

those convicted of bribery, perjury, or other infamous crime.

There are no voting restrictions because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry in Ohio; nor does Ohio require literacy tests prior to voting.

Proposed Federal provision: In elections involving the Presidency and other Federal offices, no voter can be barred because of immaterial errors in registration applications, and the same standards must apply to all applicants.

The bill would create the assumption that any person who has completed the sixth grade shall be deemed literate enough to vote and stipulates that all literacy tests be written unless the applicant requests otherwise.

It would speed disposal of discrimination suits by authorizing the Attorney General or any defendant to request that a three-judge district court be convened to hear the suit. An appeal would go directly to the Supreme Court.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Ohio: Under a 1961 amendment to the State Fair Employment Practices Act, there are fines up to \$500 and imprisonment up to 90 days or both for denial of public accommodations because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

Enforcement is by the State civil rights commission, which acts on receipt of any sworn charge. The procedure involves investigation, conferences, conciliation attempts, and persuasion before public hearing and formal order.

Proposed Federal: All persons shall have access without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin to hotels and places of lodging (except those having five or fewer rooms for rent), eating establishments, places of amusement, gasoline stations, and any place segregated by State of local law.

Private clubs are exempt except when their facilities are made available to customers of one of the hotels, restaurants, or other places mentioned above.

Aggrieved persons themselves or the Attorney General may bring action against violations. The latter would be compelled to seek corrective action from State or local agencies before going to court.

Contempt cases arising from failure to comply with court orders could result in fines and imprisonment. The Attorney General also would be authorized to file suits to ban discrimination in public facilities such as parks and libraries.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Ohio: The State's last school segregation law was repealed in 1886, and the courts have enjoined local boards from assigning Negro children to all-Negro schools.

Proposed Federal: The bill would authorize the Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General to assist the States in desegregation of schools. The latter would be authorized to institute civil actions to desegregate if voluntary measures failed.

The education commissioner could conduct surveys, supply technical assistance to school authorities, issue grants for hiring and training personnel to deal with desegregation problems, and sponsor university institutes for training teachers to handle those problems.

As approved by the House, the bill specifically prohibits action under this program to shift schoolchildren to correct racial imbalance.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Ohio: The Civil Rights Commission may create advisory agencies at the local level to foster better community relations. There are local community relations agencies in Toledo, Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus.

Proposed Federal: The bill would create a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce to assist States and cities to solve difficulties arising from racial friction.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Ohio: The Ohio commission has been in existence since 1959, administering the Fair Employment and Public Accommodations Acts as well as conducting educational and research programs.

Proposed Federal: The bill would extend the life of the Federal Commission for 4 years and give it additional authority to serve as a clearinghouse for information. A House amendment barred the Commission from investigating membership policies of private clubs and fraternal groups.

PUBLIC PROGRAMS

Ohio: Since 1935, Ohio has barred discriminatory practices by contractors and subcontractors dealing with the State or its subdivisions.

Proposed Federal: Government agencies would be authorized to withhold grants or assistance programs from areas where discrimination is practiced, provided they informed Congress beforehand and held a public hearing.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Ohio: The State Fair Employment Practices Act bans discrimination because of race, color, religion, etc., on the part of employers of four or more persons, employment agencies, or labor unions.

Proposed Federal: This section declares a national policy of freedom from discrimination in opportunity for employment. It would not become effective until a year after the bill is signed into law and in the initial year would cover employers and unions with 100 or more workers or members.

This provision would be tightened gradually until the fourth year of its effectiveness when it would cover those with 25 or more workers or members.

The law would be administered by an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission of five members empowered to act in complaints filed by individuals. It could bring legal action only after attempts to settle cases by conciliation.

The commission, however, would be required to work with State and local agencies, such as that in Ohio, unless such agencies were not performing effectively.

What form a Federal civil rights bill will take, if and when one is passed, is of course impossible to determine. The prolonged Senate debate now appears to be some weeks away from the filibuster stage, and indications are that the House version will be toned down with Republican-sponsored amendments.

Yet it is apparent that the impact of any bill enacted will be felt almost exclusively in the South. For Ohio and the other 35 States with civil rights codes of one kind or another, it would mean only that Washington would become a secondary point of recourse for those with grievances, real or fancied.

SECRECY AND THE A-11 PROGRAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a short time ago, I spoke briefly as to the facts surrounding the announcement of the President of the United States concerning the A-11 program.

It is interesting to note, from the testimony and the articles which have ap-

peared subsequently, that the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and certainly a great majority of the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations apparently had no knowledge whatever, even of the beginning of the development of the A-11. During the past 3 years, there has been extensive testimony before that committee, discussing the B-70 and the RS-70. The technical matters surrounding that work tie in intimately with the development of any supersonic plane, particularly in the area of mach 3.

I am greatly indebted to outside reporters who have ferreted out a part of the truth behind this matter. It is somewhat difficult to understand how this country could have spent \$100 million to \$500 million in the development of a supersonic plane, which is probably—although we do not know—an improved manned interceptor, without the Appropriations Committee having knowledge of it.

I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that he did have knowledge of it, and that he was fully informed. This does not evade the responsibility of every Senator who serves on that committee in the Senate, and every Representative who serves on the corresponding committee in the House of Representatives, to account to the people of his own State and to the people of the United States and to have knowledge of the functions of the Government.

If we can develop an airplane which must have cost from \$100 million to \$500 million—the best estimate is \$500 million over the course of 2, 3, or 4 years, no one knows how long—without the Appropriations Committees of the Congress having knowledge of such appropriations, questions arise as the source of the money, and where was it hidden in the budget.

Mr. President, I intend to pursue this matter further, because in my opinion it represents a grave threat to our representative form of government. It represents an abrogation of the right of Senators to know what is going on in the Government and to bear the responsibility for the decisions which are made.

A decision was made. It was made in our name, using hidden funds, and other methods to which I do not have access. But, somehow, it was accomplished. I hope that the Secretary of Defense particularly, and anyone else who had knowledge of these matters, will disclose the information to Congress at an early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Less Than the Whole Truth," written by Claude Witze and published in the Air Force magazine of April 1964, which discusses this situation in detail.

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

LESS THAN THE WHOLE TRUTH

(By Claude Witze)

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 18.—There are substantial reasons why public pressure

cial, and when such services are rendered, either in whole or in part, at the taxpayers' expense it is even more subject to criticism.

I am sure the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration after checking into these transactions can give us a more complete report.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.
Mr. MORSE. It is kind of the Senator to say, as he did in his last sentence, that he is sure the Committee on Rules and Administration will give us a report. I believe we are entitled to a report, and very quickly, because if these allegations are true—and I am sure they are or the Senator from Delaware would not be making them on the floor of the Senate—we are entitled to have a report from the Committee on Rules and Administration without delay.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I agree that this should be public information.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.
Mr. ALLOTT. I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I should like to ask one question, and that is whether or not his investigation has disclosed that the Senate restaurant, which is operated with public funds, is carrying any private accounts for any other person outside the Senate or its employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not to my knowledge. It is my understanding, and it has always been my understanding, that when the Senate restaurant furnishes its services or supplies to any group or to Senators it is to be done only within the Capitol Building or the Senate Office Buildings, and in each instance a Senator or employee must guarantee payment. It was not my understanding that the Senate restaurant under any circumstances could operate or furnish its services to any private function outside the Capitol or Senate Office Buildings. I was under the impression that such was prohibited under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator's understanding is the same as mine. On various occasions, when constituents have been here who wanted to have lunch or dinner with Members of the Colorado delegation, I was informed in every instance that there was only one way it could be done, and that was to have one of the Senators from Colorado make the reservation, be personally present, and to assume complete responsibility for the bill. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding. On occasion I have arranged luncheons for groups from Delaware. My colleague and I recently had the Delaware Farm Bureau as our guests. But we guaranteed and paid the bill. We pay for those guests at the regular rates. If a separate room is used, there is an additional charge for it, which

is proper. It was my understanding that in all instances the services and facilities of the Senate restaurant would be available only to Senators or employees of the Senate. This is not a privately owned restaurant that can compete with private enterprise.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that is the understanding we have always had.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

OHIO'S CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not seek to establish new rights as relates to citizens of my State of Ohio. Through this legislative proposal we seek only to preserve old rights—rights guaranteed to all Americans, regardless of race or color, by our Constitution, as amended, our Declaration of Independence, and our heritage of freedom.

I have received letters from uninformed, or misguided Ohio citizens, who fear that the President's civil rights proposals will in some way infringe on their own liberties or way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is nothing in these pending legislative proposals which will deliver to our Negro citizens rights or privileges which they do not already enjoy in the State of Ohio and have enjoyed in our State for years. I am proud of this fact, as all Ohioans should be. What this legislation will do is extend these rights to all Americans regardless of the States in which they live or in which they travel.

The fact is the Ohio civil rights and antidiscrimination laws are much more effective and more far-reaching than the civil rights bill which is presently pending before the Senate. This was pointed out clearly and concisely in an article written by George Jenks, Washington correspondent of the Toledo Blade and published in that newspaper on April 12, 1964. The article is entitled "Ohio's Civil Rights Law Tougher Than Federal Proposals," and is an outstanding example of accurate and informative reporting at its best. The Toledo Blade, one of the great newspapers of Ohio, and the Nation, and its publisher, Paul Block, Jr., have a well-earned reputation for responsible and in fact outstanding journalism. Certainly, this article is in that tradition.

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

AN APPRAISAL—OHIO'S CIVIL RIGHTS LAW TOUGHER THAN FEDERAL PROPOSALS—IMPACT OF NATIONAL LEGISLATION WOULD BE FELT LARGELY IN SOUTH

(By George Jenks)

The men trying to steer the civil rights bill through Congress are disturbed more than they care to admit by signs that the massive propaganda drive against it is making headway in the North.

There is no overlooking the fact that Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, was able to take a fourth of all the votes cast in the Wisconsin primary last week with no other issues than diehard segregationism and States' rights.

But what is causing more consternation is mail from home. A number of northern Congressmen, both Republican and Democratic, report that the letters they are receiving show widespread apprehension over the proposed civil rights program.

Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Republican, of Piqua, last week said he has been amazed by the letters he is receiving, criticizing the bill. He wrote almost the entire measure himself and played an important part in winning its approval in the House.

Mr. McCULLOCH, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, says these protests largely are based on distortions and misinformation which he traces to the work of such southern-based segregationist groups as the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental Freedoms.

Incidentally, the propaganda campaign does not seem to have taken hold in the Toledo area. Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY reported that when the bill first came up in committee last year, his mail was running from 4 to 5 to one against it.

When the measure came up for debate in the House this year, however, the tide had turned and the margin was almost 10 to 1 in favor, he said. He attributed the shift to the strong stand taken by church groups in the community.

Mr. McCULLOCH said most of the protests against the bill concern things which are not in it at all, such as compulsory pupil exchanges between school districts to achieve racial balance.

He described himself as hard put to understand the complaints from residents of Ohio, which he says already has civil rights laws much more comprehensive, tougher, more rigorous, and more punitive than the proposed Federal bill.

The bill as passed by the House and now before the Senate, he points out, is not the original administration proposal. He and other Judiciary Committee members substituted the present version with the idea of making it moderate enough to be acceptable to the great majority of Congressmen, excluding those in the deep South.

To support his argument that Ohio, like a number of other Northern and Western States, already has civil rights and anti-discrimination laws more stringent and far-reaching than the Federal proposal, Mr. McCULLOCH has obtained from Ohio House Speaker Roger Cloud a point-by-point comparison of the State and Federal provisions. Here is a condensation of that comparison:

VOTING RIGHTS

Ohio: Every citizen meeting age and residence requirements is entitled to vote except

should be maintained for the revelation of more facts about the new Lockheed A-11 mach 3 airplane. And none of the facts that should be public property in this democracy will menace national security if they are disclosed. The A-11, like the TFX, the RS-70, and the Skybolt missile before it, is involved in arguments about concept and policy that are properly the subject of public discussion.

The general capabilities of the A-11 and the mission for which it was designed can be aired before Congress and the voters without disclosing any specific information about the technologies involved and the precise threat it presents to a potential enemy. If the A-11 is undergoing tests to determine how good it is as an interceptor, which is what we were told by the White House, the threat to the enemy will not be real until the system is combat ready. The A-11 is far from that state and may never reach it.

Details of President Johnson's announcement that the A-11 exists and an analysis of its technological significance appear starting on page 33 of this issue. Of equal importance is the administration's insistence that the A-11 is an interceptor aircraft and that it meets the Air Force requirement for an Improved Manned Interceptor (IMI). So long as the news about the A-11 is carefully managed, the administration is not likely to get a serious challenge to its assertion, but the atmosphere on Capitol Hill is charged with skepticism. When Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, USAF Chief of Staff, was testifying a few weeks ago before the House Armed Services Committee, he said, "We need a new long-range interceptor and we feel that \$40 million this year will move us in an orderly program toward producing it." Asked at what point we are in the IMI program, he said, "We are doing some work in this field, but we are not going fast enough to have an orderly program to produce it." He made a further statement that was deleted from the published record.

Whatever the general told the committee in confidence, the House included the \$40 million in its version of the defense authorization bill. There is no evidence in the record that Chairman CARL VINSON or any of his colleagues knew of the A-11 or considered it the prototype of an interceptor if they did know about it. Chairman MELVIN PRICE of the Subcommittee on Research and Development voted with the majority in favor of granting the money. Three Democratic members of his subcommittee, Representatives SAMUEL S. STRATTON, JEFFREY COHELAN, and OTIS G. PIKE, voted against it and signed a minority report. In this, they argued the money had not been requested from the subcommittee but indicated they knew of progress made toward an IMI. They then picked up the argument of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara that there are several airplanes which could take on the IMI mission, citing the F-106, the F-4, and the TFX or F-111. General LeMay already had said he wants something better.

There was a strange change of attitude in the Senate. The \$40 million item was dropped from the bill. After the A-11 was uncovered Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, floor manager for the bill, bolstered the President's portrayal of it as an interceptor. He said he had been privy to all of its history and that what has been learned has applicability to other types of aircraft. The Senator said the \$40 million was taken out of the bill because the A-11 already is past the research-and-development stage and is undergoing test and evaluation. He said he did not know why the Air Force, meaning General LeMay, asked for the money.

Secretary McNamara was the next witness in Washington. He told a press conference, "The A-11 is an interceptor aircraft, it is

being developed as such, and beyond that I have nothing further to say on its use." He said the Air Force naturally knew all about the A-11 and that there was a misunderstanding about what was requested. This was not new money, he said, but a request "to have the authority within the total funds budgeted to reallocate funds to increase the expenditures on the IMI and to reduce expenditures on certain other projects." He said there is no doubt that the A-11 is the plane USAF has in mind for the IMI mission.

One of the more significant sentences in Mr. McNamara's remarks was his comment that "hopefully, we can have multiuse aircraft evolve from the single-purpose designs."

It is this conviction of his, first brought to fruition in the TFX joint USAF-Navy project, that has not been accepted by experienced airmen in any branch of the services. The A-11, it has not been denied, was laid down in 1959 as a high-flying and fast reconnaissance airplane and the undisclosed amount of money that has gone into it would be hard to disguise in USAF's budget. It could have been financed by the Central Intelligence Agency, but that is not as important as the fact that the reconnaissance and interceptor missions cannot be performed efficiently by the same airplane. It is obvious that the technologies overlap in such areas as propulsion, materials, human factors, and aerodynamics, but weapon systems differ according to their missions.

All through the discussion following the A-11 announcement here has been an aura of the half-truth about administration statements. Asked bluntly whether the A-11 had been designed as an interceptor, Secretary McNamara replied, "I don't think that I said that, and I would rather not say." Nobody asked, "Why not?" It was brought out in General LeMay's testimony that all of the Chiefs of Staff favored going ahead with an IMI and that even the Chairman, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, gave it his endorsement. USAF Secretary Eugene Zuckert testified that "No formal proposal has gone forward from the Air Force, that is, from the civilian Secretary [Mr. Zuckert] to the Secretary of Defense. I did write him a letter in which I said it looked as if we were progressing to the point where we would need a sizable sum of money such as the one General LeMay mentioned for 1965."

Later Representative PORTER HARDY quizzed the Air Force Secretary and asked whether Mr. McNamara showed any signs of "mellowing" or beginning to understand the requirement for an IMI. Mr. Zuckert acknowledged that his boss was not "too encouraging." He added that he favors a larger development program than the Defense Secretary, but "I have not personally proposed that we build a force of any particular size leading toward a full defense capability with an IMI."

Further quotations are not needed to display the status of the IMI project, at least as it stood in February. If we accept the natal date of the A-11 as 1959, it seems clear that nobody called it an Air Force airplane at least until sometime in 1963, by which time the concept probably had been overtaken by more esoteric systems operating in space. If the A-11 was designed as an IMI there was no reason to blanket its existence with any more secrecy than would have surrounded the F-108, interceptor counterpart of the B-70 and also designed by North American Aviation, if that project had not been abandoned a few years ago. It was after cancellation of the F-108 that airmen concerned with the defense mission, most notably Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, first proclaimed the requirement for an IMI. If they knew the A-11 was being developed as an interceptor, which they should have known

if it is true, their speeches, in retrospect, make little sense.

Since disclosure of the A-11 by President Johnson, most of the verbiage has been concerned with its place in the history of aeronautical progress and the fact that the story was kept out of the public prints, whether by publicists or patriots. The emphasis has been in the wrong places. The sophisticated observer, be he aeronaut, editor, or military officer, knows that USAF does not develop a new interceptor by starting with a vehicle that flies higher and faster, with limited maneuverability, and then try to determine its capability. The interceptor capability would be built in, starting on the design boards. There is much justification for suspecting that the A-11 has been used for manipulation of American public opinion, possibly to cast aspersions on Air Force competence in an area of Air Force specialization. The outlook for national security is frightening if this kind of manipulation is allowed to continue, making it look as if technology escaped the grasp of the men with the mission.

WHY DOESN'T ANYBODY GET MAD?

As we write this, the East Germans, who are Communists, are withholding information on the condition of three USAF officers who were shot down a few days ago when their RB-66 reconnaissance bomber strayed out of its flight path. A compilation by the Associated Press shows that in the past 14 years at least 80 American military flyers have been killed by Russians in attacks that ranged from the Baltic Sea to the Sea of Japan. The airmen have been from the ranks of the U.S. Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

So far, there has been no sign of official indignation in Washington other than a demand for the release of our men. Our attitude, according to the Washington Post, is tempered by our "hopes to avoid having the incident damage the relatively moderate climate of present American-Soviet relations." Indeed, the Post, which should know better, peers around the 80 corpses and poses an editorial question: "What is wrong with the Air Force that it cannot prevent its planes from wandering over Communist East Germany and getting shot down?" Then the paper says U.S. Air Force does not say the airplane strayed but suggests it was lured by phony radio signals.

Somehow, the lives of 80 American flyers seem to have been sacrificed in near silence while the climate of our relations with Russia shows no material change. It should be pointed out that the Washington Post, which hesitates to put any blame on the Russians, is a paper that speaks out loud and clear in favor of avoiding escalation in any conflict with the Reds. The response should be non-violent to most provocation, according to this school of thought, and if it must be violent it should be graduated to the minutest degree possible. The Communists disagree.

Any responsible reporter could learn by asking that U.S. Air Force pilots have strict orders not to resist challenges in the air, even if they are armed. The Russians, in this case, destroyed an airplane which they could have had intact with its airborne equipment if they had told the pilot to land instead of shooting him down. This indicates they were more intent on murder than capturing the RB-66 to see what reconnaissance equipment it was carrying. A responsible reporter also could have learned that the pilot was following a filed flight plan for a navigation training mission that was to be flown entirely in France and West Germany. An informed reporter would know that the RB-66 is an obsolescent airplane and it is not likely it would be sent on a sensitive mission so close to the Iron Curtain. Even an editorial writer, lacking all these facts, should be able to re-

call that in late January a T-39 jet trainer out of Wiesbaden strayed across the border and was shot down, killing the crew of three U.S. Air Force officers. In this case the Reds merely said it was our fault because we violated their airspace, and they gave us permission to retrieve the bodies and wreckage.

It is not generally discussed, but these violations of airspace have at least one of the characteristics of a cultural-exchange program. The Russians violate airspace, too. They have overflown Alaska and are reported to have violated Western airspace in Europe at least 20 times in 1963. They have been intercepted by our airmen and warned to go back. There is no record that they have been fired upon. On top of this, it is no secret in Europe that Aeroflot, the Russian airline, and Polska Linie Lotnicze, its Polish counterpart, treat airlines with disdain. On scheduled flights to and from such major points as Paris, their pilots wander far from their routes as assigned by traffic controllers. There is a strong conviction on the Continent that these deviations are not accidental, but are part of the Communist reconnaissance effort.

In view of the record, it is difficult to believe we are dealing with reasonable people concerned in any way about the climate of our relations. It is even more difficult to understand how an American newspaper, in particular the Washington Post, can ignore the Soviet trigger finger, the 80 dead, and the nature of the cold war.

READING LOUD, BUT NOT CLEAR

Almost exactly a year ago Lt. Gen. Alfred S. Starbird, an Army officer who serves as Director of the Defense Communications Agency, told a committee on Capitol Hill the Defense Department needs a satellite communications system as soon as possible. Testifying before Representative CHET HOLIFIELD and his Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, General Starbird cited some of the reasons why communication through space has become essential to military operations. Clearly, the ballistic missile has changed the threat to existing systems as much as it has altered national strategy. The missile, the General said, puts a new premium on speed. Service must be almost instantaneous. The communications system also must be able to survive attack. On top of this, there is a more pressing requirement for reliable ways of talking to remote spots on the globe. Thus it is the nature of war, the cold one we are fighting and the hot one that we may have to fight, that makes DCA look into space, where it finds the satellite system most promising.

We are fortunate, General Starbird said in April of last year, in that we can meet the requirement with a simple system that is entirely within the state of the art. It is designed as a lightweight, active, medium-altitude random system, and efforts to build and test it have been underway for more than a year. The basic orders were issued by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in the summer of 1962. The Air Force today has a contract with the Philco Corp. to provide program definition for the satellite itself. The Army, which is in charge of the ground-based elements, has hired Hughes Aircraft Co. to develop and build six link terminals.

So far as the Hollifield subcommittee is concerned, it has recorded testimony on this subject even predating the appearance last year of General Starbird. In August of 1962 USAF Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Systems Command, had testified on the requirement for a space communications system that would be owned and operated by the military services. He was supported that year by Dr. Ivan Getting, president of the Aerospace Corp., and USAF's top technological consultant.

With this background, the Hollifield group was provoked by curiosity last fall when Mr. McNamara wrote a letter to the Communications Satellite Corp. (Comsat) and asked whether it would be interested in selling its services to the Defense Department. Currently, the Defense Department and General Starbird are back on the witness stand to face an examination on the current status of their project. Mr. McNamara's spokesman, and a highly competent man in an acquisition, has been Dr. Eugene Fubini, an Assistant Secretary of Defense and Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering. Dr. Fubini was being asked, in Mr. HOLIFIELD's words, "why the signals have now changed and whether military requirements for security, privacy, and remote-area coverage can be fulfilled by a commercial system which must give first consideration to high-density traffic for profitable operations?"

The answer, the witness said, is that the Defense Department may have been too hasty when it gave the green light to DCA and more or less ignored the Comsat potential. Dr. Fubini claimed that when Mr. McNamara put his query to Comsat last October he really expected the corporation, which still does not know what kind of a satellite system it will have and when it will have it, to politely show no interest in doing business with the Pentagon. But Comsat, which is in business to make money and works under a charter granted by Congress, replied that it would like to start negotiations. They are underway, and Dr. Fubini discussed the possibility that Comsat can satisfy the Government's needs:

"Extensive discussions with the corporation in the last several months have revealed the possibility of using the global system to be deployed by the corporation for satisfying these needs, provided that during the next year the corporation's program continues in the present direction toward the design of an appropriate system to satisfy the Government's needs, and at a pace which assures its early deployment. Such a program may be capable of meeting Government trunk communication requirements without compromising the U.S. goal of establishing a single global commercial system, open to all countries of the world. We see no problem of operational control that would not also have been applicable to a Government-deployed system." Later, he added that if an agreement is reached "there would then be no need for a separate system to satisfy the Government's requirements for command-and-control and other communications." And he restated the requirement for a system that provides "links for worldwide traffic * * * a high degree of satellite reliability and availability and a reasonable invulnerability to interference, and permits ready access to remote areas and use of transportable ground terminals under the Government's control."

Under questioning, Dr. Fubini reiterated several times that the Defense Department will not compromise an inch on its insistence that its requirements be met. The alternative is to press on with DCA's present program, although he admitted that at least a year will be lost because of the reexamination of Comsat's potential. The questions put to Dr. Fubini betrayed a good deal of skepticism on the part of the committee, against which his main argument appeared to be the hope for economy. The cost of renting a system, or the use of one, would be less than that of creating a Defense Department satellite chain, probably of 24 units in orbit. For Government use of Comsat channels the witness anticipated paying a fee of \$25 million a year. He indicated the most important issue in negotiations with COMSAT is the Government's requirement that the system be as nearly jam-proof as possible. Dr. Fubini said any system is vulnerable to deliberate electronic interference, and

our aim should be to make the creation of that interference as expensive as possible for an enemy. At the same time, there is the question of how much Comsat can and will pay to meet this defense requirement.

General Starbird, in his repeat performance before the committee, indicated there is no change in the DCA attitude that a satellite system must be provided as soon as possible. It was clear, however, that he is being forced to wait the outcome of negotiations with Comsat and that the general will not express an option on what the corporation can provide until he has the specifications at hand.

The general is showing good military and political judgment. Informed observers of the present investigation are expressing skepticism that Comsat can and will meet the real military requirement. Dr. Fubini, fortunately, is on the record with his promise that they will not get any Defense Department business unless they do. For the sake of security, which may be jeopardized by delay, the Hollifield committee should press for a quick decision.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A-11—Born in the Skonk Works, Reared in Secret, It Blazes New Heights in Aircraft Performance," written by J. S. Butz, Jr., technical editor, and also published in the Air Force magazine for April 1964.

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

A-11—BORN IN THE SKONK WORKS, REARED IN SECRET, IT BLAZES NEW HEIGHTS IN AIRCRAFT PERFORMANCE

(By J. S. Butz, Jr.)

The dramatic disclosure last month that the United States has manned airplanes that are secretly cruising at speeds above mach 3 was good news to the aviation community.

President Johnson, in revealing the Lockheed A-11 program, showed understandable pride in this important U.S. "first." He said that several A-11's were being flown "at more than 2,000 miles per hour and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet," and are "capable of long-range performance of thousands of miles." The President added that the A-11 "has been made possible by major advances in aircraft technology of great significance for both military and commercial application."

He mentioned only one specific application. He said that the A-11 was being tested extensively to determine its suitability as a long-range interceptor. Former White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara stressed the interceptor role in their brief expansions of the President's remarks. However, Mr. McNamara, in response to insistent questioning by reporters, has indicated that the A-11 was not designed originally as an interceptor but that he has considerable confidence that it can be adapted to that role.

Beyond these minimum remarks, the secrecy lid has been clamped on. The administration opened the door on the most tantalizing aviation news since the X-1 proved there wasn't a sonic barrier. But the door was slammed shut immediately.

From the technical viewpoint, the A-11 clearly is the most important aircraft since the X-1. It is by far the most efficient airplane yet to fly at supersonic speeds. It is the first to have adequately high aerodynamic efficiency (low drag) and high powerplant efficiency to allow it to carry enough fuel to sustain flight above mach 1 for more than 30 minutes or so. In the President's words, the A-11 also is extremely important because it led to "the mastery of the metallurgy and fabrication of titanium metal which is required for the high tem-

1964

peratures experienced by aircraft traveling at more than three times the speed of sound."

As reported by Claude Witze on page 16 of this issue, a tight information clamp has forestalled meaningful public discussion of the A-11, its genesis, or its proper role in civil and military aviation.

The following questions are typical of those which should be asked, for the answers concern the use of a very large sum of the taxpayers' money. Congress and the public have a legitimate right to frank answers.

How much did the A-11 and its engines cost? Judging from previous pioneering programs that fought their technical battles out beyond the state of the art, the A-11, with its mach-3-plus performance, titanium construction, and high-temperature engines cost at least \$500 million and possibly \$1 billion. That is \$100 to \$200 million per year for the 5 years the program has been active. (President Johnson said the A-11 design work started in 1959. The J-58 program was initiated several years earlier by the Navy.) This kind of money is in the cost range of the much-criticized and now-defunct nuclear airplane, and programs of this magnitude should get a thorough working over by the Congress.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the information available is that the A-11 was originally developed for the CIA as a high-altitude reconnaissance airplane to replace the U-2. Most reporters reached this conclusion, supported largely by the close secrecy on the airplane, Mr. McNamara's refusal to divulge the original design objective, and the fact that the project was not handled in normal management channels. If this conclusion is correct, several questions arise immediately concerning the past and future expenditure of large sums of money:

1. Does the fact that a given airplane can cruise at mach 3 also mean that it automatically has a multipurpose capability—reconnaissance, interceptor, bomber—without a major design change for each type of mission?
2. If the answer is no, was there coordination between the CIA and the DOD at an early stage to make certain that the A-11 was not hopelessly boxed into one role?

3. Can the A-11 development expedite the supersonic-transport (SST) program?

4. Have reconnaissance satellites eliminated the need for reconnaissance aircraft such as the A-11, and will it therefore end up only as a high-cost experimental aircraft with limited capability?

Precise answers will require the most candid discussion of the current version of the A-11 and its design and development history. Certainly no one can judge the exact performance or mission capability of a supersonic-cruise airplane using only the two side-view photographs and brief statements currently available on the A-11.

Estimates of this type are riskier for supersonic-cruise airplanes than they are for subsonic aircraft or for those that are capable of only short dashes at supersonic speed.

Basically, supersonic-cruise airplanes involve extremely difficult design problems. Their payload-range performance is extremely sensitive to engine weight, structural weight, fuel consumption, and aerodynamic efficiency (lift/drag ratio, written L/D). Small mistakes in predicting these values can lead to large errors in payload and range.

Fortunately, the supply of technical literature concerned with these problems is large. This literature points to some general conclusions about the A-11 and places some broad limits on the possible performance of this new aircraft.

The difficulties described in this literature also provide the best tribute to Clarence L. (Kelly) Johnson and his "Skonk Works" colleagues at Lockheed, who, with the J-58 engineers at Pratt & Whitney, led the team that first achieved supersonic cruise.

Here is what can be deduced about the A-11, based on this literature:

Size: The airplane is about 90 feet long based on scaling of the A-11 pictures, using published data on the J58 diameter and estimating the size of the pilot's helmet visible in the front window. There is room in the slim fuselage and in the wing stub areas for more than 70,000 pounds of fuel, with space left over for substantial mission equipment. Since efficient supersonic-cruise airplanes have to carry at least 50 percent of their weight in fuel, the A-11 takeoff weight apparently is more than 150,000 pounds. This is roughly the same as that of the B-58 bomber.

Wing: Densely loaded aircraft such as the A-11 need large wing areas; otherwise their wing loadings will quickly rise above 100 pounds per square foot and severely reduce both cruise altitude and flight efficiency.

The side view photographs obscure most of the A-11 wing, and published drawings of the A-11 have not indicated a large lifting surface. However, the aircraft must have an effective wing area in the neighborhood of 2,000 square feet. This includes not only the area outboard of the engine nacelles but also the area between the engines, and the area of the long, very narrow wings on the fuselage, which have been referred to in some reports as fairings. The long and narrow wings form the forward section of a large, double-delta wing similar to that used by Lockheed in its supersonic transport proposal. At supersonic speeds these long, narrow wings plus the fuselage area between them generate much more lift than they do at subsonic speeds.

This generation of additional lift up forward is important in maintaining control over the airplane above mach 1. The controllability problem arises because the rear portion of the double delta acts like a conventional lifting surface at supersonic speeds, and its center of lift moves abruptly aft, a long distance away from the center of gravity. This can make the aircraft so stable that it can't be controlled by a normal-size horizontal tail. In any event, it calls for a large deflection of the tail and an unacceptably big trim drag, which eats into range. On the A-11, lift on the long, narrow wings counteracts the shift of center of lift on the main surface and keeps the center of lift near the center of gravity. On some designs a small canard (horizontal) surface near the nose serves this purpose. The Swedish Saab Draken, the mach 2 fighter operational for several years, was the first of the so-called tailless (no conventional horizontal tail and no canard) airplanes to use the double-delta planform.

Design mach number: The centerbodies of the engine air inlets on the A-11's in the photographs released by the White House appear to have a ramp angle suitable for a maximum economical cruise speed slightly above mach 3.

Cruise altitude: Most press reports have placed the A-11's maximum cruise altitude between 90,000 and 125,000 feet. This appears to be a serious error. There is a well-established procedure for checking maximum cruise altitude. It indicates that the A-11 must cruise between 70,000 and 80,000 feet or its range will severely suffer. Thus, the A-11 can be expected to get its maximum range while cruising about 6,000 to 10,000 feet below the U-2. The U-2's superior wing and lower wing loading give it better altitude capability in unaccelerated flight. But in a zoom climb the A-11 would outperform it.

To figure maximum cruise altitude you have to know two characteristics of any aircraft—the wing loading (written W/S and equal to the gross weight divided by the wing area), and the lift coefficient (written C_L , a dimensionless number indicating the lifting power of the wing) generated when the aircraft is flying at the proper angle of attack for maximum range (maximum aero-

dynamic efficiency). When the W/S is divided by the C_L , it equals the dynamic pressure required to keep the aircraft in level flight. The dynamic pressure is the term that fixes the altitude of flight for any given speed.

There is enough information on the A-11 to put the above relationships to work. For instance, when the A-11 is flying at mach 3 at 70,000 feet, the dynamic pressure is nearly 600 pounds per square foot. The lift coefficient for maximum L/D is about .1 (this has been confirmed in many NASA reports on aircraft similar to the A-11). So 600 may be multiplied by 0.1 to give a maximum possible wing loading of about 60 pounds per square foot. This is about the wing loading the A-11 would have if it had a 2,000-square-foot wing area, weighed 150,000 pounds at takeoff, and burned about one-third of its 75,000-pound fuel load during its climb to altitude.

This procedure can be run through again to show that the A-11's wing loading would be a little better than 30 pounds per square foot once it had burned all its fuel. It, therefore, would end its cruise at mach 3 at 80,000 feet.

Speed would not change this picture too much. If the A-11 were capable of mach 4, it would begin its cruise at about 82,000 feet and in the lightened condition at the end of cruise would be flying at nearly 95,000 feet.

The press reports of 125,000-foot altitude completely fall apart under check. If the A-11 flew at that altitude at mach 4 it would need a wing loading of less than 10 pounds per square foot. In other words its structure could not be any heavier than that of a Piper Cub.

Or, if the A-11 tried to fly at 125,000 feet at a wing loading of about 30 pounds per square foot, corresponding to an end-of-cruise weight, its speed would have to be at least mach 8 to maintain level flight and to keep it from stalling out.

The same procedures can be used to show that the U-2's altitude during maximum range cruise will vary from about 75,000 feet to a little more than 90,000 feet.

Another check on the operational altitude of the A-11 can be made by examining the engine air inlets which appear to be about 6 feet in diameter at the most. Therefore, the maximum capture area for both inlets to take in air is between 50 and 60 square feet. This is just about enough to fly an airplane like the A-11 at 80,000 feet at mach 3. At 100,000 feet at mach 3 the required capture area goes well over 100 square feet. At 125,000 feet the inlets would become truly gigantic.

In recent years, the ability of Century-series fighters to zoom higher than 100,000 feet has tended to distort the picture as far as maximum cruise altitude and maximum level flight altitude are concerned. Most of the Century-series fighters cruise best between 35,000 and 45,000 feet, and their maximum level flight altitude is around 60,000 feet. Therefore, the A-11's ability to cruise in the 70,000- to 80,000-foot level is certainly not to be disparaged. With the A-11 cruising at mach 3 at those altitudes, on a gentle dogleg course, it would be essentially impossible for any operational fighter in the world to intercept it. And it is doubtful that any existing ground-based missile system could down the airplane.

Aerodynamic efficiency: The A-11 came along in time to benefit from several years of inspired aerodynamic research during the middle and late 1950's. By 1960 the unclassified literature had made it clear that the old idea that L/D (aerodynamic efficiency) was certain to be less than five at mach numbers above 3 had to be discarded. There were strong indications that L/D's of 7 and 8 and possibly higher could be attained.

These were still well under the L/D's of 18 to 23 at which subsonic transports and bombers operate. However, an L/D of 8 is enough to bring the total flight efficiency (and range) of a supersonic airplane up close to that of the subsonic jet because propulsive efficiency increases rapidly at supersonic speeds. The idea that an economical supersonic transport (SST) was possible grew out of supersonic L/D research in the late 1950's, and the idea of the A-11 undoubtedly had the same beginning.

The basic rules for obtaining high L/D have been discussed exhaustively in NASA reports and the publications of the technical societies. The A-11 appears to use all of them. First, the wing leading edges are as sharp as possible, even sharper than those of the F-104. Second, the fuselage has a fineness ratio (length divided by diameter) of around 18, which gives it a very high internal volume for carrying fuel and equipment. Such design was found to be the optimum means for carrying any given weight at supersonic speeds, and the A-11 has the highest fineness ratio yet used on any aircraft.

Third, proper distribution of the pressure forces, the lift and drag forces, is a key to getting high L/D's with any airplane. Several important techniques which bring pressure distributions closer to the ideal were developed during the 1950's. They primarily involved twisting and cambering the wing. The side-view photographs of the A-11, both looking endwise at the wing, clearly show its twists and cambers.

Supersonic vehicles offer designers one unique opportunity for reducing drag and improving L/D. This is to arrange the vehicle components (fuselage, wing, tail, nacelle, etc.) so that they interfere favorably with each other. At supersonic speeds interference effects are negligible at a distance of more than a few inches away from any surface.

However, at supersonic speeds strong shock waves and pressure fields spread away from all objects. Pressure fields spreading from an aircraft's components can combine unfavorably to make the total vehicle drag much higher than the drag of the components taken separately.

Happily, this situation can be reversed. The components can be arranged so that their pressure fields and shock waves cancel out each other and reduce total drag. For instance, an engine nacelle outboard from a fuselage can throw a high-pressure field on the curved aft side of the fuselage to create a thrust force and reduce fuselage drag. The ultimate in favorable interference is a theoretical supersonic biplane postulated by Adolph Busemann in the 1930s. This was an arrangement of two wings, properly shaped and spaced apart, which canceled all of each other's wave drag at one particular mach number.

In the 1950's supersonic interference effects were the object of intensive research notably by Antonio Ferri of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and A. J. Eggers, Jr., of NASA. Their basic information was applied on the B-70, which is arranged so that a powerful positive pressure field is created on the lower wing surface by the engine air duct during mach 3 cruise to increase lift and improve L/D. Design techniques for favorable interference have been under continuous refinement and are very important in the SST proposals now being evaluated by the FAA.

On the A-11, the area on the back of the fuselage between the engine nacelles is a highly critical flow area in which several strong pressure fields meet. Undoubtedly, the fuselage slopes off continuously in this area and forms a gentle ramp ending in the sharp point visible in the photographs.

It would be possible to reduce drag, improve L/D, and increase the effectiveness of the vertical tails by creating favorable pressure fields along this ramp. The slope and contour of the ramp, the spacing and shape of the engine nacelles, the location of the vertical tails, and the flight speed all would be important in creating a favorable flow field and a high L/D. This leads to the conclusion that the A-11 is a single design point airplane. That is, it has a high L/D at its cruise mach number, but its aerodynamic efficiency falls off at both lower and higher speeds. Consequently, the airplane probably doesn't have much growth potential in speed and would be in serious trouble about making its range if one engine were lost.

Structure: The extent and the manner in which titanium is used in the A-11 has not been disclosed. However, the President's remarks hinted that titanium was the main load-bearing metal. If this is true, the A-11's airframe must be relatively light and efficient for a high-temperature structure. According to data from the SST program, it would have been possible to design the airframe for mach 4 temperatures with only a slight increase in weight and probably the installation of new leading edges made of higher temperature material. The refractory metal alloys developed in the Dyna-Soar program, for example, would have a long life on a mach 4 airplane.

After the heating problems the most important structural question about the A-11 is its design load factor. If the load factor were low, say, 2 G's at cruise, the structure would be extremely light, and amount to only about 20 percent of the airplane's total weight, or even less. Consequently, maneuverability would be sharply limited and the aircraft certainly would be marginal as an interceptor even if its missiles were extremely maneuverable. However, the light structure would result in a low-wing loading and a high cruise altitude, and it would allow a greater percentage of the airplane's weight to be carried as fuel, which would increase range.

If the design load factor were high, to allow 7 G turns, for instance, the structural weight would go up sharply. Such design would make the aircraft very useful as an interceptor or a bomber, but it would substantially reduce maximum cruise altitude and range.

The question of adapting the A-11 to an interceptor or a bomber mission depends largely upon the design load factor, which, of course, is a closely held secret. Structural strength is more important in this case than the problem of incorporating the necessary electronics and missiles, for the A-11 is big enough.

Engine: Official reports dating back several years describe the Pratt & Whitney J-58 as a simple supersonic turbojet with an afterburner. An early version lost the B-70 competition to the General Electric J-93. If an early version is powering the A-11, the specific consumption (SFC) is high and the range is low. Simple turbojets of the middle 1950's all ran on afterburner at mach 3, and their SFC was more than 2 pounds of fuel consumed per pound of thrust per hour, compared to an SFC of about 0.8 for the best fan engines on subsonic jet transports.

However, great strides have been made in engine design, and it seems highly unlikely that a 1955 vintage supersonic engine would still be in the A-11. The J-58 undoubtedly has been improved in many ways through higher operating temperatures, the use of advanced turbine-cooling techniques, better compressor blading, and possibly the addition of a fan and new thrust-augmentation systems.

If such engine improvements have been incorporated in the A-11, the SFC during cruise is down near 1.5 pounds of fuel per

pound of thrust per hour. Figures almost this low are being quoted for the SST engines. And, in 1962, three Lockheed engineers—F. S. Malvestuto, Jr., P. J. Sullivan, and H. A. Mortzschky—in a most interesting paper before the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences gave Lockheed's views of what could be done in the way of optimizing supersonic and hypersonic-cruise configurations in the near future. On the key question of achievable SFC's they said, "Propulsive efficiency (mach number divided by SFC) of 2 * * * appears to be a reasonable value for any chemically fueled pure-turbojet or dual-cycle propulsive system now available or projected in the near future." According to this estimate, the best expected SFC is 1.5 in the near future for mach 3 airplanes.

One point, continually emphasized in the literature, is that the match between airframe and engine on supersonic-cruise airplanes is much more critical than on any aircraft of the past. Engine weight becomes a larger percentage of the total airplane weight, and fuel consumption rises sharply compared to subsonic powerplants, so the engine becomes relatively more important in achieving long range. Consequently, tailoring the airplane to achieve the best possible engine air inlet and exhaust flow conditions has a large payoff. This tailoring must be balanced by airframe considerations, however. On the relatively narrow-span supersonic airplanes the placement of engine nacelles, inlets, and exhaust flows can seriously affect the total flow pattern over an aircraft, which is the determining factor in achieving a high L/D.

On the A-11, the fuselage and the forward and aft portions of the double-delta wing apparently ride at an angle of attack of about 4° to 5° during cruise. This angle gives maximum L/D for the A-11 type configuration. The openings of the engine air inlets and the inlet spikes are canted forward through the same angle to face directly into the airflow and maximum inlet efficiency during cruise. The engine exhaust flow, however, nearly parallels the fuselage and is directed downward at an angle of about 4° to the line of flight. Therefore, about 7 percent of the thrust force is realized as lift to improve L/D and range.

In addition, the A-11 powerplants apparently have been placed so their thrust line is slightly below the airplane's center of gravity during most of the cruise flight. Therefore, the engines produce a nose-up pitching moment and reduce the amount of elevator deflection needed to trim the airplane. NACA reports have estimated that the proper placement of the engine thrust line to reduce trim drag of the elevator can increase range 5 to 10 percent in aircraft of the A-11 type.

Fuel: Several years ago there were reports that the J58 was being tested with boron fuel. If pentaborane were burned in the J58 afterburner—and research has shown this to be possible—then a thousand miles or more could be added to the A-11's range.

U.S. production of borane fuels has been stopped, but Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara last year told the Congress that enough was stockpiled to satisfy projected needs for the foreseeable future. The boranes are now being used in rocket-engine research, primarily by the Air Force, and conceivably the A-11 could draw from this reservoir.

Borane fuels are expensive compared to the hydrocarbons, and this is a major reason why the use of pentaborane was dropped from the B-70 plans. However, on a relatively small aircraft such as the A-11, with relatively limited numbers involved, the extra cost could be justified by the large performance improvement.

Range: Maximum range on the A-11, if it is hydrocarbon fueled and powered by a J58

1964

model only slightly better than the original version, probably is around 3,500 miles. This assumes an L/D of 6, an SFC of 2.0, and 50 percent of the aircraft weight in fuel, with about one-third of it being consumed in the climb to altitude. Boron fuel would add around 1,000 miles to the range.

If it has been possible to achieve the maximum L/D's and SFC's suggested in the Lockheed paper mentioned above, the range would go over 5,000 miles on hydrocarbon fuel. This assumes an L/D of 8 and an SFC of 1.5. But this level of performance probably will not be achieved for some time.

Development schedule: It has been reported that the A-11 was delivered and flown for the first time in 1961; that is slightly more than 2 years after design work started. The same report also claims that the A-11 has been operational for 2 years, meaning 1963 and most of 1962. That would leave about 1 year, early 1961 to early 1962, for flight testing.

If this report is true, it would have been necessary during this 1 year to move in relatively small speed increments toward mach 3 to make sure that all systems were responding properly to all speed, temperature, and vibration conditions. The inevitable fixes would have been made and the modified systems rechecked. Finally, it would have been necessary to move slowly toward maximum-range flights, by cruising at mach 3 for longer and longer periods to ensure that all systems were withstanding the high-temperature soaking.

Under any conceivable set of circumstances, designing, fabricating, flight testing, and bringing a pioneering, first-generation, mach 3 cruise airplane to operational status in 3 years would be an almost miraculous achievement. True, the CIA-type management system is conducive to rapid developments. In effect, the CIA simply says to the contractor, "Bring us one of these. We are making you responsible for performing all tests and making all technical decisions."

The U-2 was designed this way and delivered for first flight in little more than 1 year. But the U-2 was a completely straightforward project with a well-known type of wing, aluminum construction, and a slightly modified version of a well-developed turbojet. The A-11 designers were breaking new ground in every department, although they did have access to development data from the B-70 and J93 projects.

It seems reasonable that design, fabrication, and ground testing of the A-11 and its systems took nearly 4 years and that the first flight took place in 1963. Less than a year of flight testing probably would have allowed President Johnson to say that the aircraft "has been tested in sustained flight at more than 2,000 m.p.h." and is "capable of * * * long-range performance of thousands of miles." He didn't say the range had been achieved.

But if the shorter development time reported is true, the SST program certainly bears review. If any mach 3 cruise airplane can be brought to operational status from scratch in 3 years, then maybe the FAA is correct in taking the position that SST costs, technical uncertainties, and development time will be much lower than industry estimates.

Development of an economic supersonic transport is a much more difficult problem than the A-11, but if the CIA's handoff management concept can indeed get us a mach 3 airplane in 3 years, this concept certainly should be considered for the SST. And the Pentagon could benefit from this example as well.

Supersonic transport: The A-11 probably can spell the difference between success and failure in any U.S. mach 2.5-plus supersonic transport program. The A-11 provides an immediately available means of getting vital

flight-test time on all SST systems. It will yield data on the performance of titanium structure at mach 3 that could not be obtained by any other means. And, when the SST engines are ready, the A-11 will allow them to be exhaustively tested in flight in a known vehicle and not an unproven SST airframe. By allowing such testing, the A-11 will fill a gap in the Government's SST plan that has worried many in industry. The A-11 experience should make it possible to go ahead in an orderly manner and build the SST, which must be a true second-generation, supersonic-cruise airplane that has high aerodynamic and propulsion efficiency at all subsonic and supersonic speeds, and an extremely rugged titanium structure which can last through 10 years of airline flying.

By any standard the A-11 is a magnificent technical achievement. Quite obviously it can outfly any known aircraft in the world by a substantial margin. It is a natural for reconnaissance. However, if the A-11 is from the U-2 mold and built with an extremely light airframe, it will not have significant combat potential as a bomber or an interceptor without major redesign. Even if such redesign is not forthcoming, the A-11 will play a key research role in building the technology of mach 3-plus cruise airplanes of all types—transport, fighters, and bombers. In this role its ultimate importance to aviation and the Nation may be as great as any aircraft ever built.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in closing, what is most disturbing about this situation is that we received from the Secretary of Defense and his Director of Research, Dr. Harold Brown, over the last 3 years, many reasons—which I shall not discuss at this point—why we could not develop a B-70 or an RS-70, and why it was not practical from a technical standpoint, when in fact they knew they were developing a plane and already had it in the works. In fact, it was operational and had overcome many of the defects which had been discussed in committee.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I ask the Senator to yield so that I may commend him for raising this question regarding the supersonic plane, and to make the further point that I have also raised the question concerning secrecy, the failure of the executive branch to properly involve Congress, and the decision to channel such matters through the Central Intelligence Agency.

Almost every time the question of secrecy is raised, Senators rise and state that there are some Members of the Senate who are made privy to certain inside information. No one knows. I believe the senior Senator on the Appropriations Committee thought he was being reasonably fully informed on these vital matters, but it seems that that was not the case.

I believe we must raise this question about every vital area of government upon which there is the possibility of secrecy and determination of matters by the executive branch, and with respect to which Congress, which has the congressional responsibility, is not necessarily fully informed, but at least is adequately informed and is called upon to participate in a judgment. I hope that

progress will be made in opening up some of the other areas in which there is too much secrecy, and in which Congress is excluded from vital judgments affecting the welfare of the country.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I agree with him completely. I have never had a more flagrant case called to my attention. I know that there are certain matters which are of a highly sensitive nature. So long as I know that the senior members of my committee, both minority and majority, are aware of them, I do not object, because I know that the information is available to me.

Mr. MCCARTHY. As a matter of principle, we should not allow it. If we were to permit the executive branch to decide which Members of Congress to confide in, the next step would be to ask, Why not let the Secretary of State name the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Secretary of Defense the members of the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. When I look back, I believe that some of the statements I have made about the B-70 and the RS-70 really are ridiculous in light of the new announcement and in light of the information which I ought to have had but did not have.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for yielding.

NEED FOR STUDY OF STRIP MINING OF COAL AND OTHER MINERALS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill that would authorize a study of strip mining operations of coal and other minerals throughout the country.

The bill is now pending in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Today I received a letter from Mr. John C. Kinder, a citizen in Belmont County, Ohio. Belmont County is in the eastern area of our State, on the Ohio River. It is in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains.

In the past this industry has consisted mainly of the mining of coal. I have no doubt that Belmont County and other counties immediately adjacent to it properly fall within the definition of the Appalachias which are now being discussed in the newspapers.

The purpose of my presentation this morning is to demonstrate the inconsistency and the folly of Government on the one hand in providing subsidies used for the destruction of the land, and on the other hand in spending moneys through the Appalachia program to restore destroyed land into what is said will be gardens of paradise with vegetation growing, recreational grounds available, and lakes fit for use by the public as it comes into the area.

The two operations are completely inconsistent. It is the equivalent of trying to build the front of the house while the back of the house is on fire. That is exactly what is happening in Belmont, Harrison, Jefferson, Morgan, Colum-

April 15

biana, Tuscarawas, Coshocton, and other counties of our State.

The experience of the people in the Appalachias of Ohio is duplicated by the experience of the people in Pennsylvania. About 10 days ago, I read excerpts from an article written by a Mr. Sperling, of the Christian Science Monitor, quoting his conversations with inhabitants of the Pennsylvania area. He talked with the leaders of unions. He asked them, "Do you think that Federal money will be of help in rehabilitating these areas?" One of the union leaders said, "Look out over the land. Behold what is there. You find pits, crests, ridges, and toxic lands upon which nothing will grow—miles and miles of area completely devoid of all wildlife, vegetation, and waters."

The letter from the citizen in Belmont County reads:

I think we have a crisis here in Belmont County and that your sympathies will be with us and possibly you may be able to help us. We are enjoying the best prospect for general economic improvement we have had for years, and it is threatened by an extensive stripping operation apparently receiving the indirect encouragement of a governmental agency.

As you undoubtedly know, Ohio University recently decided to expand into this county—

That is Belmont County—

and its plans call for a considerable institution to be created here over the next few years. The new Interstate 70 is nearing completion through this county and within the next 2 or 3 years should be in use. West Virginia is at work constructing its portion of the road across the panhandle and Pennsylvania has already completed the road to the Pennsylvania State line. The effect of the opening of this highway augers well for the area. Wheeling Steel Corp. is well along with a considerable expansion of its facilities in Martins Ferry.

Without question, this is the happiest prospect which we have had for many years.

All these things have encouraged those of us who live here and caused us to hope that the county's population will cease to decline and to hope that a new era might be beginning.

Unfortunately, it has now become apparent that a huge stripping operation is also about to be launched which will decimate the western third of the county and be so close to the site of Ohio University that we are afraid that it will decide not to come here at all or that it will curtail its wonderful plans.

Although the leases and options of the new coal company are being taken under the name of a small concern called the Marietta Coal Co., there is little doubt that this company is being used as a strawman by the Peabody Coal Co.

The Peabody Coal Co. is the largest stripping operator in the world and has equipment in Kentucky which is far larger than the equipment Consolidation Coal Co. is using in its Harrison County operations.

The seam of coal which is the subject of this interest is the No. 11 vein. It has never been exploited before, and there are huge acreages of it in this county as well as in the portions of Harrison County which have not yet been stripped. One unfortunate geological characteristic of this vein is that in many places the overburden is free from limestone, so that the spoil banks will be very acid. (The No. 8 coal—

By way of interpolation, the No. 8 coal is three levels above the No. 11—

which is that most heavily stripped in Harrison County, is overlaid by heavy limestone deposits.) It is very doubtful if anything will grow on the spoil banks which will be left after this No. 11 is stripped. Certainly Harrison County will look like the Garden of Eden compared with what will be left of our county.

As you probably also know, it has recently been announced that a huge new coal-burning powerplant will be constructed in Brilliant, which is in Jefferson County, by the Ohio Power Co. and the REA.

It is the REA, I may say by interjection, which is a Government agency, that will participate through financing in this huge strip operation. The letter continues:

It is perfectly apparent that the interest in the new field has been precipitated by the new powerplant, since No. 11 coal has certain properties which make it undesirable for use in most existing markets. Certainly there is no existing market which could absorb the quantities which will be removed in this county from the proposed field, while the new facility could be designed to make economical use of this coal.

It seems to me that the REA—

That is a Government agency—

should not be a party to an operation which would be so patently damaging to the already depressed economy of our county and which would dim its first prospects for improvement in many years. I thought that perhaps you would be in a position and inclined to agree and to act to call this to the REA's attention and persuade it to oppose the use of this stripping coal or any coal from a new stripping field in this State in the new plant.

The man who has been most active in procuring leases and options for this coal has told farmers and landowners whom he has contacted that it is his belief that this coal may be sold to the Government-sponsored pilot coal-to-gasoline conversion plant to be constructed across the river in Ravenswood, W. Va. I am inclined to discount the credibility of this story, but, if true, it would be another illustration of a Federal project leading to decimation of our county by stripping.

This is a crisis because it is becoming more apparent every day that a heavy commitment has been made to exploit the coalfield and because the university is just at the outset of its development plans.

We are acting locally and the only way I can see that we can, as you will be able to determine from the enclosed clipping from today's issue of the Times-Leader.

Zoning is not a very effective tool, however, to use to save the major part of the county and the most effective way this threat could be arrested would be for REA to refuse to purchase strip coal, which it certainly should do.

I know that you will sympathize with us and I hope that you will feel that you can do something to help us.

If the writer only knew how helpless we are in these matters most often, it makes no difference where our affections, our sympathies, and our judgments lie. We are helpless to bring relief when there is an overall, powerful action indulging in this unpardonable, irreparable, and, in my judgment criminal conduct. His letter continues:

One of the principal assets which we have in this locality is the beauty of our countryside which is great in areas removed from the scars of previous exploitation, which are gradually healing. This beauty will be completely destroyed if the county is stripped

and there will be no hope for betterment of our people.

If you want, I can produce considerable factual information to support the conclusions stated in this letter, and I will be more than happy to do anything I can in any way to assist you, if you would be interested in helping us try to solve this problem.

The eyes which have not seen the damage caused to the countryside and the landscape by the strip mining operations can have no conception of what is done to nature by the strip miners.

The Peabody Coal Co. is now developing a shovel that will lift 115 cubic yards of coverage—that means practically 170 tons—in one bite. With a 200-foot boom, the massive shovel will dig into the tender soil, destroy the grass coverage and legumes, the flowers and the trees, drive out the birds, lower the water table, and finally after the coal has been removed, bequeath the land to posterity.

Ghost towns are developing in eastern and southeastern Ohio. The taxpayers will be asked to provide money to restore Appalachia.

I ask the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]: How foolish can we get? How can we boondoggle in that way? How can we be so careless in government as to allow this exploitation to continue; and then to say, after the economy of a community has been destroyed, that with a poverty war program we will go in to restore it? That is exactly what is being proposed.

According to my understanding, the powerplant which is being built at Brilliant, Ohio, is a joint venture by the Ohio Power Co. and, as I recall, 23 rural electric cooperatives. It will be the largest powerplant under one roof in the country. I have no doubt that it is being constructed there because the coal is cheap, and it will be economically profitable to operate the plant, especially when there is absent a conscience that should be mindful of the destruction that is being done to the land.

I should like to know: Where are the great advocates of conservation? Where are the men who argue that money should be spent to restore the land? Why are they not speaking up to stop the causes rather than to buy the medicine with which to provide what is supposed to be the cure?

Not a single one, I am sure, will speak up. The easy way out will be to let the destruction continue, but then to dig into the taxpayers' money and engage in a project that simply cannot be profitable and healthfully achieved.

Senators may ask, "Why are you so excited about this?" In about 1920, after the First World War, I went into a little town in Belmont County to play baseball. A team known as the Cleveland All Stars went into that mining area to play the local community team.

I came into Belmont County; and there, as a kid of 22 years, I looked at those hills; and the ravages of strip mining were apparent. They struck me deeply. I could not believe that an ethical human being would proceed to do to the land what was being done there. It left an indelible impression upon me.

The next time I went into that town, where we played the baseball games, was

ation. Now all three Academies are being expanded and costly improvements in facilities are being requested. There is equal or greater reason to improve educational standards concurrently with improvement of facilities.

Now, I shall add this final word. All of my discussion has been about weapons and military strength. I would not have us forget the people who serve in the military forces or the civilians who work beside them. Military effectiveness cannot be entirely based on weapons. Weapons alone will win no battles and gain no victories. Those who man the weapons, who service them, and those who design them are the essential forces which lead the way to victory. For their esprit de corps, their dedication, their knowhow, we should be very grateful indeed. I salute them for a job well done.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in past years I have applauded the bipartisan efforts of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, in producing bills engineered to give this country the best possible military protection. This we have always done and have done again in this bill.

This year more than 3,000 pages—5 volumes—of printed testimony have been released. But, examining the original typewritten transcripts, which are locked in subcommittee safes, I was too often disturbed by the excessive number of deletions made under the guise of national security. More times than not the only security involved was the political security of the present administration.

It was political censorship, not national security, that was the guideline in determining what should be left for you to read in the final printed copies of the hearings. If partisanship had not put a false security stamp on much of the hearings, the five volumes would have been doubled in number.

By striking off the record questions and answers not pertaining to genuine security matters, much of the five volumes is rendered meaningless. The public record has been transformed into a document designed to nurture the myth of the infallibility of top Pentagon civilians.

The printed hearings only hint at what Secretary McNamara actually said about the interlocking of our defense and foreign policies.

His comments on foreign policy were almost entirely erased from the record. But, within days, he issued similar statements to the daily press, with the emphasis carefully shifted. The testimony on Vietnam and Cuba covered many, many hours of committee work. In the printed hearings, political censorship makes it appear that we glossed over those two vital areas of concern in a matter of minutes.

Intelligence estimates, which I agree should be classified, were made use of just last week by the Secretary of Defense, but were blanked out of the

printed hearings made available to this House.

Certainly all that we hear in Defense Subcommittee sessions should not be published as general information. But the test of whether specific information is of aid and comfort to an enemy must be applied without any taint of selfish partisan advantage attached to it.

More than half of General LeMay's testimony was stricken by the blue pencil. Much of what he told us was his own opinion as a military expert and did not contain either figures or technical security data. His remarks did not happen to agree with Secretary McNamara's views, and so they were eliminated from the printed hearings.

I protest and will continue to protest withholding essential information if this Congress is to make intelligent and knowledgeable decisions regarding our military program and a correct evaluation of the conduct of our foreign affairs.

I do not protest the proper deletion of classified information by the Defense or State Departments for bona fide national security reasons. I do protest the abuse of the "Top secret" stamp to block out honest dissenting opinions if they reflect adversely against the administration. I protest this "political censorship."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in my opinion this is a good bill. It will add to the military strength of this Nation. The most important question before the American people today is the ability of the military forces of the country to preserve peace in the world.

The potential enemies, the Communist community, still have the ultimate objective of extending the sway of communism over the rest of the world. The alleged dispute between the leadership of Communist Russia and the leadership of Communist China is not over the ultimate objective, but how it is to be achieved and who is to control the worldwide Communist movement.

Our potential enemies respect one thing and one thing only—that is strength and military power. In my opinion, we have the necessary strength and military power to command their respect.

Having served on this subcommittee for the past 12 years, I have had the opportunity of seeing our military strength grow.

I have seen our missile program grow from a mere idea in a scientist's mind to the great arsenal of efficient and reliable intercontinental ballistic missiles that we have today. Our subcommittee has had the responsibility of determining the amount of money spent for the buildup of our military partnership. According to the testimony of all military experts who appeared before the committee, we have today a retaliatory capability which is sufficient to prevent a major attack on us. Such capability consists of our bombers, missiles, and bomber systems.

During the past 3 years we have had a substantial build-up in our military strength both for a general and limited war. Here are a few specifics: A 100-percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces; a 45-percent increase in the number of combat ready Army divisions; a one-third increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons; a 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe; a 75-percent increase in our airlift capability; a 100-percent increase in general ship construction and conversion; a six-fold increase in our counterinsurgency forces. Our troops are being issued the most modern and sophisticated weapons. I am convinced that we have today the best equipped army in the world.

This bill provides an Army of 974,000 officers and men, a Navy of 677,900 officers and men, a Marine Corps of 190,100 officers and men and an Air Force of 838,800 officers and men, for a total of 2,680,700 officers and men in the Regular military services. Our military men are well trained. They have excellent weapons. We have an abundant supply of atomic weapons and an accurate delivery system.

In short, we are better prepared today than ever before in history, and this should be comforting to the peaceloving people of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, each year that I come from our committee room after hearing testimony for several months, I am convinced of two things: first, that our potential enemy has the capability, regardless of what we do, of inflicting severe damage on our Nation. I am also convinced that we have the capability of immediate retaliation if an attack is launched upon us, regardless of the size of the attack, regardless of the effect of the attack. I am convinced we have the retaliatory capability of absolutely destroying our potential enemy as civilization is known today.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have the prayerful hope that these two great, powerful nations, standing opposite each other with opposite ideologies, opposite concepts of human life, will wind up like two men that I heard about years ago here in Washington who started to have a duel. One was a bloodthirsty killer. The other had never fired a gun. The killer challenged the peaceful, quiet, law-abiding man to a duel, and under the rules of the game of dueling, the challenged man had the right to select the weapons to be used and the circumstances under which the duel would be fought. He chose a sawed-off shotgun to be used at a distance of 2 feet. The bully canceled the duel. Figuratively speaking that is the position we are in today, Mr. Chairman. We stand 2 feet apart with sawed-off shotguns. If the triggers are pulled nobody will win. Let us hope and pray that the duel will be canceled. And I say again that it is comforting to know today that we are better prepared than ever before.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10939 reported favorably by the Committee on Appropriations for the funds re-

1964

8295

erly directed, are adequate to destroy a target.

Nor has the committee been overdisturbed by statements that the Russians may be closing the megatonnage gap. I refer primarily to capability for delivery of megatons of nuclear devices on targets. As the B-47's, which are now antiquated, are phased out, we lose some capability to deliver nuclear bombs. A bomber carries a larger payload of nuclear weapons than does an ICBM. But, the number of B-47's which will reach a target against present-day air defense systems is rapidly being downgraded. By cost comparison, they are too ineffective to compete with newer weapons. The fact that the Russians boast of a 100-megaton nuclear weapon, which in reality is nearer to a 50-megaton weapon, makes their side of the story look more impressive. But, there is not enough justification for 100-megaton weapons, or even 50-megaton weapons, for us to enter into competition in this area. We do not need to kill an enemy but once. And, may God help us that we do not have to kill once.

Apprehension has been created in some areas by Mr. Khrushchev's boasts that he can shoot down attacking ICBM's. So can we—in limited numbers and under anticipated conditions. There is no evidence to show that he has significantly bypassed our developments in this field. We are pushing the development of the Nike-X and its follow-on, Sprint, and other devices. But there is doubt their effectiveness will ever justify the cost of a complete system. Very serious and careful tests now in progress, and continued by this bill, will tell us much more than we know now.

We are building a conventional carrier. The last one was a nuclear carrier. This looks like a backward step. Many people in and out of the Navy would have preferred a nuclear carrier. I consider that we need a carrier too badly to quibble at this point. We have not been able to get an agreement that a nuclear carrier will be built even if funded, and it is a fact that another conventional carrier will be an important adjunct to the fleet.

The followon bomber for which we provide \$47 million above the budget request may be one of the most important items in this bill. The \$5 million request carried in the budget would provide only a minuscule start. The appropriation which we made is the same as that recommended by the House Committee on Armed Services under the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. General LeMay said this amount will cut a year from the development time contemplated for the followon bomber. A year can be extremely important. It is to be an entirely new concept of aircraft by which we will attempt to insure that we have an effective, 2,000-mile-an-hour, manned bomber fleet in the 1970's.

Some of you will ask why the B-70 or the RS-70 now under development cannot be altered or converted to this requirement just as the A-11 is being converted from its initial mission to that of interceptor. I wish the RS-70 could be so utilized. It has cost a billion and a

half dollars. It has not even flown. The Air Force now has little hope of significant use for this plane in future years, but all of the cost of development has not been lost. From it we have gained much knowledge about metals, stress, fuels, and design problems associated with a plane which will fly at three times the speed of sound. The Air Force feels that flight testing the RS-70 presently under development will provide additional highly valuable information about the aircraft of the future. The facts are that time has bypassed the B-70 and even before it flies it is not modern enough for the requirements of the followon bomber.

Some of the strongest criticism of the Defense Department has been directed at sole source noncompetitive contracts, and in much of this I concur. But with the modernization presently required, sole source contracts cannot be avoided. Please bear in mind we are constantly developing new or greatly changed weapons systems. They require very complex operating parts, backup systems, and communications facilities. A competitive bid on a rifle already in the hands of troops presents no problems. But a competitive bid on a communications system for an aircraft which has not even been built presents an entirely different situation. There are few guidelines by which manufacturers can estimate costs. They simply will not bid competitively.

There are a number of situations of this nature in this bill. And the fact is the agencies of government like to deal in noncompetitive, sole source bids. It is simpler and easier. So, sometimes contracting officers will continue sole source, noncompetitive procurement longer than is necessary. To try to stop this sort of thing and to force competitive buying wherever possible, the committee has cut \$80 million from requests totaling some \$2 billion for electronics, aircraft, and telecommunications procurement. It is the highest cut percentage in the bill. There are some who would have us cut deeper. A deeper cut could be ruinous to reliability and to modernization. Remember, in this field we are getting to the very heart of present-day defense programs. We are talking about aircraft, missiles, antimissile developments; the new Red-Eye with which a footsoldier can knock down an airplane; even Polaris, one of the most important weapons systems in our arsenal.

I want to say a word about the Reserve components. For years we fought efforts from the Pentagon to reduce the paid drill strength of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard below 700,000. Well, it now is below 700,000. Not by virtue of a deficit in congressional appropriations or even by reason of Pentagon desires. The programs for modernization set forth for the Reserve components are now so exacting that their units are in many cases little different from the Regular forces. It is intended that they be prepared for immediate or early utilization in times of emergency. The standards have been raised and the Reserve components have

taken these exacting new requirements in their stride, but recruitment has been more difficult and the number of participants fell off. Now strength figures are increasing. Both the Reserve and the Guard are optimistic about regaining lost strength. The committee has been assured and reassured that the Defense Department will support efforts to increase the numbers of reservists and will support the necessary funding.

For the first time the committee is providing funds above the budget level to deal with a problem which exists in Navy Reserves and in Air Force Reserves. One involves deteriorations in numbers of personnel and the other a limitation in drill pay periods. Our action should correct both and make it possible for the Reserve program of both services to operate more effectively than in the past.

I have indicated very general support of this bill and that is my attitude. I would have changed some of its language. I question the wisdom of cutting procurement of the new Redeye weapon which very definitely is needed by modern ground forces as a defense against low-flying, strafing and bombing enemy aircraft. I would have written differently the language on the 65-35 item on repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, because I do not want to cripple the effectiveness and to diminish the know-how possessed by personnel of naval shipyards. I would have placed greater emphasis on chemical and biological studies. These are carried in the bill at budget level, but I say today as I have said many times before that our capability in these fields is too largely a laboratory capability, and a sudden surge of interest in this area by the Russians could leave us seriously jeopardized. Of particular significance is the advance in the nondestructive, nonlethal effects of chemical and biological weapons.

This bill slows Army modernization just as it was reaching full stride, and before modernization of the Army was completed. The saving thus obtained is not as important as the risk to our forces. In that connection I note that there is at long last a cooperative undertaking between Germany and the United States to develop a new battle tank. This is commendable. The Germans historically have been expert in weapons development. Their weapons have been among the best. We can gain from a pooling of knowledge with the Germans and other allies. There are indications the whole thing may become bogged down in redtape and legalism. This must be avoided under all circumstances.

One word of caution. A recent newspaper release stated that a flourishing numbers racket had been exposed in the Pentagon. No one has denied it. I am concerned about the security in the Nation's military nerve center if a numbers racket can develop and operate there without detection.

I am not certain there is sufficient progress in upgrading the Army and Navy Academies. In national ratings the Air Force Academy far outshines both. Nor am I certain there is in the Army and Navy Academies sufficient urge to stay abreast of the forward trend in edu-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 16

10225

Gruening	McClellan	Robertson
Hart	McGee	Russell
Hayden	McGovern	Saltanostall
Holland	McIntyre	Scott
Hruska	McNamara	Simpson
Humphrey	Miller	Smith
Inouye	Monroney	Sparkman
Johnston	Morton	Stennis
Jordan, Idaho	Mundt	Walters
Keating	Nelson	Williams, N.J.
Lausche	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.
Long, Mo.	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
Mansfield	Ribicoff	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from OREGON [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

Mr. CARLSON. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as Chairman of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:
S. 2851. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Manousakis and Eleni Manousakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:
Editorial entitled "President Projects Two Big Moves Possible Without Loss of Security"; also editorial entitled "Investing Money in People Is Wise," published in the Anderson, S.C., Independent of April 23, 1964.
Editorial entitled "Nation Honors Noted Statesman; Harry Truman Is 80 Years Young," published in the Anderson, S.C. Independent of May 8, 1964.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE MAHON, OF TEXAS, NEW CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, all of us were deeply shocked at the passing of our old friend and colleague, Clarence Cannon, who was chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. However, despite the feeling of Congress, we are very pleased and happy that to step into the breach we had a man of the caliber of Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas.

Many Members of this body served with Representative MAHON and know him as a man who is understanding, tolerant, and reasonable, who does not seek notoriety and publicity, but who does a good, sound job, day in and day out.

In some respects he is not as well known as he should be and this, I know, is a matter of personal preference; but so far as Congress and Texas, his State, are concerned, we know him as a man of devotion, dedication, ability, and experience.

I feel that the Nation is fortunate, under the sad circumstances, to have a man like GEORGE MAHON, the tall Texan with his ability, devotion, and dedication, to step into the breach and fill the place left by our late beloved colleague, Clarence Cannon.

Because of my high respect and great admiration for this great Texan and American, I ask unanimous consent that an article by William S. White, which appeared in last evening's Washington Star, entitled "The Passing Scene—All Nice Guys Don't Finish Last," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALL NICE GUYS DON'T FINISH LAST

(By William S. White)

Not even in politics do nice guys always finish last. For distinguished evidence of this there is Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, who has just ascended to the chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee in succession to the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri.

For more than 20 years Mr. MAHON has been a significant Member of Congress. For

most of these years he has had a responsible hand in the allocation of countless billions of dollars and a critical and decisive role in defense appropriations alone running to more than \$450 billion.

For a decade, at least, he has been among the 10 or 12 men who really run Congress, as head of the appropriations subcommittee which has the military directly in its charge. Now, as chairman of the entire committee, his writ runs everywhere and he is unquestionably among the topmost six of Congress.

DOES JOB QUIETLY

In spite of it all, he has been Mr. Anonymous, quietly doing his job, bearing a staggering responsibility for the military safety of this Nation and its allies around the world, and never making the headlines. Ask the first six people you meet to tell you who is GEORGE MAHON and from all six you will very likely get the reply: "Who, indeed?"

Mr. MAHON, a tall, shy, reticent and soft-spoken man of 63 who at a glance could pass for 45, is a leathery product of west Texas who could easily be either the fellow in the white hat or the black hat in any Dodge City of television. His simple, undemanding demeanor masks one of the wisest and most sophisticated minds in the United States in the strategic fundamentals of warfare as seen from the ultimately controlling vantage point held by such political masters of all high strategy.

It is said of him, and rightly so, that he knows the byways of the Pentagon far better than any Secretary of Defense we have ever had—because while Secretaries come and go, Mr. MAHON has stayed on and on.

Still, if you met him you might think him a reserved country schoolteacher or, possibly, a sedate rancher in town to see the banker about a loan. It is the Mahons of Congress—the quiet, little-noticed, deeply responsible men who are content with the power and never mind the power and never mind the pomp and publicity—who are its last and best justification.

Mr. MAHON is never seen at the glittering Washington parties. Celebrated hostesses know him not. Nor is he invited to the intimate affairs of the diplomatic and bureaucratic sets. They, too, know him not. And the more fools they, for within the modest 7-gallon Stetson he wears is a capacity for real decision over real matters a hundred-fold greater than in the more socially aggressive guests who are in the curious order of things, asked in his stead.

In reality, Mr. MAHON to, say, an Assistant Secretary of State, is about what a commanding general of an Army group is to an aide de camp wearing his shoulder cord over the gilt bars of a second lieutenant. But reality escapes many people here—and this is fine with such as GEORGE MAHON. For they have the work to do.

JUSTIFICATION OF FACTS

Moreover, the Mahons as a class, and GEORGE MAHON specifically, are also the last and best justifications of the very two congressional facts of life now under the widest attack from reformers: The seniority system and the one-party system believed by many to be so notably evil.

But for the seniority system, mere personal popularity polls and log rolling, and not the hard competence that can only come from long experience, would choose the committee chairmen of Congress. And but for the one-party system, with all its faults, men like GEORGE MAHON could never survive long enough to reach that place of power from which the Mahons alone are able to disregard the little local pressures and passing hysterias and so to concentrate on the great and timeless national issues.

At this point they are in fact statesmen; and only politicians some of the time and then only incidentally. They are nice guys, yes; but they are something far more. They are indispensable guys.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1964

No. 98

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 18, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

Senate

SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1964)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Rev. Fred M. Chapman, pastor, First Baptist Church, Midlothian, Tex., offered the following prayer:

We lift our voices unto You in prayer, our Eternal Father. To You we give praise, the God of all mankind, the Creator and Ruler of the universe.

It is with hearts of contrition we bow before You. We recognize Your holiness and our sinfulness. We know that You are absolute, and we know that we are completely dependent upon You. Have mercy upon us and cleanse us from all sin.

To You we give thanks for all our blessings. We are especially thankful for our Nation, for our forefathers, and for our sustaining fathers. We thank You for our system of government, the Constitution, and the freedom it affords.

We petition You, our Father. We pray for this great Senate and each Senator. We pray your guidance upon this body as it deliberates the great issues of the day.

May all that is done here today bring glory to God and honor to all men everywhere.

In the name of Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1964.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a

Senator from the State of Oregon, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

LEE METCALF,
Acting President pro tempore.

Mrs. NEUBERGER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 15, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 14, 1964, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1005. An act to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 809(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain non-broadcast operations; and

S. 1193. An act to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that positions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of a quorum call, there be a morning hour, under the usual circumstances, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has permission been granted for the Senate to take a recess, on the completion of its business today, until 10 o'clock Monday morning next?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Permission has been granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Carlson	Dominick
Bartlett	Case	Douglas
Bayh	Church	Eastland
Hennett	Clark	Ellender
Bible	Curtis	Ervin
Cannon	Dodd	Fong

[No. 233 Leg.]

10687

1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I join the distinguished majority leader in commending the elevation of this great Representative from Texas. It was my privilege to serve with him in the House commencing in 1934. I came to know him very well when we made the trip to the Philippines in 1935 for the inauguration of the first President of the Philippines in the fall of that year.

I had many contacts with Representative MAHON in the handling of the defense appropriation bill. Senators will remember that during the 2 years that the late Senator Chavez of New Mexico was ill, I substituted as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

GEORGE MAHON is one of the ablest men in the entire Congress. There is no more patriotic, dedicated American citizen.

The Nation is fortunate that he will now head what is probably the greatest committee in the entire Congress, because appropriations are bound to be the lifeblood of any government. Whether it is in the Constitution or not, appropriation bills originate on the House side, and the Senate acts later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add to what has been said that I have sat across the table in many conferences with Representative MAHON on defense matters. I have always found him to be a very honorable man, a man who was willing to make concessions, who saw the other point of view. I am very happy to be able to serve with him now as chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations. I know we shall be able to get along, and I know we will get results.

I join the majority leader in putting into the RECORD the article of William S. White of last night, which I personally read, and whose expressions I share.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Representative MAHON is really a pillar in the House of Representatives. He is fair. He is thorough. He does his homework. He is courteous and considerate to all Members. He is a man of great knowledge and experience and well respected. It is fortunate that an individual of this type can assume this grave responsibility.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I join the distinguished majority leader and other Members of the Senate in strongly approving the selection of Hon. GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, to be successor to the late distinguished Clarence Cannon, deceased, who was the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

I served with the distinguished Representative MAHON, of Texas, for 12 years and know of the great work he has done

in the House of Representatives. Now he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He knows as much about the \$50 billion budget and all the technicalities of the needs and requirements of all branches of the service as do the admirals and generals in the Pentagon. His dedication to civilian control of the military has been very pronounced. He is a frugal man, insisting on 100 cents for every dollar's appropriation, with his expertise, knowledge, and study of defense needs on the Military Appropriation Subcommittee. He has shown a dedication always and an intense interest to carefully and considerably allocate Federal funds to the many divisions of Government that come before the full Appropriations Committee. He has been a leader of men, and distinguished himself in this important capacity.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, one of the important problems facing the country's economy is the possible reduction and changes in the character of our defense establishment. Many communities across the country have become dependent either upon defense contracts or on military installations. Termination of such contracts or military installations can produce painful distress in terms of disrupted payrolls and loss of business. I believe that we all recognize that the opportunity to reduce unneeded spending and unneeded military installations is one upon which we should seize and which should not be lost sight of because of any impact it may have on the economy.

What is needed is intelligent planning to provide alternative uses for manpower and resources when they become excess to our military security needs.

It is for that reason that I introduced S. 2274 last October, which would create planning machinery for that purpose.

I am happy to ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the names of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as cosponsors to the bill.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, this brings to 15 the number of Senators cosponsoring the proposed legislation. Some 28 Members of the House of Representatives—Republicans and Democrats alike—have since introduced identical measures. I am pleased that on a week from Monday, May 25, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will begin hearings on the proposed legislation.

I urge attention and support of the Senate for those hearings.

CIVIL RIGHTS—A RELIGIOUS AND MORAL ISSUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, we all know that a strong bipartisan ef-

fort was highly significant in bringing about the passage of H.R. 7152 by the House of Representatives. We know, too, that Members of both parties will be responsible for the passage of this bill in the Senate. This is but one reflection of the fact that support for the achievement of equal justice under law comes from every corner of the American population.

Madam President, another development in this struggle for equal rights is the outstanding leadership we are witnessing on the part of the churches, synagogues, and the religious leaders of America.

The injustices suffered by American Negroes and other minority groups have awakened Protestants, Catholics, and Jews to an awareness that the institutions which should be in the forefront of the fight for equality of opportunity—the churches—cannot be silent. The churches and synagogues and the religious leaders of our land are speaking out. They are saying that this great issue of human rights is not primarily a political or partisan issue but fundamentally a religious and a moral question.

They are saying this every day, Madam President, through sermons, church publications, resolutions, and worship services similar to the Church Assembly on Civil Rights, which is held daily at the Lutheran Church of the Reformation on Capitol Hill.

Madam President, the support of men and women of religious faith can be decisive in determining the future of civil rights in this country. In order that their expressions of support be made a part of this historic debate, I ask unanimous consent that 53 statements on civil rights, representing 29 religious groups and denominations, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Armenian Church of America]

EMANCIPATION OF THE WHITE MAN

(NOTE.—The following editorial was reported in lieu of an official statement.)

There is no question that the fight for social justice to Negro citizens must be fought on two fronts, and the less obvious but more decisive battle is that which is being waged, or should be waged, in the conscience of white men and women, who must first rid themselves of the accumulated racial prejudice of the past centuries before a worthy solution to the problem can be effected.

A full century has passed since the Gettysburg Address and the emancipation of Negro slaves.

It is now time for the total emancipation of white men and women and children from the rusty chains of their own un-Christian racial prejudice and intolerance. (The Armenian Church, a monthly published by the diocese of the Armenian Church in America, September 1963.)

BAPTIST BODIES—AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION, MAY 1963

(a) The church and racial tensions: We reaffirm our stand that not only should all followers of Jesus Christ regardless of their race but that we should earnestly and actively seek to win all unchurched persons

May 16

within our community to Christ and to the fellowship of the church. We reaffirm our belief that all persons should be given the opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills needed for church leadership and that all positions of leadership within the local church and on area and national levels should be open on the basis of qualification without regard to race.

(b) Civil rights:

1. Voting rights: The universal right of a qualified citizen to vote is one of the most cherished bases of our democracy. To deny a citizen the right to vote solely because of his race, creed, color, or national origin is contrary to our democratic principles and violates our Christian concept of oneness under God. We, therefore, urge the enactment of appropriate Federal and State laws to assure the equal and unhindered right to qualify, register, and vote.

2. Education: We urge the Federal Government to make available technical and financial assistance to aid public school districts which encounter unusual difficulties in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

3. Civil Rights Commission: We urge the continuation and strengthening of the Civil Rights Commission until such time that the President and Congress determine that no major constitutional violation of civil rights exists.

(c) Employment:

We commend our denominational agencies for their progress in fair, nondiscriminatory employment practices. These agencies have set an enviable standard for our churches and all our constituency. We urge them to continued effort in this direction.

We urge our local churches to adopt nondiscriminatory employment practices as their policy and to implement them when engaging pastoral and professional leaders. It is both right and reasonable for the church to engage all staff on the basis of experience, training, and competency, and not race. Local churches should recognize that they may challenge and set the standard for employment practices in their community and in industry, commerce, and municipal agencies by their example. We commend all employers who have already adopted nondiscriminatory practices.

We urge local churches as corporate bodies to exercise their influence to secure local, State, and Federal fair employment practices legislation. We urge American Baptist laymen to exercise their faith by using all their persuasion to introduce and establish just and equitable employment practices.

We strongly urge the general council and those responsible for securing hotel and meeting-hall facilities for annual and other meetings of the American Baptist Convention and its boards and departments, to request that the employment practices of those responsible for these facilities adhere to the principles of fair play in hiring personnel for the various categories of service, without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

(d) Housing: Believing that this is God's world, and accepting all that His creation and sovereignty imply, we believe it incompatible with Christian teachings and beliefs to deny housing to any on the basis of race.

We urge that our fellowship champion open occupancy through legislation and personal practice; that local churches urge their members to work in their community to accomplish the following:

1. Encourage church members to list their houses with real estate dealers who have adopted nondiscriminatory practices.

2. Encourage laymen to use their influence as Christians and businessmen to the end that mortgage loans will not be denied to any person because of race.

3. Organize neighborhood and civic groups dedicated to dealing realistically and openly with racial change in a community.

4. Urge newspapers, chambers of commerce, PTA's, and ministerial groups to advocate open occupancy.

5. Publicize the fact that property values need not decline as racial change occurs.

6. Encourage real estate brokers to adopt nondiscrimination practices in the sale and rental of housing.

7. Introduce and encourage legislation making discrimination illegal in the sale and rental of housing.

We urge our churches, institutions and agencies to make certain that their funds deposited in lending institutions be placed in those that do not deny mortgage loans to any person on the basis of race.

We further urge that in all American Baptist sponsored housing there be public and open declaration that persons of all races are welcome as residents.

(e) Demonstrations against racial segregation: While we regret the need for "sit-ins" and "kneel-ins" and other nonviolent demonstrations, we deplore even more the injustices which provoke and make them necessary to awaken a nation from apathy and summon it to action in eliminating every form of segregation and discrimination.

The way to end demonstrations is to correct the abuses which evoke them, to establish communication between white and Negro leaders, and to negotiate in good faith and with a sense of urgency which a world in ferment requires if change is to come in a peaceable way.

BAPTIST ACTION FOR RACIAL BROTHERHOOD

(NOTE.—The American Baptist Convention announced a program for action, based upon a resolution unanimously passed at the American Baptist Convention in Detroit last May, to be known as Baptist Action for Racial Brotherhood.)

1. Suggested confirmation by all constituent churches of their readiness to accept and welcome as members individuals of all races.

2. Enrollment of present members in personal action of one or more individual steps for racial brotherhood.

3. Individual or group financial contributions to leading organizations working constructively in the field of civil rights.

4. Reciprocal visits with families of other races.

5. Reciprocal church delegation visits with congregations predominantly of other races.

6. Support of comprehensive civil rights legislation on the Federal, State, and local levels.

7. Participation in or initiation of local interfaith committees or conferences of clergy.

8. Taking part in nonviolent demonstrations for civil rights.

9. Encouragement of nondiscrimination practices in housing and in other facilities.

10. Affirmative action to assist in overcoming handicaps of minority citizens resulting from past discrimination and segregation.

11. Special aid to those who have innocently suffered exceptional loss due to racial tensions.

12. Circulation of information literature folders, including Martin Luther King's "letter from Birmingham jail," reports of the "Challenge to Religion," from the Interfaith Conference on Race in Chicago, Ill., January 1963, and material on civil rights legislation.

13. Suggested inclusion of the aims of the program in individual and church prayers.

14. Requesting program content within all American Baptist Assembly sessions at Green Lake, Wis. in 1963, and at the national convention at Atlantic City in 1964.

15. Encouragement of seminary leadership of their students and alumni in all phases of racial brotherhood.

16. Providing consultants to meet with local churches on any special problem situations.

NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION, U.S.A., INC.

Almost any American tourist of Europe and other eastern countries meets with the question of the attitude of America toward the intermingling of the races composing the population of the United States.

Some of these peoples are quite "scathing" in their remarks concerning the American claim of democracy and Christianity on the one hand and the treatment America permits to be accorded her minority peoples on the other.

For many years Negroes have been puzzled as to the attitude they should adopt regarding the sincerity of the American claim of the policy of "justice to all and special privilege to none."

When, however, the Supreme Court issued her memorable decision outlawing segregation in the public schools, the race took heart and reorganized her thinking with regard to America being in truth "The land of the free and the home of the brave."

Negroes love America and entertain no bitterness toward her despite the vicious wrongs some commit against them in certain sections of the country. They have too long agonized in prayer for her security. They have given too freely of their blood to vouchsafe her institutions—not to love her with undying devotion. They believe the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, justified the faith, the hope, and the love they exercise toward this country.

SEVENTH DAY BAPTIST CHURCHES, GENERAL CONFERENCE, AUGUST 1963

The General Conference of Seventh Day Baptist Churches in the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 has affirmed the conviction that Christian love transcends differences of race, color, or position in life; has expressed itself as in harmony with the Supreme Court decision concerning race; has urged conduct in the spirit of Christ in the period of adjustment and planning; and has stated its belief that equality should extend to schools, housing, the ballot, and business and employment opportunities, and that this equality should be promoted by peaceful means.

Therefore, Seventh Day Baptists commit themselves to practice racial equality within their congregations as the only basis on which the church may offer moral advice to the state.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST STATE CONVENTIONS

(There follows a report carried in the January 1963 issue of Home Missions, an official publication of the Southern Baptist Convention. It is doubtless as the editor of that publication has said: "The most significant group of reports Southern Baptists have ever produced on this subject, simply because of their number and the fact the reports are from State instead of national groups, and therefore closer to the man in the pew.")

In North Carolina

In a history-making action, the North Carolina Baptist Convention voted in Raleigh to hold a joint meeting with the State's Negro Baptist convention in 1964.

This was believed to be the first such joint meeting of major Negro and white church groups ever to be planned in the South.

The meeting has already been approved by the Negro church body—the North Carolina General Baptist Convention.

The action came after O. L. Sherrill, executive secretary of the Negro convention, had told the messengers that "interracial cooperation is a major challenge to the Christian churches of our country today."

"This is not just a courtesy call," Dr. Sherrill said of his appearance at the convention. "I am here to say that the Christian church has reached a crossroads in the interpretation of the mission of the church."

Christians, he said, can no longer afford internal strife but have to "think of a tre-