

Of course, the USIA had no alternative but to announce a ban on this fake film. The fact is, it should never have been contracted for in the first place—and it causes one to wonder how much more is being spent to sugar-coat the news. This should be looked into. I say further, it is time the administration started to give the American people the truth about Vietnam.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. CORBETT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, RECEIVES FIRST GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER AWARD

(Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Tuesday, January 5, was George Washington Carver Day—a day set aside each year by act of this Congress when a grateful nation that has benefited so greatly from his genius commemorates the passing of the great scientist, teacher, and humanitarian.

At impressive ceremonies held here in the Nation's Capital on that day, the man most responsible for the designation of January 5 each year as George Washington Carver Day, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] was appropriately honored by receiving the first George Washington Carver Award.

The award was presented to Mr. CORBETT in the form of a handsomely inscribed bronze and walnut plaque by Dr. Rosa Gragg, chairman of the Career Commemoration Committee of the District of Columbia, "in appreciation for his pioneering efforts in introducing legislation in the 79th Congress of the United States to honor a great scientist and insure future recognition of Carver's outstanding contributions."

I am pleased to bring this to the attention of the Members of the House as I know that all his colleagues feel as I do that this is an honor which Mr. CORBETT richly deserves and that they all join with me in offering him sincere congratulations.

[Mr. HALL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NO WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, like other Americans I am well aware that the situation in Vietnam has been going badly. I do not claim to have, any more than anyone else, a pat or simple solution to our military difficulties there.

But I have watched with increasing concern and uneasiness in recent days as individual Members of the Congress, in the face of these mounting discouragements, have proposed abandoning our commitments in Vietnam and retreating or disengaging there in one fashion or another. I do not believe that these

sentiments, though they may have come in for special attention in the press, represent the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House or the Senate and I believe it is important for some of us to say so publicly without delay.

For nearly two decades America has led the worldwide fight for freedom and against Communist aggression and encroachment. We formalized that commitment in the Truman doctrine, and expounded it in the policy of containment. We underwrote it with money and courage and blood in the Marshall plan, in military and economic aid, in the Korean war, in the Berlin airlift, in Lebanon, in the Formosa Straits, and in the Cuban missile crisis. Over the years as we have discharged these responsibilities we have had our ups and downs. But we have continued to honor this commitment. Never before have we seriously considered quitting just because the going was getting tough. Most emphatically we should not do so now.

For what is at stake today in Vietnam is far more than the current military situation in one faraway corner of the world. It is nothing less than the leadership and credibility of the United States of America. Having put our hand to the plow we cannot now possibly turn back without disastrous results not merely in southeast Asia but around the world. If the United States, once sufficiently harassed and embarrassed, can be persuaded to back down on its commitment in Vietnam, who then can ever again put faith in our commitment in any other part of the world? What better proof that Uncle Sam is after all just a paper tiger, that our will and determination simply do not measure up to the megatonage of our nuclear arsenal? What more dramatic evidence that American democracy just does not have the stomach to stay the full distance, that communism, not democracy, is the real wave of the future? If America can be harassed and frustrated out of southeast Asia, how could she then be counted on to stand firm if the going suddenly got tough in Berlin or Cuba or Latin America?

Mr. Speaker, I believe these counsels of retreat and discouragement do a grave disservice to the American tradition of world leadership and I believe they must emphatically be rejected. However long and hard the road may be, America in my judgment has no honorable alternative but to stay in Vietnam until the independence of the people of Vietnam has been assured.

I was gratified that President Johnson made it clear in his state of the Union message that this Nation will continue to honor its commitment to freedom in Vietnam. As one Member of this Congress and as one member of its Committee on Armed Services, I intend to support whatever additional commitments of American power to Vietnam may be necessary to insure the continued freedom of the people of this area and the continued denial of their country to the forces of aggressive and totalitarian communism, whether Soviet or Chinese.

FARM PROBLEMS

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to attack farm problems on three fronts and wish to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to give this measure their fullest consideration.

We in the Congress have been witness to a vast number of farm programs that have been enacted over the years. Many of us have been opposed to several of these programs for two prime reasons. First, although the need to help the individual family farmer was most pressing, it was the corporate farms that obtained the greatest advantage from the majority of these programs. Second, and certainly equally significant, far too many of these programs have failed to give the farmer an option as to whether or not he would participate, thus serving to usurp the farmer's control over his own operation and placing it in the hands of the Federal Government.

I have steadily maintained that this trend has served to give the little farmer a "big brother" complex and must be abated. I strongly feel that the farmer should retain the right to make major decisions with regard to the production and sale of his products and should not be dictated to by an impersonal authority in a distant city.

The bill that I am introducing is geared to first, increase per family farm income; second, reduce the surplus of wheat and feed grains; and third, decrease the public costs of maintaining farm programs. Its principal provisions call for adjustments to wheat and feed grain production programs and the establishment of a cropland retirement program.

I anticipate that the programs will help to stabilize feed grain prices so as to make more nearly possible the planning that is requisite for successful farming and, with regard to the cropland retirement program, protect the Nation with respect to future needs of an expanding population.

This measure was prompted by lengthy discussions with my farmer constituents. It reflects our combined thinking and sincere desire to arrive at sensible and workable solutions to many of the problems that plague our existing farm programs. I do not claim that it is a cure-all; however, I feel that it constitutes a giant step in the right direction.

At this time, I would like to include in my remarks several salient points pertaining to the main features of this bill. These points were developed in my several conferences with spokesmen from and for the farm community.

New wheat legislation should be enacted in time to eliminate the necessity for another referendum on the wheat certificate plan provided by existing law which was rejected by wheatgrowers in 1963.

The present "emergency" feed grain program was initiated in 1961 and has been extended with minor modifications

since that time. Considering the vast acreage of land diverted from production by the program, the growth in market attained during its 4 years of operation, the poor crop in 1964, and the continuing surplus of feed grains, the program clearly has failed to solve the feed grain problem.

Furthermore, the programs for wheat and feed grains have aggravated the price and income problems of livestock producers and have proved an enormous financial burden on the American taxpayer.

The bill that I am introducing states that authority for wheat marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be terminated and the multiple-price wheat plan provisions of the 1962 Farm Act would be repealed. The provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1964, authorizing the 1964 and 1965 program for wheat would be allowed to expire. The 1963 Feed Grain Act, which applies only to the 1964 and 1965 crops of feed grains would be allowed to expire. These actions would clear the slate, beginning with the 1966 crops, for a new approach to the wheat and feed grain problem.

Beginning with the 1966 crop, price supports for wheat would be set at the U.S. farm price equivalent of the average world market price during the immediately preceding 3 marketing years—currently about \$1.34 per bushel. Premiums and discounts would be used to reflect market demand for milling and baking quality. For corn, supports would be 90 percent of the average price received by farmers for corn during the immediately preceding 3 years. Currently this would mean a price support of about \$1 per bushel for corn. Supports for other feed grains would be related to corn with differentials to reflect differences in feeding value.

Under no circumstances would the price support level be less than 50 percent of the applicable parity price. At the present time support prices computed by the market price formulas would be considerably higher than 50 percent of parity in all cases. This approach would automatically adjust support prices to changing supply and demand conditions.

The cropland retirement provisions of this measure deserve special attention. They are both temporary and voluntary in nature. Producers of all commodities would be given an opportunity to participate in the cropland retirement program. The voluntary nature of this proposed program minimizes the likelihood that it would have any adverse effects on individual counties or communities; however, to make certain that no area would be adversely affected, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which could be retired in any one State or county.

The key to this entire bill that makes it attractive to me, a number of my colleagues and, most important, to the farmers, is that it preserves the opportunity for each farmer to make his own decisions. It provides for needed adjustments in resource use without forcing every farmer to retire a part of his farm

without regard to his individual situation. It uses support prices to encourage orderly marketing and orderly adjustments in production rather than to fix prices. In short, it demonstrates our sincerity to maintain our partnership with the farmer and willingness to do all that we can to assist him and preserve his role as a bulwark in our society.

HON. LUTHER H. HODGES, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we have an opportunity of associating with and observing the work of many outstanding Americans who perform brilliant services in various stations of our Government. It has been my privileges, as well as yours, to work with so many outstanding, capable, experienced, and dedicated persons who have rendered service to America and added strength to our country in its great institutions.

I wish to pay tribute today, Mr. Speaker, to one of our great Americans who has served his country so well and contributed so much over the past two decades. In addition to outstanding public service he has rendered in many stations in Government, serving his country since the early part of World War II, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges has served as a member of the Cabinet in the high post of Secretary of Commerce for the past 4 years with brilliance, courage, and dedication.

It has been my privilege and certainly a very great pleasure to have worked closely with him during his service, which I would describe as that of a truly great Secretary of Commerce of the United States. Since it has been my pleasure to have had the association with him officially and personally during these years, I wish to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge our Nation's debt to this dedicated public servant as he retires from this outstanding Cabinet post.

As President Johnson so well said to him as he leaves his post:

Your leadership in the Commerce Department has been marked by prudence and progress. You have given of your wisdom and your tolerance not only to your own Department, but to the entire Cabinet as well.

As is well known, Secretary Hodges came to the Commerce Department already highly successful in both business and politics—as an executive in the great American textile industry, and as a Governor of the populous and progressive State of North Carolina.

In leaving his Cabinet post tomorrow, Secretary Hodges will be leaving that great Department with a legacy of purpose that is unique in our time. He has reorganized it and revitalized it, and given it a new sense of mission in its service to the business community and to all the American people.

In our century so many of the great decisions in the lives of men and nations are economic decisions—choices ground-

ed in the very stuff of our individual and national existence, our livelihoods, and our security. In these economic decisions, the Commerce Department has a vital role and a growing responsibility—for supplying information and services, and the leadership and guidance to help us, individually and as a nation, to make the most of our opportunities.

Secretary Hodges has stirred the Department to its organizational roots, bringing forth a new vitality, a new awareness of its mission to promote growth at home and the fulfillment of the grand concept of expanding free trade in a free world society. He was a tower of strength in the battle to enact the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and he has gone around the country with missionary zeal preaching to American businessmen the need to get into the mainstream of international trade. And in these years of developing world markets our shipments of American goods abroad have soared by more than \$5 billion or 27 percent to a record last year of \$25 billion.

He has also traveled tirelessly to every continent promoting the sale of U.S. goods and extending a personal invitation to businessmen and tourists alike to come to the United States, to make this great country the No. 1 travel destination of the world. In these and other efforts, he has made the Commerce Department a major force in our increasingly successful effort to alleviate the persistent deficit in our international balance of payments.

Secretary Hodges has brought science and technology into focus as a vital economic determinant, affecting our ability to compete abroad and to maintain a rapidly rising American standard of living in an atmosphere of price stability. He has promoted the modernization of our industrial plant, the development of techniques for making existing technology more readily available to the production line and the small business firm. He has helped to bring new prosperity to the great textile industry, and has shown great courage in spotlighting the problems of our national transportation system.

Throughout the Department he has made its activities more responsive to the needs of American business and the American economy. Never before have businessmen had such a broad range of services, and never before has there been a greater effort to bring these coordinated services to the attention of those who need them, when they need them, and where they need them—from New England to Hawaii, from Alaska to Puerto Rico.

Luther Hodges has had a leading part in the growing involvement of businessmen in the civic and social goals of our country.

We bid farewell tomorrow to a great Secretary of Commerce. Our country and our future is the richer because of his labors. His efforts will live in the industrial spirit that has made America the envy and the hope of mankind.

We wish for him and his lovely companion, Mrs. Hodges, who has been a tower of strength sustaining him

throughout the years, continued good health, joy, and happiness, and all blessings of life which they so richly deserve.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I am very happy to yield to our majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is to be commended for taking this time to pay this tribute which is so well deserved, to a great American as he leaves this area of high public service in the Nation's Capital.

Governor Hodges has had a long and distinguished career of public service as Governor of his State, as a Cabinet officer, and in many other positions of importance and public trust. He is a big man. He is a kind man. He is a wise man. He carries those attributes of greatness in a frame and habit that becomes the greatest of men.

It has been a great pleasure and privilege to have known him and his good wife for a number of years. Secretary Hodges is certainly one of the great men of this generation and I join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who in his committee work has worked so closely with Secretary Hodges during the past 4 years, in wishing them all the richest blessings of life as they leave us.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his most appropriate comments.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

[Mr. COOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

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

Mr. HARRIS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee who has observed the work of Secretary Hodges throughout the last 4 years as I have been privileged to do.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in these remarks in expressing our best wishes to Secretary Hodges as he retires from his Government service.

As the chairman has said, it has been my honor to observe his work, being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce myself. I think the great confidence that Luther Hodges brought to Government and the people who came in contact with him was one of his greatest contributions. I think the business community certainly had their confidence reestablished in the way he ran the Department of Commerce. It certainly was a great privilege to work with him as a member of this committee and my chairman working with him, to see the success and the progress of the programs that he initiated.

So I too, Mr. Speaker, would like to join with my chairman and colleagues in wishing for Secretary Hodges and

Mrs. Hodges Godspeed in their voyage through life in the days ahead.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS ON MONDAY, JANUARY 18, AT 10 A.M.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of informing colleagues on this side of the aisle that there will be a caucus of Democratic Members of the House here in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 18, at 10 a.m., for the purpose of agreeing to recommendations of the Democratic committee on committees in designating Democratic members of the several committees and their assignment thereon.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 114, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 114

Resolved, That during the Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of thirty-four members.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Oklahoma indicate the distribution of the three additional members?

Mr. ALBERT. This is an addition of three memberships to the Committee on Government Operations, two of which will be assigned to the majority and one of which will be assigned to the minority.

This is a matter which has been worked out, as a few other matters have been, between the leadership on both sides for the convenience of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader, if he can give us a schedule for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Next week there will be one or more messages received. I know the Defense Department message is coming up. We expect to receive that on Monday.

There will be considered a resolution designating Members on this side of the aisle to serve on committees; and I assume that a similar resolution will be offered for the Republican side of the aisle.

The District of Columbia budget is expected to come up next week.

Except for resolutions and procedural matters, I know of no legislative business for next week. There will be, of course, the inaugural procedures next week. We hope to be able to expedite matters and to meet at appropriate times for the House to participate in those ceremonies.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the House go over until Monday when it adjourns today?

Mr. ALBERT. It will be my purpose, since we do not have any business which requires a meeting of the House tomorrow, to make such a request. If the gentleman will yield for that purpose, I will make the request now.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 53)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:
To the Congress of the United States:

We live in a turbulent world. But amid the conflict and confusion, the United States holds firm to its primary goal—a world of stability, freedom and peace where independent nations can enjoy the benefits of modern knowledge. Here is our difference with the Communists—and our strength. They would use their skills to forge new chains of tyranny. We would use ours to free men from the bonds of the past.

The Communists are hard at work to dominate the less-developed nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their allies are the ancient enemies of mankind: Tyranny, poverty, ignorance, and disease. If freedom is to prevail, we must do more than meet the immediate threat to free world security, whether in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We must look beyond—to the long-range needs of the developing nations.

Foreign assistance programs reach beyond today's crises, to offer:

Strength to those who would be free;
Hope for those who would otherwise despair;

Progress for those who would help themselves.

Through these programs we help build stable nations in a stable world.

II

Acting on the experience of the past 4 years, I am presenting a program which—

Is selective and concentrated;
Emphasizes self-help and the fastest possible termination of dependence on aid;

Provides an increasing role for private enterprise;

Improves multilateral coordination of development aid;

Reflects continuing improvement in management.

Specifically, for fiscal year 1966 I recommend—

No additional authorizations for development lending or the Alliance for Progress; existing authorizations for those purposes are adequate;

Authorizations of \$1,170 million for military assistance;

Three hundred and sixty-nine million dollars for supporting assistance;

Two hundred and ten million dollars for technical cooperation;

One hundred and fifty-five million dollars for contributions to international organizations;

Fifty million dollars for the President's contingency fund; and

Sixty-two million dollars for administrative and miscellaneous expenses.

I am also requesting a special standby authorization for use if necessary in Vietnam only.

My appropriation request for fiscal year 1966 under these authorizations is for \$3,380 million—\$1,170 million will be used for military assistance; \$2,210 million is for the other categories of aid.

This is a minimum request, the smallest in the history of the foreign aid program. It is \$136 million less than requested last year, and will impose the smallest assistance burden on the American people since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

This minimum request reflects my determination to present to the Congress the lowest aid budget consistent with the national interest. It takes full account of the increasing efficiency of the assistance program, and the increasing availability of assistance funds from international agencies in which the costs are shared among a number of countries.

I believe that in carrying out this program the American people will get full value for their money. Indeed, we cannot afford to do less. Russia and Red China have tripled their promises of aid in the past year. They are doing more than they have ever done before; the competition between them has led to increased efforts by each to influence the course of events in the developing nations.

If, during the year, situations should arise which require additional amounts of U.S. assistance to advance vital U.S. interests, I shall not hesitate to inform

the Congress and request additional funds.

III

I am requesting \$1,170 million for the military assistance program. This is an increase of \$115 million over the total appropriation for military assistance for the current fiscal year. In order to meet urgent requirements in southeast Asia during fiscal year 1965, we cut back programs in other countries which are under pressure. Some of the fiscal year 1966 appropriation will be needed to make up what we have left undone.

Still, the program is highly concentrated. Nearly three-quarters of the money will go to 11 countries around the great arc from Greece to Korea. Vietnam alone will absorb an important share.

Military assistance makes it possible for nations to survive. It provides a shield behind which economic and social development can take place. It is vital to our own security as well. It helps to maintain more than 3½ million men under arms as a deterrent to aggression in countries bordering on the Sino-Soviet world. Without them, more American men would have to be stationed overseas, and we would have to spend far more for defense than we now do.

IV

As a supplement to military assistance, I am requesting \$369 million for supporting assistance—economic aid which is directly related to the maintenance of stability and security. Eighty-eight percent of the money will be used in Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Jordan.

V

The world's trouble spots—the Vietnams and the Congos dominate the headlines. This is no wonder, for they represent serious problems. Over \$500 million of the current request for military and supporting assistance will be deployed to meet the frontal attack in Vietnam and Laos.

Indeed, \$500 million may not be enough. I am therefore requesting for fiscal year 1966 an additional standby authorization for military or supporting assistance which would be used only in Vietnam and only in case we should need more funds to protect our interests there. Any program which would make use of this additional authorization will be presented to the authorizing committees of the Congress concurrently with the appropriation request.

Our past investment in the defense of the free world through the military assistance and supporting assistance programs has paid great dividends. Not only has it foiled aggression, but it has brought stability to a number of countries. Since the beginning of this decade, the funds used each year for military aid and supporting assistance have been sharply reduced. Today, we are spending \$1 billion less on these accounts than we did in 1960 and 1961.

VI

Military security in the developing world will not be sufficient to our purposes unless the ordinary people begin to feel some improvement in their lives and see ahead to a time when their

children can live in decency. It follows that economic growth in these regions means as much to our security as their military strength. That is an important reason why the United States has taken the lead during the past few years in organizing, on an international basis, a program of development assistance.

Of course, such assistance is and must be concentrated where it will contribute to lasting progress. Experience has demonstrated that certain requirements need to be met by the developing countries if such progress is to occur.

They need to undertake sound measures of self-help—to mobilize their own resources, eliminate waste, and do what they can to meet their own needs. And they need to avoid spending their resources on unnecessary armaments and foreign adventures. Our aid can contribute to their economic and social progress only if it can be provided within a framework of constructive and sensible policies and programs.

Fortunately, most of the developing countries recognize the relationship between the wise use of their own resources and the effectiveness and availability of external aid.

It is a cardinal principle of U.S. policy that development assistance will go to countries which have undertaken effective programs of self-help and are, therefore, able to make good use of aid. During fiscal year 1964, for example, 64 percent of our development assistance went to seven such countries: India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey, Brazil, and Chile. In other countries as well, including a number of smaller countries, sound self-help efforts are making it possible for us to provide effective development aid.

With development assistance we seek to help countries reach, as rapidly as possible, the point at which further progress is possible without external aid.

A striking example of how, through self-help, a developing country can reach the point where it can carry on without concessional aid is the Republic of China. Little more than 10 years ago, free China faced enormous security and development problems. The prospects for economic growth looked dim. But in only 10 years, as a result of determined self-help supplemented by effective U.S. aid:

Per capita gross national product has risen 45 percent;

Saving accounts for one-fifth of the national income;

Exports have tripled;

Industrial output has tripled;

The private share of output has doubled, and now accounts for two-thirds of all industrial production;

Agricultural production has increased by 50 percent.

Free China has also joined other nations as a good cash customer for U.S. exports, particularly agricultural commodities.

This remarkable cooperative effort has brought the Republic of China to the point where it no longer needs AID assistance. Fiscal year 1965 marks the end of this successful program.

I am requesting \$580 million as our fiscal year 1966 aid commitment to the