus of wheat that is costing us millions of dollars just to handle and we need gold. I therefore have considered a cash deal to be in our best interest.

I question the advisability of extending credit, however, and I voted last week against the guarantee of such credit by the Export-Import Bank when the question was before the House in connection with this bill. And I felt the position of the House in opposing the guarantee of such credit was sound.

It was my responsibility, on the other hand, to represent the House in conference with the Senate, which has voted twice against placing any restrictions whatsoever on the Export-Import Bank in the event that agency is called on to guarantee credit in a transaction with the Soviet Union.

It became the job of the House conferees, therefore, to work out with the Senate conferees an agreement acceptable to both Houses. And I must confess that I do not think the debate we have engaged in since does justice to the job we were able to do in conference under the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The House had approved a \$2.8 billion foreign aid appropriation. The Senate increased this to \$3.3 billion but we got

it back to an even \$3 billion in conference—a reduction of \$1½ billion in the budget request and \$600 million in the amount previously authorized by the Congress.

What is more, we were able to get into the bill a statement of congressional policy on the guarantee of credit in trade with Communist countries where no policy now exists. We were successful in retaining the prohibition against guaranteeing credit with an exception—to satisfy the Senate—where the President certifies to the Congress that the transaction is in the national interest. Such certification by the President to the appropriate committees will give the Congress an opportunity to take action on the question of credit in each instance if it is so inclined.

This was not exactly what I wanted—but what agreement in the Congress satisfies everyone to every degree? It was, I feel, the best agreement the Senate would accept and I do not think the compromise was unreasonable.

We are achieving a \$900 million reduction in the foreign aid program and we are getting a prohibition against the guarantee of credit to Communist countries where no prohibition now exists.

I do not believe we will strengthen the House position by refusing to accept the conference report. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

**Mr. SIKES.** Mr. Speaker, the wheat sale amendment is a much misunderstood and highly controversial item which will demand explanation for months to come. It is at this time unpopular with the people and a vote against it would be far the simplest way to meet the issue.

Unfortunately for me the problem cannot be resolved that simply. Many factors are to be weighed. This is foreign policy. Foreign policy is by law the responsibility of the President. Congress can set guidelines but in this first major issue affecting the new administration, Congress could endanger foreign policy by tying the President's hands; by saying we do not trust him.

Few people will realize the real issue before the House is not a prohibition against credit on sales of wheat to Communist nations. The House voted such a prohibition—and my vote was cast for it. However, that amendment was dropped in conference. What is before us now is a restriction on the way credit is used. If the wheat amendment is voted down, the President can, under existing law, extend loans and credit. The amendment before us would require a certification that credit is in the national interest and require that Congress be notified of each transaction. It tightens existing law.

This is only a beginning in the tangled skein of the wheat amendment. We are talking about short-term credit in which the Export-Import Bank would endorse the Russian's promise to pay in gold. Actual terms would be 25 percent cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. A similar system is followed by other

Western nations when sales are made to the Russians.

Significantly we have for years been making loans and grants to Communist nations without the furore which accompanies today's action. Billions have gone—my vote to the contrary—notably to Poland and Yugoslavia. There is no assurance any of it will come back.

By contrast, in the present deal, the United States proposes to cut down on the \$8½ billion tied up in agricultural surplus, to cut down on the million-dollar-a-day storage costs, to move more U.S. products onto the world market, to move them at world prices instead of cut rate, and to realize money instead of promises from the transaction. This is not a giveaway.

Other Western Nations trade with the Communists. They are using our money, our methods, even our machinery to get business we admittedly can use. There is nothing in this which smacks of appeasement or soft dealing. It is a business transaction with reasonable safeguards.

We still are committed to the winning of the cold war; to the defeat of communism. We are not financing communism through this transaction. We tried building a wall around the free world but the free world would not be so contained. Now we seek areas where a thaw can be achieved with benefit to us. Turning surplus wheat into gold is to me a transaction more advantageous to the United States than to Russia.

**Mr. LLOYD.** Mr. Speaker, in listening to debate on the amendment made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] it appears to me that a significant matter should be added to this record. This is testimony of Hon. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, Banking and Currency on February 25, 1963. I call the attention of the House to a record of these hearings on the matter of the Export-Import Bank Act extension.

The testimony is significant to this debate because Mr. Linder cites the fact that three entities in Cuba, after that country was overrun by Castro, have failed to make payment to American exporters. These defaults exceed \$36 million and have been guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank.

I call attention of the House to page 14 of the hearings, wherein Mr. Linder states the following:

In addition to this \$3.7 million [in losses] we have loans in default which have not been written off because we are still hopeful of ultimate collection or at least some settlement thereon. These comprise three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating \$36.3 million.

I further call attention of the House to page 28 of the hearings, and the following question and answer:

**Mr. MOORHEAD.** Mr. Linder, in the three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating \$36.3 million, do you really have some reasonable expectation of salvaging something from those loans?

**Mr. LINDER.** Well, we have the same reasonable expectation I would think, Mr. MOORHEAD, that the United States in general has of not expecting the Castro regime to last forever. Except in the case of a Communist takeover, successor governments have invariably honored the obligations of their predecessors and to that extent we have some reason to hope. I will leave it to you.

**Mr. Speaker,** the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has reported to this House that the intended Russian payment for wheat purchased from this country would be 25 percent in cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months.

If defaults were made in the case of Cuba due to Communist takeover, it seems perfectly clear that in the event we should have an increasingly hostile relation with Russia, the Communists would default as they have done in Cuba, in which case the money of American taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank would be used to guarantee the Russian payment, and we would thus be in the position of paying Russia to use our wheat.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should support this kind of financing. On the basis of the proven record in Cuba alone, I urge that we continue our refusal to concur with Senate amendment No. 20.

**Mr. PASSMAN.** Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

**The SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion.

**Mr. RHODES** of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 158, answered "present" 6, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—189

Addabbo	Fascell	King, Calif.
Albert	Flood	Kirwan
Ashley	Flynt	Kluczynski
Barrett	Fogarty	Kornegay
Bass	Fraser	Landrum
Beckworth	Friedel	Lankford
Bennett, Fla.	Fuqua	Leggett
Blatnik	Gallagher	Lesinski
Boggs	Garmatz	Libonati
Boland	Gary	Lindsay
Bonner	Gathings	Long, La.
Brademas	Giaino	Long, Md.
Brooks	Gilbert	McDowell
Brown, Calif.	Gill	McFall
Buckley	Gonzalez	Macdonald
Burke	Grabowski	Madden
Byrne, Pa.	Gray	Mahon
Cameron	Green	Matsunaga
Carey	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Chelf	Hagan, Ga.	Mills
Clark	Hagen, Calif.	Minish
Cohelan	Hanna	Monagan
Conte	Hansen	Moorhead
Cooley	Harding	Morgan
Corman	Hardy	Morris
Daddario	Harris	Morrison
Daniels	Hawkins	Moss
Davis, Ga.	Hays	Multer
Dawson	Healey	Murphy, Ill.
Delaney	Hechler	Natcher
Dent	Hemphill	Nedzi
Denton	Holland	Nix
Dingell	Ichord	O'Brien, N.Y.
Donohue	Jennings	O'Hara, Ill.
Dulski	Joelson	O'Hara, Mich.
Duncan	Johnson, Calif.	Olsen, Mont.
Edmondson	Johnson, Wis.	Olsen, Minn.
Edwards	Karsten	O'Neill
Elliott	Kastenmeier	Passman
Everett	Kee	Patman
Fallon	Kelly	Patten
Farbstein	Keogh	Pepper

Perkins  
Pike  
Plicher  
Poage  
Pool  
Price  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Pickle  
Rains  
Randall  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts, Ala.  
Roberts, Tex.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Roosevelt  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush

Roybal  
Ryan, Mich.  
Ryan, N.Y.  
St Germain  
St. Onge  
Senner  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sickles  
Sikes  
Slisk  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Staebler  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, N.J.

Thompson, Tex.  
Toil  
Trimble  
Tuten  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vinson  
Watts  
Weltner  
White  
Whitener  
Wickersham  
Willis  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wright  
Young  
Zablocki

NAYS—158

Abele  
Alger  
Anderson  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews,  
N. Dak.  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Ashmore  
Auchincloss  
Avery  
Ayres  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Baring  
Barry  
Bates  
Battin  
Beermann  
Bell  
Bennett, Mich.  
Berry  
Betts  
Bolton,  
Frances P.  
Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bow  
Brock  
Broomwell  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Bruce  
Burleson  
Burton  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Chamberlain  
Chenoweth  
Clancy  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Colmer  
Corbett  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Curtin  
Curtis  
Derwinski

Devine  
Dole  
Dorn  
Dowdy  
Dwyer  
Feighan  
Findley  
Fisher  
Ford  
Foreman  
Fountain  
Gibbons  
Goodling  
Grant  
Griffin  
Gross  
Grover  
Gurney  
Hall  
Halleck  
Halpern  
Harsha  
Harvey, Mich.  
Hoeven  
Hoffman  
Horan  
Horton  
Huddleston  
Hutchinson  
Jarman  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Keith  
King, N.Y.  
Kyl  
Laird  
Langen  
Latta  
Lipscomb  
Lloyd  
McClory  
McDade  
McIntire  
McLoskey  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Marsh  
Martin, Calif.  
May  
Meader  
Miller, N.Y.  
Minshall

Mosher  
Nelsen  
Norblad  
O'Konski  
Pelly  
Pillion  
Pirnie  
Poff  
Quie  
Quillen  
Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rich  
Robison  
Rogers, Fla.  
Roudebush  
Rumsfeld  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Schenck  
Schneebeli  
Schweiker  
Schwengel  
Seldin  
Short  
Shriver  
Sibal  
Skubitz  
Smith, Va.  
Snyder  
Stafford  
Stinson  
Taft  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Wallhauser  
Watson  
Weaver  
Westland  
Whalley  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Wydler  
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Downing Mathias Morse  
Frelinghuysen Matthews Rivers, S.C.

NOT VOTING—80

Abbt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Aspinall  
Becker  
Belcher  
Bolling  
Bray  
Brown, Ohio  
Burkhalter  
Cahill  
Cannon  
Celler  
Clawson, Del  
Dague  
Davis, Tenn.  
Derounian  
Diggs  
Ellsworth  
Evins

Finnegan  
Fino  
Forrester  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Glenn  
Goodell  
Gubser  
Haley  
Harrison  
Harvey, Ind.  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Hollifield  
Hosmer  
Hull  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Karth

Kilburn  
Kilgore  
Knox  
Kunkel  
Lennon  
McCulloch  
Maillard  
Martin, Mass.  
Martin, Nebr.  
Michel  
Milliken  
Montoya  
Moore  
Morton  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Murray  
O'Brien, Ill.  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Philbin

Powell  
Reuss  
Riehlman  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Scott  
Shibley

Siler  
Smith, Calif.  
Springer  
Stephens  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Taylor

Tollefson  
Tupper  
Waggonner  
Wharton  
Williams  
Younger

So the motion was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
On this vote:  
Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Downing against.  
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.  
Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Haley against.  
Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. McCulloch against.  
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Knox against.  
Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Derounian against.  
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Adair against.  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.  
Mr. Burkhalter for, with Mr. Abernethy against.  
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Williams against.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Henderson against.  
Mr. Finnegan for, with Mr. Lennon against.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Scott against.  
Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Waggonner against.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Abbt against.  
Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.  
Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Michel against.  
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.  
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Fino against.  
Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Smith of California against.  
Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Cahill against.  
Mr. Shibley for, with Mr. Bray against.  
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gubser against.  
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Harrison against.  
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Becker against.  
Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.  
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Younger against.  
Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hosmer against.  
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Until further notice:  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Riehlman.  
Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Glenn.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Siler.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Talcott.  
Mr. Murray with Mr. Tollefson.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Goodell.  
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Moore.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH]. Due to transportation difficulties he could not be here. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. Because of the very, very heavy snow it was physically impossible for him to be here today. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], who is ill and

could not be here today. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] who finds it impossible to be here today. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Senate amendment No. 22: Page 18, line 22, insert:

"For payment to Nancy P. Kefauver, widow of Estes Kefauver, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee, \$22,500."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.  
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Senate amendment No. 25: Page 18, line 10, insert the following:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous Items', \$215,000: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'one hundred and twenty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and sixty' and by striking out the words 'six hundred' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight hundred'."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.  
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:  
Senate amendment No. 26: Page 18, line 21, insert the following:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For an additional amount for stationery, \$60,600: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the



President of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$2,400 per annum."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 601) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to wait on the President.

#### STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to express his thanks to all Members of the House, all of my colleagues, for the many courtesies and kindnesses you have extended to me during the past year.

I realize the sacrifices that each and everyone of you has made and I know that a grateful constituency and the country as a whole will appreciate it.

I extend to each and every one of you and your loved ones the greetings of the holy season and my very best wishes for happiness and joy for you and your loved ones at Christmas and during the coming new year and that God will bestow on each and every one of you and your loved ones an abundance of His choicest blessings.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, since the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation recommended that each State consider reducing the voting age to 18, there have been a great many expressions of support for this proposal.

At Huntington East High School, Huntington, W. Va., and at Marshall University in Huntington, the West Virginia Youth Suffrage Committee has been organized. Among the leaders in the movement at Huntington East High School are Ann Cyrus, June Hunt, David Webb, and Richard Jackson. All of these high school seniors are extremely busy with responsible extracurricular activities—for example, Jackson, first-string halfback on the football team is also vice president of the student body at Huntington East—yet they regard it an obligation and a responsibility to devote a vast amount of time to this civic activity. At Marshall University, among those who have played a leading role in this drive are Kenneth Gainer, president of the student body; Francis Fabi, Michael Carroll, Dean Thompson, and John L. Jones.

In the current December 1963 issue of the Huntington East High School newspaper the Babbipes, Miss June Hunt, Huntington East senior, has penned a cogent editorial entitled "Time To Move" which, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks:

#### TIME TO MOVE

This, the 100th anniversary of the founding of our State, is the year in which to move forward.

Since the beginning of 1963, certain young citizens, including five seniors at Huntington East, interested in the progress of the State of West Virginia, have become aware of the need for exercising their opinions in government both on a local and State level. These opinions can best be expressed by giving young people the right to vote at the age of 18.

During the past summer, I had the opportunity to work in Congressman KEN HECHLER's office for a week. This experience—the excitement of seeing our Government in action and getting to meet governmental leaders—greatly increased my awareness and interest in governmental and civic affairs. By the time students reach 18, many are very much interested in current affairs; if denied the right to vote, they frequently lose interest by the time they are 21 and are allowed to vote.

The minimum age for employment under Federal civil service laws is 18. The minimum draft age is 18. Federal relief for dependent children is suspended upon reaching the age of 18. Under the penal code, an 18-year-old can be committed to the Federal prison at the discretion of the Attorney General.

In four States this lowered voting age has been successfully tried—Georgia (18), Kentucky (18), Alaska (19), and Hawaii (20). According to John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii, "It is difficult to give reasons why the voting age should be 20 or any other specific age, older or younger, for as you know, the necessary maturity can come to exist in some people while still very young and perhaps never develop in others. I cannot believe, however, that 18 would be too

young, as young people today are becoming more politically conscious at an earlier age."

In 1961, U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH proposed an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to set the voting age in all 50 States at 18. At the same time Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia introduced a companion bill. Many State officials, including Governor Barron, Representative Ken Hechler, Senators Jennings Randolph and Robert Byrd, Lyle Smith and C. H. "Jackie" McKown, State Auditor Denzil Gainer, State Fire Commissioner Dick Kyle and others, are personally in favor of this move.

Many young West Virginians are leaving the State. But the right to vote will give 18-year-olds a voice in the kind of future they would like for West Virginia and give them a stake in building the State.

I, personally, am proud to be associated with such a movement. I'm happy that this campaign began at Huntington East, and is spreading throughout the State from here. This can really raise our school's prestige in the eyes of both the student and adult world. I feel that we, as students, should back this campaign and continue spurring it on to the hilt.

JUNE HUNT.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the rising tide of support for the 18-year-old vote, I also ask to be printed an editorial in the December 23, 1963, issue of the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch:

#### IF THEY'RE OLD ENOUGH TO FIGHT, THEY'RE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE

With the recommendation of a Presidential Commission that 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote in all States, we are heartily in accord and have previously said so on several occasions.

There are no really valid arguments against this needed reform in State and National election laws. Such arguments as there are do not amount to much alongside the blunt fact that an 18-year-old can be inducted into the armed services and required to fight for his country.

A nation which—in 48 of the 50 States—disfranchises its unformed fighting men until they attain the age of 21 is following a policy that is both illogical and embittering. Young people cannot understand why such a paradoxical system exists. It is indefensible.

The Commission did not, however, base its recommendation for voting age on military service age. The members expressed the belief that the lower voting age would stimulate the interest of young people in politics and government and raise voter participation in the age group from 21 to 30.

By the time these young people reach 21, the Commission said, they are "so far removed from the stimulation of the education process that their interest in public affairs has waned."

Only two States—Kentucky and Georgia—currently extend the vote to 18-year-olds. Pending a more extensive study of voting trends in the last Kentucky statewide election, State officials are reasonably certain that young voters went to the polls in encouragingly large numbers.

As we pointed out here recently in urging West Virginia's Legislature to submit the question of a lower voting age to the people, our Constitution does not specify 21 as the legal voting age. It simply says that "no person who is a minor" shall vote—and by common law that term is used to describe a person who is not yet 21.

The Presidential Commission made several other recommendations, including abolition of the poll tax and abolition of all literacy

tests—but not on the grounds that they are being abused. The Commission conceded the abuses, but said that "no American should be denied the right to vote because his formal education is limited."

This would imply that literacy tests—in those States which have them and enforce them—are being used to deny the vote to people who can at least read and write.

The dictionary definition of illiteracy is the inability to read and write, and if this is the only test being used to establish literacy, there are excellent reasons why it is justifiable. It seems doubtful that a voter in this day and age can inform himself intelligently on the qualifications of candidates—or even on their availability—if he cannot read.

Again, West Virginia's constitution is silent on this matter of literacy. It does deny the vote to paupers, but the stricture is seldom invoked.

In several other recommendations the Commission seeks to "make voting easier" by simplifying registration practices and residential requirements. By and large, these proposals would be ineffective, even if there were any prospect that the States could agree on standards for registrations and residences.

Making it easier to vote does not necessarily increase the desire to vote. It does not expand the citizen's sense of obligation to go to the polls and participate in the affairs of government.

Until we find the stimulants which will awaken voters to their responsibilities as well as their privileges, the American record of nonvoting will continue to be one of shameful indifference toward a heritage which was so dearly acquired and which was once so proudly preserved.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST MONTH

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as the flags of the Nation go up to the top of the mast, we pause on this eve of Christmas to express the firm confidence of the people of America in our President.

One of the crowning achievements of President Lyndon B. Johnson is that he has so keenly sensed the mood of the American people. Millions of Americans walked with him, stunned with grief, on that Sunday afternoon in late November when he strode up to place the wreath by the casket of our martyred President. We were proud of the warmth and dignity with which President and Mrs. Johnson greeted the great heads of state who had come from all corners of the earth to pay their last homage to our fallen leader.

President Johnson expressed the personal emptiness which each of us felt at the loss of President Kennedy, because he felt it so deeply himself. Yet he also sensed that out of this tragedy, tears had washed away some of the malice and hate and laid bare the Nation's conscience. Just as President Kennedy had articulated the burning desire of the people for a fresh idealism in programs like the Peace Corps, now President Johnson successfully lifted the Nation from its despair and gave voice to its determination to move forward toward higher goals.

In his first hundred days in 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt electrified

the Nation with his program which rescued the ship of state from the slough of despond. Nothing comparable to that happened until the man who so much admires F.D.R. took the helm a month ago.

As the President and his gracious First Lady are winging their way homeward for Christmas, our hopes and our prayers go with them. They have forged a new unity and strength of spirit in the American people. In President Johnson's first month in office he has displayed that touch of greatness which gives new meaning to the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of December 22, 1963:

#### THE FIRST MONTH

This day, by the calendar, marks the first month of the Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson; but the calendar is inadequate to measure days so packed with events. It must seem an epoch or an era to the man who assumed great office in the wake of great tragedy just 31 days ago.

Such was the dreadful impact of the events of November 22 that much that happened thereafter is seen as though dimly remembered from a distant dream. But what happened after November 22 also will have its place in history. These events are at once a tribute to the man who became President and to the country of which he became President.

President Johnson took up the burdens of great office with confidence and assurance and he has met the challenge of the crisis without false step or faltering. It has been a flawless performance. The Government plainly is in the hands of a professional politician whose virtuosity, if it continues, promises to make that sometime pejorative term more synonymous with statesman.

The great Federal Establishment has moved on with the business of state without a single disorder or convulsion, steady in the wake of calamity, to all the demands that crisis has made upon it. Those in the most sensitive governmental posts contributed to the uninterrupted and ongoing conduct of affairs by continuing in office at the invitation of a President who instantly sensed the especial contribution they could make to governmental stability.

The new President skillfully met the challenges of transition; and so did the Federal organization and the country governed by it. In these 4 eventful weeks surely the world has had a revealing glimpse of our institutions and of our people, operating in the midst of great emergency. If doubts there were, the glimpse must have been reassuring.

A people, shattered, stunned and dismayed by the assassination of a President who was greatly loved and admired, have a right to feel proud of themselves, of their governmental institutions and of the new President at their head, as they survey the eventful weeks through which they have just passed.

**NEVER SHUN A CONTROVERSY, LET THE CHIPS FALL WHERE THEY MAY, LET'S BE FORTHRIGHT ON FEDERAL SPENDING, ETC.**

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at

this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in these last trying days we have been concerned in this body with one of the more controversial categories of Federal spending—the foreign aid program. In the course of this debate I have received many letters from my constituents asking, not only how I stand on foreign aid, which I support, but how I stand on public spending in general.

Mr. Speaker, this is always an exciting challenge, for like all Members I am anxious to make my views eminently clear on every question that comes up.

Now, in regard to Federal spending, I find in some parts of my State a clear consensus that we should have lower taxes but more defense, fewer Federal aid programs but more Federal money spent in Arizona, less bureaucracy but more jobs for deserving constituents. I am not at all sure that my State is unique in this respect.

In recent days I received a letter from one constituent asking my views on Federal spending, and I drafted a reply. I was about to mail it when I decided to give the matter just a little further thought. However, I put so much work into the letter that I thought it might be of some value to those of my colleagues who find themselves similarly hard pressed on the Federal spending issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert my unmailed constituent reply at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR FRIEND: You have expressed alarm at the rate of Federal spending, and asked me as your Congressman where I stand. I had not intended to discuss this controversial question at this particular time. However, I want you to know that I do not shun a controversy. On the contrary I will take a stand on any issue at any time no matter how fraught with controversy it may be. Here is exactly how I stand.

If, when you say "Federal spending" you mean the billions of dollars wasted on out-moded naval shipyards and surplus airbases in Georgia, Texas, and New York; if you mean the billions of dollars lavished at Cape Kennedy and Houston on a "moondoggle" our Nation cannot afford; if, sir, you mean the \$2 billion wasted each year in wheat and corn price supports which rob midwestern farmers of their freedoms and saddle taxpayers with outrageous costs of storage in already bulging warehouses; if you mean the \$4 billion spent every year to operate veterans hospitals in other States in order to provide 20 million able-bodied veterans with care for civilian illness; if you mean such socialistic and pork-barrel projects as urban renewal, public housing, and TVA which cynically seek votes while robbing our taxpayers and weakening the moral fiber of millions of citizens in our Eastern States; if you mean the bloated Federal aid to education schemes calculated to press Federal educational controls down upon every student in this Nation; if you mean the \$2 billion misused annually by our Public Health Service and National Institutes of Health on activities designed to prostitute the medical profession and foist socialized

medicine on every American; if, sir, you mean all these ill-advised, unnecessary Federal activities which have destroyed States rights, created a vast, ever-growing, empire-building bureaucracy regimenting a once-free people by the illusory bait of cradle-to-grave security, and which indeed have taken us so far down the road to socialism that it may be, even at this hour, too late to retreat—then I am unyielding, bitter, and four square in my opposition, regardless of the personal or political consequences.

But, on the other hand, if when you say "Federal spending" you mean those funds which maintain Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Fort Huachuca, and other Arizona defense installations so vital to our Nation's security, and which every year pour hundreds of millions of dollars into our State's economy; if you mean the Truman-Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson mutual security program which bolsters our allies along the periphery of the Iron Curtain enabling them to resist the diabolical onslaught of a godless communism and maintain their independence; if you mean those funds to send our brave astronauts voyaging, even as Columbus, into the unknown, in order to guarantee that no aggressor will ever threaten these great United States by nuclear blackmail from outer space; if you mean those sound farm programs which insure our hardy Arizona cotton farmers a fair price for their fiber, protect the sanctity of the family farm, insure reasonable prices for consumers, and put to work for all the people of the world the miracle of American agricultural abundance; if you mean those VA programs which pay pensions to our brave soldiers crippled in mortal combat and discharge our debt of honor to their widows and orphans and which provide employment for thousands of Arizonans in our fine VA hospitals in Tucson, Phoenix, and Prescott; if, sir, you refer to such Federal programs as the central Arizona reclamation project which will, while repaying 95 percent of its cost with interest, provide our resourceful people with water to insure the growth and prosperity of our State; if you mean the Federal educational funds which build desperately needed college classrooms and dormitories for our local universities, provide little children in our Arizona schools with hot lunches (often their only decent meal of the day), furnish vocational training for our high school youth, and pay \$10 million in impact funds to relieve the hard-pressed Arizona school property taxpayers from the impossible demands created by the presence of large Federal installations; if you mean the Federal medical and health programs which have eradicated the curse of malaria, smallpox, scarlet fever, and polio from our country and which even now enable dedicated teams of scientists to close in mercilessly on man's age-old enemies of cancer, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental retardation that afflict our little children, senior citizens, and men and women in the prime years of life; if you mean all these Federal activities by which a free people in the spirit of Jefferson, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, and F.D.R., through a fair and progressive income tax, preserve domestic tranquillity and promote the general welfare while preserving all our cherished freedoms and our self-reliant national character, then I shall support them with all the vigor at my command.

This is my stand and I will not compromise.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,  
Member of Congress.

#### OUR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE U.N. VOLUNTARY PROGRAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the Foreign Assistance Act Congress has reduced the U.S. support for the U.N. voluntary programs. In an attempt to restore House cuts in the U.N. allocation I submitted an amendment restoring the full amount to these programs on Monday, December 16, the day the House passed the aid appropriations bill.

In the course of debate on the amendment, several points were raised criticizing our efforts under the U.N. Time did not allow extensive rebuttal, so I wish now to submit my replies to what I consider to be the 10 most salient arguments against our contributions for the U.N. voluntary programs.

I have listed the criticisms point by point and my reply follows each specific charge:

1. Increasing U.S. bilateral technical assistance aid doesn't warrant increasing the U.S. dollar contributions for U.N. technical assistance aid.

Comment: The needs of the less developed countries for assistance in improving their techniques of production, for building up their educational systems, for training of officials to provide essential governmental services, and for preparing sound and well-based plans for economic development far exceed the technical assistance now being provided by the United States on a bilateral basis, by the U.N. agencies, and by other bilateral programs.

The U.N. programs, with major support from the United States, complement the U.S. bilateral programs by tapping the substantial pool of technical and linguistic skills and familiarity with the less developed areas which are available in other developed countries such as those of Western Europe. The multilateral programs also permit the sharing of developmental experience of the underdeveloped countries with each other, through the exchange of experts and students.

The Clay Committee noted other advantages. "A multilateral organization, having no political or commercial interests of its own to serve, is able to concentrate on obtaining the greatest possible return, in terms of economic and social development, for each dollar of aid funds invested. It is also better able to limit its assistance to projects which are soundly conceived and executed and to condition the financing of such projects under appropriate economic performance by the recipient country. Moreover, conditions imposed by an international cooperative organizations are not so susceptible to the charge that they infringe on the sovereignty of the recipient country; even if they offend national sensitivities, they do less damage to the fragile fabric of comity among nations than when such resentment is directed against a single country."

Finally, it should be noted that the U.S. pledge to match contributions of other governments to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance and Special Fund at a 40-60 ratio, has been an important factor

in the steady increase of financial support by other countries.

2. The Clay Committee recommended 32 percent contributions instead of the present 40 percent for U.N. voluntary programs.

Comment: The executive branch keeps under continuing review the rate of U.S. voluntary contributions to international programs, with the objective of assuring that the programs are carried forward at the minimum level consistent with U.S. national interests and at the minimum cost to the United States.

Over the past several years the United States has urged, where appropriate, the incorporation of voluntary programs into the regular assessed budgets of international organizations, and have achieved this with respect to the NATO science program and the World Health Organization's program for malaria eradication. This incorporation has meant that the U.S. contribution to the former program, initially at 50 percent, was reduced to 25 percent and that the U.S. contribution to malaria eradication was reduced from virtually 100 percent to less than 32 percent.

In recent years the U.S. contributions to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance, the U.N. Special Fund, and the world food program have been a level of 40 percent. Our contribution to the U.N. Children's Fund has been higher, but is proposed at 40 percent in 1964. This is, in the opinion of the executive branch, an appropriate level, as it is a fair proportion taking into consideration the relative per capita income of the contributing countries; it exerts pressures on other donor governments who we believe are able to contribute more; and it is considered an appropriate proportion for the United States to contribute as the leader of the development efforts of the free world.

There is another type of U.N. program, primarily of a peacekeeping nature, such as the U.N. military operation in the Congo and the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East, toward which the United States has in the past contributed up to 48 percent. Our national security interests were of course significantly involved. The United States recently undertook an initiative at the United Nations to develop a better system of financing these activities. The formula for 1964 worked out at the U.N. brings down the U.S. contribution to about 37 percent on the basis of combined assessed and voluntary contributions.

The UNRWA program on relief to Palestine refugees is one which again relates directly to U.S. security interests and it would be difficult to reduce our percentage share of support below our current 70 percent without affecting many of our vital interests in this sensitive area of the Middle East. We are, nevertheless, seeking to reduce the dollar outflow to this program through a number of devices, and we have achieved a remarkable degree of success in this direction through the use of Public Law 480 foodstuffs, U.S.-owned local currencies, etc.

3. State Department asked for reduced funds—from \$136 million down to \$127 million.

Comment: In late September, after the formal hearings on the foreign aid appropriation bill before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, consulted informally with the chairman of the subcommittee. At that time, the Secretary stated that the estimate made in the fall of 1962 of the U.S. contribution to the Indus Waters Development Fund during fiscal year 1964 appeared too high. Indications from the managers of the fund sug-

gested that their call would be roughly \$9 million less than the earlier estimate.

On the other hand, the Secretary indicated that negotiations at U.N. headquarters on the financing formula for U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo suggested a new requirement of approximately \$3.8 million as a voluntary contribution for the latter half of 1963 and the first half of 1964. These changes taken together suggested a reduction to \$127,090,000 of the amount required for contributions to international organizations in fiscal year 1964.

In November 1963, the annual pledging sessions for the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and Special Fund for

1964 were held at U.N. headquarters. The pledges made by other governments were substantially higher than the U.S. estimate made a year ago. On the 40-percent matching formula, the U.S. contribution to the two U.N. programs would be higher than the \$55 million contained in the original fiscal year 1964 estimate.

In his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, on December 12, the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs formally stated that the estimate for voluntary contributions to international organizations had been reduced from \$136,050,000 to \$130,903,000. The original estimate as compared with the revision follows:

*Voluntary contributions to international organizations*

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year 1964 program	Presentation volume	Current request	Change
1. UNTA and Special Fund.....	55,000	59,000	+4,000
2. U.N. economic assistance to the Congo.....	5,000	5,000	-----
3. U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.....	17,200	17,200	-----
4. U.N. Children's Fund.....	12,000	12,000	-----
5. U.N.-FAO world food program.....	2,000	2,000	-----
6. IAEA operational program.....	1,250	1,250	-----
7. WHO medical research.....	.500	.500	-----
8. Indus Waters.....	43,100	30,300	-12,800
9. U.N. peacekeeping.....	-----	3,653	+3,653
UNOC.....	-----	(2,473)	-----
UNEF.....	-----	(1,180)	-----
	136,050	130,903	-5,147

4. The President may transfer money out of the contingency fund into other funds of the U.N.

5. The committee took out the provision limiting the transfer of funds by the President to \$10 million. Therefore, the President can fund U.N. programs completely if he desires.

Comment: The applicable legislation (sec. 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) provides that the contingency fund may be used in accordance with other provisions in the act governing economic assistance, when the President "determines such use to be important to the national interest."

The use of contingency funds to supplement the funds appropriated for voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs will therefore require a determination by the President.

6. There is "fat" in the U.N. appropriations that can be eliminated.

Comment: In order to seek congressional approval of the level of U.S. voluntary contributions to international organizations, the executive branch submits its proposals in advance of pledges to the organizations. As the U.S. pledges are normally made a percentage of total contributions, the executive branch must estimate the contributions which will be forthcoming at a future date.

In some years, the executive branch has underestimated the amount of funds required in a given fiscal year to meet proposed pledges. Such shortfalls have been met by transfers within the foreign assistance funds or by appropriation in a following year. In other years, the executive branch has overestimated the amounts which will be drawn down by other contributions. Only in this sense is there "fat" in the request for fiscal year 1964. If the funds requested prove to be in excess of the amount needed, they will not of course be obligated.

7. The World Health Organization sent two boatloads of jeeps to Cuba, and Cuba and other Communist countries are being assisted by U.S. contributions to the U.N.

Comment: The reference to 2 boatloads of jeeps may relate to the voluntary contribution by the U.S.S.R. of 19 jeeps and 16 trucks to the World Health Organization in 1961, which were shipped to Cuba for use in the malaria eradication campaign.

The campaign in Cuba is part of a worldwide effort, undertaken by both the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), and the World Health Organization (WHO), pursuant to resolutions of the governing bodies of both organizations in 1954 and 1955, respectively, which complements U.S. extensive bilateral activities in this field.

The United States has strongly supported the campaign for the eradication of malaria and has been the chief contributor to the malaria eradication special accounts of the WHO and PAHO since their establishment. The U.S. Congress, in making provision for such contributions has declared it to be our policy to assist other governments in eradicating the scourge of malaria in order to raise the economic and social conditions of the people of these countries.

All countries in the Americas having malaria have participated in and benefited from this program, including Cuba, which first requested assistance from PAHO in 1957. An agreement was signed between the Cuban Government and PAHO in 1959 and technical assistance has been rendered the Cuban Government since that date. This assistance has taken the form of assignment of malaria consultants, and supplies and equipment as in the case of other countries engaged in the campaign. For the current year, all such assistance to Cuba is financed by WHO from its regular budget. WHO is providing the salaries and allowance of one medical officer, one sanitary engineer, one entomologist, and two sanitarians, estimated to cost \$83,375, and \$10,000, is being expended for supplies and equipment, and \$4,300 for fellowships. Estimates of the Cuban Government contribution for this activity in 1963 are approximately \$1 million.

The malaria program in Cuba has now entered the major operational stage of DDT

spraying of houses. Spraying was initiated in January 1962 and a first cycle was completed in one portion of the country in June. The program of spraying is planned for continuation throughout the current year. Nonetheless, the incidence of malaria in Cuba has been on the increase and has risen from 1,600 cases in 1960 to 3,000 plus in 1962.

There has been a heavy breakdown in both automotive and spraying equipment and the absence of spare parts for replacement has impeded the progress of the program. Since the importation of the 35 Russian vehicles donated to the WHO by the Soviet Union, no new vehicles have been made available to the Cuban Government by WHO.

It should be noted that as long as malaria is present in Cuba there is a risk of reinfestation of neighboring countries including the United States, from which malaria has been eradicated. Continuation of WHO assistance to Cuba under its regular program is therefore considered desirable.

With respect to the statement that Cuba and other Communist countries are being assisted by U.S. contributions to the U.N., it is pertinent to note that Communist countries contribute considerably more to the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund than they receive from these programs in project assistance. In the years 1950-63, the Communist countries contributed \$20.4 million to the expanded program and received \$10.1 million in assistance. From the inauguration of the Special Fund in 1959 to June 1963, the Communist countries gave \$8.2 million and received Special Fund projects totaling \$5.6 million.

In other words, Communist contributions to the two programs, in addition to financing U.N. Technical Assistance projects in Communist countries, also contributes to the financing of \$13.5 million worth of projects in non-Communist countries.

8. UNICEF is more than adequately supported. It recently had enough reserve funds to provide a \$10 million loan to finance the operating expenses of the U.N.

Comment: Normally, payment of U.S. funds pursuant to voluntary pledges made to international organizations are made at periodic intervals after notification by the respective Secretariats that matching contributions have been received from other governments. This procedure has been adopted as a matter of administrative policy.

In the spring of 1961 the U.N. was facing a major deficit in the financing of the U.N. military operations in the Congo. While the operation was authorized in July 1960, first assessments were not actually voted until December 1960. Payments by governments in response to the peacekeeping assessment were not, of course, immediately forthcoming.

In May, the United States made a payment of \$10 million as part of its contribution of \$12 million appropriated by the Congress and pledged to UNICEF for the latter's 1961 program. While UNICEF had not received sufficient matching contributions in May to draw down the entire \$10 million, it should be noted that contributors to UNICEF had in the past faithfully fulfilled their pledges to that program. As authorized by the U.N. financial regulations the Secretary-General then borrowed the \$10 million to help pay urgent bills; the \$10 million was repaid to UNICEF on December 27, 1961.

In 1961 and earlier years, UNICEF pursued a policy of setting aside sufficient funds to carry projects through to completion, even though they might be planned to run for several years. Therefore the temporary unavailability of the \$10 million did not disrupt ongoing projects. And since UNICEF could plan on the basis of a later return

of the \$10 million, it continued during 1961 to develop new projects.

9. The U.N. TAP and Special Fund are funded for \$55 million this year and they also receive aid from other accounts, some of which will go to Cuba.

Comment: As noted in the comment on point 7 above, the ratio of input into the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund as compared with output is running substantially in favor of the free world and against the Communist bloc. Over 98 percent of U.N. projects go to countries on our side of the Iron Curtain.

This result has not been achieved by the introduction of political considerations into the distribution of U.N. funds, but on the basis of technical and economic criteria applied by the U.N. secretariats. This non-political character of U.N. programs has made it possible to have projects approved for Nationalist China over the objections of the Soviet Union and of a project in Israel over the objections of an Arab country.

The United States has consistently advocated and supported the position that decisions on U.N. programs and projects for development of the less-developed countries be made objectively on economic and technical grounds. An about-face by the United States could encourage other countries to

attach similar political strings to their contributions, thus transforming the U.N. assistance programs into a complicated set of bilateral aid channels designed to reap political advantage for one side or the other in the cold war. It should be noted that after a review of the U.N. technical cooperation programs, an advisory committee on eminent American citizens recently recommended "that the cold war can and should be kept out of the technical cooperation operations of the U.N."

10. It is impossible to audit the U.N. voluntary programs nor can there be any American control over use of these funds even though we pay the major share.

Comment: The accounts and other financial records of the United Nations are audited annually by a Board of Auditors, presently consisting of the Auditors General of Colombia, the Netherlands, and Pakistan. These professional auditors are assisted by a staff. Their reports are distributed to all member governments and are reviewed by a committee of the General Assembly.

Since the U.N. voluntary programs are carried out by international organizations, it is obvious that no one country can impose unilateral control over the use of funds contributed from many sources. However, the United States is a member of the governing board of each of these programs and,

as a major contributor, can and does exert much influence over decisions on the use of program funds.

**GOLD OUTFLOW AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we debated the appropriation for foreign aid. The House had previously authorized a figure of approximately \$3.6 billion after the adoption of the conference report. The Appropriations Committee, in making a case for a drastic reduction in the appropriation below the amount authorized, advanced as one of the key arguments the problem of gold flow to foreign aid recipients.

The committee presented the following table, showing sales of gold to 52 countries which were foreign aid recipients:

*Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients*

[In millions of dollars—Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]

Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1— June 30, 1963	Total	Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1— June 30, 1963	Total
Austria	-84.2	-82.7	-1.1		-142.5	-50.0	-360.5	Israel		-4.4			-10.0		-14.4
Belgium	-329.4	-38.5	-140.9	-144.4	-63.0		-716.2	Italy	-348.8			+100.0			-248.8
Burma			-3.8		-20.9		-24.7	Ivory Coast					-1.5		-1.5
Cambodia			-12.0	-3.1	-1.7	-2.3	-19.1	Japan	-30.1	-157.4	-15.2				-202.7
Cameroon								Korea		-1.6					-1.6
Republic						-1.9	-1.9	Laos				-1.9			-1.9
Central African								Lebanon				-21.0	-32.1		-53.1
Republic						-7	-7	Mexico		-30.0	-20.0				-50.0
Ceylon		-7.5					-7.5	Morocco			-21.0				-21.0
Chad						-7	-7	Netherlands	-260.9	-20.9	-249.4	-24.9			-565.1
Chile	+3.0	-1.3	-2.0	-6.6	-2.3		-6.9	Niger							-8
Costa Rica					-5		-2.8	Nigeria					-20.0		-20.0
Cyprus				-2.0			-2.0	Pakistan			-12.5				-12.5
Dahomey						-8	-8	Peru			-15.0	-5.0	-6		-20.6
Denmark	-17.0	-15.0	-15.0	-35.0	+15.0		-67.0	Portugal	-20.0	-10.0					-30.0
Dominican								Saudi Arabia			-11.3	-47.5	-12.6		-71.4
Republic				-3.0			-3.0	Senegal						-1.7	-1.7
Ecuador					-3.2	-2.3	-5.5	Somalia					-1.9		-1.9
Egypt			-7.5	-7.8	-1.2	-9	-17.4	Spain	+31.7		-113.7	-156.2	-146.1	-130.0	-514.3
Country A		-4.7	-3.0				-7.7	Surinam	-2.5		-2.5		+2.5		-2.5
France	-205.7	-173.0			-459.1	-202.6	-1,100.4	Syria			-2.1		-1.3		-3.6
Gabon						-7	-7	Tunisia			-5		-5		-1.5
Germany (West)			-33.8	-22.5			-56.3	Turkey			-6.1	-2.5	-1.1	+6.0	-3.7
Ghana			-5.6				-5.6	United Kingdom	-900.0	-350.0	-550.0	-305.7	-387.0	+124.5	-2,368.2
Greece		-15.0	-47.0	-10.2	-19.1		-91.3	Upper Volta							-8
Honduras			-8				-8	Yugoslavia		-1.5	-15.9		-1.5		-8
Indonesia		-11.0	-24.9				-35.9								-19.7
Iran	-2.3		-4	-16.1		-5.9	-24.7								
Iraq			-29.8				-29.8								
								Net sales of gold	-1,960.5	-1,026.2	-1,535.8	-737.7	-1,289.9	-273.1	-6,823.2

Utilizing the table, the committee report went on to reach this conclusion:

While there may be good and valid reasons why foreign nations have been able to purchase our gold, in the opinion of the committee one of the primary reasons is that the United States, through the foreign aid program for the same period of January 1, 1958, to June 30, 1963, extended \$11,947,400,000 in economic and military assistance to these same 52 foreign nations. This financial assistance by the United States in turn released the revenues of these 52 nations to be used in any way they saw fit and obviously one of the ways was to buy \$6.3 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

It is regrettable that the decision of the House in reducing the appropriation

reflected this conclusion because it is erroneous and misleading.

A closer examination of the figures will demonstrate that it is not true that the "financial assistance by the United States released the revenues of these 52 nations to buy \$6.3 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury."

Twelve of the countries, listed on the following charts, accounted for \$6.3 billion of the total gold purchases.

The amount of military and economic assistance which these 12 countries received is shown on the chart. Note that the total economic assistance for the 12 countries aggregated only \$253.8 million. The total military assistance, delivered

very largely in the form of weapons and materials from this country's stock and not in cash, aggregated \$3.09 billion.

The largest purchaser of gold, the United Kingdom, purchased \$2.3 billion during this period, received no economic assistance and only a modest amount of military assistance. In the case of France, the second largest purchaser, which obtained \$1.1 billion gold, the economic assistance amounted to \$200,000 during the period, and the military assistance was modest. In the case of the third largest gold purchaser, Belgium, there was no economic assistance and a small amount of military assistance.

Gold outflow and foreign assistance to 12 major purchasers of U.S. gold, 1958-63

[In millions of dollars]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	Total		1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	Total
Austria:								Japan—Continued							
Gold outflow.....	-84.2	-83.0	-1.0		-142.0	-50.0	-360.0	Military assistance...	130.9	146.9	85.8	66.9	74.0	49.1	553.6
Economic assistance.....	-.1	.1	0	0	0	0	.2	Lebanon:							
Military assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Gold outflow.....				-21.0	-32.1		-53.1
Belgium:								Economic assistance.....	2.5	19.1	1.3		.5	0	23.4
Gold outflow.....	-329.4	-38.5	-140.9	-144.4	-63.0		-716.2	Military assistance.....	1.3	3.6	.2	.9	.2	.2	6.4
Economic assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Netherlands:							
Military assistance.....	66.0	13.3	22.4	9.8	18.8	28.1	158.4	Gold outflow.....	-260.9	-29.9	-249.4	-24.9			-565.1
Denmark:								Economic assistance.....	3.0	0	0	0	0	0	3.0
Gold outflow.....	-17.0	-15.0	-15.0	-35.0	+15.0	-8.0	-67.0	Military assistance.....	72.5	22.8	49.9	30.5	14.7	16.3	206.3
Economic assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Portugal:							
Military assistance.....	23.6	27.2	36.5	33.4	15.0	24.0	159.7	Gold outflow.....	-20.0	-10.0					-30.0
France:								Economic assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gold outflow.....		-265.7	-173.0		-459.1	-202.6	-1,100.4	Military assistance.....	18.9	16.7	10.1	3.4	5.0	11.2	65.3
Economic assistance.....	.1	.1	0	0	0	0	.2	Spain:							
Military assistance.....	133.8	110.5	74.3	25.9	40.9	30.5	395.9	Gold outflow.....	+31.7		-113.7	-156.2	-146.1	-130.0	-514.3
West Germany:								Economic assistance.....	55.1	74.9	49.0	25.2	14.5	0	218.7
Gold outflow.....			-33.8	-22.5			-56.3	Military assistance.....	48.2	51.6	60.7	51.8	20.7	31.8	264.8
Economic assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	United Kingdom:							
Military assistance.....	165.7	49.6	134.4	16.0	1.5	.3	367.5	Gold outflow.....	-900.0	-350.0	-550.0	-305.7	-387.0	+124.5	-2,368.2
Italy:								Economic assistance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gold outflow.....	-348.8			+100.0			-248.8	Military assistance.....	22.6	133.8	116.5	14.0	27.5	11.2	325.6
Economic assistance.....	.3	.3	0	0	0	0	.6	Total gold outflow (12 countries).....							6,300.0
Military assistance.....	102.5	96.6	105.6	135.0	83.7	72.4	595.8	Total economic assistance (12 countries).....							253.8
Japan:								Total military assistance (12 countries).....							3,099.3
Gold outflow.....	-30.1	-157.4	-15.2				-202.7								
Economic assistance.....	2.5	2.5	1.7	.9	.1	0	7.7								

A further figure which confirms the point that gold-purchasing nations are not aid recipients is demonstrated by the transactions for 1962. In that year, only eight nations receiving economic aid had gold transactions with the United States and from these transactions there was a net gold inflow into the United States of \$123.6 million in 1962. The countries that did not receive aid accounted for a net gold outflow of \$833 million.

I hope that when the question of foreign aid comes up again in the House, we may take the occasion to recognize the facts about foreign aid and the great contribution which it makes to our foreign policy and to the preservation of the free world.

After all, it is foreign aid which gives foreign policy, and the President in conducting it, his leverage in dealing with many situations. Our great military strength, on which the peace of the world and freedom depend, is a basic background for our policy. The active component of it depends upon the availability of military and economic aid.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on November 19 the House considered a public works appropriation bill, H.R. 9140. Being home and ill, I was not recorded as voting on the measure on final passage. Had I been present for roll No. 207, I would have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, further, on Saturday, December 21, in a continuation of the previous legislative day, the House considered the conference report on foreign

aid appropriations. Earlier in the evening of December 20 and during the recess, I had given my home telephone number to the Democratic cloakroom for the purpose of being notified in the event of any further votes on the preceding matter. I was not notified as to the quorum call or either of the two rollcalls and did not learn that I had missed these proceedings until later the following morning.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present on roll No. 251, relating to the rule on the foreign aid conference report, I would have voted in the affirmative, and on roll No. 252, relating to recommitting the conference report on H.R. 9499, I would have voted in the negative.

STARVING ILLITERATES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in three instances and include some editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written today about the severe economic plight of the Appalachian region of the United States. Certainly, there are parts of the large region which are suffering great problems resulting from the loss of industries and the closing of mines that once supported thriving economies. However, the picture of hopeless gloom that is being broadly painted of this whole area is a distortion of fact which is a disservice to the proud people in many Appalachian counties who have done much to develop their many resources and improve the conditions under which they live.

I have spent a good part of my life in the mountain countries of the congress-

sional district I have the honor to represent here. I resent, as I know the fine people of these areas do, the allegations that apathy and ignorance abound and that the economic salvation of people without imagination or initiative awaits a kindly handout. It is time that when the rest of the country looks at Appalachia, it sees problems where they exist and the facts of progress where they are so clearly apparent.

The Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte in an editorial of December 19 makes this point well—particularly as it discusses economic development in Watauga County, N.C. I commend the good advice in this excellent editorial to the Congress and those beyond Capitol Hill to whom it is addressed:

STARVING ILLITERATES

If we know the southern mountain people, the members of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission are going to find themselves extremely unpopular if they don't tone down their more lurid statements. And when you get unpopular with Carolina mountain people, you might as well have leprosy.

One member said the commission had to deal with what he called tragic starvation in the mountains.

A northern newspaper correspondent attending a meeting at Asheville twisted Governor Sanford's statement on the North Carolina fund so that it seemed to represent typical rather than exceptional conditions. He said the fund aims to "break the listless dependency of thousands of mountain families on relief handouts."

There certainly are depressed areas in the Appalachian region. They need help and need it badly. To deny this would be to turn one's back on reality, but statements such as those we have just quoted give the impression that the whole mountain region is one vast poorhouse of starving illiterates.

The northern correspondent described Watauga County as an example of extreme poverty and unemployment, where 60 percent of the boys drop out of school before reaching the eighth grade.

We have been all over Watauga County and have seen some pockets of depression. But to describe them as typical of the whole county betrays either ignorance or dishonest journalism.

We'd like to take this correspondent to Boone, as modern a small town as we know of. We'd show him Appalachian State College, give him a room in one of the excellent motels, and feed him a mountain dinner he would never forget. We'd take him to the Daniel Boone Amphitheater, which the people of the town built with their own resources for one of the country's finest outdoor historical dramas, "Horn in the West." He should see the new industrial plants employing hundreds of people. He should also see Blowing Rock with its State park and its Cone Museum of mountain artifacts and crafts.

"Well," he would say, "there are sophisticated towns. How about the back country?"

All right. Go over to Cove Creek and see some "starving illiterates" attending one of the finest school plants in the State. Keep going to Avery County, also on the backward list, and have a look at Lees-McRae College and its fine hospital. Drop down to Yancey County, another on the list, and have a look at Burnsville's community theater and art center. And there a dinner of plain mountain food at Nu-Wray Inn will revise some ideas about starving mountain people.

We don't object to helping those who need help. We are all for it. But we do wish that these people with the missionary urge would watch their language. If they don't, they've got a lot to learn, and the Carolina mountain people are just the ones who can teach them.

#### HOUSE PROCEDURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, December 15, 1963, raises a question of why I have not stated whether I had signed the petition which seeks to discharge the Rules Committee from considering a rule under which the civil rights bill would be debated on the floor of the House.

Actually, as any enterprising reporter could find out, my position in this matter is rather well known, particularly among my colleagues. I am opposed to discharge petitions except as a measure of last resort and then only under very strict guidelines. I have signed only one discharge petition since I have been in Congress. It was to discharge the District of Columbia Committee from further considering legislation for home rule for the District of Columbia. I pointed out to the sponsors, who asked me to assist them, that before such a discharge petition would lie, a case had to be made against the District of Columbia Committee of misfeasance and/or nonfeasance in considering the matter. It became quite apparent in our discussion that the sponsors had not done their homework. However, I told them I was interested enough in both the subject matter and the procedure so that I would

undertake to do the necessary homework. And, if objective research revealed that a case could be made, I would take the floor of the House to make the case, but only after notifying the members of the District of Columbia Committee of my intentions and the general nature of the charges.

I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make a study of the actions and inactions of the District of Columbia Committee over a period of the past few years in respect to the issue of home rule. This study took several months and revealed what I thought was a serious violation of responsibility on the part of the District of Columbia Committee. Accordingly, I notified the members of the District of Columbia Committee that I would take the floor of the House on a certain day to air these charges and to give the chairman and the members of the District of Columbia Committee the opportunity to reply. The day came. I took the floor: The chairman and several members of the District of Columbia Committee made a point of being present and, as I rose to speak, to march out of the House Chamber in protest. I set forth the charges. They remained unanswered. I felt a case had been made against this committee and, accordingly, I signed the discharge petition—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 9, pages 10774-10779.

To my amazement, the sponsors of the legislation seemed unimpressed with this procedure and the reporting media gave it only a passing comment. This is the last I have heard of a petition to discharge the District of Columbia Committee on the subject of home rule. Did the sponsors want legislation or simply an issue?

There has been no effort on the part of the sponsors of the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from considering a rule for the civil rights bill to charge the Rules Committee with either misfeasance or nonfeasance in handling this matter. Quite the contrary; the discharge petition was conceived before the Rules Committee had any opportunity to act one way or the other and was filed just as soon as the minimum time required, which was accelerated by the unusual procedure of holding a Saturday session, had elapsed. The basis for the discharge petition was not that the Rules Committee had acted improperly—or failed to act—although it was suggested that it would act improperly—but rather the sponsors stated it was to bypass the procedures in order to bring the civil rights bill to the House forthwith.

The fact that there are proper procedures available to bring a measure to the floor forthwith without doing violence to the theory of the discharge petition, which in effect is an accusation of impropriety against a committee has been pushed under the rug. One such procedure is Calendar Wednesday. It should be obvious to any objective observer after the parliamentary maneuvering of the House Democratic leader-

ship to adjourn the House to avoid Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday, December 11, if it was not before, that the arguments that Calendar Wednesday is a cumbersome and ineffective procedure are unfounded. Indeed, this was a strange argument to be advanced by sponsors of a discharge petition which in truth is cumbersome and time consuming. It is clear that the House by majority vote can prevent any committee from abusing Calendar Wednesday by preempting a committee which sincerely wishes to use Calendar Wednesday. Any Member can raise the "question of consideration." The question is privileged and not subject to debate. The majority can vote "nay" on all questions of consideration until the committee which has a bill waiting for floor action is reached in the alphabet.

Congressman BOLLING, after consulting with the Parliamentarian, has now agreed with me that Calendar Wednesday continues until the business before the House is finished and does not terminate in any set number of hours, or days for that matter. The same legislative day continues until by majority vote the House agrees to adjourn. All of us in the House know that no minority group can delay the debate against the will of the majority. Routinely debate is shut off in the House by majority vote. Incidentally, Calendar Wednesday provides the rule which is most frequently employed when the House debates a matter in the Committee of the Whole, the open, or 5-minute rule.

I have been anxious to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, as well as of the general public, the purpose and availability of Calendar Wednesday. Once one understands the Calendar Wednesday procedure, one realizes that a great hoax is being played upon the American people in leading them to believe that the House Rules Committee can successfully thwart the will of the majority of the House in keeping matters voted out of a legislative committee from reaching the floor of the House for orderly debate.

Of course, those who see political advantage to be gained from perpetrating the myth of the power of the Rules Committee have resisted this effort to clarify the House rules. These people come from all shades of political ideology and from both the two major political parties; however, their motives are different. The so-called liberal Democrat has found the mythical power of the Rules Committee a successful target, helpful in perpetrating another myth, the so-called southern Democrat-Republican coalition. The southern Democrat and many Republican conservatives have been willing to play the game because it means that legislation they oppose is kept bottled up. The general run of Congressmen find the myth very advantageous in keeping pressure groups off their backs. The House leadership of both political parties, of course, seeks to keep Calendar Wednesday submerged because it is a major gap in their power to control the legislative process. In other words, the Rules Committee serves

as a very convenient whipping boy for many groups for varied reasons.

There was an interesting Associated Press story appearing on page 3-H of the same Sunday edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as the editorial under comment, discussing the Rules Committee as a "whipping boy" to avoid the embarrassment some Congressmen might experience in voting against the quality stabilization bill. I am placing this article in the RECORD at the end of this statement. If the retail druggists realized that Calendar Wednesday was an effective way of getting the quality stabilization bill on the floor of the House they would immediately direct their lobbyists to pursue this course and this would end this particular shell game which has been going on ever since I have been in the Congress. I might state, incidentally, I am opposed to the quality stabilization bill.

In one sense I think the myth of the Rules Committee serves a very valuable function. It keeps overzealous pressure groups from effectively pressuring their measures to a vote against the better judgment of the majority of the House. However, the damage to the representative process caused by this myth is much greater than this little bit of potential good. The best way to get rid of undue pressure from pressure groups is to make known the merits and demerits of the legislation to the general public. The failure to get the message to the people is the evil to representative government, not the pressure, even if it is what some would call undue pressure. With good reporting from Washington, the Congress would have no fear of being unduly pressured into voting for something its studies and debates revealed was not in the best interests of the country.

All Congressmen are familiar with the main purpose to which the discharge petition has been put in recent years. Many petitions are filed, but few are ever intended to get anywhere. Essentially, they are public relations gimmicks for lobby groups. Discharge petitions have an element of drama about them, just like a community chest drive where the objective is to go over the top. Daily or weekly reporting on how many signatures have been added and how many now are needed serve as the grist for the publicity campaign.

The House, in the past, realizing the explosive aspects of discharge petitions being pushed by zealous lobby groups, placed in the rules one great deterrent. The House rules require that the signatures on a discharge petition be kept confidential. Actually, the number signing the petition is also supposed to be confidential. The lobby groups, of course, have developed many techniques for getting around this rule. One is to get a friendly Congressman to violate the rule and tell them who has signed. Another, and the most effective if it can be done, is to get some reporter or newspaper or other public relations media to utilize its prestige and its power to undertake the chore, by calling all the Congressmen, one by one, and asking them about their own individual action which, of

course, any Congressman is entitled to give out. So, by a process of cumulative inclusion, those not signing are pinpointed.

It became apparent to me that the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, or perhaps individual newspapermen working on the staffs of these newspapers, had undertaken to do this work, which I regard as highly improper, for the group sponsoring the discharge petition on the civil rights bill.

A member of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch left word with my office on Thursday, December 12, that he wanted to talk to me "only 30 seconds" about civil rights. The whole week preceding I had been trying to bring about the utilization of Calendar Wednesday for immediate consideration of the civil rights bill, or to make the Democratic leadership openly confess that they had no intention of bringing about early consideration of this measure.

This had culminated in a most unusual maneuver on the part of the Democratic leadership, supported by the sponsors of the discharge petition, to adjourn the House forthwith. This motion to adjourn was put to a record vote and by this vote the Democratic Party clearly demonstrated that it, or large elements in its ranks which the leaders were powerless to control, had been engaging in an effort to gain an issue rather than legislation in the field of civil rights.

No one from the Washington Bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, or any other newspaper for that matter, called me to find out what this was all about, although it was quite clear from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I was a primary moving force. There was not even a followup by the news media on the press releases I had issued on the subject. No news media reported the ejection of a Republican staff member sent as a representative at the request of Congressman McCULLOCH, the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and other interested Representatives, including myself, to attend the conference called by the sponsors of the discharge petition chaired by Roy Wilkins, the president of the NAACP, on Monday, December 2, at the Mayflower Hotel, although this ejection became the subject of rather heated debate in the conference. In fact, the leaders who decided to sponsor the discharge petition route made it clear in many ways that they did not want any Republican participation in the strategy to be evolved. No Republican had been invited to attend, and it was only by the fairness of some Members of the participating groups we even learned about the conference. It is clear to me that a very narrow and selfish partisan move was afoot.

This strategy on the part of the self-styled liberal Democrats and their allies to keep Republicans out of the civil rights battle lest they gain political credit has been in existence for a number of years. It was revealed this year most vividly by the sparse reporting and comment by the news media and by civil

rights groups on the civil rights bill prepared and introduced by 26 Republicans, including those on the crucial House Judiciary Committee in January this year. This civil rights bill received the approval of the House Republican Policy Committee and the endorsement of the Republican House Leader, CHARLES HALLECK, who appeared at the press conference called at the time the measure was introduced.

Attorney General Kennedy, when he finally testified before the House Judiciary Committee in June, 1963, on civil rights legislation, stated that he was unaware of the Republican proposals.

National columnist and Post-Dispatch reporter, Marquis Childs, wrote a column appearing May 29, 1963, stating in effect that the Republicans Party was one without a policy on civil rights. I wrote to Marquis Childs immediately, calling his attention to the Republican proposals and the statement I made in the House that he and other reporters writing along similar lines could never have written articles with any readership acceptability if the Republican proposals had been adequately reported in the first place. I received a letter from Mr. Childs' secretary stating he was abroad and my letter would be called to his attention upon his return. This is the last I have heard of this matter. I am setting out a copy of my letter to Mr. Childs. The reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the statement to which I refer is on page 9798, May 29, 1963.

To get back to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau call. I thought maybe at last the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was going to do a news story on Calendar Wednesday. Regrettably, I was wrong. The reporter said he was doing a story on which Missouri Congressmen had signed or not signed the discharge petition.

An article did appear subsequently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this subject. This article set forth some, but not all, of what I had said to the reporter on the subject. I not only said that it was against the rules of the House to disclose the names of those who had and who had not signed a discharge petition, but also that it was against the rules of the House for a newspaper to undertake the task of revealing this information by the process of cumulative inclusion. I said I would not be a party to this endeavor. I also said that it appeared to me that he or the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was accommodating the sponsors of the discharge petition and so indulging in what I would call partisan politics.

The reporter said I was attacking his integrity and he thought he should terminate the conversation. I told him my attack was directed to the specific incident and that I was drawing no general conclusions from it, but only the particular conclusion I stated. I, too, felt the conversation should terminate.

An allegation had been made to me previous to this conversation that Congressman BOLLING had been preparing to release all the names on the discharge petition to a New York Times reporter



but was dissuaded from this course by one of his own colleagues. It seemed to me that what Congressman BOLLING was dissuaded from allegedly doing directly, he or someone else was trying to do indirectly with the help of certain newsmen and newspapers. Perhaps a statement by Congressman BOLLING on this allegation and statements by any newsmen or newspaper involved in disclosing the names of those who had signed the discharge petition would resolve this question.

It also has been alleged that various civil rights groups which are sponsoring the political maneuvers of the discharge petition are also working closely with Congressman BOLLING and the so-called Democratic study group of the House to further the efforts of this Democratic liberal group to finance its plans to elect more liberals like themselves in the next Congress.

An interesting article about the plans and aspirations of this liberal group appeared on the front page of the *New York Times*, Thursday, December 12, and a similar article appeared on the front page of the *Sunday*, December 15, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. Nothing is said in these articles about financing, but it would be appropriate to have a public disclosure of who is financing the lobbying activities in behalf of the discharge petition and who is financing the electioneering activities of the Democratic study group.

I find no fault with the endeavors of any political group to be politically effective, but its concept of proper procedures is always a proper subject of consideration. Any group appropriating for itself the label "liberal" should be especially careful about the methods it employs. Certainly, if public debate is to move forward, the news reporters must report the debate objectively. If they should participate in the debate personally the least they can or should do is disclose their participation. Such participation is important news which must be reported if the public is to objectively weigh the arguments pro and con.

The letter and articles follow:

MAY 29, 1963.

MR. MARQUIS CHILDS,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARQUIS: For your information I am enclosing a copy of statements which I made in the House of Representatives on editorial column of yours which appeared in the May 29 issue of the *Washington Post*. As a convenience, I am also enclosing a copy of the statement of Congressman WILLIAM McCULLOCH in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of January 31 to which I make reference in my remarks.

There are a few people in the reporting profession who picked up this Republican effort in the field of civil rights. One of them was Roscoe Drummond, and I am enclosing copies of his column as it appeared in the *Post* and in the *Lima (Ohio) Citizen*. This general subject came up again at the end of February when Mr. McCULLOCH took a special order to point up the differences between the President's civil rights message and the Republican bill. A tear sheet of the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* with this is enclosed as is the report of it in the *Baltimore Sun*. In addition, I am enclosing Congressman

McCULLOCH's statement to the Judiciary Committee at the time this and other civil rights legislation was under study, and I am enclosing my remarks for that hearing.

Finally, I am enclosing an analysis of the bill which I cosponsored with McCULLOCH and other House Republicans.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

[From the *St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch*,  
Dec. 15, 1963]

#### HOUSE PANEL'S DELAY TACTICS CUT BOTH WAYS

WASHINGTON, December 14.—H.R. 3669 is a bill that has nothing at all to do with civil rights, but it is a key to understanding why the House Rules Committee has the power to bottle up the civil rights bill.

Many of the people complaining about the Rules Committee holding up the civil rights bill are overjoyed that the committee is holding up H.R. 3669. The administration, in fact, opposes the bill just as much as it supports the civil rights bill.

H.R. 3669 is the quality stabilization bill and it is designed to allow manufacturers to set prices for their brand goods. Its sponsors say it would help the small businessman, who has been hurt by the competition of large discount houses. Its opponents say it would increase the cost of living and hurt the consumer.

#### PRESSURE ON LAWMAKERS

Many Congressmen are caught in the cross-fire of controversy over the bill.

Representatives of pharmacists and big manufacturers have put pressure on them to vote for the bill. Congressmen do not want to offend potential campaign contributors. At the same time, Congressmen do not want to be known back home as the man who voted for a bill that increased the costs of some goods in the store. Rather than vote "yes" or "no," many Congressmen would rather not vote at all.

That is where the House Rules Committee comes in. In the 86th, 87th, and present 88th Congress, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, the chairman, and other members of the committee have successfully kept the bill from coming to a vote on the floor of the House. Unless the committee gives the bill a rule, which sends it to the floor and sets the limits on debate and amendments, the bill has little chance of coming to a House vote.

#### OK'D BY COMMERCE COMMITTEE

In the 88th Congress, the bill was approved by the House Commerce Committee but never received a rule from the Rules Committee. Supporters tried to release it with a discharge petition just as civil rights supporters are trying to release their bill now. But the bill's supporters never got the required 218 signatures.

In the 87th Congress, the bill was approved by the House Commerce Committee and this time received a rule from the Rules Committee. But the rule was granted in the last few days of the final session, and there wasn't enough time for the House to consider it.

In this year's 1st session of the 88th Congress, the House Commerce Committee approved the bill last July 22 and asked the Rules Committee for a rule.

#### ONE HEARING HELD

On September 25, Representative SMITH called a meeting of the Rules Committee to hear testimony from Representative OREN D. HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Commerce Committee. After an hour of testimony, SMITH vetoed the session to a close and told HARRIS he would schedule another session soon.

SMITH still has not called HARRIS back.

No one is sure that SMITH and the Rules Committee will be successful in holding back the quality stabilization bill. But, at the moment, he and the Rules Committee are standing in the way of the quality stabilization bill and taking the pressure away from the other Members of Congress.

This is the kind of job that the Rules Committee often does on bills that hardly anyone wants, but almost everyone is afraid to vote against.

And this is the reason that although many Congressmen cry out against the Rules Committee for holding up the Civil Rights bill, few of them cry out against the power of the committee to hold up a bill.

[From the *St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch*,  
Dec. 15, 1963]

#### ODD EXCUSES

Missouri Representatives who have signed the civil rights discharge petition deserve credit for leadership on an urgent issue. We admit of being somewhat baffled by the reasons given by other Congressmen for not signing the petition.

The signers include Representatives KARSTEN and SULLIVAN of St. Louis, BOLLING and RANDALL of outstate Missouri, and PRICE of East St. Louis. The two St. Louisans agree on using every means to facilitate early House consideration of the issue. That is the real purpose of the petition. Even if it does not acquire enough signatures to force the rights bill from the Rules Committee to the House floor, it offers leverage against the committee.

Representatives CANNON and ICHORD contend they did not sign because the discharge petition would delay consideration. The evidence is the other way around. Chairman SMITH of Virginia did not even promise early Rules Committee hearings until the petition was proposed.

It is left to Representative CURTIS alone to refuse to say whether he has or has not signed the petition, and his reasoning is the most peculiar of all. The Webster Groves Republican argues that it is against House rules to disclose names on a discharge petition. So it is, and so what? There is no rule against a House Member making his own position clear, as the other Missourians have done.

This is no time for timidity and needless parliamentarianism. The discharge petition offers a reasonable test of conviction and of leadership for civil rights—on the part of Republicans as well as Democrats. Every Congressman ought to stand up and be counted.

#### HILL AND REILLY STATEMENTS ON OTEPKA "BUGGING" REPUDIATING OWN TESTIMONY AND CONTAINING FURTHER FALSE INFORMATION CLEARED BY RUSK

MR. CRAMER. 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. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, statements enclosed with letters sent to Senator EASTLAND by former State Department employees Elmer Dewey Hill and John F. Reilly, intended to supplement and clarify their testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in July and August of this year, still

contained false information concerning the tapping of the office of ousted State Department security officer, Otto Otepka, and according to reliable information Otepka's office was tapped and certain information was recorded.

These false statements, along with a letter sent to Senator EASTLAND by State Department employee, David I. Belisle, were placed in the hands of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before being transmitted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee chairman.

I repeat my earlier statement, made last week, that Rusk was the man behind the move to have Otepka ousted from the State Department before for furnishing information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and thus could hardly be impartial upon review of the Otepka case:

The State Department's partial denial was as expected as Santa Claus at Christmas. Still, they confirmed enough of the memorandum I released to satisfy me as to its substantial accuracy and to justify a thorough investigation by the Congress of the entire matter.

The State Department in its reply to my charge admitted that the meeting of security officers with William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, took place as described in his memorandum:

They admitted that the Otepka case was discussed and they admitted the validity of that part of the memorandum which reported that security officers with policy problems should go to Crockett if they could not get immediate satisfaction from their immediate superiors and that even meetings with Rusk would be arranged to solve such policy problems.

Attesting to the accuracy of this much of the memorandum makes wholecloth of the State Department charge that the entire memorandum is inaccurate.

Certainly enough of the memorandum has been confirmed to justify a thorough investigation of the entire matter by the Congress.

I make a part of the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Reilly, Mr. Hill and Mr. Belisle before the Senate committee together with their later repudiating letters, which were cleared by Rusk and still contain false information:

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF ELMER DEWEY HILL, JULY 9, 1963 (PP. 1105, 1106, 1107, AND 1108 OF THE TRANSCRIPT)

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any single instance in which the Department has ever listened in on the telephone of an employee? I am talking about his office telephone—the telephone that does not belong to him; it belongs to the State Department. Do you know of any instance where that has been done?

Mr. HILL. I cannot recall such an instance.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know of any instance where a listening device has been placed in an employee's office?

Mr. HILL. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are these not normal security measures which in proper circumstances would be indicated and would be taken?

Mr. HILL. I have never engaged in this—in that type of security measure.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see.

You do not know whether the Office of Security has authority to do this?

Mr. HILL. I personally have not ever been requested to do such a thing.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would not your division be the one to do this, if the Office of Security wanted to do it?

Mr. HILL. I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who else would do it? Who else would be competent to do it in the Office of Security?

Mr. HILL. This falls under the category of personnel security, and, as such, is out of my balliwick.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, do you know of any other office or division or branch in the Office of Security that would be competent to place a listening device in an employee's office, or compromise his telephone?

Mr. HILL. I do not know of anyone who would be competent.

Mr. SOURWINE. But you say your division has never done it, has never been called upon?

Mr. HILL. We have never been called upon; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Specifically, did you ever have anything to do with tapping the telephone of Mr. Otepka, the Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Office of Security?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had no knowledge of it, if it was done?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have anything to do with placing a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any knowledge of it, if it was done?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever have anything to do with the searching of Mr. Otepka's desk or his safe or any of his files at night?

Mr. HILL. No, I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have any knowledge if this was done, if it was done?

Mr. HILL. I now have knowledge of it.

Mr. SOURWINE. How did you acquire that knowledge?

Mr. HILL. It was discussed with me by Mr. Belisle.

Mr. SOURWINE. After it had been done?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was that after this committee had started asking questions about it?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. I see.

Did Mr. Belisle discuss it with you in the context of your testimony here?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. What did he tell you about it?

Mr. HILL. He told me that questions were asked regarding this.

Mr. SOURWINE. He told you it had been done?

Mr. HILL. No, sir; he did not tell me it had been done. He told me that this committee was concerned with that.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that is all?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. He did not indicate anything about what your own testimony should be?

Mr. HILL. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he not tell you that this committee was concerned over the question of the tapping of Mr. Otepka's telephone?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And why did you make the distinction in the way you answered with respect to the tapping, that you had no knowledge of it, and with respect to the search that you had acquired knowledge of it?

Mr. HILL. It was an accidental distinction.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you want us to understand that you had no knowledge of either until Mr. Belisle told you about this committee's interest?

Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that, in the telling, he did not indicate to you, that there had been a tapping or a search?

Mr. HILL. That is right. Yes, sir.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 6, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A copy of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security on July 9, 1963, has recently been made available to me. Upon review of this testimony I have concluded that mention of an incident which occurred last March would serve to clarify my responses to Mr. Sourwine's questions concerning interception of conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. I believe that my answers to these questions were correct. I would like, however, to have the attached statement inserted in the record of my testimony in order that there be no misunderstanding.

If you approve my request, I suggest that the statement and this letter be inserted at page 1107 of my testimony.

I enclose the copy of my testimony which was made available to me.

Sincerely,

ELMER DEWEY HILL.

On Monday, March 18, 1963, Mr. John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, asked me to explore the possibility of arranging some way to eavesdrop on conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office. Mr. Reilly explained to me that he would only consider such a technique if other investigative methods failed.

Later that day, I discussed the technical aspects of this matter with Mr. Clarence J. Schneider who, at that time, was serving as Chief of the Technical Operations Branch of the Division of Technical Services. We agreed on the approach to be used—modifying the wiring of Mr. Otepka's telephone instrument—and decided to return that evening to try the approach.

That evening Mr. Schneider and I altered the existing wiring in the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office. We then established a circuit from Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory by making additional connections in the existing telephone system wiring.

Mr. Schneider and I tested the system and found we would be unable to overhear conversations in Mr. Otepka's office, except actual telephone conversations, because electrical interference produced a loud buzzing sound. (It was never contemplated that an attempt would be made just to monitor Mr. Otepka's telephone line in order to overhear conversations on it.)

I reported our unsuccessful effort to Mr. Reilly the following morning. Mr. Schneider has told me that during that day he asked an officer in the Division of Domestic Operations of the Office of Security whether he had, or knew where to acquire, equipment which would eliminate such a buzzing sound. Mr. Schneider assured me that he did not discuss with the officer the specific application for which the equipment was needed. I also attempted during that day to obtain such equipment, but was unsuccessful.

On the following day, March 20, Mr. Reilly informed me that I should not pursue the matter further because he had found the type of information he was looking for from an examination of Mr. Otepka's classified trash. Mr. Reilly directed me to disconnect the wiring connections which Mr. Schneider and I had made. That evening, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Schneider, and I met in the Office of Security. In the space of a few minutes, I removed the extra connections which Mr. Schneider and I had made in Mr. Otepka's

telephone while Mr. Reilly and Mr. Schneider stayed in the hall outside Mr. Otepka's office.

To summarize, for a 2-day period it might have been possible to intercept conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office if certain technical problems could have been resolved. These problems never were resolved and the wiring connections which were made were removed without any conversations having been intercepted.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF DAVID I. BELISLE, JULY 29, 1963 (PP. 1213 AND 1214 OF THE TRANSCRIPT)

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Belisle, what the respective rights are of a State Department employee on the one hand and the Office of Security of the Department on the other with respect to the tapping of the employee's telephone, or are there any rights involved there?

Mr. BELISLE. I don't know.

Mr. SOURWINE. How about the placing of listening devices in the offices of employees? Does the Office of Security have the right to do this?

Mr. BELISLE. Well, that would be a legal question, I guess, and inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, I don't know whether he has any rights or not.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have never had occasion to look into this question?

Mr. BELISLE. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would that mean that you have never been involved in an authorization for either the tapping of an employee's telephone or the placing of listening devices in his office?

Mr. BELISLE. No, it wouldn't mean that; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you been so involved?

Mr. BELISLE. Yes, I have.

Mr. SOURWINE. While you have been at the Department of State?

Mr. BELISLE. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. The question concerned the rights of the Department of State, so I guess I wasn't precise enough in asking.

Can you tell us what the policy is in the Office of Security in the Department of State? If the Office or head of the Office thought the employee might be a security risk, would he have the right to tap his telephone or put a listening device in his office?

Mr. BELISLE. I really don't know, and in the Department of State it hasn't come up since I have been there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any information with respect to the tapping of the telephone of Mr. Otto Otepka, the Chief of the Division of Evaluations of the Department of State?

Mr. BELISLE. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether this was done?

Mr. BELISLE. No, I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you have anything to do with the placing of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?

Mr. BELISLE. I did not, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know if this was done?

Mr. BELISLE. I do not.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, November 6, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the course of my July 29, 1963, testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security, I was asked by Mr. Sourwine whether I had any information concerning the interception of conversations in Mr. Otto F. Otepka's office. I replied that I did not.

After review of my testimony, I would like to amplify my responses to Mr. Sourwine's questions by stating that Mr. Reilly men-

tioned to me the events which I understand he has described to you in a separate letter, and accompanying enclosure. He mentioned these events to me, however, only after the events occurred. At the time the events took place, I was in Costa Rica in connection with the visit of the President and the Secretary to that country. I had, therefore, no firsthand information concerning these events, and it was for this reason that I answered Mr. Sourwine's questions as I did.

I would appreciate it if this letter could be inserted in the record of my testimony. If this is done, I suggest that it be included on page 1214 of my testimony.

I am enclosing the copy of my testimony which was provided to me.

Sincerely,

DAVID I. BELISLE.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF JOHN F. REILLY ON AUGUST 6, 1963 (PP. 1322-1326, OF TRANSCRIPT)

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember giving any previous testimony here on a question of bugging or tapping a telephone in the State Department?

Mr. REILLY. I don't recall any questions along those lines.

Mr. SOURWINE. Then let me start fresh. Have you ever engaged in or ordered the bugging or tapping or otherwise compromising telephones or private conversations in the office of an employee of the State Department?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You never did?

Mr. REILLY. That is right, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Specifically in the case of Mr. Otepka you did not do so?

Mr. REILLY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you tell Jerome Schneider to install an electrical device to compromise Mr. Otepka's telephone?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that audible conversations in his office could be heard whether or not that phone was on the hook?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know this had been done?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you say it was not done?

Mr. REILLY. That I cannot say, sir.

Senator HEUSKA. Is that within the order from Mr. Crockett?

Mr. REILLY. No, no. His questions have already made it clear that I cannot—I don't know.

Senator HEUSKA. It is on your own?

Mr. REILLY. Yes.

Senator HEUSKA. Your own lack of information?

Mr. SOURWINE. When I say "tell Jerome Schneider" I would like to have that include tell somebody to tell him. Did you give an order to have this done?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Has any device for clandestine listening or an aid of physical surveillance been placed on the automobile of any individual employed by the Office of Security?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Not while you have been—

Mr. REILLY. Not while I have been there; no, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Doesn't the Office of Security make use of any clandestine listening devices at all in dealing with its employees?

Mr. REILLY. Not while I have been there, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does it make use of them in dealing with prospective employees or with security cases from other parts of the Department?

Mr. REILLY. Not while I have been there, we have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Don't you have concealed microphones in your interviewing rooms?

Mr. REILLY. We tape interviews. That is not a clandestine listening device in the sense—

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you do this with the knowledge and consent of the person being interviewed?

Mr. REILLY. No, we do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is not clandestine?

Mr. REILLY. It is not a clandestine listening device in that there are State Department people conducting the interview, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. REILLY. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. The listening device, is that a microphone standing up in the center of the table?

Mr. REILLY. Oh, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is hidden?

Mr. REILLY. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. But it is not clandestine?

Mr. REILLY. No, of course we do that, but I wanted you to understand the sense in which I understood your question to me.

Mr. SOURWINE. I thought you would understand it in the commonly accepted sense of the word. Apparently, I was wrong. Now let's see if we can get back to Mr. Otepka's case. Have any listening devices been installed in his office?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have any devices or contrivances been installed in or connected with his telephone wires or with a box outside his office so as to activate his telephone so as to make it in a sense a permanent receiving microphone?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are familiar with this technique. You know what I am talking about?

Mr. REILLY. Yes, I do, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And it has not been used in Mr. Otepka's case?

Mr. REILLY. No, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, you have a clear issue here on which we will have to take the testimony of other State Department employees. I have no more questions of Mr. Reilly at this time, sir. It is 3 minutes of 12. Senator HEUSKA. Very well, sir.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, November 6, 1963.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the course of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security on August 6, I was asked a series of questions by Mr. Sourwine concerning the compromise of conversations in Mr. Otto F. Otepka's office and over his telephone. My responses to these questions were, I believe, accurate. I have concluded from a review of my testimony, however, that mention of one incident might serve to avoid a misleading impression.

I would like, therefore, to amplify my testimony by the inclusion in the record of the attached statement and this letter. If this request is granted, I suggest that the statement and this letter be inserted at page 1326 of my testimony.

I am enclosing the copy of my testimony which was provided to me.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. REILLY.

In the course of the year following my present appointment I began to suspect that Mr. Otepka might be privately furnishing information to Mr. Jay Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, without authority and possibly in violation of applicable laws and regulations.

On March 13, 1963, I discussed with Mr. David I. Belisle, my special assistant, a

variety of investigative techniques which might be used to determine whether my suspicions were accurate. As a result of these discussions, I concluded that the best technique would be to recover and examine Mr. Otepka's classified trash from his burn bag. On March 14, Mr. Otepka's burn bag was recovered, but an examination of its contents revealed nothing of significance.

On March 18, while Mr. Bellisle was in Costa Rica in connection with the visit to that country by the President and the Secretary, I asked Mr. Elmer D. Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services, to undertake a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. I made it clear to Mr. Hill that I was not authorizing the actual interception of any conversations. Rather, I desired to know whether this technique could be used without undue risk of detection in the event that subsequent examination of Mr. Otepka's burn bags continued to reveal nothing of significance.

On March 19, Mr. Hill told me that he and Mr. Clarence J. Schneider had discussed the means by which conversations in Mr. Otepka's office might be intercepted and had conducted a feasibility survey by connecting spare telephone wires from the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory. Mr. Hill told me that the system attempted had not proven successful when he and Mr. Schneider had tested it and that they were uncertain whether it could be made to work. I made it clear to Mr. Hill that I did not wish any conversations to be intercepted at that time.

Later during the same day, March 19, a second bag of Mr. Otepka's classified trash was recovered and examined. Its contents revealed that Mr. Otepka had furnished certain material to Mr. Sourwine. As a result, I then determined that I would not at any time authorize the interception of conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office.

Shortly after the close of business on March 20, I directed Mr. Hill and Mr. Schneider to disconnect the telephone wires which they had connected. Later that evening Mr. Hill complied with my directions while Mr. Schneider and I remained in the corridor outside Mr. Otepka's office.

No conversations were intercepted as a result of the events described above. Other than these events, I know of nothing which could have given rise to the belief that Mr. Otepka's office was being "bugged" or that his telephone was being "tapped." I understand, however, that about the same time that the events described above took place, Mr. Otepka asked Mr. Stanley Holden, of the Division of Domestic Operations to examine his telephone system. I also understand that Mr. Holden did examine Mr. Otepka's telephone system but found no evidence that Mr. Otepka's office was "bugged" or that his telephone was "tapped." In this connection, I might point out that Mr. Bellisle and I have both noticed unusual sound phenomena on our telephones and have had our telephone systems checked. These checks have not produced any evidence that our telephone systems had been interfered with.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO INFORM PRESIDENT CONGRESS IS READY TO ADJOURN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

#### SECOND SESSION EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 880 fixing the beginning of the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H. J. Res. 880

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Eighty-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up for immediate consideration House Concurrent Resolution 248.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 248

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Monday, December 30, 1963, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 249

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any recesses, adjournments, or the sine die adjournment of the House, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been sitting here listening to these adjournment resolutions going through. What transpires, if I may ask the majority leader, if the other body refuses to concur on December 30 or refuses to adopt the conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the gentleman that I could not imagine that happening as a practical matter, but I will state that the Members will be protected. We cannot adjourn although we have adopted the sine die adjournment, until the resolution has been agreed to by the other body, but we can adjourn from day to day, and there will be no business on those days except what I am requesting on behalf of the Speaker. There will be no unanimous consent agreements, no 1-minute speeches, nor any legislative business or other kind of business except ringing of the bells at adjournment. If worst should come to worst and we did not get a sine die adjournment adopted, we would have no business until January 7 under any circumstances except the business required by the statute which would be to get a quorum on January 3.

Mr. GROSS. Then, there would be no attempt to bring up the supplemental appropriation bill that is pending?

Mr. ALBERT. There will be no attempt to bring up any legislation. None whatever.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 88th Congress.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF MEMBERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of

the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS TO CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS THEREOF**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

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

There was no objection.

**ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY NEXT**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

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

There was no objection.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM**

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. When will the distinguished majority leader announce a program for January 7?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be prepared to announce that before we adjourn.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

**PRESS RELEASE BY SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK ON DECEMBER 21, 1963**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to discuss the 1st session of the 88th Congress—indeed, the history of this century—without immediately confronting the tragic impact on our time, on our hearts, and on our souls, of the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Few episodes that I can recall, in a lifetime at the center of action in a world shaken to its foundations by world wars, world revolutions, and world depressions, match the dramatic incomprehensibility of this most dreadful single event of these history-laden decades.

It is a tribute of the first magnitude to the wisdom of the governmental structure of our country, to the ruggedness of its underpinnings designated by the Founding Fathers, that we were able to make the remarkable transition from President Kennedy to President Johnson, so smoothly and so competently under the pall of this awful crime. It is a tribute to the strength and unity of our people. I believe it demonstrates a profound religious and a deeply spiritual quality in us all. Also, in the tragic death of President Kennedy, we are fortunate in having as his successor President Johnson, with his great qualities of leadership. Thus, there was reassurance and relief for the whole free world, under the ruthlessness of this disruption, in the decisive acceptance, at once and fully, by President Johnson, of the monumental responsibilities that suddenly and within a moment fell to his lot. This Congress, like President Johnson, is fully cognizant of its responsibilities to the Nation in these trying times, and it has moved to meet these responsibilities.

The weepers and the criers who are raising great lamentations over the Congress that they say is dragging its feet are purblind to the great basic truth of the life of this Congress so far: This truth is that the 1st session of the 88th Congress has met the needs of the times in accordance with the aims, the desires, and what I call the mood of the country at this hour.

The legislative problems of our times are characteristic of an era that must be considered in long-range terms, not in terms of brief, urgent, dramatic crises, demanding great risks and speculative legislative adventure.

This is not a Congress dealing with the hundred days.

This is not a Congress dealing with a state of war.

This is not a Congress dealing with the spreading poverty of depression.

Up to the instant of the tragedy in Dallas, our country on the whole—and with some spots that marred the general picture—did feel in the home, in the economy, in the general health, in the pervading sense of well-being, the effectiveness of the Kennedy program of peace and prosperity. The 1st session of the 88th Congress reflects the national appreciation that our genius for finding the ways of peace, through the skills, the boldness, the diplomacy of our brilliant young President, had settled definitely upon the whole world the conviction that the United States is indeed in the posture of plain and obvious world leadership.

All this produced a spirit of caution, as distinguished from complacency, in the 88th Congress. It removed from the Capitol of the United States the driving sense of immediacy, and the pressure of crisis. It filled the individual Member of Congress with an attitude of study as differentiated from an attitude of precipitate action. And while there was action to a considerable degree, as the record clearly indicates, it was calculated action. It was action that hesitated to do violence to the mood of the country, which demanded a period of relief and surcease from the spectacular. This is far from being a lethargic Congress, as some critics would have it, it is a thorough, studious, and a careful Congress. In several areas it has established a record of accomplishment that is unequaled by any Congress of recent times.

Indeed, it is only necessary to examine the record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress in the field of education to realize that this is a landmark Congress for American education. This Congress under Public Law 88-129 authorized a 3-year program of \$175 million in matching grants to expand the teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and \$30.7 million in student loans to increase health personnel. Public Law 88-210, the vocational educational bill, provides for vocational education grants, extension of the aid program to Federal installations, and extends the National Defense Education Act. Of even greater importance is Public Law 88-204, which establishes a comprehensive program for the construction and improvement of institutions of higher learning. The magnitude of the contributions that this legislation will make to the national strength and character are impossible to predict, but this Congress is certain to be long remembered for its action in this vital field.

Likewise, the mental health program which this Congress has passed stands as a monument to the dedication, vision, and cooperative spirit of the 88th Congress. This legislation, which was close to the heart of President Kennedy, authorizes \$329 million to assist the fight against mental illness and promotes with meaning the cause of mental health.

The 88th Congress in this 1st session is to be commended, not criticized, for having met its obligations in accordance with the mood and the spirit of the times, and the will of the people. Sensationally bold experimentation and precipitate legislation compelled as in other Congresses, by acute and pressing need, were not in the cards. But thoughtful and profound legislation on such major problems as civil rights and tax reduction was, indeed, called for, and will be well and ably disposed of in the forthcoming session.

In sum the 88th Congress will find itself evaluated not alone upon what it did in terms of a score card on its enactments in this first session, but even more on the careful preparations it made for wise and considered legislation for the forthcoming session. With the passage of the civil rights bill and the tax bill, both of which will pass in the next session, the 88th Congress will, with the other important bills it has already passed, be recognized as a historic Congress.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS  
OF THE 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST  
SESSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we all have reason to be proud of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. It has been a long and difficult session—one of the most exacting in all our history—and one deeply stricken only recently by a tragedy which grieved the heart of the world.

All men of good will are stunned. No rational being can explain or understand the evil impulse which took the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy at the zenith of his mission. All the world mourns with us. And all the world takes new courage and new confidence in the dignified and orderly presidential succession, which we have witnessed and which once more demonstrated for history the majestic authority and power of freedom under law.

Our work in Congress has been directed toward peace, progress, and prosperity, not only for our own country, but for the entire world; and we have beckoned all who strive for order and tranquillity to join with us in our search for the methods and instruments of peace on earth—that noble quest which has lighted the world these many centuries. We shall never drop the torch.

As we adjourn for the festive days of the Christmas season, we would do well to pause for a moment of tribute to our own distinguished leader, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, our Speaker, guide, mentor, friend, and noble counselor. His fairness, wisdom, patience, and gentle spirit truly reflects the genius of America. The House and the country are indebted to him for the determination and devotion he has brought to his tasks here during these many years as Member, leader, and Speaker. May he be with us for many, many years to come.

Our record at the halfway mark of the 88th Congress speaks for itself as an example of the constructive functioning of a legislative body in a nation of free men deliberating under conditions of extraordinary stress both at home and abroad. Yet we have approached our work in confident spirit, determined that there shall be no retreat.

The Congress of the United States will be 175 years old next year. And I dare say that in the century and three-quarters since the leaders of the American Revolution launched the infant Republic, few other Congresses until our own ever faced problems of such magnitude, complexity, and challenge.

First and foremost, we have maintained and strengthened the national defense and security. We have in no direction faltered or quibbled on the great issue of national survival as a free nation.

Peace has been maintained, and the first timorous step taken by international agreement to defuse the time

bomb of holocaust. At the same time, we have increased our conventional Armed Forces, strengthened our nuclear deterrent power, and authorized the funds necessary to resume nuclear tests should the Soviet Union violate the test ban treaty.

We have written the greatest record in the field of education of any Congress since the founding of the Republic. The 1st session of the 88th Congress would go down in history as truly magnificent for this reason alone—and there are many other reasons.

It has been a long session, Mr. Speaker, but who can say a session is not a landmark session when it pushes through to enactment the long-awaited Higher Education Facilities Act, a \$1.2 billion measure?

Who can say this session has not distinguished itself when we have crossed all horizons in vocational educational opportunities through enactment of the better than \$1 billion Vocational Education Act and when we have extended and greatly expanded the National Defense Education Act as well as the federally affected areas education program?

Who can say we have not broken vital new ground in the twin areas of education and health by passage first of the \$236 million Medical Professions Educational Assistance Act and then passage of two great measures plus the implementing appropriations in the field of mental health and mental illness?

Our energies have been largely devoted to the forthcoming enactment of the Revenue Act, a far-reaching tax reduction and reform measure to take up the slack in the national economy, and the Civil Rights Act, which will hasten the fulfillment of many promises uttered a hundred years ago. These measures of such great dimensions have commanded the unwavering attention of the entire Nation. This House has already passed the Revenue Act and sent it to the Senate. The Civil Rights Act is ready for floor consideration next month. The final passage next year of both these acts will rest upon the grueling but sustained efforts of this year.

We have extended the emergency corporate and excise taxes. We have adjusted the debt limit to the new demands of the budget.

Throughout the session this House has cast a frugal and prudent eye on every item in the departmental appropriations bills, as it came along. The net result was combined reductions of some \$7.1 billion under the original departmental estimates. President Johnson has admonished that every agency of Government must get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent for the public weal. On this score the present session has been truly responsive.

Our balance of international payments is a problem of genuine concern, to which we have given earnest attention in all our fiscal decisions.

Another historic forward step in 1963 was the enactment of a new national program to reduce or eliminate air pollution. This energetic and forward-looking health program provides \$95 million for a 3-year effort to fight a health menace which now touches every community in the Nation. No one com-

munity can do this job by itself. A national effort promises the only solution; that effort is now underway.

Our new authorizations in military preparedness were the largest in our peacetime history, making a total of more than \$15.3 billion for new weapons systems designed to insure the peace of the world. We extended the Draft Act; we authorized vast new projects in military construction; we adjusted military pay in all ranks and grades, and in all branches of the service; we enacted new laws regulating the military reserves; we gave final clearance to the Philippine war claims, a problem which has been hanging over the Nation for 17 years.

For the first time in history we enacted laws to provide equal pay for women in industrial occupations.

We broadened the program for housing assistance to the elderly. We have a new program for the development of outdoor recreation areas from coast to coast.

We extended the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to give new emphasis to our policy of "trade, not aid."

In all areas of legislation we have sought earnestly to keep abreast of the 20th century and to plot a future of sound and practical national development. America is changing, its population is burgeoning, the national economy is becoming more challenging. The sustained attention of this Congress to the tasks at hand will be broken by a pause of only 2 weeks at year's end. Every Member well may be proud of our record of devoted effort and solid accomplishment.

PRELIMINARY APPROPRIATIONS  
RÉSUMÉ, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST  
SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted and in accord with practice, I include for information of Members and others a preliminary résumé of the appropriations work of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The House has completed its work. Only the foreign aid bill, cleared by the House today, is pending; and the expectation is that it will clear the other body by next Monday.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, and because other actions of the session outside the annual appropriation bills affect final budget and Treasury results in any particular year, including this year, we will include a more comprehensive summary of the situation in the RECORD next week.

A comprehensive executive updating of the financial situation for the current fiscal year 1964 will also be reflected in the new budget from the President next month. That will include:

First. Revised estimates of budget revenues for fiscal 1964 in light of current conditions and outlook. The original budget projection of \$86,900,000,000 has since been informally revised by the Treasury to \$88,800,000,000; it will, probably, be further updated in connection with the next budget.

Second. Revised estimates of fiscal 1964 budget expenditures from all sources, including the effect of appropriation reductions made in the bills of the session as disclosed in the tabulations

I am including. And in this connection, it is to be noted that roughly 35 to 40 percent of annual budget expenditures—disbursements—are from prior year appropriations, and some from permanent appropriations, and are therefore not directly affected by congressional actions in the appropriation bills of the current session.

Third. The effect of congressional action, or inaction, on new legislation urged in the original 1964 budget or subsequently submitted or amended—the original appropriation budget request for the first year, fiscal 1964 cost of such new legislation was \$2,727,468,000 of which it was indicated some \$1,202,000,000 would, if enacted, be disbursed during fiscal 1964. Some legislation has not been enacted and some was adopted at variance with the budget provisions.

All these factors will join—and they are characteristic of every annual budget—to influence the final results and the budget deficit originally projected at \$11,902,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964 which began last July 1, and more recently informally projected by the Treasury at \$9,000,000,000. Whatever the final deficit, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th

year of budget deficits in the last 34 years.

Mr. Speaker, the original budget for fiscal 1964, submitted last January, proposed total new obligational authority—annual appropriations, permanent appropriations, Treasury borrowing, contract authority, and reappropriations—everything which, if enacted, would authorize an obligation against the Treasury—of \$107,927,000,000, the second peacetime year in history the total request has exceeded \$100,000,000,000. The executive branch has revised that figure from time to time by an amount not yet precisely determinable, but not by much; it remains roughly close to that sum. And since not a dollar can be removed from the Treasury for any purpose at any time unless the Congress has first appropriated or otherwise enacted authority to obligate the Government, the obligational authority request, not the more widely used \$98.8 billion expenditure budget total, is the more significant long-run figure and the more accurate barometer to future spending levels urged in the budget. Congress acts on the obligational authority budget, not directly on the expenditure budget.

The principal portion of the obligational authority budget is disposed of in the bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations. In this session, there were 2 supplementals having to do with fiscal 1963 and 12 regular bills for fiscal 1964 plus a small joint resolution for limited last-minute supplements. As noted, everything has cleared the House and only the foreign aid bill awaits final approval in the other body. The last-minute supplemental passed both Houses but was not enacted.

#### SUMMARY OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House for action this session in bills from the Committee on Appropriations total \$98,833,372,581, as shown by the tabulations included. This divides \$2,149,679,106 as supplements for fiscal 1963 earlier in the session and \$96,733,693,475 for fiscal 1964 bills. And as noted, this does not include permanent appropriations recurring automatically under permanent law, estimated in the January budget at about \$11,500,000,000; in view of subsequent indications of rising interest costs on the record-breaking national debt, that total will, probably, go to \$12,000,000,000 or more.

*The appropriation bills, 88th*

[Does not include back-door appropriations<sup>1</sup> or permanent appropriations under previous

Bill No.	Title	House							House action compared with—	
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	Amount reported	
<b>1963 SUPPLEMENTALS</b>										
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, agriculture.....	\$ 508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	\$508,172,000	-----	Feb. 27	\$508,172,000	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 5517	Supplemental.....	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	-\$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	-\$202,815,600	+\$449,935,000	-----
	Public works acceleration.....	(500,000,000)	-----	-----	(-500,000,000)	-----	(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)	-----
	All other.....	(1,141,507,106)	-----	(988,756,506)	(-152,750,600)	-----	(988,691,506)	(-152,815,600)	(-65,000)	-----
	Total, 1963 supplementals.....	2,149,679,106	-----	1,496,928,506	-652,750,600	-----	1,946,863,506	-202,815,600	+449,935,000	-----
<b>1964 APPROPRIATIONS</b>										
H.R. 5279	Interior.....	968,069,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,680,200	-68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	-75,383,800	-7,065,000	-----
	Loan authorization.....	(13,000,000)	-----	(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----	(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----	-----
	Contract authority.....	(17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	-----
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office.....	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	-149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	-149,816,000	-----	-----
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW.....	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	-309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	-309,508,000	-7,000	-----
H.R. 6754	Agriculture.....	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 359)	5,979,457,000	-389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	-389,298,000	-----	-----
	Loan authorizations.....	\$ (855,000,000)	-----	\$ (855,000,000)	-----	-----	\$ (855,000,000)	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 6868	Legislative.....	\$ 148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	\$ 140,038,919	-\$ 8,541,326	June 11	\$ 140,038,919	-\$ 8,541,326	-----	-----
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary.....	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	-308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	-308,622,000	-----	-----
H.R. 7179	Defense.....	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	-1,922,028,000	June 26	47,062,009,000	-1,932,228,000	-10,200,000	-----
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia.....	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 490)	(284,286,800)	(-5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(-5,295,000)	-----	-----
	Federal payment.....	34,868,000	-----	32,868,000	-2,000,000	-----	32,868,000	-2,000,000	-----	-----
	Loan authorizations.....	(8,000,000)	-----	(8,000,000)	-----	-----	(8,000,000)	-----	-----	-----
H.R. 8747	Independent offices.....	14,638,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	-1,535,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	-1,535,869,300	-100,000	-----
H.R. 9139	Military construction.....	1,966,400,000	Nov. 14 (No. 901)	1,562,964,000	-403,436,000	Nov. 18	1,562,964,000	-403,436,000	-----	-----
H.R. 9140	Public works.....	4,561,747,000	Nov. 15 (No. 902)	4,276,116,400	-285,630,600	Nov. 19	4,276,116,400	-285,630,600	-----	-----
H.R. 9499	Foreign aid.....	4,874,400,330	Dec. 14 (No. 1040)	3,113,100,370	-1,761,299,960	Dec. 16	3,113,100,370	-1,761,299,960	-----	-----
H.J. Res. 875	Supplemental, mental retardation.....	41,886,000	Dec. 14 (No. 1041)	41,886,000	-----	Dec. 19	41,886,000	-----	-----	-----
	Total, 1964 appropriations.....	\$ 96,733,693,475	-----	\$ 89,569,432,489	-7,164,260,986	-----	\$ 89,552,060,489	-7,181,632,986	-17,372,000	-----
	Total, all appropriations.....	\$ 98,833,372,581	-----	\$ 91,066,360,995	-\$ 7,767,011,586	-----	\$ 91,498,923,995	-\$ 7,334,448,586	+\$ 432,563,000	-----
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(874,000,000)	-----	(869,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	-----	(869,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	-----	-----
	Total, contract authority.....	(17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, (probably low).

<sup>2</sup> Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$330,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes Senate items.

As sent to the House floor, the committee bills for the session totaled \$91,066,360,995 in appropriations, or \$7,817,011,586 below the corresponding budget requests—the largest such aggregate reduction in several years. Every regular bill was below the budget. There were, of course, as in most every session, three or four reductions somewhat in the nature of funding adjustments or of uncertain durability because of limited discretionary control in the appropriations process.

The House made only minor changes in the regular 1964 bills but did insist on restoring the accelerated public works appropriation to the supplemental last spring. As sent to the other body, the bills aggregated \$91,498,923,995 in appropriations, a total cut of \$7,384,448,586 from the requests considered in the House.

In virtually every session the President sends supplemental budget items to the other body after the House has acted on the bills. This year was no exception but the added amounts were nominal; they totaled only \$62,791,555, so that the Senate considered \$98,946,164,136 of appropriation budget estimates. As passed

by the other body, the bills totaled \$93,221,837,607, a reduction of \$5,724,326,529 below the corresponding estimates but \$1,722,913,612 above the House totals. I am certain the House and the country will be glad to note that both Houses have, this year, held every regular bill total below the related budget requests. But, of course, the other body, somewhat characteristically, also raised every regular bill, except one, above the House allowance.

The bills finally adopted, including the foreign aid bill cleared by the House and pending final disposition, aggregate \$92,433,123,132 in appropriations, a cut of \$6,513,041,004 below the budget requests.

And to repeat, because it is important in the total situation, these amounts exclude something like \$12,000,000,000, plus, of permanent appropriations for fiscal 1964 under previous law.

And significantly, Mr. Speaker, while the bills adopted for fiscal 1964 are substantially below the budget requests, they are also for the first time in several years, below appropriations for the preceding fiscal year—for the fiscal year 1963. The bills enacted are \$3,317,416,885 below last year, in contrast to the

upward trend of recent years. I should say that the reduction includes the \$2,000,000,000 nonrecurring IFM item, but the residue, nonetheless, leaves a significant cut below last year. Comparison with the previous year is the more accurate and informative measurement, because while the House needs to know what disposition has been made of the budget requests, you never really re-trench when you cut a budget level that has never before been appropriated and conclude with appropriations higher than the previous year.

Of course, as is always the case, not every dollar cut from appropriation budget requests for a given year results in an equivalent reduction in expenditure estimated for that same year; the rough rule of thumb, for the budget as a whole, is that 35 to 40 percent of total appropriations are not expended in the first year. However, that is essentially immaterial here. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar not taken from the Treasury.

This significant step, this departure from the general trend, is summarized in the following tables. The first table supplies more details on bills of the session at each stage of consideration:

Cong., 1st sess., as of Dec. 24, 1963

legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Senate				Senate action compared with—		Date filed and report number	Conference		Public Law	
		Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved		Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved	
\$508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	\$508,172,000	Mar. 4	\$508,172,000				\$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6	
1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	-\$163,616,615	+\$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	-\$184,869,965	88-25	May 17	
(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)		May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)			
(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(-113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)	(-134,869,965)			
2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	-163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491	-184,869,965			
998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	-18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	-45,552,500	88-79	July 26	
(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)			(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)			
(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)				(-17,500,000)			
6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 108)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	-77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	-101,376,000	88-39	June 13	
5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	-263,661,750	+45,846,250	Sept. 25 (No. 774)	5,471,087,500	-288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11	
6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	-320,766,660	+68,531,340	Dec. 21 (No. 1088)	6,224,370,215	-144,384,785			
(855,000,000)		<sup>3</sup> (880,000,000)		<sup>3</sup> (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)		<sup>3</sup> (855,000,000)				
182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	-13,945,381	+28,234,150	Nov. 12 (No. 806)	<sup>4</sup> 168,293,069	-13,925,381			
2,159,891,900	Dec. 5 (No. 747)	1,821,283,000	Dec. 12	1,821,343,000	-338,548,900	-29,926,900	Dec. 17 (No. 1056)	1,820,093,000	-339,798,900			
49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	-1,674,530,000	+257,698,000	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	-1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17	
(328,724,000)	Nov. 6 (No. 632)	(319,582,825)	Nov. 18	(319,587,785)	(-9,136,215)	(+35,300,985)	Dec. 17 (No. 1055)	(313,093,424)	(-15,630,576)			
52,868,000		47,868,000		47,868,000	-5,000,000	+15,000,000		40,368,000	-12,500,000			
(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)	(+12,800,000)			(19,300,000)	(-1,500,000)			
14,668,588,000	Nov. 13 (No. 641)	13,390,214,650	Nov. 20	13,300,214,650	-1,358,373,350	+197,495,950	Dec. 5 (No. 1004)	13,224,518,050	-1,434,069,950	88-215	Dec. 19	
1,966,400,000	Dec. 5 (No. 750)	1,617,489,000	Dec. 9	1,617,489,000	-348,911,000	+54,525,000	Dec. 12 (No. 1036)	1,585,880,000	-380,520,000	88-220	Dec. 21	
4,561,957,000	Dec. 5 (No. 746)	4,500,988,200	Dec. 9	4,500,983,200	-60,993,800	+224,846,800	Dec. 11 (No. 1027)	4,406,272,700	-155,684,300			
4,874,550,330	Dec. 17 (No. 785)	3,604,364,667	Dec. 19	3,578,058,607	-1,296,491,723	+464,958,237	<sup>5</sup> Dec. 21 (No. 1091)	3,298,705,607	-1,575,844,723			
41,886,000	Dec. 20 (No. 814)	258,090,000	Dec. 20	258,090,000	+216,204,000	+216,204,000			-41,886,000			
<sup>6</sup> 96,785,691,680		91,374,652,826		91,224,981,766	-5,560,709,914	+1,672,921,277		90,457,520,641	-6,328,171,039			
<sup>6</sup> 98,946,164,136		93,368,921,667		93,221,837,607	-5,724,326,529	+1,722,913,612		92,433,123,132	-6,513,041,004			
(888,800,000)		(906,800,000)		(906,800,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+37,800,000)		(880,300,000)	(-8,500,000)			
(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)			(17,500,000)				

<sup>1</sup> Report rejected by Senate on Nov. 27, 1963. Amendments adopted separately on House floor on Dec. 17, 1963, and on Senate floor on Dec. 18, 1963.

<sup>2</sup> Does not include \$32,427,000 included in H. Doc. 174 but not considered. <sup>3</sup> Does not include \$32,277,000 included in H. Doc. 174 but not considered.

<sup>4</sup> Report No. 1087 of Dec. 20 rejected previously.

Source: Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.



The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess.—A summary as of Dec. 24, 1963

Bill	Appropriations	The appropriations—	
		Below (—) the budget requests	Above (+) or below (—) fiscal 1963 appropriations
1. Supplemental bills for fiscal 1963	\$1,975,602,491	—\$184,869,965	
2. Bills for fiscal 1964:			
Interior and related	952,456,500	—45,552,500	+\$22,762,400
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
Contract authority		(—17,500,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	6,045,466,000	—101,376,000	+383,961,830
Labor-HEW	5,471,087,500	—288,401,500	—100,885,100
Defense	47,220,010,000	—1,794,227,000	—1,130,072,500
Independent offices	13,224,518,080	—1,434,069,980	+1,354,896,750
Public works	4,406,272,700	—155,634,300	—1,128,429,910
Military construction	1,885,880,000	—380,520,000	+426,765,500
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	1,820,093,000	—339,798,900	—323,333,841
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	40,388,000	—12,500,000	+7,169,000
Loan authorizations	(19,300,000)	(—1,500,000)	(—6,742,000)
Legislative	168,293,069	—13,925,381	+17,880,224
Agriculture	6,224,370,215	—144,384,785	+216,770,305
Loan authorizations	(855,000,000)	(—)	(+35,000,000)
Foreign aid (pending Senate approval)	3,298,705,607	—1,575,844,723	—2,904,861,543
Supplemental, mental retardation		—41,886,000	
Total for fiscal 1964 bills	90,457,520,641	—6,328,171,039	—3,317,416,885
Loan authorizations and contract authority	(880,300,000)	(—26,000,000)	(+28,288,000)

<sup>1</sup> The 1st figure, \$1,130,072,500 is, on a comparable basis, overstated by \$184,869,965, and the 2d figure, \$266,765,500, is understated. (Thus converting a real decrease to an apparent increase) by approximately the same amount due to the shift, in 1964, of financing of operation and maintenance and debt payments in connection with family housing from the regular defense bill to the military construction bill.

#### AS THE HOUSE PREPARES TO ADJOURN SINE DIE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 88th Congress is now in its waning moments. It has been an extraordinary session in many respects—its extended length, the scope and impact of the measures we have had to consider, its record of solid accomplishment in many areas, both domestic and foreign, and the loss of our great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and our transition to immediate cooperation with our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

As we prepare to adjourn sine die, we can lay down our legislative burdens until January secure in the knowledge that we have risen to many challenges which have confronted us. We have written a record in which every Member can take pride.

I know that I speak for the House as a whole when I say that not only we, but the entire Nation, owes a special tribute to our beloved Speaker, whose inspiring leadership was indispensable to the many successes of this session.

It was Speaker McCORMACK who, more than any other person, provided the patience and the bedrock determination that carried us through to the end of this lengthy session.

It was the pool of energy of Speaker McCORMACK which provided the fuel to ignite the legislative fires which have burned so long and produced so much in the way of solid accomplishment—accomplishment in which every Member of the House can take pride.

I know I speak the sense of this House when I say that the Speaker has executed his duties with a fairness, a judiciousness, and a devotion that is unsurpassed in the history of this great body.

He is our leader, our tutor, our friend and advisor, and one of the most honorable and remarkable men ever to grace the position of Speaker. He has our love and respect forever.

I am personally indebted to the Democratic whip, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and his assistant whips, for their tireless efforts and magnificent work. The accuracy of their polls on legislative matters could not be easily matched.

I am at a loss for adequate words to express my gratitude for the many kindnesses shown me by all the Members of the House, both Democratic and Republican. Members of my own party have given me daily support and help to an extent that I could never have hoped to receive.

I owe a special tribute to my good friend, the distinguished minority leader and gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. They have given the best of their great abilities to this House and this country, and their statesmanship and fairplay have been indispensable to the efficient operation of this House. They are great Americans and have my eternal admiration and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this House have given unstintingly of their time, efforts, and abilities. It is difficult for persons, not intimate with the legislative process in this country, to understand how this body operates, being composed of Members having many different and sometimes conflicting opinions and views on all the great issues. We function, Mr. Speaker, because this Chamber is filled with great Americans, devoted first and foremost to the concept of government by consent of the

governed through orderly procedures and respect for the rights of the majority and minority alike. I salute my colleagues, each and every one, for their great contributions to the record of this session.

We also must recognize the magnificent part played by the officers and employees of the House, all of whom have given tirelessly of their devoted efforts to the work of this session.

We will be back together in a short while. I hope we all enjoy our brief rest, which is so well deserved. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and everyone of you good health and good fortune, and a happy Christmas holiday.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. BRUCE. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, due to the unnecessarily long session of this House, much is being said concerning congressional reform. Much of the comment is unduly harsh on Congress and some reveals a lack of knowledge of the true function and role of this House.

Because such comment is beginning to feed upon itself and is helping to create unfair disrespect for this House which, despite imperfections, is still the main-spring of democracy, it is important that perspective be kept. For this reason, it is refreshing to read a comment by the noted columnist, Max Freedman, which honestly attempts to place this matter of mounting criticism into proper perspective. Because of increasing interest in this general question, Mr. Freedman's column, which appeared in the Evening Star on December 23, follows:

IN DEFENSE OF OUR CONGRESS—KENNEDY'S VISION OF AMERICA'S NEEDS POSSIBLY AHEAD OF MAJORITY IN UNITED STATES

(By Max Freedman)

Few Americans will regret the end of this year's session of Congress. It has talked too much and done too little to earn respect or gratitude. But the criticism of Congress has now reached such a pitch of bitterness that it is necessary to speak up in its defense if only to guard it from undeserved and exaggerated abuse.

We can never know what the final tally of legislative achievement would have been if President Kennedy had been spared. He himself thought that the most important parts of his program, including civil rights, would all pass by June of next year. He always spoke of his proposals as forming a 2-year program which would be endorsed by Congress as public opinion slowly prevailed. Perhaps President Kennedy could have mobilized those pressures in a way that would have brought action from Congress. He was certainly not despondent about the prospect at the time of his death.

In short, President Kennedy used a larger timespan in judging Congress and therefore

he refused to join the angry critics. As a matter of practical politics he had very little choice. It was possible for Mr. Truman in 1948 to campaign against Congress because that Congress was under Republican control. In 1964 it would not have been easy for Mr. Kennedy to denounce a Congress dominated by his own party.

Yet there is a deeper reason than party loyalty for President Kennedy's troubles with Congress. It may be one of his best titles to greatness that his vision of America's needs was ahead of majority opinion in Congress and maybe even in the country. As a prophetic voice as well as a national leader he raised issues that could only be settled after long debate. He was less critical of Congress than many people wanted him to be, not only because he was much wiser than these critics, but also because he knew so much more about the legislative process.

In retrospect, his friends in Congress have only one criticism of his technique of leadership. They believe he made a mistake in sending so many proposals to Congress instead of bending its energies to action on a few major measures. It should be observed that this criticism reduces to complete futility all arguments which measure the success of Congress by the volume of legislation which it has endorsed.

Those arguments assume that the proposals sent to Congress are always wise and necessary; and that any opposition to them must be an offense against the national interest. The men in both parties who direct the work of Congress will never accept this wretched formulation of the legislative role. All criticism based on the inherent wisdom of presidential action will merely widen the breach between Congress and the executive branch, and delay rather than facilitate the passage of useful legislation.

It is, for example, no real contribution to legislative reform to suggest that Congress should be compelled to vote on certain measures within a period specified by the White House. Congress will not do it; nor should it.

When President Kennedy's trade program passed the House of Representatives, Mr. WILBUR MILLS was the hero. When the tax program got stuck in the House this year, he suddenly became a devil. Isn't this rather silly? Nor can all the abuse of Senator BYRD obscure the two essential facts that the Senate Finance Committee under his chairmanship is making progress with the tax bill and the Senate will be able to pass this legislation, despite his personal views, early next year.

All this trivial chatter about personalities cheapens Congress by degrading the debate into a scuffle for personal vindication. In the TFX controversy, for instance, this particular kind of attack dwells on the motives of Senator McCLELLAN or Senator JACKSON instead of recognizing the genuine and widespread resentment that prevails in the Senate over the Defense Department's role in awarding this contract.

No wonder experienced and responsible Members of Congress have refused to be persuaded by the kind of criticisms they have been forced to endure in the last few months. Those criticisms will find no champion in President Johnson, who has pledged himself to respect the integrity and independence of Congress. He knows that the best way to get good results is to treat Congress not as a destructive critic but as a useful partner in the necessary compromises of national leadership.

#### EXTENSION OF CREDIT TO RUSSIA

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I must take issue today with those who urge that we cast our votes in the Christmas spirit. The folks of West Texas elected me to carefully consider each issue on its merits, to be diligent, thrifty, and frugal in the expenditure of their hard-earned tax dollars and to do what best my conscience dictates—not because of emotion, but because of reason.

I do not believe my folks want me to play Santa Claus to Khrushchev by issuing him an international meal ticket or a credit card for communism. The Russians are faulty now, some \$10 billion plus, in their payments to the United States of America for goods previously purchased. By granting credit to Russia, we will, in effect, be subsidizing the expansion of communism around the world.

Our foreign aid program is unrealistic and wasteful enough as it is, but it is repulsively unconscionable to make it even worse by extending credit to the avowed enemy of freedom and all that America stands for.

We are now shelling out American foreign aid dollars to 104 nations of the 112 in the world. The Agency for International Development now has 64,508 employees carrying on this program. I cannot and will not be a party to adding to this by an extension of credit to those not now covered in our foreign aid largess. In my opinion, it is not American.

#### NEW GOP TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA APPOINTED

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the special projects subcommittee of the House Republican policy committee, today I am proud to announce the formation of a new GOP Task Force on Latin America.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, who is one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House on Latin America is named chairman of the task force. Representative JAMES F. BATTIN, Republican, of Montana, is named as vice chairman.

The purpose of this special task force is to probe deeper into United States-Latin American relationships. This will be done with the idea of trying to establish a foreign policy which will first, work toward real friendship with our Latin American neighbors based on mutual respect and understanding;

second, abate the anti-American feeling which is now prevalent in Latin America; third, destroy the Communist movement in that area and deny it to the Communist bloc; and fourth, make the Alliance for Progress program a workable one.

The task force will confer with experts in all areas of Latin American relations, develop long- and short-range programs to meet the challenges America faces in this area, and make reports to the Congress.

We are hopeful that the work of the task force will prove beneficial to the new administration as well as to the Congress.

Other Members appointed to the task force are Republican Representatives H. R. GROSS, of Iowa; JAMES D. WEAVER, of Pennsylvania; DON H. CLAUSEN, of California; JAMES T. BROYHILL, of North Carolina; DURWARD HALL, of Missouri; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan, and JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio.

#### BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on December 9 of this year I addressed the House on the accomplishments of the economy drive undertaken at the beginning of this session of Congress. At that time I estimated that we might make savings in the House of Representatives of approximately \$7,500 million. Even as of this date it is impossible to determine the exact cuts that were made, but they were substantial. More could and should have been done, and the task force will continue its operations during the next session of the Congress, and we shall continue to make every effort to make reductions where they are feasible and do not affect the national interest. It is our opinion we can accomplish a balanced budget and with a balanced budget that we may have a meaningful tax bill which will reduce the heavy burden of taxes upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to submit on this closing day of the session a comparative budget comparing the budget requests from 1960 to 1964. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not complete insofar as the action taken by the Congress this session is concerned, but it does give the picture on budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been published, to my knowledge, a comparative budget. By this I mean a budget allowing a complete comparison of appropriations from the general fund in the past several years. Every year, it is true the budget message contains some historical perspective on Federal expenditures, but never a detailed analysis. The Budget

of the United States does print data for the previous 2 years, but often with estimates or possible revisions—due to supplemental requests. The fact is that there simply is no long-range view of the budget.

Not that there is not a need for such a view. Members of Congress must ask questions before they vote on appropriations, or even authorizations, questions about trends in Government spending, total outlays in certain areas over the past few years, and the extent of Government involvement in the economy. Such questions cannot be answered by mere reference to the past 2 years. Yet, without much effort and a good chance for error, the Members of Congress cannot find more information.

"Much effort and a good chance for error" is a real picture of the situation, too. Every year the structure of the budget is altered; a commission is created; an agency abolished; a service transferred from one department to another; two offices merged; and so on. The final product is never final; yet, one must set up some base for comparison and work around it. This requires "much effort and a good chance for error."

This summer I attempted to make a "Comparative Budget." Based on the budget documents of 1962-64, the supplemental appropriations of this session, and the Appropriations Committee reports printed thus far, this budget is as accurate and up to date as possible. Yet

this budget is quite limited: It covers only the last 4 fiscal years; it deals only with new obligatory authority, not expenditures; it contains only estimates for indefinite appropriations, which could now be corrected; and, in several specific areas, it lacks the necessary material for making an accurate comparison.

These limitations could all be overcome by a comprehensive document from the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that a full presentation along the lines of my "comparative budget," but covering all of the fiscal years from possibly World War II on, such a budget would be invaluable to the Members of Congress.

The "comparative budget" I have made is put in the structure of the present executive budget.

[NOTE.—All figures are in thousands of dollars. Figures in parentheses are not counted in the totals. Asterisks indicate budget requests to be transmitted at a later date. The final column represents action taken by the House Appropriations Committee only and does not reflect changes occurring either on the floor of the House or in final action by the Congress]

Department of Defense—Military functions

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Military personnel:</b>						
<b>Military personnel:</b>						
Army.....	3,204,188	3,254,548	3,697,009	3,662,900	3,885,000	3,785,000
Navy.....	2,476,700	2,503,244	2,652,536	2,747,400	2,676,000	2,614,000
Marine Corps.....	608,600	606,74	632,000	667,900	678,600	676,600
Air Force.....	3,918,000	3,964,843	4,175,820	4,167,690	4,418,000	3,943,000
<b>Reserve personnel:</b>						
Army.....	227,700	220,598	205,530	239,200	210,100	210,100
Navy.....	85,000	85,584	83,000	85,600	92,300	92,300
Marine Corps.....	24,300	24,831	26,400	28,100	28,500	28,500
Air Force.....	54,000	52,250	52,080	50,100	55,100	55,100
<b>National Guard personnel:</b>						
Army.....	234,961	230,277	218,550	261,800	240,300	240,300
Air Force.....	48,000	46,000	47,000	53,000	58,300	58,300
Retired pay, Defense.....	715,000	789,500	920,000	1,029,000	1,163,000	1,143,000
Pay increase.....	0	0	0	0	*900,000	-----
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>11,596,449</b>	<b>11,778,421</b>	<b>12,709,916</b>	<b>12,992,690</b>	<b>13,235,200</b>	<b>12,848,200</b>
					*+900,000	
					14,135,200	
<b>Operation and maintenance:</b>						
<b>Operation and maintenance:</b>						
Army.....	3,075,596	3,209,772	3,770,726	3,452,552	3,395,200	3,361,000
Navy.....	2,610,610	2,597,626	2,986,282	2,864,414	2,984,000	2,905,000
Marine Corps.....	178,850	176,725	187,271	194,000	192,300	191,000
Air Force.....	4,202,303	4,306,617	4,493,543	4,412,877	4,385,000	4,341,000
Defense agencies.....	0	0	0	358,987	451,400	446,000
(Office of Secretary now included in above).....	20,500	19,850	21,500	0	0	0
Army National Guard.....	151,700	166,316	165,485	174,400	176,600	176,600
Air National Guard.....	169,000	189,481	189,100	194,400	222,700	222,700
National Rifle Promotion Board.....	300	501	500	622	528	528
Claims, Defense.....	16,500	19,575	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Contingencies, Defense.....	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Court of Military Appeals.....	425	425	445	472	509	509
Adjustment figure.....	-120,074	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10,316,510</b>	<b>10,701,888</b>	<b>11,758,852</b>	<b>11,688,724</b>	<b>11,792,237</b>	<b>11,678,337</b>
<b>Procurement:</b>						
Equipment and missiles, Army.....	1,407,300	1,495,352	2,532,102	2,520,000	3,202,000	2,969,094
Aircraft and missiles, Navy.....	1,961,644	2,141,760	2,680,888	3,034,660	3,066,000	2,877,445
Shipbuilding, Navy.....	1,330,700	2,245,590	2,966,860	2,919,200	2,310,000	2,080,089
Other, Navy.....	583,219	424,480	852,012	903,600	1,208,000	1,175,231
Marine Corps.....	133,850	91,180	264,600	256,000	207,700	201,960
Aircraft, Air Force.....	4,284,600	3,562,237	3,657,852	3,562,400	3,559,000	3,328,900
Missiles, Air Force.....	2,465,550	2,615,120	2,729,784	2,459,000	2,177,000	2,129,490
Other, Air Force.....	1,109,650	877,171	1,096,182	956,250	951,500	871,299
Defense agencies.....	0	0	0	36,000	43,600	43,164
Adjustment figure.....	-171,418	-1,737,100	-1,034,744	0	0	0
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>13,105,095</b>	<b>11,715,790</b>	<b>15,745,636</b>	<b>16,047,110</b>	<b>16,724,800</b>	<b>15,676,672</b>
<b>Research, development, test, and evaluation:</b>						
Army.....	1,074,128	1,147,417	1,337,175	1,319,500	1,469,900	1,363,141
Navy.....	1,066,624	1,366,609	1,308,905	1,475,958	1,572,900	1,525,713
Air Force.....	1,448,850	1,583,858	2,529,857	3,632,100	3,621,800	3,416,146
Defense agencies.....	329,620	194,000	191,650	444,000	447,400	434,000
Emergency fund, Defense.....	5,288	4,159	14	150,000	150,000	150,000
Adjustment figure.....	291,492	1,737,100	1,034,744	0	0	0
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>4,215,902</b>	<b>6,038,043</b>	<b>6,402,345</b>	<b>7,021,558</b>	<b>7,262,000</b>	<b>6,889,000</b>

## Department of Defense—Military functions—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Military construction:</b>						
Army.....	263,632	148,407	171,284	151,407	249,500	
Navy.....	204,112	162,519	198,618	161,354	269,900	
Air Force.....	783,832	676,084	522,746	730,068	628,200	
Defense agencies.....	16,545	0	350	35,677	29,900	
Army Reserve.....	20,000	16,038	14,381	8,000	4,500	
Naval Reserve.....	8,980	4,000	7,000	7,000	6,000	
Air Force Reserve.....	4,000	4,000	4,608	5,000	4,000	
Army National Guard.....	23,219	17,540	21,869	7,000	3,500	
Air National Guard.....	16,440	13,850	20,775	14,000	16,000	
Loran stations, Defense.....	23,200	19,000	10,000	20,000	20,500	
Arizona Memorial.....	0	0	150	0	0	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,363,961</b>	<b>1,061,438</b>	<b>971,781</b>	<b>1,189,506</b>	<b>1,232,000</b>	
<b>Family housing.....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>596,879</b>	<b>734,400</b>	
<b>Civil defense:</b>						
Operation and maintenance.....	0	0	0	72,848	82,200	
Research, development, and construction.....	0	0	0	53,000	217,800	
Civil defense and construction.....	0	0	257,206	0	0	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>257,206</b>	<b>125,848</b>	<b>300,000</b>	
<b>Revolving and management funds:</b>						
Permanent appropriation.....	30,000	30,000	0	0	0	
Permanent, indefinite, contract authorization.....	0	0	324,639	0	0	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>324,639</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Grand total, Defense, military.....</b>	<b>40,627,918</b>	<b>41,320,580</b>	<b>48,170,275</b>	<b>50,262,315</b>	<b>51,280,637</b>	
					<b>*900,000</b>	
<b>Total.....</b>					<b>52,180,637</b>	

## Legislative branch

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Senate.....</b>						
<b>House of Representatives:</b>						
Compensation of members.....	10,638	10,673	10,672	10,672	10,622	10,622
Mileage and expense allowance.....	200	390	200	200	200	200
Salaries, employees.....	7,123	7,648	7,661	8,149	8,458	8,384
Members' clerk hire.....	16,300	18,122	20,400	21,348	21,800	21,300
<b>Contingent expenses of the House:</b>						
Furniture.....	232	243	243	270	283	270
Miscellaneous items.....	2,443	2,544	2,549	2,689	2,825	2,800
Reporting hearings.....	150	150	150	175	175	175
Special and select committees.....	2,450	2,634	2,900	3,059	3,325	3,300
Joint Committee on Taxation.....	295	322	322	338	344	344
Joint Committee on Immigration.....	20	20	20	20	20	20
Joint Committee on Defense Production.....	0	0	0	68	70	70
Office of Information.....	99	168	168	120	122	122
Telephone and telegraph.....	1,300	1,275	1,300	1,500	1,670	1,670
Stationery.....	1,056	794	745	788	785	785
Physician's office.....	15	17	17	17	17	17
Postage stamps.....	184	184	184	184	183	183
Folding documents.....	220	250	236	251	257	251
Revision of laws.....	18	20	20	20	21	21
Special autos.....	38	30	30	30	31	31
Portrait of Speaker.....	0	0	0	3	0	0
New edition, United States Code.....	150	0	100	0	0	0
Payments to widows and heirs.....	135	112	102	45	0	0
<b>Capitol Police:</b>						
General expenses.....	37	37	37	37	37	37
Capitol Police Board.....	106	113	125	136	144	144
Education of pages.....	62	68	68	73	77	77
Penalty mail costs.....	2,691	3,269	3,836	3,986	4,867	4,867
Statements of appropriations.....	8	8	8	8	8	13
North Atlantic Treaty Conference.....	80	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation of Clerk's report.....	0	8	0	0	0	0
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>46,049</b>	<b>46,038</b>	<b>52,023</b>	<b>54,186</b>	<b>56,340</b>	<b>55,702</b>
<b>Architect of the Capitol:</b>						
<b>Office of the Architect:</b>						
Salaries.....	278	316	338	363	496	480
Expenses.....	50	50	50	50	50	50
<b>Capitol Building and Grounds:</b>						
Capitol buildings.....	1,020	1,152	1,630	1,633	1,437	1,428
<b>Extension of Capitol:</b>						
Contract authorization.....	0	3,000	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization.....	0	0	(1,500)	(800)	(1,000)	(700)
Capitol Grounds.....	357	388	446	435	496	476
Senate office buildings.....	1,832	2,363	2,320	2,252	2,945	(2,945)
Legislative garage.....	116	112	79	63	50	50
House office buildings.....	1,460	1,703	1,639	1,722	1,928	1,778

See footnotes at end of table.

Legislative branch—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Architect of the Capitol—Continued						
Capitol Building and Grounds—Continued						
Acquisition of property:						
Contract authorization.....	5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization.....	(16,500)	(18,000)	(6,000)	(8,500)	(20,000)	(20,000)
Capitol Power Plant:						
Current.....	1,902	2,029	2,052	2,052	2,230	2,313
Liquidation of authorization.....	(2,500)	(3,230)	0	0	0	0
Extension of Senate Office Building site.....	200	140	0	0	0	0
Subway transportation.....	6	6	0	0	0	0
Library of Congress buildings:						
Structural and mechanical care.....	1,085	967	3,748	1,116	3,522	3,388
Furniture.....	140	123	99	225	189	180
Contract authorization.....	75	0	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization.....	0	(75)	0	0	0	0
Total, Architect of Capitol.....	13,520	17,350	12,401	9,912	13,344	10,044 1+2,945
Total.....						12,989 462
Botanic Garden.....	328	352	489	514	483	
Library of Congress:						
Salaries and expenses.....	7,160	8,123	8,455	10,141	10,405	9,726
Copyright Office.....	1,450	1,589	1,600	1,674	1,794	1,781
Legislative Reference Service.....	1,455	1,780	1,809	1,961	2,143	2,138
Distribution of card catalogs.....	1,981	2,173	2,347	2,754	3,077	3,042
Books for general collection.....	350	400	470	570	670	650
Books for law library.....	90	90	90	110	110	110
Books for the blind.....	1,619	1,723	1,786	1,894	1,902	1,900
Presidential papers.....	107	113	113	113	113	113
Motion picture preservation.....	60	61	61	61	61	50
Collection and distribution of materials (foreign currency program).....	0	0	400	680	978	978
Alaskan church records.....	0	0	0	15	0	0
Revision, annotated Constitution.....	0	0	25	0	0	0
Oliver Holmes Fund (permanent, indefinite (special fund)).....	26	17	26	18	20	20
Total.....	14,299	16,068	17,182	19,992	21,273	20,508
Government Printing Office:						
Printing and binding.....	11,500	11,900	13,400	15,200	18,200	18,200
Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses.....	3,520	4,044	4,724	4,760	5,418	5,242
Acquisition of annex site.....	0	0	0	6,450	3,758	0
GPO fund, contribution.....	0	0	0	0	11,000	8,500
Total.....	15,020	15,944	18,124	26,410	38,376	31,942
Grand total, legislative branch.....	116,656	124,665	129,086		161,136	119,358

<sup>1</sup> Senate office buildings appropriations are not handled by the House Appropriations Committee.

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests of January 1963: House of Representatives, salaries of officers and employees, raised by 8. Penalty mail costs, raised

by 881. Architect, liquidation of contract authority, acquisition of property, raised by 3,500. Library of Congress, distribution of card catalogs, raised by 100. Government Printing Office, GPO fund contribution, raised by 11,000. Total, raised by 11,988, plus (3,500).

The Judiciary

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
The Supreme Court:						
Salaries.....	1,336	1,440	1,479	1,503	1,588	1,588
Printing and binding reports.....	90	90	105	138	141	138
Miscellaneous expenses.....	79	70	83	79	87	85
Care of buildings and grounds.....	347	287	284	323	354	348
Auto for Chief Justice.....	6	7	7	7	7	7
Books for Court.....	30	35	38	35	35	35
Total.....	1,888	1,929	1,996	2,085	2,212	2,201
Court of Customs and Patents Appeals.....	332	357	359	370	390	388
Customs Court.....	788	840	895	931	989	989
Court of Claims.....	884	924	964	1,044	1,124	1,110
Court of Appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:						
Salaries of judges.....	9,185	9,200	10,100	11,048	11,200	11,200
Salaries, other personnel.....	21,501	23,751	25,654	27,988	31,480	30,650
Fees.....	4,820	4,635	4,800	5,800	5,500	5,500
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	3,500	3,835	5,438	4,670	4,550	4,500
Administrative office.....	1,200	1,368	1,442	1,530	1,640	1,590
Referees' salaries (special).....	2,006	2,125	2,370	2,552	2,600	2,550
Referees' expenses (special).....	3,050	3,651	4,310	4,897	5,456	5,250
Total.....	45,262	48,565	54,104	58,486	62,426	61,240
Grand total, Judiciary.....	49,154	52,615	58,319	62,916	67,141	65,927
Plus Grants to Alaska from Court receipts (permanent, indefinite, special fund).....	749	0	0	0	0	0
Transfers from GSA.....	0	0	934	2,354	1,587	0
Total.....	49,903	52,615	59,253	65,270	68,728	

Department of Agriculture

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Agricultural Research Service:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	138,848	151,520	159,558	173,595	184,204	
Salaries and expenses (foreign currency).....	18,193	15,131	5,265	(178,457)	(190,814)	(181,588)
Construction of facilities.....	0	7,750	800	0	0	0
Permanent appropriation.....	30	400	0	0	0	0
Total.....	158,071	175,801	166,623	178,860	186,704	
				(183,722)	(193,314)	(181,588)
<b>Cooperative State Experiment Station Service.....</b>	<b>31,804</b>	<b>32,803</b>	<b>35,803</b>	<b>38,263</b>	<b>40,383</b>	<b>40,383</b>
Extension Service.....	64,123	67,431	70,804	75,344	77,328	77,313
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	616	657	657	1,156	1,280	1,195
<b>Soil Conservation Service:</b>						
Conservation operations.....	82,322	89,204	86,646	93,976	99,453	97,480
Watershed protection.....	22,750	36,800	53,752	61,376	63,992	63,222
Flood prevention.....	18,000	19,570	24,994	25,326	25,576	25,465
Great Plains conservation program.....	10,000	10,168	10,166	12,354	14,640	12,994
Water conservation and utilities program.....	75	0	0	0	0	0
Resource conservation and development.....	0	0	0	0	6,275	1,200
Total.....	133,147	155,742	178,558	193,031	209,936	200,361
Economic Research Service.....	0	0	9,360	9,511	10,301	9,832
Statistical Reporting Service.....	0	0	8,761	10,022	11,552	11,079
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>						
Research and service.....	41,417	47,221	37,961	40,897	42,905	
Research and service (permanent).....	0	0	285	(36,034)	(37,895)	(37,061)
Construction of facilities.....	0	0	0	0	1,600	0
Payments to States.....	1,195	1,195	1,325	1,425	1,425	1,425
Special milk program.....	66,731	74,668	171,181	100,000	102,000	100,000
School lunch program.....	110,000	110,000	125,000	125,000	137,000	137,000
School lunch program (permanent).....	43,657	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Perishable Commodities Act fund (permanent-indefinite).....	679	693	665	729	913	913
Food stamp program.....	0	0	0	0	*25,000	
Total.....	463,981	545,600	654,085	577,904	639,026	
				(573,041)	(632,416)	(629,582)
					*+25,000	
<b>Foreign Agricultural Service:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	15,071	19,031	15,901	21,129	19,039	18,505
Salaries and expenses (permanent).....	2,493	2,817	3,117	3,117	3,117	3,117
Total.....	17,564	21,848	19,018	24,246	22,156	21,622
<b>Commodity Exchange Authority.....</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>1,061</b>	<b>1,095</b>	<b>1,093</b>
<b>Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:</b>						
Expenses.....	40,535	43,598	62,598	95,423	114,944	105,737
Sugar Act program.....	71,500	74,500	78,000	77,650	80,000	78,000
Agricultural conservation program.....	241,702	242,000	243,000	212,900	220,000	215,000
Land-use adjustment program.....	0	0	0	2,000	19,000	10,000
Conservation reserve program.....	335,000	351,825	312,000	304,000	294,000	294,000
Total.....	688,737	711,923	695,598	691,973	727,944	702,737
<b>Foreign assistance programs:</b>						
Public Law 480:						
Sales of commodities.....	968,016	881,000	1,250,451	1,588,804	1,452,000	1,452,000
Famine relief grants.....	104,508	115,000	140,868	250,000	215,451	215,451
Losses on contracts.....	0	0	13,000	40,000	79,000	52,515
Total, Public Law 480.....	1,072,524	996,000	1,404,319	1,878,804	1,746,451	1,719,966
International wheat agreement.....	63,875	52,042	70,681	81,218	62,356	86,218
Materials for stockpile.....	129,000	422,950	125,000	125,000	82,860	82,860
Total.....	1,265,399	1,020,592	1,600,000	2,085,022	1,921,667	1,889,044
<b>Commodity Credit Corporation:</b>						
Price support programs.....	2,043,693	1,151,832	936,429	2,370,698	2,799,400	2,500,000
Other programs.....	2,664	1,018	1,861,915	0	0	0
National Wool Act (permanent-indefinite).....	50,050	67,190	75,278	69,165	69,000	69,000
Total.....	2,096,407	1,264,095	1,011,707	2,439,863	2,868,400	2,569,000
<b>Federal crop insurance program.....</b>	<b>6,377</b>	<b>6,561</b>	<b>6,550</b>	<b>6,779</b>	<b>7,210</b>	<b>6,950</b>
<b>Rural Electric Administration:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	9,632	10,024	10,024	10,442	11,344	11,162
Loans (from debt receipts).....	265,000	310,000	407,500	480,000	495,000	495,000
Total.....	274,632	320,024	417,524	490,442	506,344	506,162
					*-151,000	
<b>Farmers' Home Administration:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	30,745	33,017	34,501	35,779	39,367	38,367
Housing grants and loans.....	0	0	10,000	0	0	0
Housing for elderly fund.....	0	0	0	1,000	5,000	2,000
Rural renewal.....	0	0	0	0	2,350	1,000
Loan authorizations.....	226,000	467,000	326,000	340,000	0	0
Farm tenant mortgage fund.....	6,245	0	0	0	0	0
Housing credit fund.....	0	0	0	0	*100,000	0
Total.....	262,990	500,017	370,501	376,779	46,717	41,367
					*+105,350	
<b>Office of Rural Areas Development.....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>120</b>
Office of General Counsel.....	3,162	3,550	3,649	3,855	3,987	3,953
Office of Information.....	1,432	1,548	1,591	1,662	1,684	1,684
Agriculture centennial.....	0	0	100	0	0	0

Department of Agriculture—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
National Agricultural Library.....	900	951	1,029	1,185	2,145	1,870
General administration.....	2,881	3,080	3,096	3,397	3,975	3,735
Defense food stockpiling.....	0	0	0	0	*30,000	
Forest Service:						
Protection and utilization.....	129,120	150,676	204,389	183,865	190,397	183,500
Cooperative range improvement.....	700	700	700	700	700	700
Roads and trails (contract authority).....	0	0	0	80,000	0	0
(Permanent contract authorization).....	30,000	35,000	40,000	0	85,000	85,000
(Liquidation of authorization).....	(28,000)	(30,000)	(35,000)	(37,500)	(60,400)	(60,000)
Access roads.....	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	0	0
Acquisition of lands:						
Superior National Forest.....	0	750	250	2,000	0	0
Special Acts (indefinite).....	10	10	10	30	70	70
Cache National Forest.....	50	0	0	0	0	0
Wasatch National Forest.....	0	0	0	0	20	20
Klamath Indians lands.....	0	68,717	0	0	0	0
State tree-planting assistance.....	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Permanent, indefinite, special funds:						
Expenses, brush disposal.....	7,222	6,762	7,699	9,000	9,000	9,000
State roads and trails.....	11,870	14,166	10,024	10,900	12,000	12,000
Fire prevention.....	14	22	20	20	20	20
Land restoration.....	6	5	10	196	100	100
Minnesota, payments to.....	121	123	324	125	128	128
Counties, payments to.....	453	392	421	425	438	438
School funds, payments to.....	114	140	99	80	100	100
States, payments to.....	29,669	35,409	25,056	27,235	30,000	30,000
Construction, Salt Lake City.....	25	0	0	0	0	0
Total (permanent, indefinite, funds).....	40,494	57,019	43,453	47,971	51,786	51,786
Total, Forest Service.....	210,374	322,872	291,082	317,566	328,973	322,076
Grand total, Agriculture.....	5,683,507	5,559,430	7,409,736	7,528,008	7,618,941 *+9,350	7,222,746
Total.....					7,628,291	

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests of January 1963: Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, land-use adjustment program, cut 8,000. Foreign assistance program, Public Law 480, sales of commodities, cut 568,172 (by supplemental, 1963). Total, original requests cut by 516,172.

Department of Commerce

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
General administration.....	2,673	2,831	3,638	3,952	4,520	4,000
Special projects:						
New York World's Fair.....	0	0	17,000	0	0	0
Century 21 Exposition.....	9,000	0	900	0	0	0
West Virginia Centennial.....	0	10	0	0	0	0
Great Lakes pilotage administration.....	0	60	0	0	0	0
Total.....	9,000	70	17,900	0	0	0
Area Redevelopment Administration:						
Operations.....	0	0	8,148	12,416	14,800	13,500
Grants for public facilities.....	0	0	40,000	35,000	35,000	0
Area redevelopment fund.....	0	0	122,500	115,500	190,000	132,000
(Authorization from debt receipts).....	0	300,000	0	0	0	0
Total.....	0	300,000	170,648	162,466	239,800	145,500
Business and Defense Services.....	6,175	4,553	4,212	5,059	6,250	4,600
Office of Business Economics.....	1,400	1,508	1,600	1,869	2,350	2,000
Bureau of the Census.....	100,999	38,182	16,483	21,689	33,100	29,435
Office of Field Services.....	0	2,868	3,148	3,445	5,000	3,725
International Activities.....	5,187	6,490	8,402	11,029	19,500	13,600
Office of Trade Adjustment.....	0	0	0	25	1,700	100
U.S. Travel Service.....	0	0	2,500	3,350	4,200	2,600
Civilian Industrial Technology.....	0	0	0	625	7,400	1,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	14,084	23,161	33,106	37,388	40,900	38,000
Patent Office.....	22,000	23,882	24,816	27,545	32,300	29,000
Bureau of National Standards.....	19,390	45,253	69,500	60,665	57,540	39,288
Office of Technical Services.....	0	0	0	48	1,700	1,020
Weather Bureau.....	51,355	60,497	118,400	116,179	109,500	95,550
Maritime Administration:						
Ship construction.....	130,250	126,200	98,000	64,200	112,500	112,500
Research and development.....	0	0	6,500	3,550	8,250	7,000
Salaries and expenses.....	14,014	15,148	14,334	15,249	15,752	15,500
Maritime training.....	2,900	3,216	3,218	3,319	3,495	3,495
War shipping claims, payment.....	0	0	18	0	0	0
State marine schools.....	165	250	250	250	250	250
Permanent contract authority.....	2,489	1,642	1,407	1,125	1,155	1,155
Liquidation of authority.....	(960)	(1,020)	(1,020)	(1,125)	(1,155)	(1,155)
Operating-differential subsidies:						
Permanent contract authority (indefinite).....	153,232	176,861	193,332	200,000	210,000	210,000
Liquidation of authority.....	(152,750)	(150,000)	(202,000)	(220,400)	(225,000)	(225,000)
Total, Maritime Administration.....	303,050	300,527	317,050	287,693	351,402	349,900

Department of Commerce—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Bureau of Public Roads:						
Forest highways:						
Contract authorization:						
Permanent.....	33,000	0	33,000	0	33,000	33,000
Current.....	0	33,000	0	33,000	0	0
Liquidation of authority.....	(30,000)	(27,000)	(27,400)	(36,900)	(33,000)	(33,000)
Public lands highways:						
Contract authorization:						
Permanent.....	3,000	0	3,000	0	9,000	9,000
Current.....	0	3,500	0	15,000	0	0
Liquidation of authorization.....	(4,000)	(2,700)	(3,000)	(2,500)	(4,000)	(4,000)
Control of outdoor ads.....	0	0	0	2,000	3,000	2,000
Inter-American Highway:						
Current.....	0	0	0	0	16,000	13,000
Contract authorization.....	0	0	0	12,000	0	0
Liquidation of authority.....	0	0	0	0	(6,000)	(6,000)
Study of Alaska highways.....	0	0	0	400	0	0
Total.....	36,000	36,500	36,000	62,400	61,000	57,000
Transportation research.....	0	0	0	625	2,500	1,500
Grand total, Commerce.....	571,313	869,112	827,412	806,052	980,572	817,818

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Food and Drug Administration:						
Salaries and expenses.....	13,800	18,848	22,929	29,065	35,805	35,805
Reappropriation.....	0	0	0	0	718	0
Buildings and facilities.....	0	0	0	0	13,300	4,347
Laboratory building.....	0	100	1,750	0	0	0
Certification, inspection, and other services (indefinite, special fund).....	1,712	1,506	1,737	1,931	0	0
Total.....	15,512	20,454	26,416	30,996	49,823	40,152
Office of Education:						
Vocational education.....	33,702	33,672	33,672	34,716	34,756	34,756
Endowment, colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts.....	2,502	2,502	8,194	11,950	11,950	11,950
Library service grants.....	6,131	8,800	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Payments to school districts.....	186,300	217,300	247,000	282,322	104,466	104,466
					*+216,204	
Assistance for school construction.....	61,135	63,392	61,942	63,686	320,670	23,740
					*+37,984	
Total.....					61,784	
Defense educational activities.....	159,700	187,480	211,627	229,450	229,620	229,620
Education of mentally retarded.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Education of deaf.....	0	0	1,575	1,500	0	0
Cooperative research.....	0	3,357	5,000	6,985	17,000	11,500
Educational research.....	0	0	0	400	800	500
Land-grant college aid.....	0	2,225	3,775	0	0	0
Foreign language training.....	0	0	0	0	2,500	1,500
Salaries and expenses, Office of Education.....	12,800	10,549	11,594	12,645	16,261	14,761
New education program.....	0	0	0	0	*1,215,170	
Colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts (permanent).....	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550
Promotion of vocational education (permanent indefinite).....	7,161	7,170	7,161	7,161	7,161	7,161
Total.....	472,981	539,997	602,590	661,465	459,304	451,004
					*+1,479,358	
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	75,438	74,519	88,397	102,926	1,928,722	125,415
					131,435	
Public Health Service:						
Buildings and facilities.....	300	3,776	18,230	33,200	19,072	13,811
Community health:						
Accident prevention.....	0	0	3,616	3,668	4,857	4,163
Chronic diseases.....	0	0	12,955	22,942	55,907	53,377
Communicable diseases.....	8,158	15,393	9,988	15,492	30,429	25,405
Community health practice.....	24,497	27,135	22,231	26,276	31,648	28,608
Control of TB.....	6,452	6,493	6,493	6,993	6,828	6,828
Control of VD.....	5,400	0	6,000	8,000	9,588	9,588
Dental services.....	0	0	2,400	3,006	6,227	6,218
Nursing services.....	0	0	7,641	8,438	11,245	11,217
Hospital construction.....	187,850	187,936	221,500	226,220	179,514	177,914
					*+35,000	
Total.....					214,514	
Mental health research facilities.....	0	12,139	0	0	0	0
George Washington University Hospital.....	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,500
Aid to medical education.....	0	0	0	0	*34,352	
Total.....	232,357	249,096	292,924	321,035	338,743	325,815
					*+69,352	
Environmental health:					408,095	
Environmental health activities.....	15,720	27,768	0	0	0	0
Environmental health sciences.....	0	0	0	0	4,246	4,224
Air pollution.....	0	0	8,590	11,069	12,998	12,954
Milk, food, interstate, and community sanitation.....	0	0	7,422	8,536	9,079	9,009
Occupational health.....	0	0	3,970	4,122	4,621	4,590
Radiological health.....	0	0	10,482	15,875	18,776	18,745
Water supply and pollution control.....	0	0	20,270	24,707	29,980	27,921
Waste treatment works construction.....	46,816	46,101	80,645	90,000	100,000	90,000
Total.....	62,536	73,869	131,379	154,309	179,700	177,443



## Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Public Health Service—Continued</b>						
Medical services:						
Hospital and medical services	51,600	56,023	50,069	48,820	50,038	49,962
Foreign quarantine activities	4,686	5,110	6,082	5,910	7,116	6,456
Indian health activities:						
Current	45,245	49,742	52,549	56,597	58,085	58,750
Contract authorization (permanent)	529	435	435	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	(455)	(529)	(432)	(432)	0	0
Indian health facilities	4,946	9,714	8,285	9,335	6,096	5,000
Total	107,006	121,024	117,357	120,662	122,235	120,168
National Institutes of Health	430,000	577,861	773,000	930,800	980,454	962,454
Other services:						
Scientific activities overseas	0	3,707	9,000	2,800	6,647	4,000
National health statistics	0	0	4,642	5,150	5,949	5,949
National Library of Medicine	1,566	1,738	2,066	3,335	4,074	4,074
Pay of retired officers (indefinite)	1,682	1,927	2,360	5,784	6,436	6,436
Office of Surgeon General	5,816	7,368	5,560	5,850	6,091	6,091
Emergency health activities	0	0	35,433	7,000	41,361	
Total	9,064	14,740	59,061	29,919	70,558	
Total, Public Health Service	811,263	1,010,366	1,391,952	1,589,225	1,780,114	
St. Elizabeths Hospital:						
Salaries and expenses (definite)	3,805	4,572	5,105	6,332	0	0
Salaries and expenses (indefinite)	0	0	0	0	9,716	7,354
Buildings and facilities	330	5,445	645	8,095	627	627
Total	4,135	10,017	5,750	14,427	10,343	7,981
<b>Social Security Administration:</b>						
Payments for military service credits	0	0	0	0	63,400	
Grants to States for public assistance	2,037,500	2,177,000	2,401,200	2,738,300	2,900,000	2,725,000
Personnel training	0	0	0	0	2,000	0
Aid for repatriated U.S. nationals	0	0	764	467	500	467
Bureau of Family Services	2,345	2,727	3,442	3,874	5,400	4,756
Maternal and child health service	0	0	0	0	*17,250	
Maternal and child welfare	46,500	51,833	69,100	79,295	87,000	86,943
Children's Bureau	2,300	2,493	2,668	2,956	3,401	3,401
Cooperative research	0	350	700	1,100	2,000	1,455
International social security meeting	0	0	0	0	95	95
Research and training	0	0	1,607	0	1,200	0
Refugee assistance	0	0	0	70,110	70,000	
White House Conference on Youth	200	150	0	0	0	0
Office of Commissioner	337	373	590	736	1,025	1,025
Total	2,089,182	2,234,926	2,480,071	2,896,838	3,072,621 *+80,650	
American Printing House for Blind	400	400	670	739	3,153,271	775
Freedmen's Hospital	3,190	3,498	3,736	3,909	3,880	3,880
Gallaudet College	1,285	3,600	1,857	2,544	4,616	4,616
Howard University	4,646	7,166	11,915	13,552	15,064	15,064
Office of the Secretary	6,541	7,372	15,550	15,210	29,502	20,737
Grand total, Health, Education, and Welfare	3,514,572	3,942,315	4,628,904	5,332,930	5,488,185 *+1,619,360	
					7,107,545	

NOTE.—Revisions in requests from original budget, January 1963: Social Security Administration, grants to States for public assistance, cut by 50,000. Total cut by 50,000.

## Department of Justice

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
<b>Legal activities and general administration:</b>						
Salaries and expenses (administration)	3,695	4,036	4,165	4,428	4,778	4,600
Salaries and expenses (legal activities)	12,665	14,265	15,785	17,096	19,173	18,573
Salaries and expenses (Antitrust Division)	4,500	5,074	5,873	6,219	6,600	6,600
Salaries and expenses (attorneys and marshals)	22,825	24,583	25,185	28,167	29,580	29,230
Fees and expenses, witnesses	1,775	1,835	2,235	2,500	2,500	2,300
Salaries and expenses, Administrative Conference	0	0	150	100	0	0
Total	45,460	49,793	53,394	58,509	62,531	61,363
Federal Bureau of Investigation	114,600	125,550	127,177	135,925	146,900	146,900
Immigration and Naturalization Service	55,750	62,890	63,450	66,272	70,000	69,011
<b>Federal prison system:</b>						
Salaries and expenses	42,350	45,195	46,785	50,242	54,109	53,000
Buildings and facilities	5,625	9,875	2,350	3,454	17,775	9,425
Prisoners' support	3,300	3,705	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,100
Total	51,275	58,775	53,135	57,887	76,075	66,525
Grand total, Justice	267,085	297,008	297,156	318,593	355,506	343,799

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests in January 1963: Legal activities and general administration, salaries and expenses, attorneys and marshals, raised by 200. Total, original requests raised by 200.

Department of Labor

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Bureau of Labor statistics	10,749	12,440	14,767	15,955	19,905	17,805
Bureau of International Labor Affairs	0	0	500	809	935	882
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training	0	0	14,000	82,018	178,093	149,000
Office of Welfare and Pensions	0	0	0	0	1,720	1,565
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training	4,047	4,329	4,962	5,212	5,460	5,460
Bureau of Employment Security	454,954	965,093	508,140	150,387	119,870	110,870
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	692	632	633	652	790	760
Bureau of Labor Standards	2,488	2,522	3,257	4,686	3,470	3,470
Bureau of Labor-Management Reports	3,025	5,550	5,767	5,924	5,900	5,900
Bureau of Employees' Compensation	63,011	66,432	67,798	69,053	58,123	58,123
Women's Bureau	509	554	668	930	785	785
Wage and Hour Division	11,489	12,261	17,250	18,274	19,300	19,300
Office of Solicitor	2,695	2,878	4,107	4,362	4,570	4,570
Office of Secretary	1,611	1,870	1,796	2,098	2,664	2,364
Youth employment opportunities	0	0	0	0	*100,000	
Trade adjustment activities	0	0	0	100	7,635	4,000
Grand total, Labor	555,170	1,074,561	643,645	360,454	427,220 *+100,000	384,884
Total					527,220	

Post Office Department

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Payment for public services	37,400	49,000	62,700	0	0	0
Contribution to postal fund (indefinite)	608,821	845,580	811,460	808,400	564,964	564,964
Authorizations and limitations on use of the postal fund: <sup>1</sup>						
Administration and operation	71,575	79,911	82,000	79,471	85,700	83,500
Research and development	0	0	0	12,000	13,700	11,500
Operations	3,008,200	3,365,841	3,440,500	3,701,863	3,959,814	3,890,000
Transportation	636,500	563,000	582,000	594,500	611,750	611,000
Facilities	187,835	137,780	159,000	167,000	195,000	185,000
Plant and equipment	81,200	131,107	105,000	102,267	111,000	104,000
Total	3,885,310	4,268,639	4,368,500	4,657,461	4,976,964	4,885,000
Grand total, Post Office	646,221	894,580	874,160	808,400	564,964	564,964

<sup>1</sup> The postal fund is not included as an item in the general fund and, therefore, is not included as expenditures in the executive budget. On the other hand, the House Appropriations Committee controls the expenditures from both funds and must act on requests of the postal fund.

Department of State

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Administration of foreign affairs:						
Salaries and expenses	112,300	125,265	136,868	147,548	162,800	153,000
Representation allowances	825	872	925	950	996	973
Acquisition of buildings abroad	17,372	10,723	10,000	10,000	27,000	0
Acquisition of buildings abroad (foreign currency)	0	4,500	4,650	2,205	3,900	2,750
Emergencies	1,500	2,300	1,500	1,800	1,600	1,500
Extension, State Department	3,600	500	0	0	0	0
Payment, Foreign Service retirement	2,860	2,540	0	0	0	0
Replacement of autos sold abroad (permanent, indefinite, special fund)	256	255	264	284	343	343
Total	137,613	146,955	154,208	162,788	196,639	158,566
International organizations and conferences:						
Contributions to organizations	54,533	80,905	87,192	69,227	81,821	81,305
Missions to organizations	1,950	1,953	2,115	2,322	2,745	2,500
Conferences and contingencies	2,100	1,943	1,943	3,117	2,170	1,943
Tariff negotiations	0	650	171	0	495	450
U.N. loan	0	0	0	100,000	0	0
Citizens Committee on NATO	0	150	250	0	0	0
Total	58,583	85,601	91,671	174,666	87,231	86,198
International commissions:						
Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	573	616	604	692	729	715
Operation	2,610	2,021	1,950	1,972	2,043	2,015
Construction	1,400	9,225	13,168	11,000	8,354	8,000
Total	4,583	11,862	15,722	13,664	11,126	10,730
American sections, international commission	1,725	382	415	415	500	430
International Fish Commission	0	1,896	1,910	1,910	2,053	1,910
Total	6,653	14,140	18,047	15,989	13,679	13,070
Educational exchange:						
Mutual exchange activities	64,137	32,616	34,399	41,950	55,975	42,250
East-West Exchange Center	0	10,000	3,300	8,340	5,690	4,460
Preservation, Nubian monuments	0	0	4,000	0	0	0
Fund payments by Finland (permanent, indefinite, special)	397	396	396	396	396	396
Total	64,534	43,012	42,095	50,290	62,061	47,106

## Department of State—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Other:						
Rama Road, Nicaragua:						
Current.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,500	0	0
Contract authorization.....	0	0	0	850	0	0
Liquidation of authorization.....	0	0	0	0	850	850
Migration and refugee assistance.....	0	0	0	14,947	11,800	-----
Payment of foreign claims.....	20	0	0	0	0	0
1-time items.....	0	6,018	217	0	0	0
Payment to Republic of Panama (permanent).....	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930
Total.....	2,950	9,823	3,147	18,377	13,730	-----
Grand total, State.....	270,333	299,532	309,168	422,110	373,340	-----

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests, January 1963: Educational exchange, mutual exchange activities, cut by 445. Total, cut by 445.

## Treasury Department

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Office of the Secretary:						
Salaries and expenses.....	3,337	3,576	4,268	4,695	5,050	5,000
Expenses, War Claims Act (permanent, indefinite, special fund).....	18	18	6	12	10	10
Total.....	3,355	3,594	4,274	4,707	5,060	5,010
Bureau of Accounts:						
Salaries and expenses.....	3,489	3,708	3,716	3,886	4,100	4,050
Division of Disbursement.....	22,000	24,066	25,700	26,500	31,500	30,750
Claims, relief acts.....	7,229	23,866	39,147	970	0	0
Permanent, definite and indefinite.....	3,890	5,085	4,804	5,972	5,002	5,002
Interest, uninvested funds (permanent, indefinite).....	9,792	10,070	10,357	11,207	12,456	12,456
Payment to unemployment trust fund (permanent, indefinite).....	2,553	1,216	0	0	0	0
Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment.....	0	100	0	825	1,250	550
Total.....	48,952	68,111	83,724	49,160	54,308	52,808
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	48,500	47,943	47,984	48,325	48,600	48,000
Office of the Treasurer.....	17,463	16,960	16,925	16,450	16,800	16,700
Check forgery insurance fund.....	0	0	0	0	50	50
Bureau of Customs.....	54,245	59,815	63,281	67,510	76,100	72,000
Internal Revenue Service:						
Salaries and expenses.....	364,250	413,900	450,912	504,000	578,300	546,000
Refunding collections, interest (permanent, indefinite).....	76,438	82,798	67,868	70,694	70,665	70,665
Collections for Puerto Rico (permanent, indefinite, special).....	22,698	26,348	33,328	34,000	34,000	34,000
Total.....	463,386	523,046	552,109	608,694	682,965	650,665
Bureau of Narcotics.....	4,080	4,320	4,462	4,777	5,450	5,250
U.S. Secret Service:						
Salaries and expenses.....	5,859	6,098	6,306	7,358	9,400	8,860
Contribution for annuity benefits (permanent, indefinite).....	239	256	269	360	380	380
Total.....	6,098	6,354	6,575	7,718	9,780	9,240
Bureau of the Mint:						
Salaries and expenses.....	4,600	5,825	6,138	6,582	7,720	7,300
Coinage profits fund (permanent, indefinite).....	371	440	324	462	552	552
Silver profits fund (permanent, indefinite, special).....	412	615	306	618	737	737
Total.....	5,383	6,880	6,768	7,662	9,009	8,589
Bureau of Engraving and Printing.....	0	1,250	0	300	5,380	0
Coast Guard.....	258,050	281,000	298,228	302,580	363,500	351,400
Interest on the public debt (permanent, indefinite).....	9,179,589	8,957,242	9,119,760	9,700,000	10,020,000	10,020,000
Grand total, Treasury.....	10,369,100	9,976,889	10,204,088	10,817,784	11,297,032	11,239,712

## Atomic Energy Commission

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Operating expenses.....	2,539,672	2,577,104	2,351,978	2,871,993	2,472,800	-----
Plant and equipment.....	262,500	204,250	195,360	262,745	420,200	-----
Grand total, Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,802,172	2,781,354	2,547,338	3,134,738	2,893,000	-----

## National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Research, development, and operation (now includes "salaries and expenses").....	423,950	838,773	1,499,178	2,035,888	4,912,000	-----
Construction.....	99,625	125,227	325,752	737,425	800,000	-----
Grand total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	523,575	964,000	1,824,930	3,673,313	5,712,000	-----

Mr. Speaker, I also think it would be well to submit a growth budget from 1960 to 1964.

THE GROWTH BUDGET

The growth budget is an attempt to discover trends in Government spend-

ing. Every agency or service of every department is represented, with the actual appropriation made to it in 1960 and 1963. The change between those appropriations and the request for fiscal year 1964 is shown both in absolute

terms and in percentages. Finally, a study of action taken by the House Appropriations Committee follows, in order to determine the real effect of "budget cutters."

[NOTE.—The structure is that of the executive budget. All references to "1964" are to the requests made in the budget message of the President, and not to action taken by Congress. The references to the House Appropriations Committee are to action taken by the committee alone, not to any happening on the floor of the House or by the Congress as a whole. The "Total, Appropriations Committee" is to demonstrate the amount of any appropriation that comes under the jurisdiction of the committee, which is often far different from the amount that is actually contained in the budget. Asterisk (\*) indicates the effect of including the future requests with those already sent to Congress. The dagger (†) indicates that there was no appropriation in the base year, thus allowing no "Percent change" to be made]

Growth budget

Table with 11 main columns: Agency or department, Actual appropriations (1960, 1963), Budget requests, 1964, House committee, 1964, Change, 1960-64, Percent change, 1960-64, Change, 1963-64, Percent change, 1963-64, Change, Budget-House, Percent change, Budget-House. Rows include Legislative branch, The Judiciary, Executive Office of the President, Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and various sub-agencies.

See footnotes at end of table.

Growth budget—Continued

Agency or department	Actual appropriations		Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964	Change, 1960-64	Percent change, 1960-64	Change, 1963-64	Percent change, 1963-64	Change, Budget-House	Percent change, Budget-House
	1960	1963								
Department of Defense, military functions:										
Military personnel.....	11,596,449	12,992,690	13,235,200	12,848,200	1,638,751	14.1	242,510	1.8	-387,000	-2.9
Operation and maintenance.....	11,696,449	12,992,690	*14,135,200	11,678,337	2,538,751	*21.8	*1,142,510	*8.7	-113,900	-.9
Procurement.....	10,316,510	11,688,724	11,792,237	15,676,672	1,475,727	14.3	103,513	.8	-1,048,128	-6.2
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	4,215,902	7,021,558	7,262,000	6,889,000	3,046,098	72.2	240,442	3.4	-373,000	-5.1
Military construction.....	1,363,961	1,189,506	1,232,000	-----	-131,961	-9.6	-----	-----	-----	-----
Family housing.....	0	596,879	734,400	-----	734,400	(f)	-----	-----	-----	-----
Civil defense.....	0	125,848	300,000	-----	300,000	(f)	-----	-----	-----	-----
Revolving funds (permanent).....	30,000	0	0	-----	-30,000	-100.0	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	40,627,918	50,262,315	51,280,637	-----	10,652,519	26.2	-----	-----	-----	-----
(Total, Appropriations Committee).....	(40,597,918)	(50,262,315)	(51,280,637)	-----	(10,682,519)	(26.3)	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total*.....	40,627,918	50,262,315	52,180,637	-----	11,552,519	*28.4	-----	-----	-----	-----
Department of Defense, civil functions.....										
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:										
Food and Drug Administration.....	15,512	30,996	49,823	40,152	34,311	221.1	18,827	60.7	-9,671	-19.4
Office of Education.....	472,981	661,865	459,364	451,004	-13,617	-2.8	-202,101	-30.5	-8,360	-1.8
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	472,981	661,865	*1,928,722	-----	*1,455,741	*307.7	*1,267,257	*191.5	-----	-----
Public Health Service:										
Buildings and facilities.....	75,438	102,926	131,435	125,415	55,997	74.2	28,509	27.6	-6,020	-4.5
Community health.....	300	33,200	19,072	13,811	18,772	6,257.3	-14,128	-42.5	-5,261	-27.5
Environmental health.....	232,357	321,035	338,743	325,818	106,386	45.7	44,338	15.0	-12,925	-3.8
Medical services.....	232,357	321,035	*408,095	-----	*175,738	*75.6	*113,690	*38.6	-----	-----
National Institutes of Health.....	62,536	154,309	179,700	177,443	117,164	187.3	25,391	16.4	-2,257	-1.2
Other.....	107,006	120,662	122,235	120,168	15,229	14.2	1,573	1.3	-2,067	-1.6
Total.....	430,000	930,800	980,454	962,464	550,464	128.0	49,654	5.3	-18,000	-1.8
(Total, Appropriations Committee).....	9,004	29,919	70,558	-----	61,494	678.4	40,639	135.8	-----	-----
Total.....	841,263	1,589,925	1,710,762	-----	869,499	103.3	120,837	7.6	-----	-----
St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	841,263	1,589,925	*1,750,114	-----	938,851	*111.6	*190,189	*12.0	-----	-----
Social Security Administration.....	4,135	14,427	10,343	7,981	6,208	150.1	-4,084	-28.3	1,773	-17.1
Refugee assistance.....	2,089,182	2,826,727	3,002,621	2,823,142	913,439	43.7	175,894	6.2	-179,479	-5.9
American Printing House for the Blind.....	2,089,182	2,826,727	*3,083,271	-----	*994,089	(f)	-110	-2	-----	-----
Freedmen's Hospital.....	400	70,110	70,000	70,000	70,000	93.7	36	4.8	0	0
Gallaudet College.....	3,190	739	775	775	375	21.6	-29	-7	0	0
Howard University.....	1,285	3,909	3,886	3,880	690	259.2	2,072	81.4	0	0
Office of the Secretary.....	1,285	2,544	4,616	4,616	3,331	222.3	1,512	11.1	0	0
Total.....	6,541	13,552	15,064	15,064	10,418	351.0	14,292	93.9	-8,765	-29.7
(Total, Appropriations Committee).....	6,541	15,210	29,502	*20,737	22,961	62.5	31,051	2.9	-----	-----
Total.....	3,514,572	5,332,939	5,488,185	5,165,259	1,973,612	*102.2	*354,923	33.3	-----	-----
(Total, Appropriations Committee).....	(3,514,572)	(5,332,939)	(5,488,185)	(5,165,259)	(1,973,612)	(102.2)	(354,923)	(33.3)	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Figures for 1963 and 1964 are adjusted for comparability; comparisons between 1960 and 1964 are made with unadjusted figures. <sup>2</sup> Incomplete or inaccurate.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to call attention to House Joint Resolution 129 which I introduced on January 17, of this year, which provides that not earlier than May 1 nor later than May 20 of each year, the President shall transmit to Congress, in such form and detail as he may determine, such revisions of estimates and summary data contained in the last annual budget and subsequent amendments. It is difficult indeed for the Congress to rely upon the early estimates and it would be advantageous to us to have this updated budget submitted during the month of May.

Again, Mr. Speaker, may I say that some progress has been made toward fiscal responsibility and it is to be hoped that in the second session of this Congress, our accomplishments will be much greater.

**PROGRAM FOR THE 1ST WEEK OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the majority

leader concerning the program, if he can enlighten us at this time.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for the first week of the next session, which is the week of January 6—of course, we will not convene until the 7th if the resolution previously adopted is concurred in by the other body—is as follows:

On Tuesday and Wednesday we will first call the bills on the Private Calendar.

Then we will consider House Joint Resolution 871—John F. Kennedy Center Act. This provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

We also will take up S. 1153—Amendments to Federal Airport Act. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday, the state of the Union message.

On Thursday, H.R. 6041—Amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

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

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN and to include his voting record.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. HARRIS.

Mr. WIDNALL.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. JENSEN.

**ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

Mr. BURLERSON, 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. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6868. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, December 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1467. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held at Washington, D.C., September 17-18, 1963, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 184), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9563. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award

posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9564. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of \$1.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 881. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

560. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to appropriations in the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### Automation in Industry—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Sets Forth Facts—The Charleston Gazette Calls for Public Works Program

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at this Christmas season, and as we approach the new year 1964, it is important that we keep before us the fact that we have problems as well as blessings and reasons to be grateful. We must be determined that we shall not brush aside the conditions of change induced by technological advancements but, rather, that we will be resourceful and aggressive in seeking solutions.

As was stated so ably by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently:

The most dangerous myth in immediate times is that machines produce as many jobs for men as they destroy and therefore represents no threat to workers.

I agree with Secretary Wirtz that—

This is a half-truth, and, therefore, a half-lie. The truth is that machines permit the extension of men's work activities. The implied lie is that this will happen automatically or without the exercise of full human responsibility.

In the distinguished Labor Secretary's speech from which I quote—an address prepared for a midyear commencement at the University of Michigan—Mr. Wirtz declared that—

Any philosophy or policy about automation must necessarily start from clear recognition that unrestrained technological advance is not only inexorable, but essential to the maintenance and elevation of the standard of living. Full employment in this

country is completely dependent on our being more efficient producers than our competitors in a world where the competition is tougher every day. The alternative to automation would be economic stagnation. \* \* \*

Machines now have, in general, a high school education, in the sense that they can do most jobs that a high school education qualifies people to do. So machines will get the unskilled jobs, because they work for less than living wages. Machines are, in the most real sense, responsible for putting uneducated people out of work.

The answers are not to smash the machines. They are to recognize that the individual versus the machine is as unfair a match today as the individual versus the corporation was in the last century, and the advancing technology requires the exercise of collective—public and private—responsibility for its effects and collective measures to carry out this responsibility.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has provided us with a cogent statement of why people today are haunted by the "specter of becoming robots," and he is forthright in admonishing us to "recognize that the individual versus the machine is an unfair match."

The human factors behind the problems of advancing technology as expressed especially by progress in automation are part and parcel of the unemployment figures of our Nation. This is brought to our attention forcefully and clearly by an editorial, "Only Crash Programs Can Help Unemployed," in the December 21, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, in which it points out:

The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring—almost 6 percent—in round totals 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The Gazette editorial asserts further:

The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than

30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

I agree with the Gazette that—

The quickest, surest, and admittedly the most expedient way to assist these forgotten and forsaken is to trigger a huge public works program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the thought-provoking editorial to which I have made reference and from which I have quoted briefly.

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

##### ONLY CRASH PROGRAMS CAN HELP UNEMPLOYED

"The foreign front," writes James Reston in a recent column, "was Kennedy's major problem but the home front is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the 'slum war' is likely to be more urgent with every passing month."

The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring. Almost 6 percent (5.9 percent to be exact) of the Nation's work force is idle. In round totals the figure is 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than 30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

How to bring this 20 percent into the mainstream of American life, thus guaranteeing to this helpless minority a meaningful stake in the economy, is the dilemma confronting the Johnson administration.

Allocating defense reductions to alleviate their plight—and surely substantial slashes in defense expenditures can be achieved without impairing in the least the national capacity to wage total war—is undoubtedly part of the answer.

But, as Reston notes, simply transferring funds from one account to another isn't the solution it appears to be at first acquaintance. Cutbacks in defense will mean job losses among the employed, and the long-term interest isn't accommodated by elevating unemployed at the expense of those