

and force as to eliminate a large portion of the enemy's force before launch.

The concepts I have been describing are not science fiction pipedreams. They are the sound concepts and designs of many of the Nation's best scientists and engineers. They are based on a conservative estimate of scientific progress in the immediate future.

Of one thing we may be certain. The Soviets are alert to every one of these potentialities. They have a demonstrated capability in the field. We are years behind them, but not yet so far that we cannot catch up. Our beginnings are on a broad front, our resources and our capability are extensive.

It has been insisted that our space program is principally a civilian and scientific program, with only minor military implications. Our policy has been to deny that we are in a race with the Russians in this field.

The whole world knows that there is such a race, that we're in it, that we're behind. The fact is that we're plodding along slowly several laps behind the Russians, and we are losing more ground with every day that passes.

The fact is that we have urgent need of a military space program. We cannot afford to ignore, or even soft-pedal, the military significance of satellites.

And the fact is that we only impede ourselves by insisting on an arbitrary, artificial distinction between a military and civilian space program.

Every space vehicle has four major problems: First, propulsion (how to get it up there). Second, guidance (how to get it to where you want it to go). Third, reentry (how to get it back down without burning it up). Fourth, payload (what it carries).

On three of the four—propulsion, guidance, and reentry—the problems of military and scientific space vehicles are identical. Only the payload differs.

What I maintain now should be done—as I have been maintaining for more than a year—is to establish a Military Applications Division within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This would operate in similar fashion to the Military Applications Division within the Atomic Energy Commission. It would centralize our space activities in a single civilian-headed agency, but would encourage the closest cooperation between the various parts of the Government concerned with the space program.

Now, why do we need a military program so urgently?

Military satellites are the next weapons generation. Whichever side achieves them first will possess an enormous advantage over the other. Those advantages are very great indeed for a nation committed to deterrence rather than aggression. General Schriever testified that he would give our military efforts in space a priority equal to the development of our intercontinental ballistic missiles.

In summary, these are the answers to some of the questions in defense being currently debated in Congress.

We are committed to a policy of deterrence, not aggression. That means that we have to be able to sustain the first attack and have enough left to strike back. We have no present warning system that will alert us to such an attack for as much as even 15 minutes. We have no defense whatsoever against the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile. We cannot now prevent the complete destruction of our missiles on the launching pads. For the next several years we will be wholly dependent, as we are now, upon our Strategic Air Command bombers as a retaliatory strike force. In order to be sure that the SAC retaliatory strike force is not completely destroyed on the ground, we must, when the Russians have sufficient missiles

to wipe us out in the next year or two, be prepared to put substantial numbers of the Strategic Air Command bombers in the air on an airborne alert. We must provide the necessary money for training and equipment now to make an airborne alert possible within the next 2 years. In order to assure our bomber strike capability we must proceed to develop the B-70 not only as a backup for our missile strength, but for necessary reconnaissance and the fighting of limited wars.

In order to close the intelligence gap, to get us the longest possible warning of attack, and to apprise us of Soviet military preparations, we must move as rapidly as possible into the field of space satellites. The technology for the development of these satellites is already at hand. All we need are the resources to do it—and the green light to go ahead. Our decision this year will determine how safe we are 2, 3, or 4 years from now.

I predict that Congress will want to make available the money for the airborne alert when it is necessary. I believe that Congress will support placing the B-70 as a weapons system in our operational air force. And I am sure that Congress will urge the most rapid possible development of our military activities in space. These are costly programs, but they are the price we have to pay for national security—and I am convinced that the American people are willing to pay the price.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Register & Defense Times, Feb. 6, 1960]

THE REGISTER INTERVIEWS SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE—KEY LAWMAKER PROPOSES DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

Is reorganization of the Department of Defense in the "making"?

Merger, or revampment, of the defense structure looms as a big topic in this session of Congress. Retired Army Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor proposes a single Chief of Staff and the abolishment of the JCS. Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, warns of schemes to deprive the JCS of their responsibilities as heads of the services. He is satisfied with the present setup as is Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates.

On the Hill there is talk of the need to reorganize now. The new budget has been submitted on a functional rather than service breakdown. Is this a forerunner of things to come? Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, (Democrat, Connecticut), a retired Army colonel, proposes one overall commander, with all in one uniform. Another congressional proposal would have a commanding general for all of the services rather than a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

To sound out congressional thinking on this highly controversial subject, the Register's Steve Tillman, interviewed Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"Question. Do you believe the Department of Defense is really in need of further reorganization?"

"Answer. I definitely do. I believe that we should completely reorganize the defense structure along functional lines rather than the out-moded Army, Navy, and Air Force organizational setup that we now have. Furthermore, I believe that our supremacy in space science is threatened not by lack of talent, but rather by lack of purpose, direction, and organization for the best use of our scientific manpower. This we need more than we need more money for research—and we do need more money.

"Question. What is necessary as a prelude to reorganization?"

"Answer. I do not believe we can expect to reorganize in terms of functional forces until we simplify the present defense structure. Then organizational reform along functional lines should eliminate unnecessary du-

plication and the present struggle for control of important weapon systems.

"Question. Can you give an example of what you mean?"

"Answer. Yes. The continental defense force would take over the air defense of the United States, and the question of whether the Army or the Air Force should man the Nikes, Bomars, and the Zeus antimissile missile would disappear. The new command would operate all weapons.

"Question. What would be the first step to be taken looking toward unification?"

"Answer. The first step should be the preparation of a complete, time-phased plan which would set forth each step to be taken and the relation between one step and another. Then, too, I should think that the establishment of a single Chief of Staff at an early date would help. This could easily be done within the framework of the present JCS setup, but it would require legislation.

"Question. Please give an example of 'simplification.'

"Answer. Let's take procurement. A large percentage of supplies and material used are common to two or more of the services. While some progress has been made under the present single-manager system of procurement of common-user items—like food, fuel, and clothing—a lot more could be accomplished in this direction.

"Question. Why can't the Secretary of Defense reorganize without additional law?"

"Answer. While some do hold the view that there is plenty of authority to reorganize under the 1958 Defense Act, it is perfectly obvious to me that further unification is not going to be started from inside the Pentagon. The action must come from outside the Defense Department.

"This is not said as a reflection upon the Secretary of Defense and his people at all, but is simply a statement of the facts of human nature. As long as you have human beings and human institutions, you are going to have rivalry. If in uniform, then you will have service rivalry, and the more the number of services, the more fertile the field for service rivalry. I believe that rivalry is healthy as long as it does not degenerate into selfish moves which have as a primary purpose the glorification of one service at the expense of another.

"I would be the first to acknowledge that 'pride in uniform' and in 'the outfit' does make for combat effectiveness, but I do not feel that this would be lost by merging into one service.

"There is no solution, as I see it, to our present military problems within the framework of our present organization, because the problem facing us is not that of preparing for another World War II. Yet, our military organization is still geared to that kind of conflict. What is needed is a new type organization, one which will permit groupings based upon the capabilities of modern weapon systems; this can only be established by changing the present law.

"Question. Would research and development be merged?"

"Answer. The direction would be merged. Actually, research and development is carried on by a large number of agencies both within and outside the Government. I would expect that there would be a more economical use of these agencies, not only as to funds but as to better use of scientific manpower.

"With a reorganization of the Armed Forces on a functional basis, there would be less duplication of weapon systems, hence less overlap in the R. & D. field. Dr. Herbert York is supposed to be doing this now, but I am sure he is handicapped because he cannot look behind the present law which prescribes roles and missions.

"Question. Would unification reduce the budget?"

"Answer. Some budgetary savings would be made. Even more important, we would

get a much more effective defense for the money we spend. I believe that both Congress and the Department of Defense have an obligation to, first of all, see that our defense is adequate. And, second, that we get the maximum return for the taxpayer's dollar.

"I think it is significant that in the fiscal year 1960 budget, appropriations were requested first as to functions and then by service breakdown within these functions. This is a long step in the right direction. Now, I am for removing the service breakdowns within functions.

"Question. How long would it take to put this simplification plan into action?

"Answer. About 5 years, if supported wholeheartedly by all concerned. I have already emphasized the need of a comprehensive time-phased plan for accomplishing the turnover. In such a vast enterprise, the greatest care must be taken to avoid capsizing our present system during the turnover.

"We must always keep in mind that during the process we might have to stop and fight. If this should happen, we would not want to be handicapped by being caught in the midst of our reorganization. Therefore, we must always be prepared to live with what we have until the emergency passes and we can finish the job.

"Question. Is it true that much of the overlapping and costly duplication is due to the rivalry of industry for contracts? How would you bring improvement in this portion of your proposal?

"Answer. The trouble at the present time is that each of the services is bidding against the other in industry. Very often one company finds itself pulled and hauled between two of the services. Moreover, at the present time a producer of an item develops a vested interest in the continuation of the production of that item with the support of the particular service, because that branch of the service wants to keep in that field of weapon development or procurement.

"If we had the services reorganized on the basis of function, there would usually be only one service bidding for a particular type of weapons systems. There would, of course, continue to be competition between companies, which is not only necessary but good.

"Question. If a unified defense means all contracts would be handled in one office, what impact would this have on local communities?

"Answer. I certainly don't anticipate that all contracts would be handled through one office. The project is too vast and such a practice would not make sense. What I would expect to see would be one central policy direction here in Washington with actual contracts being let on a decentralized basis. However, I would expect to find one area office in a city in place of three, and no more uncoordinated bidding by the services against each other for materials and services.

"Question. You referred to wholehearted support. Do you anticipate opposition?

"Answer. I am sure that any effort looking to unification of the Armed Forces is going to meet with opposition—and it will be sincere opposition—from both within and outside of the armed services. Nevertheless, we must do something. The work involved in planning and executing a merger operation of this magnitude is breathtaking, but the greatly improved efficiency and effectiveness over the years to come should make it a project worth every bit of the effort.

"One idea I have to bring about this wholehearted support is to begin very early to persuade the personnel of the three services toward the advantages of the merger. I would put the major emphasis on the career enlisted men and the junior, that is, company grade career officers. Most of the diehards will be found in the senior grades, and

these will normally be retired within the next 5 or 10 years.

"The success of unification under merged services will depend upon the attitude of the younger men, those with many years of service ahead of them."

J.S.W.

### POLICYMAKING FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COM- MITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Government Operations Committee yesterday completed the first phase of its initial hearings. This subcommittee, under the able direction of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, is inquiring into the adequacy of our governmental policymaking machinery in the field of national security matters and how we might best organize to meet the challenges of the cold war.

Mr. President, I have been extremely pleased by the enthusiastic and dedicated manner in which Senator JACKSON and the staff have approached this difficult undertaking. The scholarly, non-partisan efforts of this subcommittee have won a great many plaudits in our daily press. One such article, entitled "Inquiry at Its Best," a fine example of press reaction, appeared in today's New York Times under the byline of the distinguished reporter, Mr. James Reston. I request that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INQUIRY AT ITS BEST—JACKSON'S STUDY OF  
POLICYMAKING IS A SCHOLARLY AND OBJECTIVE ONE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—Washington is getting at least one sample these days of legislative investigation at its very best. This is the inquiry being conducted by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, into the operations of the policymaking machinery of the Government. It is 13 years since the last major revision of the national security policymaking machinery in the National Security Act of 1947. Since then, as the Jackson committee's interim report notes, the traditional distinction between peace and war has been obliterated, and our top officials have gone on dealing with the cunning new techniques of the cold war through the old procedures of the war and prewar eras.

What Senator JACKSON is doing, with the help of a competent staff, is to conduct a scholarly, objective and nonpartisan study of this whole problem so that when the new President of the United States stumbles exhausted out of the election campaign in November, he will have a careful analysis of this problem of modernizing the policymaking process.

The present situation in Washington illustrates the problem. The President is away in Brazil. The Secretary of State is with him. There is a new Secretary of Defense—the sixth in 13 years—assisted by a comparatively new Under Secretary of Defense—the eighth in 13 years—and by a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who is in the hospital for the second time within a few months.

Meanwhile, there is a crisis in Cuba, without a U.S. Ambassador on the job, and a series of separate negotiations in process on nuclear testing, disarmament, German policy,

and summit policy—not to mention all the domestic problems including the presidential election, and a national debate on the adequacy of our whole national defense.

NO ROOM AT THE TOP

The truth is that there is a traffic jam at the top of the Government, with everybody complaining that he has too much to do in too little time. In dealing with Moscow's propaganda diplomacy, the late Secretary of State Dulles was his own policymaker and negotiator, and in the process downgraded the Ambassadors.

Now the heads of Government, including President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, have taken over the policymaking and propaganda jobs themselves, thereby downgrading the Foreign Secretaries to the point where most people cannot remember their names.

Fortunately, Senator JACKSON has avoided the temptation to turn his inquiry into an attack on the specific personalities and policies of this administration in his investigation.

Senator JACKSON is aware that the problem of security demands analysis not only of Government machinery but also of Government personnel, and that the cold war has created as many demands on the intellectual resources of the Nation as upon its material wealth.

This has led the investigating committee into a number of perplexing but important questions, including the following:

How can modern diplomacy continue to operate in accordance with diplomatic rules established at the Congress of Vienna at the beginning of the 19th century?

How can the President meet his present executive duties and still spend a good deal of his time traveling about the world and meeting social obligations that are more wearing than in the quieter days 100 years ago?

What is to be done about the maze of interdepartmental committees—now running into hundreds—that slow down the policymaking procedure and tend to produce merely compromise recommendations on which everybody can agree?

How can a government so large and complex come up with a unifying national purpose and a plan of action to meet the direct-action methods of the Communists?

What is to be done about the outmoded salary levels and conflict of interest regulations that impair the Government's ability to attract and keep brilliant men?

A LONGER CATALOG

These are merely illustrative of a much longer catalog of inquiries, and the Jackson committee is seeking the views of the most experienced men in and out of the Government in searching for the answers.

Because Senator JACKSON and his Republican colleagues are approaching their job in an objective way—and looking at the weaknesses of congressional machinery at the same time—they are getting the honest testimony of leaders of both parties.

Former Secretary of Defense and Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett was here this week. He placed before the committee an analysis of the problem that is better than anything heard in the capital in many months.

In short, some good solid critical work is afoot here and at the right time. The administration is coming into its final months. There is scarcely a major question of international policy now in negotiation that will not require the confirmation of the Senate. The chances of negotiating agreements on disarmament or nuclear testing or the security of Germany before the Congress goes home early in July are almost nil.

As a result, reflective men are putting their minds to the problems that will be

1960

facing the next administration. They are interested in the worldwide trips of the President, but not much. For they know that these trips, while useful, are largely ceremonial, and that the problems that existed when the trips started will still be there when they are over.

#### EIGHTH ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Mr. CARLSON, Mr. President, on Thursday morning, February 18, 1,000 persons, including the President of the United States, members of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, delegates to the conference and representatives of the Council of Christian Leadership groups attended the Presidential prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C.

In my opinion this prayer breakfast and program added much to the religious life of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of these remarks—a copy of the program and transcript of the proceedings of this service.

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

#### PROGRAM FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST, FEBRUARY 18, 1960, MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Presiding: Senator FRANK CARLSON.  
Invocation: Dr. Harold Ockenga, Park Street Church, Boston.

Message of welcome: Senator CARLSON.  
Solo: Jerome Hines, Metropolitan Opera, New York.

Introduction of host, William Jones.  
Old Testament Scripture, Psalm 1: Justice Charles Evans Whittaker.

New Testament Scripture, 1st John, second chapter: Hon. Fred Seaton.

Greetings from House of Representatives breakfast group: Hon. PAUL JONES.

Greetings from Senate breakfast group: Senator JOHN STENNIS.

Message from British Parliament: Hon. John H. Cordle, Member of Parliament.

Prayer: Judge Boyd Leedom.  
"America" in unison.

Benediction: Dr. Abraham Vereide.

#### PROCEEDINGS

Senator CARLSON. This morning we will have the invocation by Dr. Harold Ockenga of the Park Street Church, Boston, Mass. Dr. Ockenga.

#### Invocation

Dr. OCKENGA. Our Heavenly Father, Thou has assured us access into Thy presence through the Lord Jesus Christ, having shown contrition over our sins and having turned from them. In Thy love and wisdom and righteousness through Calvary, Thou hast procured salvation for Thy people.

Let us in a saving faith enter into Thy presence and there represent ourselves, our families, our religious groups, and our Nation.

We thank Thee that under the aegis of the International Christian Leadership, we may gather here this day. With the great principles of this movement such as the faith and the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ and the authority of the Bible and in righteousness as a way of life may it be the banner over us.

Grant now that the Christian testimony which has been so effective in building the bulwarks of righteousness in this Nation, as exemplified in the life of our President, may be spread through this movement unto the grassroots of the Nation.

We thank Thee for our heritage of freedom to express our convictions and our thoughts, and we ask that Thou will lead us in the way of righteousness.

And now, our Father, in the day when the world is divided between atheism and theism, between materialism and Christian faith, we would confess our sins, great and many as they are, and ask that Thou wouldst purify us by the indwelling holy spirit and by the work of Calvary.

Give wisdom unto our executives and our legislators and our justices, and may they lead us not only in prosperity but in peace and in freedom. Now protect our President in his travels. Give unto him wisdom and guidance as he directs this Nation and grant unto him grace in his Christian testimony.

As we gather here, may it be with thanksgiving for this food, which symbolizes all the material blessings we enjoy. May we remember those who are less fortunate and who need our prayers and our humanitarian interest. This we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord who is the nourishment of our soul. Amen.

#### Message of welcome

Senator CARLSON. It is with some hesitation that I break into your very fine breakfast this morning, but time is a matter of essence here. I have been reminded that there are many of we folks who are working for the Government and we are supposed to get back to our details and our duties, so I want to assure these visitors of ours from out of the Nation and over the Nation that we do not mean to be discourteous, but we would like very much to get this program underway.

We are delighted that there are so many here this morning at this eighth annual prayer breakfast. We are greatly honored by the presence of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I regret I do not have time to introduce the many members of the executive branch, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch of the Government who are here with us at this breakfast.

This annual breakfast is in commemoration of the organization of the breakfast prayer group of over 25 years ago, which was organized in Seattle, Wash. Now these groups have been organized in every section of the Nation and many of them in foreign countries.

This is truly a dedicated group, with a spiritual consideration of the practical problems which we believe can be solved by groups such as this. We believe that the cornerstone of American life rests on a strong prayer foundation. We firmly believe that the greatness of America comes from the loyalty of the patriotism and the righteousness of our people. We believe it is imperative—in order to preserve and save our sacred freedom—that we have a strong and courageous God-fearing people and a total mobilization of all the spiritual forces of this Nation, and we welcome you here this morning.

We are fortunate to have a member of the Metropolitan Opera, who is going to sing a solo at this time, Mr. Jerome Hines.

Mr. HINES. Mr. President, honored guests, friends, I am not supposed to say anything, but I never sing in church that they won't allow me to give my testimony and I just want to say I am here by the grace of God. I am a born-again Christian. Christ is the greatest thing in my life.

I am going to sing for you "How Great Thou Art."

(Solo by Jerome Hines.)

Senator CARLSON. This year—as last year—we are the guests of one of our Nation's outstanding businessmen, a publisher and businessman from California. He is a member of the personal board of directors of Billy Graham's staff and organization. He has picked up the tab, if I may use that expression, for 160 similar breakfasts over this Nation during the past 3 years, paid 7 visits to Russia, 7 visits to Japan, and preparations are now underway for a breakfast,

lunch, or dinner in Russia. I am glad to present Mr. William Jones, of California.

Mr. JONES. The only contribution that I can make to this is to tell you what happened to me and my own life when Jesus Christ changed it.

I was brought up in this country and received very good schooling, earned money and was determined to own a newspaper. I was successful and by the time I was 19 I owned one newspaper and at the age of 22 I owned five newspapers.

I found, after achieving everything I aimed at, there was a vacuum that was still unfilled. I looked around the city I was in and unfortunately saw people that were drinking and going a little faster than I was, so I joined them and by the time I was 23 I had come to the inevitable conclusion. I had gambled away my business, drank away my friends and the kindest thing you could say was I was a hopeless drunk.

In 1941 I started again in the business we are in and this time I tried to buy this peace of mind, this something I knew existed somewhere, and so I started giving money to the church. I started at \$25 a week, then went up to \$50, then \$100 and by the time 1950 had come around it was \$800 a week and I was still just as far away from finding this reality in my life. \* \* \*

At business I used to think I had to drink at lunchtime to keep my customers and when I stopped drinking, I found that 90 percent were happy because then they didn't have to drink any more.

No more lying. What a thrill it is to conduct business and not work behind the scenes. We have a new conscientiousness of business commitments. When our company gives its word it keeps it and last year we spent over \$100,000 just keeping our word. We will not permit our company to take a job it cannot deliver on the date we said we would deliver it. So what has happened in the last 6 years is that our business has increased over 600 percent and with this increase has come a wealth such as I have never known.

With this wealth has come a responsibility and to me the only significance of wealth is its responsibility and I, as a Christian, am responsible to God as to what is done with this wealth, so we have learned to live on around 6 percent of our income. We have the pleasure of putting the rest of it where it belongs and that is that other people, no matter where they are, might find, and at least come into contact with the reality that Jesus Christ is the answer to life, and Mr. President, even more than anything, this personal relationship for Jesus Christ permits me and my family to pray in the absolute assurance that God hears our prayers, and we can pray for you and have this wonderful assurance that you are in our prayers. We just hope that God will sustain you in everything you do. I sure thank you, so much.

Senator CARLSON. This morning we are going to have a Scripture read from the Old Testament by one of the Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Charles Evans Whittaker, and following that a Scripture from the New Testament will be read by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred Seaton. Justice Whittaker.

(Old Testament Scripture: Psalm I, read by Justice Charles Evans Whittaker.)

(New Testament Scripture: I John, second chapter, read by the Honorable Fred Seaton.)

Senator CARLSON. We will now have a message from the president of the House prayer breakfast group, Congressman PAUL JONES, and following that we will have a message from Senator JOHN STENNIS for the Senate prayer breakfast group.

Greetings from the House of Representatives breakfast group, Hon. Paul Jones

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, fellow Christians, while I appreciate the great privilege of representing our House prayer

group here this morning, it is in the spirit of humility and a feeling of inadequacy that I meet with you.

I know that most of you have been here on similar occasions and are familiar with our organization and I might say the group that meets in the House of Representatives each Thursday morning.

To me it is a rather unusual group and over the possible 10 years that I have been attending this, I have found it is a group without any published rules, bylaws, or constitution—existing, operating, growing, and being perpetuated on the basis of Christian understanding, mutual respect, and spiritual inspiration.

Not only are there no initiation fees or dues, but membership is open to every Member of the House of Representatives, who is reminded at the opening of each session and again prior to this annual breakfast that all who enjoy Christian fellowship, or who feel the need for spiritual stimulation are welcome to come and join with us at that time each week.

Ours is not a large group, although it does not remain small because of any desire to limit the membership. I think that all of us feel that it is not ours to judge whether or not any of our colleagues need or would enjoy the spiritual food of which we partake each week.

Certainly ours is not a denominational group, but many congregations are represented as we gather around the table each Thursday morning.

If at no other time during our service here in Washington, politics, partisan politics, is forgotten for at least an hour during the week as we strive to measure to our greater responsibility of serving the Kingdom of God.

I ran across a little story in the Reader's Digest this week which to me characterizes many of our group. I know that it impressed me and put into words the feeling that I have had since being privileged to meet with the ICL group there in the House. These words were attributed to a woman who was testifying at a prayer meeting, as some of you probably read, when she said eloquently, if ungrammatically, "Lord, I ain't what I oughta be, I ain't what I'm gonna be, but anyway, I ain't what I was."

Among the greatest inspirations that I have had have been on occasions when our House group, in conducting programs at our intimate meetings, have related personal experiences in driving home some great truth.

Some may think that we are selfish individuals, in that we do have an unwritten rule or custom which restricts attendance at our meetings to Members of the House of Representatives. There are only two exceptions, one being a charter member who has been regular and consistent in his attendance since the group was initiated some 14 years ago by our good friend and Christian brother, Abraham Verelde, who also meets with us when his busy schedule permits. It is not that outsiders wouldn't be welcome, or that we feel the abundance of talent within our ranks precludes the necessity of drawing on speakers outside of our group to bring the message of the day, it is just that we have learned that within the intimacy of the close association which has developed through the years, there is an indefinable something that encourages and enables one to open his heart and permit others to share and enjoy the experiences that come to all who seek earnestly and sincerely to dedicate their lives to insuring the preservation and security of this Republic—one Nation under God, with liberty and justice to all.

While dedicated to the principle that it is imperative that we preserve the separation of church and state, it is just as important that we never lose sight of the fact that the foundation of this Nation rests on the belief

in God, who through His divine guidance has directed the destiny of this Nation.

May we never be confused in distinguishing the difference between religion and government and the separation of church and state and may we as Representatives never experience the temptation of subordinating our obligations to the Deity in carrying out our obligations to our constituents and to our Nation.

Through the spiritual power that we receive at these breakfasts, I feel that we gain confidence and courage to act as Christian soldiers as we march on to greater victories for God and Nation.

May God's richest blessing be on you all as you meet here in the Nation's Capitol in the advancement of the work of His kingdom and may you gain inspiration from this meeting which will guide you in your service throughout the year. Thank you.

*Greetings from Senate breakfast group by Senator John Stennis*

Senator STENNIS. Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, and other friends. In bringing you special greetings from the Senate breakfast group, which in a large measure is a duplication of the group in the House, I will merely quote what several Members have said, that to meet around that table, as is our privilege, without any publicity and no pictures, without any outside speakers, without any dividing line, westerners, easterners, northerners, southerners, Republicans, Democrats, Protestants, Catholics, and exchange spiritual views, thoughts, and encouraging words, is not only the high point of being in the Senate, but is a most helpful experience, as the problems and the years come and go.

And in these few minutes, I shall attempt to illustrate to those of you who are visitors here in this land and this city a contrast of experience of mine.

Since January 6, my friends, I have attended closed door briefings by the Secretary of Defense, by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the Chiefs of Staff of our military services, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Director of Space, and many other scientific and governmental leaders—coming away from those meetings greatly depressed and in a condition of gloom, walking down the corridors of the Senate Chamber asking myself over and over the question, "Is this challenge really in the field of material things, or is it, after all, in the field of the spirit?"

I walked home several miles one evening and during that time there came to me, I recall, an experience when I flew across the Atlantic on one of those giant constellations, and in the wee hours of the morning went up front with the chief pilot. There he sat before that great instrument panel—this giant of the skies sailing through the clouds. I couldn't understand how he kept his bearings, how he kept his course, and how he was going to reach his final destination. I didn't know anything about navigation. I could see lights below and I asked him, "Do you get signals from those ships at sea?" He looked at me in amazement and said, "Mr. Senator, I have my own panel board and my own instruments right here before me. I know how they operate, I know how to read them and I know how to follow their course, and furthermore, I have the power in these monstrous engines to always climb above the clouds and take my further bearings from the stars."

I rather meekly crept back to my cabin, realizing that that pilot had given me a great lesson, believing he had given one to my Nation and the free world.

We have our own instruments, my friends, right here on our own panel board. We have economic freedom, we have the natural resources and the ability to wield those resources into great material power. We have

political freedom with a system of government whereby the people, through their representatives and representative government, can preserve that freedom. We have further the priceless heritage of religious freedom and have been trained in our youth to rise above the clouds and take our course from the stars—the higher power.

So let us not be discouraged nor overcome. This challenge is not in the realm of the material—the challenge is in the realm of the spirit. Let's look to our instruments in charting our course and then through God generate the courage to follow their readings.

Other generations have also had their problems. In a dark day of our own history, Benjamin Franklin, at a critical time at the Constitutional Convention, arose and addressed the Chair—George Washington presiding—and said, "Mr. President, I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more certain I am that God does govern in the affairs of man. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his knowledge, is it probable that a nation can rise without his heed?" and with that he moved that they open those sessions with prayer.

They found their instruments—they are our possessions today. Let us look to those instruments—looking ever for that light from on high, determined first and always to do our part and then we will find the light and from that light we can find the way. May God sustain us as we go.

Senator CARLSON. We are honored this morning by the presence of a Member of the British Parliament who has consented to bring us greetings and a short message, the Honorable John H. Cordle, Member of the British Parliament.

*Statement by the Honorable John H. Cordle*

Mr. CORDLE. Senator CARLSON. Mr. President, this is indeed a signal honor for me to be the only alien, as it were, to participate in this great occasion. It is my pleasant duty as a Member of the House of Commons to bring you greetings from my fellow countrymen.

We were thrilled to see you revisiting our country recently, for we have a tremendous admiration for your wartime leadership, as well, sir, as for your many achievements in world relationships and your successful world tour.

You were greeted with warm affection and admiration, as you rightly deserve, and which we rarely show to leaders of other nations. You, sir, are held in great esteem not only by those who served under you when you were Supreme Commander, as I did, but also by many millions of Britains who admire your moral integrity and devotion to duty. And I know that these sentiments are shared by Her Majesty's Government.

You will rejoice to know the happy personal association between you, sir, and our own dedicated Prime Minister. In short, we know we have in you a friend across the sea, and we knew, too, as Britains during the war that we had all Americans as friends across the sea, when we stood together shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy in those dark days of war.

It was my pleasure, on one occasion toward the close of the war, to meet you, sir, at Wiltshire Station in Hampshire in England. Those, indeed, were dark days and you did not fall us. And as we went back again after the war and tried to reestablish ourselves, again you used the Christian principle and came to our aid through Marshall aid, providing us with our material requirements from your own natural resources and surpluses. Not only did you give us material requirements, but you gave us money too, and no Briton is unconscious of what we owe to your country. Indeed, you helped us rehabilitate ourselves. We were able to