

volunteered to take the chair at this time.

(Mr. COOPER assumed the chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Chair is very happy he can preside and listen to the Senator from Oregon.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A SPEECH ON TUESDAY ON PENDING LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Tuesday I intend to make a speech in regard to pending labor legislation and that the speech will deal with three subject matters: One, hot cargo; two, organizational picket lines; and three, the need for making certain that in any labor legislation there is a full application of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I say that tonight, Mr. President, because I am very much concerned—and I speak with no criticism of the House—about the progress or lack of progress which is being made with respect to the enactment of labor legislation in this session of Congress. I think the people of the country are entitled to labor legislation. I think labor legislation should be primarily legislation which protects the public interest from racketeering, corruption, dishonesty, misuse of union funds, and the type of labor abuses which have been disclosed now for some time by the McClellan committee.

What we need to be on guard against is letting labor legislation take a course of action which would destroy fundamental labor rights. I have often said there is no justification for a union practice which results in destruction of perishable goods. For example, we sometimes find union practices which result in the destruction of milk. Sometimes such practices, as we know, have taken the form of violence in regard to farmers' trucks and result in the destruction of perishable foodstuffs. Of course, whenever there is a case of that kind there is a cry for blanket legislation on a wide range of labor's activities.

I want to point out the Rockaway decision of the Supreme Court which makes clear that where there is a contract with an employer, a worker is protected in his refusal to go through a picket line, if the contract specifies that he has a right of refusal. I am very much disturbed by legislative movements in the Congress that would seek to destroy that protection. A hot-cargo amendment which, in my judgment, makes it illegal to sign an agreement which would permit employees to refuse to go through picket lines is vindictive.

I say that as the one who wrote an arbitration decision in the so-called Encinal Terminal case, in which I held that a self-respecting man or woman should not be required to go through a good faith picket line, but it should be understood there is an implied contract in every collective bargaining agreement that a union man or woman will not go through such a picket line.

I am not going to take the time to develop the subject tonight, Mr. Presi-

dent, other than to say a loosely drawn hot-cargo amendment, in my judgment, might be popular at the present time because the average citizen would not understand its legal implications, but in my judgment, it would not be sound.

Likewise, Mr. President, with regard to organizational picket lines, they frequently involve, in my judgment, a fundamental right of employees, even though on occasion it may be abused. Again I think we need to be on guard against a move by the Congress to pass a law which would make illegal many organizational picket lines.

This calls for a rule of reason and common sense, Mr. President, and on Tuesday I intend to discuss the matter at some length. I shall make some specific suggestions as to what I think we ought to be urging by way of legislation on this subject matter, so far as the Senate is concerned.

As I said the other day on the floor of the Senate, I am for the Kennedy-Ervin bill. I voted for the bill, and I would vote for it again. But that does not mean, Mr. President, we should not seek to improve the bill. I hope the House will improve the bill. If the House does not, I hope the conference committee will improve it. If I am a member of that conference committee, I shall do my best to improve the bill with regard to these subjects.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have long awaited an opportunity to speak at length on the subject of the Supreme Court decisions. I welcome this opportunity, since the distinguished occupant of the chair is the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is a fine lawyer and a distinguished former judge, to address the Senate this evening on the subject of the Supreme Court decisions. However, because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that perhaps the Senator from Kentucky, who now graces the chair, would be more interested in the subject at some other hour, I shall delay my remarks on these decisions until a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Chair will say to the distinguished Senator from New York, if the Senator desires to discuss the decisions of the Supreme Court at some length the present occupant of the Chair would be happy to hear him do so.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the Presiding Officer would. The present Presiding Officer is always very gracious to the Senator from New York and to all other Senators. In the light of the commitments which have been made, I think it might be better if I refrained from speaking at this time, and spoke at a later date.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 16, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 602. An act authorizing the Boy Scouts of America to erect a memorial on public

grounds in the District of Columbia to honor the members and leaders of such organization, and for other purposes; and

S. 1120. An act to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central reserve city."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, July 17, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 16, 1959:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

John H. Williams, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961, vice Willard Frank Libby, resigned.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Horace W. Harper, of Texas, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1959. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 16, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jeremiah 17: 7: Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is.

Almighty God, who art the source and inspiration of every noble desire, grant that daily we may seek Thy glory and devote ourselves to the task of bringing blessedness to the life of needy humanity.

Show us how we may combat and conquer all the evils of prejudice and bigotry which impede the progress of those beneficent purposes which Thou hast for the members of the human family.

May we pray fervently and labor earnestly for the coming of that brighter and better day when the hearts of men and nations everywhere shall go out to one another in the spirit of friendship and good will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 269. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain allowances

and benefits to personnel of the Veterans' Administration who are U.S. citizens and are assigned to the Veterans' Administration office in the Republic of the Philippines.

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey;

H.R. 3269. An act to authorize the payment of veterans' benefits to certain veterans who were discharged as aliens;

H.R. 5446. An act to provide for the recovery of costs of building space utilized by the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 5447. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee;

H.R. 6054. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6435. An act to amend section 105 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, with respect to the disposition upon the death of a Member of the House of Representatives of amounts held for him in the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and of other amounts due such Member;

H.R. 7789. An act to amend paragraph (b) of section 401 of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of a publication in connection with the exercises of the joint session of Congress on February 12, 1959; and
H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the Parliament of the Kingdom of Nepal.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6118. An act to amend section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957; and

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 162. An act for the relief of Henri Polak;
S. 484. An act for the relief of Ma Bong Ching;

S. 696. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Voisin Whitley;

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Pak Jae Seun;

S. 1173. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to provide that the existing restrictions on the amount and maturity of real estate loans made by national banks shall not apply to certain loans which are guaranteed or insured by a State or a State authority;

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Mrs. John M. Cica;

S. 1500. An act for the relief of Yee You Gee;

S. 1558. An act for the relief of Theopli Englezos;

S. 1648. An act to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and other purposes;

S. 1669. An act for the relief of Evagelia Ellipoulos;

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Skogen Woods;

S. 1719. An act for the relief of Lushmon S. Grewal, Jeat S. Grewal, Gurmale S. Grewal, and Tahil S. Grewal;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Tse Man Chan;

S. 1773. An act for the relief of Alan Alfred Coleman;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Lilia Alvarez Szabo;

S. 1798. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to eliminate the payment of premiums on deposits of trust funds by fiduciary banks in uninsured banks;

S. 1837. An act for the relief of Marguerite Fueller;

S. 1928. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank;

S. 1946. An act for the relief of Vicente Soliva Empleo;

S. 2013. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day," and

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for the flag of the United States to be flown at half-staff on the occasion of the death of the last surviving veteran of the War Between the States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 602. An act authorizing the Boy Scouts of America to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia to honor the members and leaders of such organization, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1120) entitled "An act to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member bank of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification 'central Reserve city'."

THE 49-STAR FLAG

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to speak here in observance of the new flag.

Today there hangs on the wall behind our great Speaker the 49-star American flag, emblematic not only of the solidarity of our great Union of States, but also a symbol of its growth and continuing vitality.

On July 4 at Auburn, N.Y., ceremonies were held, jointly honoring the new State and the memory of William Henry Seward, former Secretary of State, who effectuated the cession of Alaska from Russia to the United States in 1867. Part of the program consisted of hoisting the new flag which became the official flag of the United States of America on that day. I had the honor of attending these ceremonies at Auburn in company with my distinguished colleagues, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK of Indiana, minority leader, and Congressmen JOHN TABER and LEO O'BRIEN, both of New York. All of us agree that the occasion was well worth celebrating, for without the foresight and driving

energy of Secretary Seward, we would not now have this new flag with its shining 49th star and the security that it represents for our Nation. To highlight the security of which I speak, imagine, if you will, our vast northwestern State, one-fifth the total size of the other 48 States and only 50 miles from Siberia across the Bering Strait, still being in the hands of the Russians during the critical struggle now in progress between the free world and the Communists. In other words, imagine Alaska as being the nearest enemy area in use for sites for jet-propelled missiles pointing in our direction within easy range of all the cities of the United States. The implications are apparent.

I believe, therefore, it can safely be said that all Americans are thankful the 49th star on our proud Star-Spangled Banner represents the extension of the frontiers of our democracy to the very shadow of the Iron Curtain and thankful that Alaska is now populated with loyal, resourceful American citizens, about five-sevenths of whom came from the other 48 great States, and all of whom are constantly ready to work for, and, if need be, fight for our country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to all of you.

FLAG OVER THE SPEAKER'S ROSTRUM

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to direct the attention of the House to the fact that as this session opens today the new 49-star flag of our beloved country is officially displayed over the Speaker's rostrum for the first time.

A flag of the United States was presented to the House of Representatives in 1901 by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution and hung over the Speaker's rostrum, back of the Speaker's chair.

On August 19, 1919, the House was presented with a new flag by this society to replace the flag displayed since 1901, which had become soiled and worn. The new flag was formally accepted by House resolution, September 18, 1919, and hung over the Speaker's rostrum, back of the Speaker's chair. By House resolution of September 18, 1919, the old flag was returned to the society, to be displayed and carefully preserved in the archives of the society.

On December 28, 1950, a new flag was once again presented to the House by this society to replace the flag that had been displayed in the Chamber since 1919, and was hung over the Speaker's rostrum back of the Speaker's chair, on January 3, 1951, the day when the House met for the first time in the remodeled Chamber. The old flag was returned to the society for preservation, December 28, 1950.

In the office of the Speaker this morning, Mrs. Doris White, distinguished

citizen of Maine and president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, presented this beautiful 49-star flag to the House of Representatives.

This continues a project which began in 1901 as a project truly in keeping with the great traditions and high ideals of this distinguished organization of American women.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to a conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, CANNON, FORD, and TABER.

ATOMIC ENERGY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the atomic energy appropriation bill, 1960.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

AMENDING SECTION 4 AND SECTION 6 OF THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 11, 1957

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6118) to amend section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 639), is hereby amended by striking the date 'June 30, 1959,' and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1960.'"

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this call for the spending of any money?

Mr. WALTER. This does not call for the expenditure of any money. The original bill provided for a 2 years' extension of the relief provisions benefiting close relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully residing aliens who are afflicted with tuberculosis.

The Senate has amended H.R. 6118 by adding to the bill one section providing for a 1 year extension of the law enacted

in 1957 under which eligible alien orphans adopted by United States citizens may enter the United States outside the immigration quotas. The Senate report states that this extension of the statute which has expired on June 30, 1959, has been limited to 1 year in order to give the Committees on the Judiciary of both Houses an opportunity to further investigate and study the administration and the broader aspects of the orphans' admission program.

The Committee on the Judiciary has unanimously decided to accept the amendment of the Senate with an amendment designed to give the Attorney General the opportunity to conduct investigations and make findings as to the suitability of the adoptive parents, and of their homes, to bring to this country the alien orphan whom they desire to make a part of their family. The Attorney General will also have the opportunity by regulations, to eliminate some reprehensible practices which, unfortunately, have marred the program.

It has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate yesterday that many instances of abuse under the provisions of the 1957 law have been reported and fairly well documented. More than that, a special committee of the Legislature of the State of New York has confirmed many of the worst suspicions. There are some indictments pending, affecting individuals who have made a lucrative business out of acting as intermediaries between the alien orphans and American couples desiring to adopt them. Irrespective of the legal and moral questions involved, the continuation of those practices may create for the children themselves more hardship in this country than they may possibly endure if they would remain abroad. Remedy must be tried, and we believe that one is readily available.

The Walter-McCarran Act contains in section 205 a very carefully specified petition procedure under which a U.S. citizen desirous to obtain nonquota immigrant status for his own, natural-born alien child, must apply to the Attorney General for a finding of his eligibility. If such petition is approved, the appropriate consular officer is authorized by the Secretary of State to execute his statutory function of determining the eligibility of the beneficiary of the petition. The amendment now before the House proposes that identical procedure be applicable in the cases of alien orphans coming to the United States under the law which is now proposed to be revived for 1 year.

There is only one additional requirement added to the petition procedure now applicable to natural-born children of U.S. citizens, and that is that there be a finding of good moral character made in the case of the adoptive parents. This is, indeed, a minimum requirement if it is borne in mind that the paramount question before us is to ascertain whether the alien orphan child will find in the United States a proper home. The authority vested in the Attorney General is sufficiently broad to permit him to eradicate the malpractices which disturb us all.

In view of the unhappy experiences, the Committee on the Judiciary believes that the alien orphans' immigration law should not be permitted to run even for 1 additional year without the necessary safeguards. Bearing in mind the debate which took place yesterday in the other body, I hope that we may have expeditious concurrence of the Senate in our amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Section 4(a) and (b) of the Act of September 11, 1957, (71 Stat. 639-640) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. (a) On or before June 30, 1960, special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section to eligible orphans as therein defined who are under fourteen years of age at the time the visa is issued. Not more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers or sisters. No natural parent of any such eligible orphan shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

"(b) When used in this section, the term 'eligible orphan' shall mean an alien child who (1) is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment, or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption; (2) (A) has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse, or (B) is coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse; and (3) is ineligible for admission into the United States solely because that portion of the quota to which he would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time his visa application is made.

"Any United States citizen and spouse claiming that any eligible orphan is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under subsection (a) of this section may file a petition with the Attorney General. The petition shall be in such form and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe. The petition shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the petitioners will care for such eligible orphan properly if he is admitted to the United States and, if such eligible orphan has not been lawfully adopted abroad, that they will adopt such orphan in the United States and that the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State of such orphan's proposed residence have been met. After an investigation of the facts in each case, the Attorney General shall, if he determines the facts stated in the petition are true and that the petitioning United States citizen and spouse are

persons of good moral character, approve the petition and forward one copy thereof to the Department of State. The Secretary of State shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant nonquota immigrant status to the beneficiary of such petition after the consular officer has determined that such beneficiary is an eligible orphan as herein defined."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The motion was agreed to.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to amend section 4 and section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes to express my admiration and sympathy for the Speaker of the House and for the leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor yesterday tentatively approved a bill-of-rights amendment to the new labor-management bill. It is unconscionable to think that any bill of rights can exist without there being included a guarantee of civil rights. There are 2,500,000 white workers in the trade movement today herded in an undemocratic ghetto from which are excluded all Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and, in some instances, Catholics. Anyone who votes for a labor-management bill that includes a bill of rights without any rights of admission guaranteed for all Americans is flirting with the label of hypocrisy. Therefore, I am offering such an amendment to remedy this anti-American situation.

KHRUSHCHEV'S VULGAR BLUSTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspaper carried the story of an attack upon religion made by Soviet

Premier Nikita Khrushchev at Ketowice, Poland.

Addressing a group of Catholic coal miners, the Premier said:

I do not want to wound your religious sentiments, but I want to underline that priests in your church promise you paradise in the sky after you are dead. But we Communists want to make you happy on earth. Are you satisfied with your lot in life?

He asked and stopped, apparently for a response from his audience.

According to the newspaper report, "the crowd stood in complete silence."

In this characteristic and consistent speech, the Soviet Premier has revealed for all the world once more to see the basic materialism and insensitivity of the Communist approach.

To Khrushchev it is obvious that man is somewhat like Pavlov's famous dog and responds to the stimulus of material satisfaction without regard to his need for spiritual satisfaction. The Communist boss following Marx, Lenin, and Stalin has not the slightest concept of the realm of the spiritual and the human need for the consolation and support of religion.

How inappropriate too, for him to have made his revealing speech in Poland where for centuries the courageous Poles have undergone successive waves of invasion and persecution, but to the admiration of the world have preserved unabated their devotion to their religion and their love of liberty.

No wonder the response of the doughty Polish miners to Khrushchev's vulgar campaign bluster was complete silence.

There could have been no more eloquent reply.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 319) from the Committee on Rules and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 105, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, is amended on page 2, line 11, by striking the comma after "Canal Zone", inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof, and inserting the fol-

lowing: "Provided further, That two subcommittees thereof, not exceeding six members and not exceeding two staff members each, as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, are hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places without the United States, in connection with steamship conferences."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has to do with some foreign travel by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries because of the fact that there are a number of very important international conferences about to take place with respect to shipping matters in which it is extremely desirable that we should be represented. The purpose of this resolution is to permit them a very limited amount of foreign travel in order to attend these conferences.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 317 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to inquire of the majority leader if he will advise us as to the program for the balance of the week and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further program for the rest of this week. The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar and there will be three suspensions:

H.R. 968, Vale Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

H.R. 804, Spokane Valley Federal reclamation project.

H.R. 7125, out of the Committee on Public Works, authorizing an appropriation of \$25,000 for a study and a report later on in connection with the Adams Parkway in Massachusetts. This is a preliminary study.

On Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar and the atomic energy appropriation bill.

Also on Tuesday there is the launching of the nuclear ship *Savannah* at Camden, and a number of Members on both sides will be there.

I think the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been officially invited and because of that it has been agreed, subject to the consent of the House, that any rollcalls on Monday or Tuesday would take place on Wednesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, if a rule is reported out on the TVA bill, which is on the Speaker's desk, that will be taken up either on Wednesday or some other day.

H.R. 3216, a bill relating to habeas corpus proceedings in the Federal courts in relation to prisoners convicted under State law will be brought up.

Also House Joint Resolution 115, reserve site, District of Columbia, Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

Then there is the usual reservation, that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced as soon as possible.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the majority leader can give us any information as to when any labor measure may come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable now to give any information on that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman give us any information as to when we may expect action on the so-called mutual security appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. My information is that the Subcommittee on Appropriations is waiting until the authorization bill is signed by the President before they proceed, which, of course, is natural.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then we have one other measure that I think may come up for consideration before adjournment, and that is the civil rights bill. Does the gentleman have any information on that?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are other bills, of course.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; there are plenty of bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. I made some remarks last week urging committees to get out bills that we must act on before

this session is over, as soon as possible. I reiterate what I said on that occasion.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

POSTPONEMENT OF ROLLCALLS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the event of any rollcalls asked for on Monday or Tuesday of next week, further consideration of the bills on which rollcalls are requested will be postponed until Wednesday of next week.

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

There was no objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the reading of the resolution made clear its purpose. It is to make in order the consideration of a public works bill. It is a public works bill which, as I understand, was reported unanimously by the committee. There was no controversy whatsoever. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H.R. 7634, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has so ably explained. It is the biennial authorization bill for river and harbor improvements and for flood control projects, which comes out of the House Committee on Public Works. Rather surprisingly, it was reported by a unanimous vote, for the first time in my recollection. The bill carries in it only authorizations for projects that have been approved by the Army Engineers. It is also my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget, perhaps for the first time, has said it had no objection to any items contained in the bill.

The rule was also reported from the Committee on Rules by unanimous vote. I have no other comment to make on the measure except to urge its consideration.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a bill to authorize the construction of public works to be paid for by Federal funds. Am I right, I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is an authorization bill only. First of all, the Bureau of the Budget will have to approve any appropriation items that may be necessary. Next, the President must include them in his budget message to Congress, and finally Congress must appropriate the money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Usually, when the House authorizes an appropriation, we follow through with an appropriation bill for some amount.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Usually, but not always, by any means.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not always; but this being a public works bill, unanimously reported out, it would be a fair guess to say that the projects will be paid for by Federal funds. I assume I need not ask the gentleman, that Federal funds means the taxpayers' dollars. So we are or should be interested in the amount as well as the authorization.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The amount contained in this authorization bill is a little over \$600 million. This bill carries authorizations for expenditures amounting to a little over \$600 million which is about half, and I understand a little less than half of the amount that was carried in the previous bill 2 years ago. So the committee has done a pretty good job of screening these projects. The number of projects that have been authorized has been very limited. Seemingly, the report indicates there are projects that are vitally needed. Some, of course, are the continuation of projects that have been under way and, I believe, the gentleman from Michigan, if he studies the report, will find that the measure is one of the most satisfactory bills of this type to come before the Congress for a long, long time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is my understanding, but one thing still bothers me a little. Our experience with the highway construction, which is federally financed and in part by the States, is that as soon as we get through a bill to construct a project, the cost begins going up and we just get less of whatever we are trying to buy with the amount that is authorized or finally appropriated than we could have bought just before the authorization. That practice really hurts and should end. I know the gentleman from Ohio was interested in labor legislation which will prevent or at least lessen the cost of project whether public or private, because a little while ago he asked the leadership when something would come out on the labor bill—we have on the floor here now a very distinguished member of that committee who has participated in the deliberations all through, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. I wonder if the gentleman from West Virginia will give the gentleman from Ohio any information as to when we will quit trading and bargaining over there on political matters and get out a bill—if that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. BAILEY. May I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that the matter is quite controversial in the committee, and I think we should continue with our deliberations, which I hope will end in a day or two and we will have some kind of a bill to bring to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In your judgment, will we get a rough draft by Monday or Tuesday of next week? Perhaps tomorrow or Saturday?

Mr. BAILEY. Probably Tuesday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope that will give the gentleman from Ohio the information he wants. He says there is some controversy there. We are divided in a way between the ADA, the Reuther men, the steel fellows and, yesterday, for the third or fourth time, a representative of Mr. Hoffa, and he is a Republican, was in my office and I asked him what Mr. Hoffa wanted. He said they did not want any bill at all. So you gentlemen, if there are any here, who are inclined to accept Mr. Hoffa's views, I give you that for what it is worth. Of course, there are some of us over there on committee, and I happen to be one who thinks we should have legislation at least on three subjects. One covering this no man's land which will give a remedy to those who are too small to be recognized by the National Labor Relations Board, and another one which will give us, give people generally a protection against secondary boycotting and against organizational picketing. We may all assume that the Kennedy-Ervin bill covers pretty thoroughly the racketeering and extortion phases and so far as I know there is no great opposition to the provisions in there which deal with those two subjects. But the other three we just must have.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 5431, be taken from the calendar and referred back to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an observation. We do not desire to prejudice the bill, and the request is made because of the fact that the Treasury in their report made a mistake of \$148,000. That item is in the report of the committee accompanying this bill. The committee does not desire to have that report become a permanent record. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7634) with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing this bill, H.R. 7634, which, as you know, is an omnibus rivers, harbors, beach erosion, and flood control bill, I should like to express my appreciation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works for the cooperation of every last member of that committee. We have held very long and exhaustive hearings on every project contained in this bill.

I am particularly indebted to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], ranking minority member of our committee, for all that he has done in connection with it, and along with that, of course, goes an expression of appreciation to all on his side of the aisle and certainly on our side.

I want to take just 1 minute, because our committee has been very active this year: We brought out the stream pollution control bill, the public buildings bill, the TVA bill, and now this omnibus rivers and harbors bill; and, we have pending further consideration of the highway bill. In all of these matters, which have taken a lot of time and effort, we have had fine support from our Chief Clerk, Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter, our chief counsel, Richard Sullivan, and our minority counsel, Mr. Robert McConnell, and our engineer-consultant, Mr. Joseph R. Brennan. I think it will not be necessary to dwell long on this bill, but I should like to remind all of you, if I may have your attention—and if I do have your attention we can dispose of this matter rather quickly I believe—I should like to remind you that we brought out an omnibus bill of this character in 1956. It has been the rule over a long period of years to offer to the House a bill of this nature every 2 to 4 years, because it is necessary. In 1956 we brought to the House a bill and it was vetoed. We came back in 1957 and got as far as the Rules Committee. In 1958, in the second session we passed a bill, but the President of the United States vetoed it. We came back a few weeks later in 1958 and passed a bill. The President signed it and it is now public law. I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, because we have lost some time and we have had a lag which makes absolutely imperative the passing of this bill at this time.

I call your attention to a statement we wrote into our bill last year, and I read from the report:

The committee notes that the basin authorization requirements are based upon anticipated appropriations through fiscal year 1960. It should be understood that in view of the delay in enacting omnibus legislation, shortages may possibly occur in some basins in the next year or so even though the amounts in the bill are made available. This will necessitate consideration of considerable amounts of authorization in 1959.

So we have brought this bill to you which has the approval of the Chief of Army Engineers, the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works of this House, and which has cleared the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure you will be delighted, as I am, that this committee has brought to you a bill as clean as a hound's tooth and which has cleared the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill calls for an expenditure of \$640,931,500. I must say to the House, however, that this morning we approved 11 other projects which have likewise been approved unanimously by the committee and by the Chief of Army Engineers and which cleared the budget. We thought it was only fair to the Members who had these important projects which we had discussed and upon which we had lots of testimony in this bill, because it will be another 2 years before we come to the House again for this authority.

I should like to remind you that in this bill we have a limited number of projects. Twenty-eight of these are in connection with navigation and 2 in connection with beach erosion, making a total of 30. In the bill last year we had 57 on navigation and 14 on beach erosion, making a total of 71. That is in chapter I.

I should like to say before I leave that subject that in these navigation projects 12 are related to the Great Lakes harbors, made necessary because of the integration demands of the Great Lakes harbors with the already completed St. Lawrence Seaway. In other words, these harbors should be able to take care of these heavily loaded vessels with iron ore and other weighty products and must be improved to accommodate these heavier vessels. Twelve of these, as I say, relate to those harbors. The others are separated pretty widely over the country.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentlemen to say that the Committee on Public Works has approved 11 other projects in a bill reported out today?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes, we approved those, and if the gentleman will recall I said we thought it only fair to approve those because they had cleared all of the agencies and they involve only \$16 million additional. We thought it fair because it will be another 2 years before we could possibly get to them again.

Mr. GROSS. I did not hear the gentleman state the amount, but is it \$16 million which is proposed to be added to this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes, I want to be frank here and say that the addition of the \$16 million will make the total \$656 million, plus.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: This bill calls for \$640,931,500, but nowhere in the report do I find the usual table comparing the expenditures contained in this bill with the budget request or with the spending for last year. Can the gentleman give me those comparative figures?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. All of these figures have been cleared by the Bureau

of the Budget. I gave the gentleman the grand total.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. This is an authorization bill based on the cost estimates submitted by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of the Budget. It is only after these projects get to the Appropriations Committee for a given year that a level of spending may be recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Then you have a comparative table of what the request was and what the Bureau of the Budget approved and what the committee finally granted.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any estimate of how this compares, any comparative statement?

Mr. BLATNIK. All we have here are the projects that have gone through all of the stages of the governmental agencies, and as approved by the agencies and now authorized. This is an authorization bill, as I stated. So, I do not know what it can compare it with. I can tell you what we authorized in our last bill a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I would like to have it.

Mr. BLATNIK. The grand total was \$1.5 billion. This is less than half of the authorization bill of a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. At this point may I further state to my esteemed friend that this authorization bill carries a top figure of cost, and the Engineers will have to present their needs to the Bureau of the Budget and through the President of the United States it will be transmitted here, and then the Committee on Appropriations will, of course, use its judgment and work its will as to how much they will allow. And, it must be said that some of these projects will carry a far lesser priority than others, and some of these projects may not be built in a decade.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the passage of an authorization bill is not a spending measure.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct. I think we have cleared the record on that.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. With respect to the 11 additional projects, they will be submitted to the committee in the form of committee amendments.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Is a list of those projects made available?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I believe the gentleman has the information there, and you have it spelled out as to amounts and the sections of the country involved. And, I am glad to say that they all have

a satisfactory benefit-to-cost ratio. We have been very careful about that.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that there are about \$8 billion worth of authorizations for which no appropriations have been made; is that not right?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. And the committee is going to try to get rid of some of these authorization that have been previously made to reduce the amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. My esteemed colleague has made a correct statement. We are working toward the deauthorization of a lot of these projects, and that is a difficult thing to approach. But, we are making headway in that direction, and I am hoping that when we come back here in January our committee will show some real progress, because we are at work on it now.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Have the hearings on this bill been prepared?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The report number is 541, but the hearings were not printed.

Mr. VANIK. Is it planned that they will be printed before we get to the appropriation bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Oh, certainly. No effort will be made to get an appropriation until next year.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Now, if I may, I will pass on to title II. Last year we had 68 flood-control projects. This year we only include 7. We had 12 river-basin projects in last year's bill, and we have only 6 this time, making a total of 13.

I should like to state that the Congress in its wisdom has never given the Corps of Engineers a blank check on this matter of spending nor on authorizations. A river-basin project will require a certain amount of money. When the Corps of Engineers spends up to that amount or within a dangerous approach to that amount, they are required to come back to our committee, and we must come back to you to authorize any increase in the authorization so that they can then go to the Committee on Appropriations and present their request for more money.

Now, then, we have these six river basins so close to the margin of safety, and we have to have a year's lag in there, because you go before the Committee on Appropriations to get money. These six projects covering these river basins will be found on page 41 of our report.

I do not want to take too much of your time, but it includes the Blackstone River Basin in Rhode Island, the Trinity River Basin in Texas, the Guadalupe River Basin in Texas, the Arkansas River Basin, the White River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, another basin on the Ohio River, North Fork Reservoir, Virginia, the Mojave River in California, and a very impor-

tant one, the Los Angeles River Basin, and that is a comprehensive plan, and the Walnut Creek Basin in California. And, another very important basin is the Columbia River. In other words, all of these river basins are reaching the margin of authorization, and we have got to increase it now because it will be 2 years more before we can do it, and the Engineers have to have this authorization to be able to go before the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I notice in looking at the report that there is a variation in the amount of local cooperation in navigation projects. Will the gentleman tell the committee what is the formula that is used to decide the extent of local cooperation? Is that considered on an individual basis or does the committee follow a regular formula?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. In the main the gentleman is correct. That is, you may have a community in this country which has had serious flood troubles, damage to property and loss of life; and that community can go just so far in local contributions. You may find another community that can go further in their contribution. We recognize that this problem is a nationwide problem. The engineers go into the matter with extreme care and we in the committee hear them exhaustively and come up with the fairest formula that we can arrive at.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, I was particularly struck by the fact that in the case of the navigation project shown on page 7, it calls for a local contribution of 4 percent, while the project on page 9 calls for a local contribution of 50 percent.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I should like to attempt to clarify that. There is no flat formula on a percentage basis covering local contributions. It depends on the nature of the project. If we are in a rocky area, where it would be an expensive proposition to deepen a channel or widen it, the Federal contribution will be high as compared to an area where there is moderate silting. The local contribution is of the usual character; land easements, rights-of-way, terminal facilities, access roads, and so forth.

In the case of the project on page 7, to which the gentleman refers, we have a 50 percent local contribution. There the usage is largely for the protection of recreational craft where a heavier contribution is asked of the local people.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may the Members who are not members of the legislative committee assume that it is the policy of the legislative committee to try to obtain local cooperation and contribution in all of these projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Every last one of them has some local contribution.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In cases where we are developing facilities for sports activities, such as yachts and fishing, the local community must supply a larger percentage of the fund, usually 50 percent of the cost of the project, as it relates to sports or recreational features of the project, whereas projects that are purely commercial, such as commercial fishing or commerce boats, the Federal Government supplies 100 percent.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I shall conclude in just a minute. It may be of interest to the Members to know that:

The many operating projects are now integral to the well-being of our economy. The navigable waterways improved by the Corps of Engineers at congressional direction now extend over 23,000 miles and provided for movements of 115 billion ton-miles of traffic in 1957. Nearly 300 local flood-protection projects, and 151 flood-control and multiple-purpose reservoirs have prevented over \$9 billion in flood damages to date, nearly 3 times the cost of the flood-control measures.

I hope I am not immodest when I say that I think this is something of a tribute to the legislative committee of this body which has so carefully screened and gone over these reports; and it is a greater compliment to the outstanding work of the Corps of Engineers in planning and designing and constructing these projects.

Some of the corps' large reservoirs now in operation provide more than 1.2 million acre-feet of water, equivalent to nearly 400 billion gallons, on contract for municipal and industrial water supply.

I should like to inject that our committee is now paying more and more attention to the overall water resources problem in this country because the water table is continuing to lower, and in many sections of our country we actually have an acute shortage of water. We recognize we are going to have to pay more and more attention to stream pollution, for instance, because in certain parts of the country we are going to have to clean up the waters so that we can use and reuse those same waters. Likewise, we know that pollution is increasing and we do know that more demand by industry is made for our water. So it becomes a rather impelling question.

The report reads further:

In addition, in 1958, the corps released from its reservoirs 1.6 million acre-feet of water for irrigation.

That should be interesting. Even in my own part of the country in certain places, they are taking water from the great Mississippi River and irrigating farm land.

The report reads further:

The normal pools of corps reservoirs provide about 3 million acres of surface area and provided 95 million visitor-days of recreational use in 1958.

I should like to close by saying that when you build these reservoirs and when you build these projects to guard and protect against flood damage and to save human life, you can use these very

reservoirs for recreation. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people and, I can quite accurately state, even millions of people are visiting these reservoirs to fish and to swim and to operate boats for their recreation. In all these reservoirs where attention has been given to recreation, it has improved the economy of that section of the country because these reservoirs bring all these people from a distance and they buy everything from fishhooks to all sorts of supplies. I trust this bill, and I did not intend to take as much time as I did, but I hope this bill will see your early, thorough, and hearty approval.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I would like at this time to speak, I know, in behalf of the members of the House Committee on Public Works to express our appreciation to the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee that handles by far the largest volume, certainly dollarwise, of the very important water-use projects in America for the patience and understanding that our friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], has shown at all times. This work requires a tremendous amount of time besides the time consumed in committee hearings with delegations coming from all parts of the country to appeal to their own Congressman who then takes his constituents to the chairman of the committee. I know that is so because I have been one of those who has brought my delegation to our chairman for help on matters affecting Great Lakes problems and the St. Lawrence Seaway problems. I know I speak for all of us when I say that on these very highly technical propositions involving projects that are of great concern and import to the entire country, it takes a great deal of time. The RECORD does not show it and we would like to express our appreciation on this occasion on the floor of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I appreciate that very much. I feel terribly bad, as I reviewed this matter, that I did not pay tribute to my colleague who has just spoken so kindly. JOHN BLATNIK is chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. He is one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives and certainly one of the most industrious and intelligent members of our committee. It was he who handled not only all of these navigation projects with very great care and skill, but it was JOHN BLATNIK who also brought out for successful passage by this House a very important bill on stream pollution to which I referred just a moment ago. So we do think we have a great committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to join with the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and with the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DAVIS] in support of this omnibus riv-

ers and harbors bill; and I am happy that the Public Works Committee saw fit to include projects that do not have the same debatable and controversial aspects the previous 85th session omnibus bills had that led to a Presidential veto and to opposition by the minority. I am glad that the Public Works Committee is unanimous in support of the bill.

I am happy to join the gentleman from Washington in his remarks and be associated with him therein.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, has paid very fine and deserved compliments to the chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. Mr. DAVIS in turn has paid very fine compliments to the gentleman from Minnesota for his chairmanship and handling of the rivers and harbors part of this bill. I agree with both of these gentlemen and join in paying compliment to both the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, more than a century and a quarter ago, in 1823, the Congress of the United States enacted a law which declared that "all waters on which steamships regularly pass from port to port shall be considered post roads", that is, roads over which mail may be carried.

But navigable waterways were in truth highways long before Congress enacted that law. The first highways known to civilized man were the Nile and Euphrates Rivers. When civilization was young and boats frail, all of the centers of population grew up along the rivers which provided the only available means for the movement of persons and goods from place to place.

Later, as boats became more sturdy, civilization moved out onto the inland seas such as the Mediterranean. Then Rome, Carthage, and Athens came into their prosperity and glory. By the 15th century, boats being more seaworthy, the oceans became man's newest highways. Since that time nearly all of the great population centers of the world have grown up along the seacoasts where rail and water transportation meet.

It is interesting to note that in our own country the 15 largest cities of the Nation all are ocean, lake or river ports. Not until we come down to the 16th city in population, Indianapolis, Ind., do we find a great American city that is not on navigable water.

We Americans proudly and truthfully boast that we can outproduce the world in manufactured goods—a fact that we have demonstrated time and time again in both war and peace. The strength of our great American productive system is not derived from well equipped and efficient factories alone but in large part is due to the fact that because of river and harbor bills enacted by Congress we possess the world's most efficient transportation system—water, rail and concrete highways—to move raw materials from forests and mines to our factories and the finished goods from producing

mills to the consuming centers of our own country and the world.

In improving rivers and harbors Congress is in fact building highways, making production more efficient and more economical and helping to maintain America's historical record of being able to outproduce the world.

This bill is in fact another highway bill and a good one. Despite the development of waterway navigation through bills like the one before us today, newspaper reporters and Congressmen who live remote from navigation have for years been calling bills like the present one "pork-barrel bills," implying they are a waste of taxpayers' money.

The phrase "pork-barrel bill" is not of recent origin. It was applied in 1821, as far as I can ascertain, for the first time to a river and harbor bill that provided for the authorization of \$150 for the removal of obstructions in the Thames River in Connecticut.

It was applied 2 years later to a small authorization for removal of obstructions from between the Gloucester and Annquam harbors in Massachusetts and in 1824 to the removal of sandbar and snags from a small section of the Mississippi River to facilitate the movement of cargo to foreign nations and thereby expand American overseas trade and the prosperity and development of our country.

The words "pork barrel" came from an old slave State practice of the slave owners occasionally rolling out the salt pork barrel and distributing pieces of pork to all the slaves who had been faithful and diligent in the service of their masters. Supposedly there was "pork" for every slave who had been faithful to his boss or master. The implication of "pork barrel" to a river and harbor bill was that all Congressmen who obeyed the political leaders of Congress received a project. We who have been Members of Congress any period of years know that this implication, even if it were once true, no longer is so.

Every project before it reaches the floor of Congress must be surveyed and approved by the U.S. Army Engineers, found by them to provide more benefits than its cost. It must have the approval of the Budget Bureau whose engineers also study the project. Then, it must obtain the approval of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors and their Committees on Public Works.

Politics plays a very minor part, if any, in a modern rivers and harbors bill. In all my experience in Congress I never have had the leaders of either political party ever suggest that some special project of any Congressman should be judged by any other formula than its merit.

It is only natural and always has been that Congressmen should want to see Federal funds expended in large amounts upon projects in their own areas. Those who live far inland, remote from navigation, may sometimes look upon money spent for navigation projects as an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money. They coined the phrase "pork barrel" in

reference to waterway projects of all kinds.

The very fact that these waterway developments have played so important a part in developing American commerce and providing the unequalled transportation system this Nation now has made the phrase "pork barrel" out-of-date and meaningless.

If it had not been for these so-called pork-barrel bills, America would not today occupy the proud and powerful place she does in world trade and world power, nor would we have the great transportation system America now possesses and the factories operate as efficiently as our factories do.

These river and harbor projects—some of which have been bad but most of which have been good—have added to the wealth, prosperity, and employment of the Nation, and through the benefits they create paid for themselves time and again. The money spent on river and harbor navigation developments, just as has been the money spent on surface highways, has been one of the best investments this Nation ever has made.

Those who live in high areas where floods seldom, if ever, occur and who live remote from navigable waters often attack the river and harbor flood control bills. Also, they sometimes attack the U.S. Army Engineers who have the responsibility of developing and carrying out these programs.

I have been a member of the rivers and harbors and flood control committee now for a period of 13 years. Out of that experience I say to you that, in my opinion, the U.S. Army Engineers, the officers of whom in most cases are the top students from each graduation class of the U.S. Military Academy, are among the ablest and most dedicated public officials of our Nation.

The U.S. Army Engineers deserve the highest praise, not condemnation.

The bill before you in total monetary authorization is the smallest in many years. It involves a total estimated cost of \$657,310,500 compared to a bill of more than twice that amount last year.

This bill contains 59 projects compared to 152 projects in last year's bill.

Many Members will recall that in last year's rivers and harbors flood control bill 18 projects were in controversy and that a vigorous effort was made by the minority to delete these 18 controversial projects from the bill. We offered 18 amendments to strike these 18 controversial projects from the bill. Our efforts failed. The bill was passed by the House and later by the Senate with all 18 of these controversial projects still in it.

I am happy to report, as has our chairman, that there are no controversial projects in this bill as far as the committee and executive agencies are concerned.

Every project in the bill has the approval of the U.S. Army Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and the Governors of the States in which each project is situated. Every project in the bill has the unanimous approval of the subcommittees on flood control and rivers and harbors and the unanimous approval of the House Public Works Com-

mittee, the members of which have gone into all details of the projects during extensive hearings.

It is the unanimous recommendation of the minority members of the committee that this bill be approved and speeded on its way to Senate passage and Presidential approval.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. I would like to compliment the committee at this time on the recognition of a much needed project in the Menominee River district. This project was approved in 1955. It is now contained in this authorization so that this much needed project may get under way. I appreciate the attention that the committee has given to the project in my district.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would also like to compliment the members of the committee and to thank them for including the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets project in this particular bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to the chairman and members of the Committee on Public Works the appreciation of citizens of the communities of Stonington and Southwest Harbor, Maine, for the favorable consideration given by the committee to the harbor improvements authorized by this bill, H.R. 7634.

Each improvement project has been very carefully studied, the citizens are willing to bear their share of costs and each project has a very favorable rate of cost to benefits.

The full cooperation of the Corps of Army Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the committee is deeply appreciated.

I assure the Members of the House these projects are in keeping with a sound program of river and harbor improvements.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, and to the chairman of the Subcommittees on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors, for their action in including the authorization of the Gulf Coast Shrimp Boat Harbors in H.R. 7634, by special committee amendment, as well as other projects for Florida.

As a former member of the Public Works Committee I know of the detailed study that is involved in each one of the projects that is included in the authorization bills, and I want to take this opportunity of again expressing my thanks to the members of the committee for the

diligent study and consideration they gave to not only this project, but to the many that come for committee consideration. I want to also say again that it was a pleasure and an honor to serve as a member of this distinguished committee.

The Gulf Coast Shrimp Boat Harbors report received all of the necessary clearances, including the Budget Bureau. It covers two localities, both of which are in my congressional district:

Fort Myers Beach in Lee County for which the following improvements are recommended: Channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide from that depth in San Carlos Bay into Matanzas Pass, thence 11 feet deep and 125 feet wide through the pass, to the upper shrimp terminals, a total distance of about 2.1 miles. The estimated Federal cost is \$165,800, and non-Federal is \$4,900.

Naples in Collier County carries the following recommended improvements: Channel 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide from that depth in the Gulf of Mexico to Gordon Pass, thence 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide through Gordon Pass and Naples Bay to a point 400 feet south of the bridge on U.S. Highway No. 41, thence 10 feet deep and 70 feet wide to the bridge; a turning basin 10 feet deep, 150 feet wide, and 200 feet long in upper Naples Bay; and a turning basin 8 feet deep, generally 250 feet wide, and 670 feet long at the municipal yacht basin. The estimated Federal cost is \$207,200 and the non-Federal estimated cost is \$140,200.

Included in H.R. 7634 is authorization for the channel and harbor at Everglades, Fla., located in Collier County. The plan for recommended improvement is for a channel 60 feet wide and 8 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico to mile 1.5 in Barron River at Everglades, Fla., with a turning basin about 0.5 acre in area near the upper end. The estimated Federal cost is \$117,200 and the non-Federal is \$24,600.

Also included in the authorization bill is an additional \$1 million deficit monetary authorization for the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] for his wonderful explanation on H.R. 7634. I wholeheartedly support this important legislation which means so much to the entire country. I am happy that they have included in this bill the Calumet project in Illinois and Indiana which means so much to us in the Midwest. I am sure that that section of the country will be making great progress by reason of the inclusion of this project, and I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee as well as all the other members of the committee for the splendid job they have done on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this very important legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents another giant step forward in the march of American progress, and in the efforts of this Congress to provide for our Nation's rapidly expanding water needs.

For the people of Oklahoma, it represents another great advance in our program to develop the Arkansas River and its tributaries, and to bring the substantial benefits of water navigation to the great Southwest.

The \$94 million additional authorization for the Arkansas Basin will make possible adequate funding of the Arkansas multipurpose program through fiscal year 1962-63.

It is essential to assume the orderly development of the long-range basin program which now has the firm support of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government, as well as that of the people of the country.

I urge the approval of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join our colleagues in complimenting the distinguished chairman of this great subcommittee and the committee itself for bringing to the Congress and to the Nation this authorization bill.

Recently there has come about an emergency in connection with an authorization for certain bank stabilization work on the Red River near Texarkana, Ark. This just developed recently. The Engineers have not had an opportunity to report it and to testify before the committee. We thought that there was sufficient authorization for this emergency project to proceed when appropriations were made available for it. It has to do with the possible destruction of an expensive and important bridge across the river.

Now, not having had an opportunity to develop it in the hearings, of course, I could not ask the subcommittee to include it in an amendment here. But, I know that these omnibus bills come about but once every 2 years on such a matter, and in view of the fact that the House is passing on this measure today and sending it on, I assume it will be a couple of more years before we have something brought back here for our consideration. I just wondered if I might at this time direct the gentleman's attention, as well as that of the committee, to this emergency matter and as to when it might be developed.

If the committee could hold hearings on that particular project, I wonder what would be the disposition of the committee toward a project of that kind.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I must reply that inasmuch as this emergency has just occurred, as the gentleman has said, recently, I could not say what the committee would do. Naturally we would recognize the existence of an emergency. But I repeat that these projects must have the approval of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, and must clear the executive agencies. That has been our policy on these matters. Of course, the committee will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman as

he works through the Chief of Army Engineers and these other agencies. It goes without saying that any real emergency such as the gentleman has described would have the sympathetic ear of the agencies to which I have referred.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman very much. This matter was brought to my attention only yesterday. That is why I did not have the opportunity to bring it up before. I understand that Senator McCLELLAN and the representative of the Corps of Engineers are seeking an opportunity to appear before the committee on the other side as well as on this side. That is the reason I bring the matter to the attention of the committee at this time. I know that we would not want to see a railroad bridge across a river of this kind put in danger.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. If the gentleman will file a resolution in the Committee on Public Works asking for a survey, I shall be glad to join with the chairman to urge the Engineers to bring this matter up very promptly.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. That is precisely what I intended to do today. That is the reason why I wanted to know the disposition of the committee about these projects that are rather late in getting in. That was the purpose of my request. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7634. It has been my privilege during the past 5 years of service on the Committee on Public Works to serve on the Flood Control Subcommittee and during those 5 years it has been my privilege to serve on that subcommittee under the chairmanship of the very fine chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis]. It has been a privilege to serve on that subcommittee under his leadership.

One of the first things I noticed when I went on that subcommittee 5 years ago was that the gentleman from Tennessee was deeply aware of the need for flood control throughout the United States. In my own State of California we had what was called the Christmas flood of 1955, a very disastrous flood in that State. When it became such an urgent matter that it was deemed advisable for a subcommittee to go out and view the situation firsthand and hold some hearings right there on the ground, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] took his own personal time and had a subcommittee go out to the State, hold hearings there, and reassure the people in the flooded areas that assistance would come to them. It is impossible actually to measure the feeling of assurance that people have in flooded areas

when a committee of this Congress comes to an area to view the situation firsthand. It makes those people feel that they are not fighting their problem alone, that there will come to them assistance in the form of action of this body, when resolutions for help reach the floor of the House and the Senate in turn.

Two years ago, in the district which I have the honor to represent, there was a great flood in the Walnut Creek watershed. Over 1,000 homes in that watershed were flooded. The chairman of our committee designated the Honorable JOHN McFALL, of California, and myself as a subcommittee to go out and view the area, which we did. Once again we saw the suffering, the damage that occurs when a flood comes. Many homes are seriously damaged and people have a feeling of great distress. Here again, the chairman of our subcommittee was kind enough to recognize the need of a flooded area of this type, and I want to express my personal thanks to him. In this bill is a provision for a flood control project on that Walnut Creek watershed in Contra Costa County, Calif.

This bill, as the chairman has said, and as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], has said, has been cleared by every agency interested in the bill, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and has the unanimous approval of our committee. It is a good bill. It is a bill in the best interests of the United States and in the best interests of all our people. I hope it will pass by a unanimous vote.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am thrilled and gratified that the House Public Works Committee was sufficiently convinced of the need for dredging of the harbor at Dubuque, Iowa, to include it in this omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The people whom I represent in the Second Congressional District of Iowa have been convinced since 1946 that this dredging was needed. Now, 13 years later, it is imperative in order to accommodate craft using the established 9-foot channel on the Mississippi River.

The first great need for this project is related to our national defense. I understand that under the Mobilization Planning Survey of the Department of Defense the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Co. is scheduled to build some vessels with drafts comparatively deep. Unless the harbor is dredged, it will be unable to produce what is required by the Department of Defense. It is imperative that the dredging be done previous to "M" day, so that this very difficult required production schedule will not be delayed. At the present time this company is unable to take any boats for construction with drafts of more than 5 or 6 feet.

The Dubuque Harbor is the only natural commercial harbor on the upper Mississippi, and the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Co. offers the only repair yard on the upper Mississippi above St. Louis. Under present conditions, it is impossible to get vessels into the harbor for repairs or layup. In former years

as many as 50 to 60 vessels came to the harbor for these purposes.

Mr. Chairman, due to the shallowness of the harbor, the industries of the city of Dubuque, whose success depends on water transportation on the Mississippi River and docking facilities at the Dubuque Harbor, have had to restrict their operations. The shallow condition of the harbor is emphasized by the fact that the Coast Guard icebreaker touches bottom in the harbor.

Dubuque, with a population of 49,700, serves the commercial needs of the prosperous dairy-farming region of northeastern Iowa, northwestern Illinois, and southwestern Wisconsin. Its principal industries are based on the predominantly agricultural economy of the region. Its main products are farm implements, meat products, fertilizers, chemical products, furniture, boats, and boilers.

The district engineer estimates the average annual benefits of this project at \$73,250, consisting of transportation savings on new movements of petroleum, scrap iron, and salt. The benefit-cost ratio is \$8.83.

Mr. Chairman, there will be many benefits, direct and indirect, from this project.

First, in the event of mobilization, we will be able to meet the required schedule for construction of vessels.

The Federal Government's investment in the 100- by 20-foot marginal pier and the buildings located on the depot grounds will be protected.

A greater volume of craft can be repaired and altered at this point. This will mean more employment for the Dubuque area.

Dredging of the harbor will make possible the construction of a proposed set of marine ways. There are no facilities of this nature on the Mississippi River north of St. Louis, and river operators have repeatedly pointed to this need.

Dredge material will be dumped in low spots on public property, thereby increasing the area available for industrial building.

It is expected the volume of shipping will increase, since Dubuque Harbor is an ideal point for shipping scrap, grain, and other items, and for receiving petroleum, sulfur, coal, molasses, and so forth, the shore being served by belt or spur lines connecting with the Burlington, Milwaukee, Illinois Central, and Great Western railroads.

I am glad that the House approved this bill.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the decision of the committee to amend H.R. 7634 to include an authorization for the West Thompson Reservoir in eastern Connecticut.

I am sure many of my colleagues here remember reading of the devastating floods which struck eastern Connecticut and Massachusetts in the fall of 1955. One hundred and seven people lost their lives in that disaster, and the property loss was nearly \$600 million. The people of this area have been waiting nearly 4 years for the completion of the necessary safeguards against a possible repetition of such a catastrophe.

The committee amendment will be an enormous step in this direction. I am very pleased that the interim report of the Corps of Engineers has been submitted in time for the committee to include the West Thompson project in its amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support the committee's recommendation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support the bill under consideration by the House today which authorizes the construction, repair, and preservation of civil works projects immeasurably beneficial to the development and economic growth of the Nation.

Over the years, Congress has developed a Federal program for participation in public works projects on navigable waterways, harbors, beach-erosion and flood-control areas. Over 23,000 miles of waterways have been improved under this program, and flood-control projects have prevented over \$9 billion in flood damages to date, nearly three times the cost of the flood-control measures.

Constant study of new needs and revision of the program are essential if we are to realize the maximum amount of sound regional and national development and the most efficient use of our financial and natural resources. Based upon the latest analyses of the developing needs of our Nation, the House Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and with the spirited cooperation of his entire committee membership, this civil works bill has been recommended to the House, and I vigorously lend my support to their recommendations.

Among the projects proposed, analyzed, and approved in this bill is one authorizing Federal participation in the construction of a harbor at Miami, Fla. A brief review of the history and condition of the existing port facility at Miami will attest to the merit of the authorization contained in this bill allowing for Federal participation in this construction project.

The present port at Miami was built in 1912 and was designed to accommodate the small population in the area at that time, as well as the size and design of the ships constructed in those early years. The present 45-year-old port is now obsolete and totally inadequate and inefficient for handling the tremendous cargo and passenger traffic emerging from the port of Miami. The population of this area has reached the 1 million mark, which is about one-third of the entire population of the State; 85 percent of the traffic at the port serves the immediate area, the two counties to the north accounting for the remainder. With the size and design of present-day ships, the use of the channel leading to the present port is restricted to one-way passage and to daylight movements because of insufficient depth, width, and navigation aids. The piers and bulkheads are in a deplorable condition, evidenced by a collapse of the bulkheads in 1954 which cost the city \$300,000 to replace. The apron along the pier ranges from 10 to 33 feet in width,

as compared to the 50-foot apron now usually provided for present-day ships.

The Corps of Engineers project included in this bill contemplates widening the ship channel to 400 feet, enlarging the existing turning basin 300 feet along the south and northeasterly sides, and providing an irregular turning basin along the north side of Fisher Island about 39 acres in extent and 30 feet deep. Spoil dredged from the existing ship channel will be deposited on the low and undeveloped Dodge Island which the city will develop for dry-cargo facilities. Tanker terminal facilities will be constructed on nearby Fisher Island.

The estimated Federal cost for this project is \$3,818,000 in addition to which local interests will contribute \$2,116,000. The project has a sound benefit-cost ratio of 2.03.

The House Committee on Public Works during the course of its hearings and extensive executive consideration of this project, gave thorough, conscientious consideration to the views of some individual property owners in the area of the proposed port. The great majority of the people of my district, their local governmental officials, civic and business groups in the Greater Miami area and both of the leading newspapers in Miami are gratified that this fine committee, recognizing the obvious urgent need for action and the reasonableness of this proposed project, completed its study of the matter by including Miami Harbor among its many other fine recommendations for congressional authorization.

Upon passage of this bill, the city of Miami can effectively proceed with its construction and financing program so that this long-awaited improvement can be undertaken.

Another project included in this bill which is of great importance and interest to the people of my district is that which authorizes Federal participation in the beach-erosion construction already undertaken by the city of Key West, the plans for which have been under review by the Corps of Engineers.

Key West, Fla., is a first-rate tourist area and approximately 200,000 tourists visit the island annually. It is also the site of one of the prime installations of the U.S. Navy. Reliable estimates from the Commerce Department and other sources indicate a continued and dynamic growth for this area over and above the 32,000 permanent civilian and 23,000 Navy personnel population. The existing limited county beach on the eastern side of the island is inadequate for the present permanent population. It is a natural beach which has been eroded through the years and is ideal for inclusion in the Federal beach-erosion program now in progress. The engineers proposed project consists of artificial placement of a protective and recreational beach about 4 miles long and 100 feet wide. The estimated total cost of the project is \$693,600, of which one-third, or \$231,200 is the Federal contribution. Periodic nourishment is estimated to cost \$35,300, of which the Federal share will be \$11,800.

Restoration of this beach in the southernmost city in the United States will provide important recreational and

shore-protection measures which are now lacking.

A third item of interest to residents of south Florida is the improvement to Baker's Haulover Inlet which the committee has thoughtfully included in the bill under consideration today. Baker's Haulover Inlet is a cut which connects Biscayne Bay with the Atlantic. The entire existing improvement was undertaken by local interests. The proposed Corps of Engineers project will allow for reconstruction of the jetties, protection of both sides of the inlet seaward of the 500-foot section, provision of a marked channel, 11 feet deep and 200 feet wide in the ocean entrance, and then a channel 8 feet deep and 100 feet wide to the Intracoastal Waterway, a Federal project. It also calls for a marine basin 8 feet deep and 200 feet wide. The benefit-cost ratio on this project is 3:2, the total cost being \$480,000, 50 percent of which is to be contributed by local interests. The annual charges on this project total \$29,000 as compared to the annual benefits of \$94,000.

Completion of this project will greatly increase the usefulness of this popular inlet in south Florida, and at the same time add to its navigational safety for the small boat traffic in the area.

A final item included in this bill which is of interest to all Floridians is the \$1 million increase in basin authorization for the central and southern Florida flood control program. This increase reflects what the committee felt were amounts necessary and sufficient for the next 2 years to permit sound progress and budgeting for this vital program to control the vast water resources of our State.

I am sure I share the feelings of all of the Members of the House that the committee has completed a worthwhile study of civil works projects needed in our country at this time and has recommended to the House a sound, well-conceived program. I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], for their assistance and understanding regarding these projects which are so vital to Florida and the country.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direc-

tion of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

NAVIGATION

Southwest Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 408, Eighty-fifth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$240,000;

Stonington Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 36, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$198,000;

Cotuit Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 142, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$320,000;

Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets, New York: House Document Numbered 126, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,858,000; Shem Creek, Charleston Harbor, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 35, Eighty-sixth Congress, maintenance;

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: House Document Numbered 98, Eighty-sixth Congress, maintenance;

Everglades Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 147, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$117,200;

Miami Harbor, Florida: Senate Document Numbered 71, Eighty-fifth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,818,000;

Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche—Jump Waterway, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 112, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,664,000;

Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, Louisiana: Senate Document Numbered 70, Eighty-fifth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$106,000;

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Port Mansfield, Texas: Senate Document Numbered 11, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,431,000;

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized the completion of the Barkley Dam project in Kentucky, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, at an estimated additional cost of \$146,000,000;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minnesota, at Dubuque, Iowa: House Document Numbered 56, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,000;

Red Wing Harbor, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 32, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$170,400;

Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 113, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$715,000;

Kewaunee Harbor, Wisconsin: Senate Document Numbered 19, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,900;

Two Harbors, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 146, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$162,000;

Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 150, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,364,000;

Ashland Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,495,000;

Presque Isle Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 145, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$215,300;

Marquette Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$236,000;

Calumet Harbor, Illinois and Indiana: House Document Numbered 149, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,240,000;

Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$14,684,000;

Sandusky Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 144, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,800,000;

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 152, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,486,000;

Lorain Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,323,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,077,000;

Buffalo Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 151, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,352,000;

Kahului Harbor, Island of Maui, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 109, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$944,500;

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

South Kingstown and Westerly, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 30, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$140,300;

Key West, Florida: House Document Numbered 413, Eighty-fifth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$231,200.

Sec. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them, on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 10 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

Calf Island, between Roque Island Bluffs and Seawall Point, Maine.

Green Harbor, Marshfield, Massachusetts.

Nauset Harbor, Massachusetts.

Eel Pond, Menauhant, Massachusetts.

Pleasant Bay, Massachusetts.

Rye Harbor (Playland Marina), New York.

Sturgeon Creek, Middlesex County, Virginia.

Beresford Creek, South Carolina.

Washburn Harbor, Wisconsin.

Sec. 104. Title I of this Act may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1959".

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

Sec. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-after designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

BLACKSTONE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Blackstone, Mill, and Peters Rivers, in Woonsocket, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 87, Eighty-fifth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,970,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 for the prosecution of the central and southern Florida comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes approved in the Flood Control Act of 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN

The comprehensive plan for improvement of the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, as authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, is modified to provide for construction of the Bardwell Reservoir on Waxahachie Creek, in the Richland, Chambers, and Cedar Creeks watershed, at an estimated ultimate net Federal cost for construction in addition to that now authorized of \$5,104,000, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 424, Eighty-fifth Congress.

GUADALUPE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood control on Bleders Creek, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,060,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$32,000,000, for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the White River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the Ar-

kansas River Basin, approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and the multiple-purpose plan for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma, approved by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, as amended, are hereby further amended to provide for the incorporation of the two plans into a single plan of development: *Provided*, That authorizations heretofore, herein and hereafter made available for the Arkansas River Basin shall be applicable to the combined plan of development.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$94,000,000 for prosecution of the combined plan of development for the Arkansas River Basin as herein authorized.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$132,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Connoquenessing Creek at Butler, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 110, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,558,700.

The project for the North Fork Reservoir on the North Fork of Pound River, Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document —, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,681,000.

MOJAVE RIVER BASIN

The plan for flood control on the Mojave River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 164, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,070,000.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$30,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

WALNUT CREEK BASIN

The plan for flood protection on Walnut Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 76, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$17,980,000.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$90,000,000 for the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent Acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, September 3, 1954, and July 3, 1958.

Sec. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be

made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law: Phillippi Creek, Florida.

Sec. 205. Title II of the Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1959".

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there are several committee amendments which are at the Clerk's desk. I ask unanimous consent that they be reported and be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Page 2, after line 14, insert the following:

"South Bristol Harbor, Maine: Senate Document Numbered 80, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$97,000;

"Wells Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 202, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$340,000;"

Page 2, after line 17, insert the following: "Apponaug Cove, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 143, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$180,000;"

Page 3, after line 3, insert the following: "Gulf Coast Shrimp Boat Harbors, Florida: House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$373,000;

"Bakers Haulover Inlet, Florida: House Document Numbered 189, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$239,000;"

Page 4, after line 12, insert the following: "Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 196, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,513,000;"

Page 4, after line 24, insert the following: "Indiana Harbor, Indiana: House Document Numbered 195, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$974,000;"

Page 5, after line 13, insert the following: "Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 199, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,729,000;"

Page 7, after line 2, insert the following: "Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana."

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following:

"THAMES RIVER BASIN

"The project for the West Thompson Reservoir on the Quinebaug River, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered —, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,010,000."

Page 10, line 8, strike out the dash mark after the word "Numbered" and insert in lieu thereof "180".

Page 11, line 24, strike out the dash mark after the word "Document" and insert in lieu thereof "Numbered 184".

Page 11, after line 25, insert the following:

"GREAT LAKES BASIN

"The project for flood protection on Cayuga Inlet at and in the vicinity of Ithaca, New York, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered —, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,950,000."

"The project for flood protection on Smokes Creek at and in the vicinity of Lackawanna, New York, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the

Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 200, Eighty-sixth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,974,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How can anyone get the floor now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. On each one of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments are being considered en bloc.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, anyway, and the first word, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when I came in today I understood there had been some trouble with a previous bill, which was vetoed, that we had a new bill, and that the projects we objected to in the former bill had been kept out of the new bill; is that right?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That was in the last omnibus bill which we vetoed twice. Then we finally got it in such shape with the approval of the White House. The bill now before the House, I respectfully suggest, comes to you with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works of the House, the approval of the Corps of Engineers, and has cleared the Bureau of the Budget. So all of these projects have been cleared by all of the executive agencies and we feel some pride that we have brought to the House a bill which, after long thought and deliberation and a lot of hearings, is as clean as a hound's tooth so far as the rules and regulations are concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have seen some pretty dirty dog teeth after the dog got into a flock of sheep. But what I would like to know is this: Is this in some way—and I will not characterize the way—but is this a partial repudiation of the veto of the President?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This has nothing at all to do with any action taken heretofore by the President or by the House of Representatives or even by the other body.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean those who advised the President to veto the bill, and this is not circumventing what they suggested; is it? Or is it?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I certainly cannot answer for the advisers of the President. I do not know whom he would ask about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, then, the veto.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I do say this with all respect to the gentleman, that we have brought you a bill with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that, but what I am getting at now is—is this a way of getting around at

least a part of the effect of the President's veto? Are we putting back something that was in the bill to which he objected when he vetoed it?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I just cannot answer that because we are presenting a bill which, if the House passes it and the other body concurs, we will give you a bill which we think is a good bill.

We cannot, of course, control the President; whatever he does is his business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. But I wondered if in this way we were taking a trick or two that he does not know about or disapproves of.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Surely.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. None of the projects in this bill were included in the bill the President vetoed. But I might point out that the President signed a bill which included most of the items he objected to when he vetoed the other bill.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield. Mr. GROSS. The question I would like to have answered is whether any of these 11 amendments which are presently being added to the bill were in the bill as previously vetoed.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I would be glad to answer that. Not a single one, sir.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that when the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill was before Congress in 1959, we on the minority offered 18 amendments to strike 14 projects that were objectionable to the President and the administrative agencies, but they overrode our objections, accepted none of the objections, and the President vetoed the bill. Afterward, a few of those projects were restored because in the meantime we got reports from the different agencies.

There are no projects in this bill that were affected by the President's veto in 1958.

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The inclusion of the Wells Harbor project in the pending amendment along with these 10 other projects is greatly appreciated by me in the interests of my constituents in the town of Wells, as well as the entire southwesterly section of Maine.

This improvement to the coastal resources of my State will result in gains far beyond the costs of the projects. Fishermen, pleasure-boat enthusiasts, and taxpayers alike benefit through this type of development of this great natural resource of ours, the coastal shoreline of Maine. In fact, Mr. Chairman, this is a self-liquidating project, increasing the real values of the community and the entire area.

The history of the Wells area is most interesting. In 1873, the Federal Government repaired a Government pier at Wells Harbor and straightened and deepened the channel over the entrance bar. This work was completed at a cost of \$5,000. Since 1873, there have been no additional Federal expenditures for maintenance so that now only ruins of the pier remain. The town has constructed seawalls for the protection of private property near the harbor entrance, but has been unable to afford additional urgently needed expenditures for navigational improvement of the harbor.

The town of Wells is one of Maine's well-known vacation areas for those who love the sea and our beaches. This is evidenced by the fact that the town's permanent population is 2,300 while during the summer the town's population mounts to over 20,000. The principal economic activities in Wells are centered around commercial fishing and the summer recreational business. Both of these endeavors require modern, efficient, and safe navigational facilities. However, incredible as it may seem, there is at present no waterborne commerce or vessel traffic at Wells Harbor. Locally owned recreational and commercial fishing craft are based at other harbors, which have been similarly improved under Federal-State-community projects.

The adequate harbor facilities to be provided by this project are urgently required to meet local commercial fishing and recreational needs. The monetary dividends which will result from the development of the Wells Harbor project will return manifold the Federal investment of \$340,000 authorized by this amendment.

These projects which are before the House today in this omnibus bill constitute an investment in our Nation's future. Consequently, I strongly urge adoption of the pending amendment and passage of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill on the minority side a question. All I want to know is whether any of the projects in the amendments, which total something near \$10 million, are items to which the administration has objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The administration has no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just who do you include in "administration"?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army Engineers represent the administration; the Budget Bureau represents the administration. They all testified in favor of these 11 projects which have come in since the original bill was approved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does whoever was responsible for the veto know about them?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army Engineers and the Budget Bureau would be directly responsible for advising the President to veto the bill. The Budget Bureau is for all of these projects.

Mr. SCHERER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SCHERER. The principal reason for the Presidential veto of the other bill was because of the inclusion of projects that did not have the approval of the Army Engineers or the Budget Bureau, or both. In the current instance, both in the bill and the amendments which the gentleman holds in his hand, the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Engineers have approved them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the information I sought. Thanks.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 317, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1945

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6134) to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act

of 1945 to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 10, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 802(c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1132(c)), is amended by inserting after the words 'service as such an employee,' the following: 'and any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives who has completed two or more years of service as such a Member.'"

"(b) Section 501(b) of the Postal Field Service Classification Act of 1955, as amended (39 U.S.C. 991(b)), is amended by inserting after the words 'service as such an employee,' the following: 'and any Member of the Senate or House of Representatives who has completed two or more years of service as such a Member.'"

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the engrossed amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. (a) The amendment made by section 2(a) of this Act shall become effective as of January 1, 1958.

"(b) The amendment made by section 2(b) of this Act shall become effective as of September 2, 1958.

"(c) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid, by reason of the amendments made by section 2 of this Act and the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, only to a former Member of the Senate or House of Representatives who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is in a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 or the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as the case may be, and with respect to whom appropriate administrative action is taken, pursuant to the amendments made by section 2 of this Act and the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, to advance such Member to a higher step rate of the grade or salary level concerned, as the case may be; and, when such administrative action is taken, such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid to such former Member for all periods from and after the date of appointment of such former Member to the position concerned."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The motion was agreed to.

The title was amended to read as follows: "An act to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as it passed the House, was to eliminate a provision of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 which was inconsistent with present budget and appropriations procedures. As it passed the House, the bill simply provides that payroll costs must be charged to the fiscal year in which they occurred. Under present laws the costs may be charged to either fiscal year in cases where the last payroll period beginning in the previous fiscal year extends beyond July 1.

The amendment added by the Senate was an amendment to correct an oversight which affects the within-grade step pay rate to which former Members of Congress may be assigned if they accept a position, paid under the Classification Act schedules, in the executive branch of the Government.

All other Federal employees, including legislative employees, may be assigned a within-grade step rate of their pay grade which is not above the salary they were previously receiving as a Federal employee. This is not the situation as far as Members of Congress are concerned. They must begin in the first step of the pay grade. This has been merely an oversight. The Senate amendment will correct the situation.

The amendment which I have sent to the desk to the bill as amended by the Senate provides an effective date for the Senate amendment. This is necessary in order that it may apply to Members presently on the rolls who could not be appointed to the proper salary rate. It will permit administrative correction of this situation.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until noon, Friday, July 17, to file a report on disposal problems of the Government-owned nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba.

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

There was no objection.

CHRONOLOGY OF INCIDENTS RELATING TO THE 19TH OF APRIL 1775, THE OPENING DAY OF THE WAR OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are 4 hours of special orders ahead of us this afternoon. I cannot wait until they are completed to ask for a special order myself, but I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include as part thereof a

narrative of the events of the American Revolution with the hope it will help the passage of the minuteman monument bill commemorating the Battle of Lexington and Concord and that historic area which is in my district.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

CHRONOLOGY OF INCIDENTS RELATING TO THE 19TH OF APRIL 1775, THE OPENING DAY OF THE WAR OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Revolutionary War of deeds, which began in earnest on the 19th of April 1775, was preceded by a long and no less significant war of words, with Boston as the principal center of agitation and objective of royal coercion. Fully living up to her reputation as the "Metropolis of Sedition," Boston was where the first British regiments were sent in 1768 to enforce, what seemed to the inhabitants, the harsh and tyrannical measures of a new British colonial imperialism and to quell the rebellious rumblings of a people possessed not only of an ardent passion for freedom but a jealous knowledge of self-government.

The presence of the royal troops provoked the famous Boston Massacre of March 5, 1770. They were removed from the town temporarily, but were back again in greater numbers after the port was closed by act of Parliament following further defiant demonstrations by mobs and the populace in general. Of these demonstrations the Boston Tea Party of December 16, 1773, was an illustrious example.

Tension between patriots and the soldiery had mounted to the breaking point and more reinforcements were on the way to aid in the increasingly difficult task of maintaining the King's rule when Gen. Thomas Gage, the Military Governor of the Province, decided to take more positive measures to curb the bold enterprise of the patriot leaders. The most important of these measures for which preparations began to be made in March 1775 was a plan to send an expeditionary force to Lexington and Concord to destroy powder and other military supplies.

The incidents listed in the chronological narrative below are indicated by date, day of the week, and the nearest hour or half hour, if known or possible to estimate. Where the hour is uncertain or cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of accuracy, nothing more definite than the part of the day is shown. This is the case with incidents that occurred before the 18th and 19th of April and, hence, are not quite so closely tied together.

Explanatory notes on matters of historical interest and commentaries on historic properties surviving or otherwise related to the incidents are added where applicable.

MARCH 20, 1775—MONDAY

Morning

General Gage, Military Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, contemplating future operations into the country, sent Captain Brown of the 52d Regiment, Ensign De Berniere of the 10th Regiment, and a private on a secret scouting trip from Boston to Roxbury, Brookline, Weston, Sudbury, and Concord. The three were well armed and so strikingly disguised in "brown cloathes and reddish handkerchiefs" that they were readily recognized as spying British soldiers. They, nevertheless, obtained useful information bearing on the topographical features of the landscape and, with the help of a friend of the royal government, learned about the location of military stores being collected at Concord by the Committees of Safety and Supplies set up by the

Provincial Congress. Plans for a night march began to be laid as soon as Brown and De Berniere returned from their mission.

(Daniel Bliss, a Tory, who lived near the millpond in the center of Concord, assisted Brown and De Berniere. He left town with them never to return again.)

APRIL 15, 1775—SATURDAY

Morning

The grenadiers and light infantry, comprising the flank companies of the British regiments in Boston, were taken "off all duties 'till further orders." The reasons given for this step were "exercise and new evolutions." Paul Revere and his self-appointed patrol of patriots noticed the removal of these troops from their normal duties and reported the fact to Dr. Joseph Warren, who in turn relayed the intelligence to the Committee of Safety. Preparations for an expedition into the country to seize the military stores at Concord, some 18 miles distant, were at once suspected.

Afternoon

The Provincial Congress, meeting at Concord as the legislative body representative of patriots in the Province of Massachusetts Bay and in defiance of the Military Governor in Boston, adjourned. John Hancock and Samuel Adams, who had attended, went to Lexington to stay with the Reverend Jonas Clarke, who resided in the dwelling that is preserved by the Lexington Historical Society and known today as the Hancock-Clarke House.

(The site of the meetinghouse where the Provincial Congress met late in 1774 and early again in 1775 to lay plans for rebellion is marked by a fitting tablet in front of the present First Parish Church, Unitarian, on the south side of Lexington Road near the central square of Concord.)

APRIL 16, 1775—SUNDAY

Midnight or soon after

Paul Revere observed "about 12 o'clock at Night, the Boats belonging to the Transports were all launched, & carried under the sterns of the men of War." They had previously been hauled up for repairs. This move was further interpreted as preparatory to an expedition, especially one that would carry troops by water across the Back Bay to the Cambridge shore.

Morning

Paul Revere rode to Lexington to warn John Hancock and Samuel Adams about the British preparations in Boston.

Evening

Returning to Boston through Charlestown, Revere "agreed with a Colonel Conant, and some other gentlemen, that if the British went out by water, he would shew two lanterns in the North Church Steeple; and if by land, one as a signal; for we were apprehensive it would be difficult to cross the Charles River, or to git over Boston neck." This arrangement was made, not to inform Revere, but to notify Colonel Conant and the "other gentlemen" so they could send word to Lexington and elsewhere if Revere should run into difficulty or be halted by the British in attempting to cross the Charles River or ride out via Boston Neck and Roxbury.

(The Old North Church or Christ Church in Boston still survives and will be discussed in the final report of the Commission.)

APRIL 17, 1775—MONDAY

Morning

The Committees of Safety and Supplies in session at Concord received word of the British preparations in Boston, probably from John Hancock to whom Paul Revere had delivered the message in Lexington the day before. Whereupon the committees voted to transport some of the cannon at Concord to places of greater safety in adjacent towns. The committees also voted to adjourn and

meet again the next day at "Mr. Wetherby's, at Menotomy," also known as the Black Horse Tavern.

(The Black Horse Tavern no longer exists, but its site on the north side of Massachusetts Avenue between Tufts and Foster Streets in the present Arlington has been marked by a stone tablet.)

APRIL 18, 1775—TUESDAY

Morning

As voted on the previous day, "four 6-pounders" were hauled away from Concord and started on the way to Groton, about 18 miles northwest of Concord.

Afternoon

General Gage sent out mounted officers from Boston to patrol the road between Cambridge and Concord. A British patrol of 10 or more horsemen dined at the Black Horse Tavern before riding farther out into the country.

Jasper, a Boston gunsmith, heard about the intended march of the troops from a British sergeant.

John Ballard, a stableman, overheard a remark in the Province House to the effect that there would be "hell to pay tomorrow." The Province House was the residence of the Military Governor, General Gage.

(The site of the Province House, on Washington Street opposite Milk Street and the Old South Meetinghouse, is marked by a bronze tablet. Built originally in 1667 as a home for Peter Sergeant, a prosperous merchant, was bought by the Province of Massachusetts Bay in 1715 for a Governor's residence. It was used for offices by the State for a time after the Revolution, but was serving commercial purposes when largely destroyed by fire in 1864.)

The cannon sent from Concord arrived at Groton. The Groton Minute Men, curious about the arrival of the "6-pounders," assembled promptly and nine of them started for Concord, arriving the next morning long before the British troops entered the town and joining the ranks of the militia who came from points nearer in answer to the alarm.

6:30 p.m.

Solomon Brown, a young man of Lexington who had been to market in Boston, arrived home at sunset with the news that he had overtaken and passed the patrol of British officers on the road. He reported his observations to Sgt. William Munroe, proprietor of the Munroe Tavern.

(The site of the home of Solomon Brown at East Lexington has been marked. The Munroe Tavern, which was the scene of incidents the next day, has been preserved. See app. C.)

Shortly after, an express rider arrived with a message for John Hancock from the Committee of Safety sitting at the Black Horse Tavern. The British patrol had been seen at Menotomy and their presence was a subject of suspicion.

7:00 p.m.

William Munroe, sergeant of the Lexington Minute Men, collected eight men in his company as a result of hearing the news from these sources and posted a guard at the Hancock-Clarke House.

Richard Devens, of the Committee of Safety, riding toward Charlestown from Menotomy after sundown, met the British patrol on the road to Lexington.

8:00 p.m.

The British horsemen rode through the village of Lexington without attempting to molest John Hancock and Samuel Adams. There is a tradition, however, that three of them, coming into the village, entered the home of Matthew Mead and helped themselves to the day's baking of brown bread and beans. The patrol continued on the old Bay Road to Lincoln.

(The small dwelling occupied by Matthew Mead no longer stands. It was replaced by the later Russell House, part of which dates back to 1779. The Bay Road, also known as the County Road, is part of the Lexington-Concord Battle Road.)

As soon as the British patrol was through Lexington, about 40 minutemen gathered at the Buckman Tavern, which still stands beside Lexington Green.

8:30 p.m.

The British patrol passed the farmhouse of Sgt. Samuel Hartwell of the Lincoln Minute Men and was seen by Sukey, a slave girl, who was gathering chips in the dooryard for the next morning's fire. She thought the patrol was a funeral procession and reported it as such to Mary Hartwell. After riding a mile or two farther on the Concord Road, the patrol wheeled about and rode back toward Lexington.

(The Sergeant Samuel Hartwell House remains today.)

9:00 p.m.

The Lexington Minute Men sent out scouts on horseback to locate and watch the movements of the British patrol. Elijah Sanderson, later a famous Salem cabinetmaker, Jonathan Loring, and Solomon Brown, who had first spotted the horsemen on the way home from Boston, volunteered for this duty.

10:00 p.m.

The three scouts from Lexington were seized at pistol point by the British patrol in Lincoln and led into a pasture through a barway in a stone wall on the north side of the road. They were held there for 4 hours.

(This site has been transformed, but its acquisition and revival as part of a national historical park is a major proposal of the Commission. The ride of Paul Revere also ended with his capture at the same place 3 hours later.)

The grenadiers and light infantry in Boston "were not apprised of the design, till just as it was time to march, they were waked by the sergeants putting their hands on them and whispering gently to them; and were even conducted by a back way out of the barracks, without the knowledge of their comrades, and without the observation of the sentries."

Dr. Joseph Warren had the news almost before the British had left their barracks. He sent for Paul Revere and William Dawes, Jr. Dawes came first and was dispatched over the route, longer by 4 miles, to Lexington via Boston Neck, Roxbury, Brookline, Cambridge, and Menotomy. Revere arrived at Warren's house after Dawes had left.

(The site of Warren's house on Hanover Street in Boston is now occupied by a parking lot. A tablet erected in 1898 is missing.)

10:30 p.m.

Paul Revere bade Capt. John Pulling, Jr., have two lanterns hung in the steeple of the Old North Church. He then went home, got his boots and surtout, and hurried to the north part of the town, where he kept a boat and was rowed by two friends across the Charles River "a little to the eastward where the Somerset man-of-war lay."

(The Paul Revere house in North Square, Boston, has been restored. It will be discussed in the final report of the Commission. Captain Pulling resided at the corner of Ann and Cross Streets, 2 blocks from North Square. The home of Robert Newman, the sexton who displayed the signal lanterns on being called by Pulling, stood until 1889 at the corner of Salem and Sheafe Streets near the Old North Church. Joshua Bentley and Thomas Richardson were the two friends who rowed Revere across the river. Their oars were muffled by a petticoat, "yet warm from the body of a fair daughter of liberty," who lived in the Ochterlong-Adan house, long since gone at the corner of North and North Centre

Streets. Revere's boat was kept near the Charlestown Ferry, at the foot of Prince Street.)

The British detachment of about 700 men assembled at the foot of Boston Common under general command of Lt. Col. Francis Smith of the 10th Regiment and with Maj. John Pitcairn of the Marines in charge of the light infantry. Embarkation in boats on the Back Bay began.

(The place where the troops entered the boats was probably near the present corner of Boylston and Charles Streets, where the shoreline of the Back Bay then extended back from the Charles River. The Back Bay was later filled in and the old shoreline completely lost.)

The British in Boston became well aware of the fact that the secret of the expedition had not been kept successfully. Earl Percy in crossing Boston Common, after being confidentially informed by General Gage that the soldiers were going out and he might be called upon later to follow with a relief force, heard one man say to another, "The British troops have marched but they will miss their aim." "What aim?" inquired Percy. "Why," the man replied, "the cannon at Concord." Percy got in touch with Gage at once and repeated what he had heard.

11 p.m.

Revere arrived on the Charlestown side and was met by Colonel Conant and others who had seen the light of the signal lanterns in the steeple of the Old North Church. Richard Devens of the Committee of Safety was also there and, upon being informed by Revere that the troops "were actually in the boats," procured a horse for him from Deacon Larkin and sent him off "to give the intelligence at Menotomy and Lexington." Before his departure, Revere was told by Devens about the British patrol he had met on the road after sundown.

(Revere landed at a wharf off Water Street, just north of the present Charlestown Bridge and near City Square. From there, he rode out the present Main Street and headed for Cambridge.)

11:30 p.m.

Beyond Charlestown Neck, the present Sullivan Square, Revere was confronted by two British horsemen waiting under a tree at a crossroads, "nearly opposite where Mark was hung in chains." Turning his horse abruptly, Revere galloped back toward the Neck and took the road for Medford, where he awakened Captain Hull of the Minute Men before proceeding to Menotomy, alarming almost every house on the way.

(The British horsemen who barred Revere's path were on Cambridge Street at the present Charlestown-Somerville line. A stone tablet, not too easily seen, marks the spot opposite Crescent Street. At the time, the body of Mark, a Negro slave, executed in 1755 for poisoning his master, Captain Codman, still hung from its gibbet as a warning against crime. After wheeling his horse, Revere rode over the present Broadway in Somerville to Winter Hill, where he bore to the right on Main Street into the center of Medford. His route from there to Menotomy, the present Arlington, carried him over High Street. A stone tablet on Winter Hill indicates the fork in the road taken by Revere.)

APRIL 19, 1775—WEDNESDAY

Midnight or soon after

Revere arrived at the Hancock-Clarke House in Lexington. Sergeant Munroe of the Lexington minutemen was stationed at the front door and refused to let Revere pass, stating that the family had retired and did not wish to be disturbed by any noise around the house. Whereupon Revere cried out, "Noise. You'll have noise enough before long. The Regulars are coming out."

12:30 a.m.

William Dawes, Jr., arriving at the Hancock-Clarke House from his longer ride over Boston Neck via Roxbury and Cambridge, set out for Concord with Revere. On his ride, Dawes had managed to elude the British sentries on Boston Neck by mingling in the darkness with some soldiers who were going his way.

After the arrival, first of Revere, and then Dawes, the bell in the belfry that stood on Lexington Green near the meetinghouse rang out the alarm and the Lexington Minute Men, about 130 in number, under Capt. John Parker, began to assemble. It took some little time for the men on outlying farms to be summoned and to get to town.

Dr. Samuel Prescott, who had spent the evening with his sweetheart, Miss Mulliken, in Lexington, started on his journey of 6 miles home to Concord. He overtook Revere and Dawes, who were soon satisfied that he was "a high son of liberty."

Dawes and Prescott rode into the doorway of a house near the Lexington-Lincoln line and, on knocking at the door, found Nathaniel Baker, a Lincoln Minute Man, still courting a Concord lass, Elizabeth Taylor, who was visiting there. Baker, who lived in South Lincoln, spread the alarm on his way home. With his father, brothers, and brother-in-law, he was at Concord Bridge in the morning with the Lincoln Minute Men. He married Elizabeth Taylor in 1776.

(The site where this incident occurred is for certain included within the boundaries of the proposed park. The Muzzey House, on the north side of the old road not far from the Lincoln boundary, is the only dwelling in the immediate locality today that was in existence in 1775. It was built about 1743. See app. C.)

1 a.m.

Dawes and Prescott were riding about 200 yards behind Revere when the latter was surprised by two British officers in the road near the opening into the pasture where the three Lexington scouts had been taken prisoners 3 hours earlier. Dawes turned his horse quickly and sped down the road back toward Lexington, pursued by two British horsemen who came through the barway from the pasture. He made good his escape by galloping up to a farmhouse and faking an ambush that frightened off the pursuing officers.

Prescott and Revere tried to push their way past the officers in the road, but, armed with pistols and swords, the officers forced them through the bars into the pasture. Pulling to the left, Prescott jumped his horse over a stone wall and escaped down a farm path by a swamp to continue his ride and carry the alarm to Concord. Revere made for a wood at the foot of the pasture, but just as he reached it, six of the British officers who were holding the three captured Lexington men grabbed his bridle, put pistols to his breast, and forced him to dismount. Thus ended the famous ride of Paul Revere.

(The site of Revere's capture is marked by a tablet erected in 1899. It is included in the proposed park area.)

1:30 a.m.

Captain Parker dismissed his men on Lexington Green with orders to respond again at the beating of the drum. Those who did not live near enough to go home repaired to the Buckman Tavern.

Eluding two of the British horsemen who pursued him as far as a swamp, Dr. Samuel Prescott came out of a thicket into a field behind the house of Sgt. Samuel Hartwell of the Lincoln Minute Men. He rode up to the back of the house and rapped loudly on the kitchen door, awakening all of the family and requesting that the news be speeded to Capt. William Smith, of the Lincoln Min-

ute Men, who lived a short distance back on the road to Lexington.

Sukey, the slave girl, in terror of the British, refused to leave the house, so Mary Hartwell, the sergeant's wife, placing her 5-month-old infant in Sukey's arms, rushed out the door and down the road in the darkness to Captain Smith's house. The latter mounted his horse and hastened to Lincoln Center, 2 miles to the south, where the two Lincoln companies eventually assembled and started off for Concord. They were the first companies to reach Concord from any of the neighboring towns.

(The Sgt. Samuel Hartwell House and the Capt. William Smith House survive and should be permanently safeguarded within the proposed park. See app. C.)

Following his capture, Paul Revere was interrogated by the British horsemen, who became seriously disturbed when he told them the people for a distance of 50 miles into the country were being notified about their intended march. Major Mitchell, of the 5th British Regiment, gave orders for the prisoners to mount and the party to ride back toward Lexington. Revere's horse was led by the bridle in front and officers formed a circle around the three Lexington scouts and a peddler, who had also been stopped by the British patrol.

2 a.m.

As the British officers and their prisoners rode down the road to Lexington, the hoofbeats of their horses awakened Josiah Nelson, a Lincoln Minute Man, who had been appointed to keep watch and carry the alarm to Bedford if the British marched. When his wife heard the sound of voices, she thought neighboring farmers must be getting an early start to market and told her husband he better hurry and find out if the farmers had any news of the British before they got past the house.

Leaving his bed hurriedly and slipping on his breeches, Nelson ran out into the road without looking up to make sure who the horsemen were and called out, "Have you heard anything about when the Regulars are coming out?" One of the officers, reaching for his sword, replied in anger, "We will let you know when they are coming" and struck Nelson on the crown of his head, cutting a long gash. Thus was drawn the first blood on the opening morning of the Revolution.

Nelson was taken prisoner, but was soon released and returned home to have his wife bind up his wound and dispatch him on horseback to Bedford, where he spread the alarm.

(The site of Josiah Nelson's farmhouse is in a tract of about 8 acres to be designated as a national historic site. The tract, part of a total purchase of 180 acres for the Air Force in March 1957, also contains the Minuteman Boulder and stone walls from which the minutemen fired on the British in retreat later in the day. The entire tract of 8 acres should be included in the proposed park.)

Upon the arrival of Dr. Prescott, Concord was alarmed by the ringing of the Town House bell. With gun in hand, Rev. William Emerson, grandfather of Ralph Waldo Emerson, who had built the Old Manse in 1769, was the first to answer the alarm. Three companies of minutemen and an alarm company soon followed and gathered at Wright's Tavern in the town square. Reuben Brown, a saddler, was sent to Lexington to confirm the news brought by Dr. Prescott. The task of removing and concealing the military stores that had not been sent away the day before began.

(Concord's first town house, erected in 1721 and used both for town meetings and the county courts, stood until 1794. The Old Manse is preserved by the Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations. Both Wright's Tavern and the Reuben Brown house also survive. See app. C.)

The British grenadiers and light infantry, who began to embark in boats on the Back Bay from Boston Common about 10:30 p.m. the evening before, crossed to Lechmere Point in East Cambridge, opposite the north end of Boston. As the boats were heavily loaded and could not be run in close, the troops had to wade ashore on marshland, wet up to the knees. They then waited in a dirty road as much as 3 hours for provisions to be brought up from the boats and divided. Each soldier then received a day's rations and 36 rounds of ammunition. This delay was serious as it gave the country people more time to get the news and assemble.

The troops were finally ready to advance about 2 a.m. They forded Willis Creek, which flowed into the Charles at East Cambridge, and got soaked to the waist in order to prevent the sound of their tramping feet on the planks of the bridge from giving alarm. From there, they proceeded through the west end of Charlestown, now Somerville, and took a road skirting the northern part of Cambridge to Menotomy.

(The landing place of the British in East Cambridge is marked by a stone tablet at the corner of Otis and Second Streets. Bulfinch's Bridge, where the British waded across Willis Creek, has been obliterated by the surge of urban growth. Only the outlet of Miller's River, surrounded by railroad yards, remains as evidence of the former Willis Creek.)

2:30 a.m.

Thomas Robins and David Harrington, of Lexington, who were carrying milk to Boston, were captured by the expeditionary force in Cambridge and compelled to return to Lexington with the soldiers. They were probably the first prisoners taken by the advancing column.

Paul Revere, the three Lexington scouts, and the peddler were let loose near the village of Lexington and the British patrol rode off in haste toward Menotomy. Revere made his way across a "burying ground and some pastures" to the Hancock-Clarke House to help with the flight of John Hancock and Samuel Adams.

These important patriots were taken first in a chase to the house of Capt. James Reed in a part of Woburn that is now Burlington, about 2 miles away, and then a little farther to the home of Madame Jones, a clergyman's widow. At the latter, they were joined later in the morning by Hancock's betrothed, Dorothy Quincy, and his aunt, Mrs. Thomas Hancock, who had also been guests of the Reverend Jonas Clarke.

The ladies brought with them a "fine salmon" that Hancock and Adams had forgotten in their hasty departure before sunrise. The party was about to sit down and make a meal of it when a Lexington farmer rushed in with a false rumor that the British were coming. They continued their flight and finally sat down to a repast of "cold salt pork and potatoes served on a wooden tray" at Amos Wyman's in Billerica, a distance of more than 4 miles from the Lexington parsonage they had left earlier in the day.

(None of the three houses to which Hancock and Adams fled remain intact. The natural setting of the Capt. James Reed house was ruined in constructing the circumferential highway, Route 128, west of Boston. The building, surrounded by gravel pits, still stood on its original base until moved away and set up elsewhere in 1956. Besides furnishing refuge to Hancock and Adams in their flight, the Reed house was where the first British soldiers taken prisoners in the Revolution were escorted after their capture. They were stragglers, five in number, left behind as the main body of troops marched on to Concord from Lexington Green. A modern dwelling rests on the foundation of the structure that was occupied in 1775 by the Widow Jones in the

present Burlington. It was better known later as the Sewell House. The cellar hole of the Amos Wyman Homestead and 1 acre of land around it, 2 miles beyond, are owned by the Billerica Historical Society. In 1898, the latter had an appropriate inscription cut on a large boulder in the yard near the cellar hole.)

3 a.m.

The British expedition arrived at Menotomy, where three members of the Committee of Safety from Marblehead—Col. Jeremiah Lee, Col. Azor Orne, and Elbridge Gerry, later signer of the Declaration of Independence and Vice President of the United States—were spending the night at the Black Horse Tavern following a session of the committee. As the troops marched by, Gerry and his associates "arose from their beds to gaze on the unwonted spectacle" and, upon the approach of an officer and file of soldiers to search the house, fled out the back door in their nightclothes and hid in a field of corn stubble.

Six companies of light infantry under Major Pitcairn were detached about this time and sent on ahead of the main body with the objective of securing the two bridges at Concord. The British commander was obviously worried about his slow progress and his anxiety was not diminished when the patrol that had taken and then released Paul Revere trotted down the road from Lexington with reports of an aroused countryside. A request for reinforcements was promptly sent back to Boston.

4 a.m.

General Gage, pondering the failure to keep the expedition a secret as a result of what Earl Percy had reported the previous evening, ordered Percy to start out from Boston via Roxbury at this hour with a relief force of 1,000 men. The order was issued without waiting to receive the request for help sent by Lieutenant Colonel Smith from Menotomy an hour before. Blunders in relaying the order to Percy delayed his start by 5 hours.

Col. James Barrett, of the Concord Militia, after answering the first alarm, returned to his farmhouse, 2 miles west of the center of town, where some of the military supplies were still stored and much work remained to be done at daybreak to place them beyond the reach of the British.

Musket balls, flints, and cartridges were put into barrels in the attic and covered with feathers, and kegs of powder were hauled into the woods behind the house and hidden. A plow and yoke of oxen were gotten out and the barrels of light cannon and muskets were covered by laying them down in furrows turned up in an adjoining field. It has been asserted that the plowman was still at work when the British came in sight around 8:30 a.m.

(The Col. James Barrett House and farm exist in good condition but are not marked nor recognized in any way. See app. C.)

4:30 a.m.

Thaddeus Bowman, the last of four scouts sent down the road from Lexington toward Menotomy to find out how near the British were, returned with the news they were less than half a mile away. The three scouts who preceded Bowman had been taken by a small guard of British flankers sent out ahead of Pitcairn's companies of light infantry.

The drum was beat, and the minutemen reassembled on Lexington Green, some coming from the Buckman Tavern and others from their homes. Those without powder entered the meetinghouse on the Green to draw from the town's supply that was kept there. Finally, 77 men of Captain Parker's company were lined up in a double row on the triangle formed by the Green to await

the arrival of the British. In the words of a later historian, deeply infused with a sense of the significance of this move, "They stood there, not merely as soldiers, but as citizens, nay, almost as statesmen, having the destiny of the country in their hands."

(The drum used by William Dimond, drummer in Captain Parker's company, to summon the minutemen has been preserved by the Lexington Historical Society.)

Benjamin Wellington, a minuteman of East Lexington, was surprised by the advance party of the approaching British and disarmed. He soon borrowed another gun, however, and hastened to join his comrades on the Green. Wellington is alleged to have been the first armed man taken in the Revolution.

(A stone tablet marks the spot where Wellington was captured and disarmed.)

Paul Revere and a clerk went to the Buckman Tavern to remove a trunk of papers that belonged to John Hancock. Before they left, daylight was breaking and they were able to see the column of the British light infantry marching up the road to Lexington Green.

5 a.m.

Major Pitcairn saw the minutemen drawn up to oppose him and formed his men into line of battle. Captain Parker then gave his famous order to his company: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon. But if they mean to have a war, let it begin here." Whereupon Pitcairn rode to the front of his ranks and shouted to the men in Parker's lines: "Lay down your arms, you damned rebels, and disperse." Realizing at last how badly he was outnumbered and how futile his situation was, Parker ordered his men to file away, but not before a single shot rang out and a volley from a British platoon. Another volley followed and, with bayonets leveled, the Redcoats charged. Eight men were killed and 10 more, wounded, were able to get away with their fleeing comrades. The first American blood had been fatally shed.

Jonathan Harrington, Jr., mortally wounded, was able to drag himself to the door of his house, opposite the northwest corner of the Green, where he died at his wife's feet. Even more heroic in death was the brave Jonas Parker, cousin of the captain, who had fired once and yet stood his ground, though wounded by a bullet and sinking to his knees. He was trying to reload, with bullets, wadding, and flints in his hat tossed at his feet, when finally cut down by a bayonet thrust.

The main body of the British soon came upon the Green. A cheer rose in token of the victory and "the musick struck up" as the troops started down the road for Concord. Any illusion as to the secrecy of their mission was now completely gone.

(The bodies of the eight minutemen who gave their lives were placed in a tomb, in 1835, behind the monument that was erected on Lexington Green in 1799. The Jonathan Harrington House still stands and is suitably marked.)

6 a.m.

The tramp of the Regulars drawing near was heard by Mary Hartwell, the young wife of Sgt. Samuel Hartwell, who had been awakened earlier and had run to Capt. William Smith, of the Lincoln Minute Men, with the news brought by Dr. Prescott. In the absence of her husband, who had ridden off to join his company in Lincoln, she had done the morning chores at the barn and was back in the house when she saw the bright red line of troops swinging up the road from the east. In later years she used to repeat her impression of the dazzling spectacle somewhat as follows: "The army of the King marched up in fine order, and their bayonets glistened in the sunlight like a field of waving grain. If it hadn't been for the purpose they came for, I should say

it was the handsomest sight I ever saw in my life."

The two companies of Lincoln Militia, which had assembled as a result of the alarm spread by Nathaniel Baker and Capt. William Smith, arrived at Concord. The Acton Minute Men, either accompanied or soon followed by the nine men from Groton, came from the opposite direction. The Bedford Militia also got there in time to face the British.

A rumor of fatalities at Lexington, brought by the men from Lincoln, was supported by Reuben Brown, of Concord, who had viewed the engagement at Lexington Green and galloped home to report.

6:30 a.m.

An array of about 150 men from the companies gathered at Concord marched down the road toward Lexington. After a mile or mile and a half, they saw the British coming. As the minutemen readily observed the Regulars had a force three or more times their number, they prudently turned around and marched back into town ahead of the Redcoats and to the "grand musick" of fife and drum.

(The march of the minutemen carried them as far as Meriam's Corner or slightly beyond, in an easterly direction from the center of Concord.)

7 a.m.

The British, with the light infantry in the van and the grenadiers bringing up the rear, approached the center of Concord. Observing that some of the minutemen had taken up a position on a ridge to the right overlooking the road and the town, Lieutenant Colonel Smith, the British commander, ordered the light infantry out as flankers to clear the ridge, while the grenadiers kept to the road.

As the light infantry ascended the height in one line the minutemen retired, without firing, onto a second ridge, now known as Ripley Hill, half a mile north of the center and nearly opposite the North Bridge that crossed the Concord River. A liberty pole with a flag flying stood near the west end of the first ridge. After cutting down the pole, the light infantry came off the ridge and halted in the center of town.

(The first ridge begins just west of Meriam's Corner and runs on the north side of Lexington Road into the center of town. From the latter, the second ridge runs northward on the east side of Monument Street and ends in a main elevation at Ripley Hill, not far from the tree-lined avenue leading into the North Bridge.)

Lieutenant Colonel Smith and Major Pitcairn climbed to a cemetery near the site of the liberty pole and through telescopes stared at the surrounding countryside from among the gravestones. As Smith later reported to General Gage, he very likely saw at this time "vast numbers assembling in many parts." During the few minutes the chief officers of the expedition were thus occupied, 13 of their companies stood on parade in the road, while some of the grenadiers began to search the buildings around the square.

(This scene is depicted in one of a set of notable prints made a few weeks later by Amos Doolittle, an engraver from Connecticut, who joined the army besieging the British in Boston. It is entitled "Plate II—A View of the Town of Concord." With the other Doolittle prints, it is part of a pictorial appendix to this report. The old cemetery is readily seen today, on a hill to the right, as the center of town is reached from Lexington.)

7:30 a.m.

Descending from the burying ground, Lieutenant Colonel Smith ordered six companies of light infantry, and then a seventh, to proceed to the North Bridge. There they

divided into two parties. Three companies under Capt. Walter Laurie, of the 43d Regiment, remained to guard the bridge, while four in command of Capt. Lawrence Parsons, of the 10th Regiment, marched on to Colonel Barrett's farm to look for the military stores concealed there. They were guided by Ensign De Berniere, who knew the location of their objective from his scouting trip made a month before. At the same time, Smith dispatched Capt. Munday Pole with a company of light infantry a mile in the opposite direction to hold the South Bridge and destroy any military stores that might be found nearby.

Col. James Barrett, in general command of the militia, was now back from the work of putting out of sight the supplies of ammunition and weapons of his farm. He ordered all the men on the second ridge or Ripley Hill, east of the Concord River, to cross the bridge to a muster field on the brow of Punkatasset Hill, a third elevation that is higher by some 200 feet beyond the west bank. There the Americans were to await reinforcements and see what the British would attempt to do.

(The North Bridge area between Ripley Hill and Punkatasset Hill requires measures to assure its permanent preservation and to forestall any prospect of future deterioration. Such measures are recommended by the Commission. The site of the muster field is indicated on a boulder in a wall on the west side of a road that goes over the brow of Punkatasset Hill. The boulder and its incised inscription, however, are not in a position to be readily seen.)

8 a.m.

The withdrawal of the minutemen to Punkatasset Hill was completed just before the seven British companies under Captains Laurie and Parsons got to the North Bridge. When Colonel Barrett saw the companies of Captain Parsons cross the bridge and take a road to the left over a causeway that led to his farm, 2 miles farther on, he galloped home ahead of them to give warning and last orders. On the way, about a quarter of a mile beyond the bridge, the marching column of light infantry passed two picturesque early colonial dwellings, the Hunt-Hosmer House and the Gov. John Winthrop House. The first of these survives today, with the old barn that belonged to the farmstead.

Meanwhile, two of the Captain Laurie's companies, the 10th Lincolnshires and the King's Own 4th Royal North Lancashires, were sent across the bridge to the first rise of ground beyond. The 43d Oxfordshires, assigned to watch the bridge itself, remained on the east bank within easy access of the stream. Troops from this company in turn surrounded the well in front of the Elisha Jones House, not far from the bridge, and drank its cool water. Little did they realize that stores of 55 barrels of beef and 1,700 pounds of salt fish were concealed there in a cellar and shed.

(The Gov. John Winthrop House, which was torn down in 1859, is also covered as a separate item in app. C.)

While these activities were going on at the North Bridge and beyond, the superior officers in the British force strolled about the center of town, directing the grenadiers in their task of seeking out hidden stores and refreshing themselves in public houses. At Wright's Tavern, Major Pitcairn, in a bad humor from bodily encountering an aged citizen of the town, is supposed to have stated as he "called for a glass of brandy and stirred it with his bloody finger" that "He hoped he should stir the Yankee blood so before night."

The search of the grenadiers in the town did not prove to be very successful though stores, public buildings, and private dwellings were all entered. Some hundred barrels of flour were found. A few were broken

open and their contents mixed with the dust in the road, while others were rolled into the millpond, near the central square, where much of it swelled and floated, and was finally salvaged. About 500 pounds of musket balls were also thrown into the millpond, but many of them were dredged up afterward. The grenadiers also set fire to the Town House and Reuben Brown's harness shop, but were prevailed upon by the inhabitants to put out the flames.

(The millpond, which formerly occupied a sizable area in the center of the town, was subsequently filled and now comprises a good part of the business district.)

9 a.m.

Earl Percy finally got his delayed orders to go out from Boston with the First Brigade as a relief party. General Gage had issued the order at 4 a.m., but two mistakes in relaying it cost a very late start for the force consisting of 1,000 men and 2 light field-pieces.

The minutemen and militia on Punkatasset Hill, now made up of a force of 400, including some individual volunteers, began to move down to a lower elevation nearer the North Bridge. From there, they saw the clouds of smoke rising from fires in the town. They did not know the exact cause, but had reason to suspect the worst. Colonel Barrett, back again from his farm, consulted with his officers; and Joseph Hosmer, the Concord adjutant, raised the question: "Will you let them burn the town down?" The decision was made "to march into the middle of town for its defense or die in the attempt."

Colonel Barrett gave the order to march, but not to fire until fired upon. Lt. Col. John Robinson, of Westford, and Maj. John Buttrick, of Concord, led the procession, followed by Capt. Isaac Davis' Acton company of minutemen, the three Concord companies, the militia of Acton, Bedford, and Lincoln, and a column of the unattached volunteers. A pair of fifers and drummers struck up the tune of "The White Cockade" and the "embattled farmers" were on their way to engage some of the finest troops in the King's army.

As soon as the Americans were in motion on Punkatasset Hill, Captain Laurie's two outer companies retreated before them and soon joined the third company at the bridge. Captain Laurie was able to perceive that the oncoming force outnumbered his and dispatched a messenger to Lieutenant Colonel Smith for reinforcements from the town. Smith ordered out two or three companies of grenadiers, but putting himself at their head and being a very fat, heavy man so slowed up the advance to the bridge as to make it impossible to arrive in time to be of any help.

9:30 a.m.

Captain Laurie moved most of his men to the east end of the North Bridge, leaving only a few to pull up the planks. Major Buttrick, coming on at the head of the American column, ordered the men at work to desist and accelerated the pace of the militia. The men removing the planks stopped and hastily formed for action in the road at the east end of the bridge. Laurie had little time to arrange his men effectively, for, as one of his lieutenants later wrote, "the rebels got so near him his people were obliged to form the best way they could * * * the three companies got one behind the other so that only the front one could fire."

(Captain Laurie's men without doubt attempted to form in a tactical design known as street firing. They lined up in columns of fours. After the men in the first two or three ranks had fired from kneeling and standing positions, they broke to the right and left, and filed to the rear to reload, while their position in front was taken by ranks moving up in succession. Thus it

was a theory that a narrow way or bridge could be kept under a steady fire.)

It was clearly Captain Laurie's intention to check the American advance at the North Bridge and his leading ranks of light infantry burst forth with the first shots—three of them, which fell harmlessly into the river. A bullet immediately after, however, passed under Lieutenant Colonel Robinson's arm and wounded Luther Blanchard, an Acton fifer, and Jonas Brown, a Concord minuteman. The first full British volley followed at a range of 75 yards or less. "Their balls whistled well" and Isaac Davis, the Acton captain, was killed as he was raising his gun and Abner Hosmer, one of his men, fell to the ground with a bullet through his head. Two others were wounded.

In obedience to Colonel Barrett's order, the Americans had not fired first. Major Buttrick now leaped into the air and fervently shouted, "Fire, fellow soldiers, for God's sake, fire." The words rang down the ranks and a volley was fired by all who "could fire and not kill our own men." A few more shots came from the British, but their morale was broken by the number and force of the round balls that came smashing among them and they began to scatter.

As the advancing column of inspired minutemen stepped onto the bridge, the Redcoats turned and fled, leaving two men on the ground. The ranks firing in front had difficulty extricating themselves, but those in back, who could not fire at all, withdrew in haste. At the end of the episode at the bridge, three privates were to become fatalities, while four of the eight British officers present were wounded, besides a sergeant and four men—a trifling loss, to be sure, when measured by modern standards, but not a bad showing considering the ineffectual weapons of 18th century warfare. Concord Flight—"physically so little, spiritually so significant"—was over in 2 or 3 minutes, but, as a noted student of that one day in history has further remarked, "the way lay open for all that America since has done."

(The two British soldiers who were left on the ground are buried beside a stone wall at the left of the approach to the bridge. A slate tablet bears a suitable inscription of verses from James Russell Lowell.)

Some conception of the inefficiency and lack of precision in the tools of war then employed is to be derived from a realistic look at the smoothbore flintlock musket, the standard weapon of the time that was popularly known in the British Army as the Brown Bess. Weighing about 10 pounds and carrying a 21-inch bayonet, the Brown Bess was about 4½ feet long and used a charge of a round ball weighing over an ounce and loose powder to explode it. The ball struck with a powerful impact, but was very inaccurate and had a range of 125 yards or less. Loading and firing involved a series of motions and an interval of seconds between the pulling of the trigger and explosion of the charge. Two or three shots in a minute were regarded as a satisfactory rate of fire.

The most up-to-date form of ammunition was the packaged paper cartridge, containing a charge of a ball and powder and carried in small quantities in cartridge boxes. On being taken from the boxes, the cartridges were torn open by the soldiers, usually with the teeth, and their contents placed where they belonged in the gun's mechanism. Most of the minutemen and militia had neither paper cartridges nor cartridge boxes, but carried the balls and powder separately in pouches or bags and powder horns. This further distribution of ammunition made loading even more awkward and slow.

(Amos Baker, of Lincoln, who was in the fight at the North Bridge, contended in an affidavit sworn to many years later that the British with their cartridge boxes "could load and fire three times to our

once." Baker also revealed that the companies of minutemen with bayonets were placed in front of the advance to the bridge as "it was not certain whether the British would fire, or whether they would charge bayonets without firing.")

Though the British were able to carry away one of their dead, their flight from the bridge was so complete that their wounded had to hobble away as best they could. As they passed the Elisha Jones House, Jones pointed his musket out of a second story window, but his wife knocked it from his hands before he could fire. Determined, however, to witness the spectacle before his eyes, Jones went downstairs and stood in the doorway of his shed. A retreating Redcoat, no doubt welcoming the chance to shoot an insolent Rebel, took hasty aim as he hurried by and fired. The shot pierced the wall of the shed about a yard from Jones' head. The hole thus made is preserved today under glass and gives to the place the popular name of the Bullet Hole House.

The fleeing Redcoats met the corpulent Lieutenant Colonel Smith coming to their aid with his grenadiers about a quarter of a mile from the bridge. They were pursued by the Americans for only a short distance. Sensing, perhaps, that the British might return to face them with their reinforcements, about 200 of the Americans proceeded up the ridge of Ripley Hill close to the Elisha Jones House, a position they had taken up earlier in the day before moving over to the brow of Punkatasset Hill. There, taking cover behind a stone wall, they awaited an assault that never came.

With his forces still divided in three or more places, Smith was nervous and undecided what to do. According to the Rev. William Emerson, who was watching from the Old Manse nearby: "For half an hour, the enemy, by their marches and counter-marches, discovered great fickleness and inconstancy of mind; sometimes advancing, sometimes returning to their former posts" before definitely withdrawing into the village.

While the British were engaged in these evolutions, about half the American force of 400 recrossed the bridge to the west bank. There, the bodies of Davis and Hosmer, the Acton Minute Men, were picked up and taken to the home of Major Buttrick, a handsome clapboarded dwelling that still stands on the slope of Punkatasset Hill but no longer in view of the picturesque river setting.

(A monument with a suitably inscribed tablet commemorates Maj. John Buttrick beside the road nearly opposite the house.)

When Capt. Munday Pole and his company of light infantry, who had seized the South Bridge at 8 a.m., heard the guns at the North Bridge, they at once started back to the center of town to rejoin the main body. They removed the planks from the bridge to protect their retreat. Some of Pole's troops were on Lee's Hill, an elevation about 100 feet high across the South Bridge, when the reports of musketry at the other end of the town echoed in the sky.

(Lee's Hill, now called Nashawtuc Hill, was the home of Joseph Lee, a Tory and the town's physician.)

During their stay of an hour and a half at the South Bridge, Captain Pole's company entered and searched at least three houses and got food for which they were careful to pay the womenfolk. They came upon three 24-pound iron cannon, which they knocked from their trunnions, and destroyed a small quantity of flour. Some gun carriages were also found and set on fire, together with a number of barrels containing wooden trenchers and spoons. The smoke that rose from the burning of these supplies may have been seen by the minutemen gathering on Punkatasset Hill and prompted their attack at the

North Bridge, perhaps, as much as the fires started by the grenadiers in the town.

While the action at the North Bridge was taking place, the four companies of light infantry under Captain Parsons, returning from Colonel Barrett's farm, had got to a crossroads still more than a mile away. "Three or four of the officers were sitting by the roadside," where "some drink was carried out to them" from a nearby tavern kept by the Widow Brown. Charles Handley, a lad of 13 then living at the tavern, claimed in a later deposition that he "heard the guns at the bridge, but the British did not appear to hear them." According to Handley: "They marched on very soon, but did not appear in haste."

(Mrs. Brown's tavern was at the southeast corner of the crossroads formed by the present Lowell Street and Barrett's Mill Road. The building, known today as the Abishai Brown or Cameron House, has been moved across Lowell Road and stands on the south side of Barrett's Mill Road not far from the southwest corner of the crossroads.)

At the Barrett Farm, the farthest reach of the British march, the troops had located a few gun carriages and burned them in front of the house. They had hoped, moreover, to find Colonel Barrett and arrest him. Instead, they seized the colonel's son, Stephen. The latter had been about a mile from the house to warn minutemen of the danger there and to take another route into town when he decided to return home and ran into the British. He was released as soon as his mother pleaded he was her son and not the master of the house. The soldiers were tired and hungry after their march of 20 miles and Mrs. Barrett was requested to feed them. This she did, but refused to accept pay by reaffirming the scriptural precept: "We are commanded to feed our enemies." When some of them, however, insisted and tossed money into her lap, she exclaimed: "This is the price of blood."

10 a.m.

The main body of the British began to reassemble in the center of Concord as Lieutenant Colonel Smith got back with companies of the grenadiers and light infantry from the North Bridge and Captain Pole's company came in from the South Bridge. The men, who had been on the move since the night before, were exhausted and needed rest. The wounded required attention and provision had to be made to carry them back to Boston. Chaises and horses were confiscated from stables, and bedding from nearby houses for the comfort of those who would have to be transported. Last but not least, the return of the companies under Captain Parsons, who had been virtually abandoned beyond the North Bridge, was awaited with real concern.

(One of the chaises seized belonged to Reuben Brown, whose harness shop had been set on fire by the grenadiers. It was recaptured later in the day as the Regulars were exposed to severe attack in their retreat through Menotomy. A second chaise was taken from John Beaton, who lived next door to Reuben Brown.)

11 a.m.

The companies of Captain Parsons recrossed the North Bridge without interference from the Americans and finally rejoined the main body of troops in the central square. They brought back the first story of atrocity in the Revolution.

They had observed the bodies of two of their slain comrades lying beside the road near the east end of the bridge. One of them had been killed instantly, but the other, though wounded in the brief engagement, had not immediately expired. About a half hour later, a boy, still short of full growth to manhood and with hatchet in

hand, had crossed the bridge to join the force of Americans on the ridge to the east. As he went by, the wounded soldier was sitting up and trying to raise himself to his knees. Whereupon the boy, doubtless under the spell of the exciting action that had just taken place and possibly fearing the soldier meant to do him harm, decided to finish the unfortunate victim by sinking the sharp blade of his weapon into his skull.

The returning troops of Captain Parsons, seeing the corpse thus mangled and bloody, originated accounts of exaggerated barbarism and cruelty. It soon became popular in England to believe that the rebels, in Indian fashion, scalped and cut off the ears of their adversaries.

11:30 a.m.

The relief party under Earl Percy, which had started out over Boston Neck more than 2 hours before and proceeded more than 8 miles through Roxbury and Brookline, finally arrived at the bridge across the Charles River into Cambridge. The planks had been removed from the bridge by order of the Cambridge selectmen and piled on the Cambridge side. The Great Bridge, as the structure was called, was the only link between Boston and Cambridge and the towns of Middlesex County that lay beyond. It was essential for Percy to get across the river if he was to come to Smith's aid before it was too late. Percy had anticipated the bridge would be tampered with and brought along carpenters and materials to repair any damage. Fortunately for him, the hastily executed job of destruction had not been very thorough. Some of his men crossed on the stringers and put enough planks back in place so the troops and field pieces were able to push on without much delay. The wagons of the supply train, however, were held up longer. By the time repairs were sufficient to allow them to cross the bridge in safety, they had been left far behind. Alert onlookers, seeing the wagon train thus widely separated from Percy's main body and protected by a sergeant's guard of only 12 men, promptly dispatched a messenger to Menotomy with advice to capture the delayed men and supplies further along the route.

(The Great Bridge spanned the Charles River approximately where the Larz Anderson Bridge now links the Harvard Business School and Harvard Stadium in Brighton with Harvard Square in Cambridge via Boylston Street.)

Noon or soon after

The British expeditionary force, at last rested and organized as well as possible for the return to Boston, pulled out of Concord, with flankers ordered up along the ridge on the north of the road to Meriam's Corner.

12:30 p.m.

As soon as the Americans who had been present at the fight at the North Bridge received warning that the British were heading back toward Lexington, they crossed the Great Meadows that lay to the north of the village and arrived at Meriam's Corner about as soon as the retreating Redcoats. They were well beyond the reach of the flanking light infantry on the ridge that runs easterly from the center of town and completely concealed from the main body withdrawing in the road. In the vicinity of Meriam's Corner, the numbers of the militia were increased to as many as 1,100 as more men from neighboring towns appeared. From the north came the Billerica, Chelmsford, Reading, and Woburn companies. From the south, those of Framingham and Sudbury. Three companies from Westfort, and at least one from Stowe, had been too late at the North Bridge but were now on hand to take up the pursuit.

At Meriam's Corner, the old Bedford road runs in from the north to join the highway

to Lexington. As the Reading companies were coming down this road and were nearly abreast the old Meriam House, a landmark at the left that yet survives, they saw the British flankers, about 100 in number, march down the east end of the ridge to the right and rejoin the main column in the highway. Taking care not to be outflanked, the Reading men then advanced to the cover of the buildings and stone walls at the homestead and waited while the British slowly made their way over a little bridge that spanned Mill brook, a few hundred feet farther along the highway.

Up to this moment, the remainder of the day might have passed without further incident. The few minutes of action at Lexington Green and Concord Bridge might even have been written off as part of a chronicle without any fulfillment or far-reaching end. Such, however, was not destined to be the case as the last of the grenadiers, reaching the east side of the narrow bridge, suddenly turned and fired a volley in the direction of the Reading companies gathered around the Meriam House. From this volley, there was to be no point of return. A war had opened that was not to end until Yorktown. During the course of the next few hours, a continuous battle was to rage around the retreating Redcoats on a battlefield only several hundred feet wide but 16 miles long, all the way from Meriam's Corner to Charlestown.

(Meriam's Corner, including the historic Meriam House, is the western terminus of a 4-mile stretch from Fliske Hill in Lexington recommended by the commission for acquisition and permanent preservation as a national historical park.)

The volley fired by the exasperated grenadiers ushered in the real results of the eventful day. No target was within range and the volley was aimed too high to strike anyone. The militia companies swarming in at the corner from both sides of the road replied with more deadly effect. A Concord minuteman was, perhaps, a bit overzealous in reporting that "a grait many lay dead and the road was bloody." Yet at least two British privates were killed in the road beyond the stream, while several more were wounded, including Ensign Lister, of the 10th Regiment.

From Meriam's Corner on, the warfare of the day became more and more of a guerrilla nature. It, indeed, was open season for shooting at the British. Any directing force and discipline beyond the company unit were lacking and, even there, they were slight as the minutemen chose to fight as individuals either exposed in pursuit or behind shelter. At best, loosely tied groups of not more than a dozen or a score stayed together and did so with difficulty. By these tactics, the British force could not be destroyed, but it could at least be expelled from the countryside and the casualties of the Americans kept to a minimum.

In contrast, the British commander tried to maintain his force in a solid formation on the highway, except when he sent out detachments of light infantry in flanking movements to patrol and guard both sides of the road. These flanking parties were effective and more than once caught the local yeomen by surprise as they fired from roadside walls, boulders, and trees. Of the total of 49 Americans killed during the day's fighting, it is probable that more than twice as many met their fate at the hands of the flankers as from the soldiers marching or retiring along the highway.

1 p.m.

As the British approached the top of Brooks or Hardy's Hill, half a mile east of the bridge at Meriam's Corner and about 60 feet higher, they were attacked by the Sudbury company of Capt. Nathaniel Cudworth, which took cover by the roadside to their right. A

constant fire was kept up by the minutemen as the Redcoats sped down the easterly slope past the Brooks Tavern and over the line into Lincoln.

(The square house with hipped roof and brick ends that stands on the south side of the road at the Concord-Lincoln line is a post-Revolutionary structure. It, however, occupies the site of the Brooks Tavern in 1775. The Brooks family built several houses on Hardy's Hill and were active as tanners and curriers. The stream at the bottom of its eastern slope, therefore, has been appropriately known as Tanner's Brook, though it is a part of the same Mill Brook at Meriam's Corner. The current designation of Elm Brook is of recent origin and has no historical value.)

Crossing Tanner's Brook at the foot of the hill, the British marched rapidly on, keeping flankers out parallel with the road. Across the bridge, the old road turns sharply to the left and rises to more elevated ground, some 20 feet higher than Hardy's Hill. On the left-hand side of the road was a tall growth of trees and on the right one somewhat smaller. Many minutemen, including the Bedford company of Capt. Jonathan Willson, raced across a shortcut to the north, over the Great Fields, in order to reach the advantageous position afforded by these woods and wait for the British to pass.

1:30 p.m.

When the Regulars reached this wooded portion of the highway, now cut off from the main route and known as Old Bedford and Virginia Road, the Americans under cover of the forest growth laid down a devastating fire that killed eight men outright and wounded many more. Fittingly, this curving section of the road was soon to be named "The Bloody Angle." The losses, to be sure, were not all one-sided. In the heat of the action on the road, the minutemen forgot all about the British flankers. Captain Willson and two others were shot or fatally jabbed from the rear, and a fourth injured and disabled for life.

(The area known as "The Bloody Angle" until two decades ago remained almost unchanged, with trees, stone walls, and boulders in their natural setting. A modern house, however, was built in the woods soon after and now the section has been developed residentially. Its historical values, however, can be recovered in time. Roadsides wide enough to include all of the bordering stone walls should first be saved from further change, and the area properly recognized by suitable markers.)

The old road bends again eastward beyond the woods at the Bloody Angle and on the north side, half a mile farther on, is faced by three old houses, only a few hundred feet apart, which were built long before the British marched by. The first or most westerly was a tavern kept by Ephraim Hartwell and also the home of Sgt. John Hartwell of the Lincoln Minute Men; the second, the Sgt. Samuel Hartwell House; and the third, the Capt. William Smith House. The last two have already been mentioned in this narrative.

(All three of the houses should be saved and safeguarded. The morning after the battle, Ephraim Hartwell, the innkeeper, and another elderly man drove along the road to the Bloody Angle with a yoke of oxen and a cart to pick up the bodies of the King's soldiers. Five of the eight dead were found and hauled away to the ancient burying ground at Lincoln Center. Their common grave in the Lincoln Cemetery is marked today by a memorial stone erected by the town in 1884. Two more of the British who were killed at the Bloody Angle are supposed to have been buried near the spot where they fell—northwest of the road before it bears easterly toward Lexington.)

As the broken ranks of the British staggered on, a grenadier was shot and fell be-

fore a pair of bars on the south side of the road midway between the two Hartwell houses. At the home of Sgt. Samuel Hartwell, the panic-stricken Redcoats, expecting to be the targets of hidden foemen, fired wildly into the upper story. One soldier in passing thrust his broken musket through a window. Sergeant Hartwell later found the castoff weapon and, with typical Yankee ingenuity and thrift, mended and used it many years for hunting.

A little farther on, another grenadier was mortally wounded near the Captain Smith House and left by the roadside to die. Members of the family carried him into the house, where his wound was dressed and he lingered on for 3 or 4 days. He was suffering such agony before the end that he begged his hosts to dispatch him. While dying, he told a servant she would find a gold sovereign sewed in the lining of his coat. She could not find it, but it was afterward located by Mrs. Smith. The soldier was buried a short distance up the highway near Folly Pond.

(The remains of the grenadier were uncovered about 60 years ago as roadbuilders were widening and grading the highway. They were reinterred over a stone wall in a field south of the road just west of Folly Pond. The field and Folly Pond are within the boundaries of the proposed park.)

The shattering fire faced by the British at the Bloody Angle had turned their retreat into a rout. As they got beyond the Captain Smith House, however, and by another half mile reached the opening into the pasture where Paul Revere had been captured the night before, Lt. Col. Smith had his flankers out again and was hopeful that he might meet the relief party of the First Brigade under Earl Percy before any further disaster should overtake his beleaguered force.

Just east of the pasture on the north side of the highway where Revere had been stopped lay two fields enclosed by stone walls. They were part of the homestead of Josiah Nelson, who, after taking a sword slash on his head from a British officer at an early hour, had spread the alarm to Bedford. The first of the two fields was being improved as a meadow through drainage and was cut up by shallow trenches and coarse mounds of soil and grass. The second, a rough pasture, was strewn with large and picturesque boulders—just the thing to provide shelter for the pursuing farmers.

A venturesome Lincoln Minute Man, William Thorning, had sunk into one of the holes in the first field and had the Redcoats in the road under incessant fire when their bullets began to bounce upon the ground around him. Turning and starting to run for the woods behind him, Thorning was caught in a cross fire as a flanking party which had been marching about 100 feet at his rear also made him a target. He narrowly missed being hit, but finally made good his escape by flattening himself in another trench and waiting for the party to pass on.

As soon as the flankers were gone, Thorning ran into the second field or pasture nearer the Nelson house and took up a position behind a huge boulder, about 50 feet from the road, where the main body of the British were still hurrying along. He resumed his fire with fatal effect. Two soldiers fell and were buried on a knoll in an orchard across the road. The rock over which Thorning leveled his musket at the fleeing Redcoats goes today by the appropriate name of "The Minuteman Boulder," and the knoll across the way is "The Soldiers' Graves."

(The ground, including the Minuteman Boulder, where William Thorning engaged in his individual fight with the British, is embraced in the tract of 8 acres acquired for the Air Force in March 1957, and to be set up as a national historic site. Both the tract of 8 acres and the Soldiers' Grave fall inside the boundaries of the proposed park.)

Less than a quarter of a mile beyond the farmhouse of Josiah Nelson, adjacent to the Lincoln-Lexington boundary, stood the home of Samuel Hastings, a member of Captain Parker's company that had lined up on the green at sunrise to face Major Pitcairn's light infantry. It was probably along the roadside walls the Nelson and Hastings homesteads that some of Parker's men now went into action again, with the help of a Cambridge company under Capt. Samuel Thatcher.

That minutemen were posted around the Hastings dwelling is certain, for a British soldier who strayed from the column to plunder the house was severely wounded by an American bullet as he emerged and stood on the doorstep. He was found and carried into the house when the family returned later in the day, but his wound was fatal and he did not respond to their ministrations. After his death, some of the family's silver spoons were found in his pocket. He was laid to rest in the field west of the house.

(The Hastings House like the Nelson House no longer remains. The dwelling now on its approximate site is a structure built within the last century.)

As soon as the news was received that General Percy's wagon train of supplies would be along without a sufficient escort, the "old men of Menotomy" assembled at the Cooper Tavern in the center of the village to make plans for seizing it. They were all old men, exempted from the alarm list, for the young men in the militia had already been called out. David Lamson, a half-Indian, who had served in the old war against the French, was chosen leader and, accompanied by the Reverend Phillips Payson of Chelsea, the little band of about 12 men took their position behind a bank wall of earth and stone nearly opposite the meetinghouse of the First Parish.

When the wagon train came abreast of Lamson and his aged companions, Lamson called on the sergeant in charge to surrender. His request was not heeded and the drivers whipped up their horses to get away. The old men, who had taken aim, then fired, killing several of the horses and two of the soldiers, while some of the others were wounded. One of the musket balls passed through the front door of the meetinghouse.

The drivers and guards who were not wounded or killed leaped in panic from the wagons and ran to the shore of Spy Pond, a half mile to the southward, where they threw their guns into the water. Continuing their flight, they came upon an old woman, named Mother Batherick, who was digging dandelions. Begging for protection, they insisted on surrendering to her. She took them to the home of Capt. Ephraim Frost, where she delivered them as prisoners, saying, "If you ever live to get back, you tell King George that an old woman took six of his grenadiers prisoners." When the story reached England, the opposition papers picked it up and pointedly asked the question, "If one old Yankee woman can take six grenadiers, how many soldiers will it require to conquer America?"

The wagons that were abandoned at Menotomy in the above manner provided the Americans with the first provisions and stores to be taken as the result of a forcible attack in the Revolution. The wagons and the living and dead horses were quickly gotten off the road and the marks of bloodshed erased. The townspeople knew the Redcoats would be returning to Boston later in the day and they did not want to expose themselves to the acts of vengeance that such a sight might inspire.

(The site of the Cooper Tavern, which stood at the intersection of Massachusetts Avenue and the Medford road, the present High Street, is marked by a stone tablet. The site of the attack on the British wagon train is also identified by a similar tablet in front of the First Parish Church, Unitarian,

at the southwest corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Pleasant Street in the present Arlington.)

2 p.m.

The British, now back on Lexington soil where the contest had begun, were once again to encounter Captain Parker's little band of minutemen under less favorable circumstances. Just over the line from Lincoln, the land rises sharply at a bend in the old road and an outcrop of ledges on the north side forms a hillock, perhaps 50 feet high, that commands the road in both directions for half a mile. There many of Captain Parker's men who had not already gone on into Lincoln gathered in the early afternoon and waited for vengeance.

As the sorely pressed Regulars came into sight and finally drew opposite their advantageous position, the Lexington men poured down a resounding volley. The British returned their fire in desperation, but without aim or effect. A British sword and rust-eaten scabbard dug up under a boulder in a garden near the road about 1895 indicates that an officer may have been one of the casualties in this exchange of shots. A round ball, partially flattened by striking a ledge, was also found by the owner of the property.

(The hillock and roadsides where the above action took place are within the continuous area proposed for a national historical park. They border the east side of the modern highway that cuts across the old road and leads into the Air Force's Hanscom Field in Bedford.)

A quarter of a mile farther along the road, on the opposite side, the famished British troops came to the Bull Tavern, also later known as the Viles Tavern. Making a swift entry and departure, they ransacked the bar for liquor and devoured what food they could find. Any thought of paying for what they took was now far from their minds.

(The site and cellar-hole of the Bull Tavern are still visible though partly covered by trees. As the Viles Tavern, it was run from 1820 to 1850 by Joel Viles, son of Cpl. Joel Viles of the Lexington Minute Men. Archaeological exploration of the foundations might yield some interesting findings. The site was taken by the State in connection with building the modern highway out to Hanscom Field, and is now in a plot surrounded by roads on all sides. The site itself, however, has not been disturbed.)

The British next approached as distinct a section topographically as any that now remains over the entire stretch of their day's march. A rocky bluff, about 25 feet high, formed by ledges of a brownish-yellow hue protrudes from the north just beyond the site of the Bull Tavern. Around this bluff, the old road winds in a northeasterly direction before ascending the western slope of Fiske Hill, an elevation some 60 feet higher than the bluff and a third of a mile farther to the east.

In the Bluff-Fiske Hill area, some of the most colorful and furious but least known and publicized action in the course of the British retreat took place. As the broken ranks of the main body of troops got around the bluff and started up the west side of Fiske Hill, Lieutenant Colonel Smith decided to make a desperate effort to rally his men. A rear guard was thrown up on the bluff, while the troops were halted in the road beyond and steps taken to restore some semblance of order.

That this attempt failed is made clear in accounts left by two young British subalterns. Lt. John Barker observed at about this point in the day's fighting that the number of the enemy was "increasing from all parts, while ours was reduced from deaths, wounds, and fatigue, and we were totally surrounded with such incessant fire as it's impossible to conceive, our ammunition was likewise near expended."

Ensign De Berniere reported a similar and even more humiliating situation: "When we arrived within a mile of Lexington, our ammunition began to fail, and the light companies were so fatigued with flanking they were scarce able to act, and a great number of wounded scarce able to get forward, made a great confusion; Colonel Smith (our commanding officer) had received a wound through his leg, a number of officers were also wounded, so that we began to run rather than retreat in order * * * we attempted to stop the men and form them two deep, but to no purpose, the confusion increased rather than lessened." In such a condition, the British were to go on the remaining mile from Fiske Hill to the village of Lexington.

Major Pitcairn as well as the wounded Lieutenant Colonel Smith was a conspicuous target for the minutemen and militia, whom Lieutenant Barker found "so concealed there was hardly any seeing them." With his superior in command, the major tried valiantly to bring the men into line. A minuteman who was witness to the major's endeavors recorded afterwards: "The enemy were then rising and passing over Fiske's hill. An officer, mounted on an elegant horse, and with a drawn sword in his hand, was riding backwards and forwards, commanding and urging on the British troops. A number of Americans behind a pile of rails, raised their guns and fired with deadly effect. The officer fell, and the horse took fright, leaped the wall and ran directly toward those who had killed his rider."

(Contrary to the above account, Pitcairn was neither killed nor wounded, but lived to receive a fatal wound at Bunker Hill. He was simply thrown by his spirited steed amid the clamor and excitement, and was obliged to fight the rest of the day on foot. His horse, when caught by a handful of minutemen, was identified by the pistols that were in their holsters on the saddle. They were carried through the war by Gen. Israel Putnam and are now in the possession of the Lexington Historical Society.)

While the main body of Smith's men were exposed to this unexpected attack on their flank at Fiske Hill, the rear guard posted on the bluff was driven in by the pursuing militia. Any hope of successfully reorganizing the British column had to be abandoned. The distraught men, to the consternation of their officers, broke and ran down the east side of the hill and, in greater disarray than before, hastened on toward Lexington.

(The Bluff-Fiske Hill area, significant as almost a breaking point in the British rout, is the eastern terminus of the proposed park. Fiske Hill lies directly west of the circumferential highway, Route 128. Massachusetts Avenue from Lexington passes over Route 128 and continues over Fiske Hill to join Route 2A at the Bluff.)

2:30 p.m.

Stragglers from the British column entered and pillaged the farmhouse of Benjamin Fiske near the bottom of Fiske Hill. They also lingered to drink from a well in the dooryard. There a personal encounter took place between one of the plundering Redcoats and James Hayward of Acton, exempt from military service because of a defective foot but no less engaged as a private citizen in the pursuit. Recognizing Hayward as an enemy, the British soldier raised his musket and exclaimed, "You are a dead man!" Hayward answered, "And so are you." Both fired at the same moment and both fell; the soldier was killed and Hayward mortally wounded by the soldier's bullet piercing his powder-horn and driving splinters into his side.

(The Hayward Well, marked by a stone tablet, and nearly half an acre of shaded ground around it are now owned by the Lexington Historical Society. It is probable that this property will be available by donation for inclusion in the proposed park as a

component of the Bluff-Fiske Hill area. The graves of three British soldiers are situated across the highway from the Hayward Well and at present are identified by a rough boulder with a crudely daubed inscription, a device hardly designed to foster a feeling of international good will. The location of the grave of the soldier killed by Hayward is not known, nor is that of another soldier who was killed near the top of Fiske Hill and buried beside the road. Two soldiers who met their fate at the bluff are buried nearby, on the opposite side of the road. No trace of their graves is now visible. The Fiske House, altered and with later additions, was demolished several years ago, together with adjacent farm buildings, by the owner. His farm had been dismembered as a result of putting through the circumferential highway, Route 128.)

The British carried some of their wounded along, but as their flight grew more perilous it became necessary to drop them by the roadside. Three severely wounded men were thus left behind as the disorganized column reached the foot of Fiske Hill and began to climb the western slope of the more elevated Concord Hill, the last eminence before reaching Lexington Green. The three soldiers were picked up by the Americans, who followed along soon after, and taken into the home of Thaddeus Reed, a member of Captain Parker's company. There they all died and their bodies were taken back to Fiske Hill for burial not far from the Hayward Well.

(The scene of this incident was mostly on property that has been transformed by construction of the circumferential highway, Route 128. The roadsides between Route 128 and Lexington Green are now fully built up as the result of residential development in the past 20 years. In consequence, any landmarks of 1775 have been eliminated beyond recognition. The graves of the three soldiers who died in the home of Thaddeus Reed were mentioned in the preceding parenthetical remarks. They are in the Bluff-Fiske Hill area of the proposed park.)

The Americans kept a harassing fire on the flying foe as he sped over Concord Hill and on past Lexington Green. No stop was now made to disperse any rebels. No minutemen were now lined up to oppose the retreat. It was too easy to add to the enemy's discomfiture on the flanks and at his rear. The situation had radically changed since the initial clash of arms at sunrise. As the British ran on in confusion, more of their number were killed and wounded. Three more soldiers were abandoned near the green and carried into the Buckman Tavern, where one of them died 3 days later. He was laid to rest in the Old Burying Ground not far from the corner of the Green, where the road leads off to Concord.

(The Old Burying Ground has graves bearing dates as early as 1690. A boulder beside the road directs the visitor to its location behind the First Parish Church and adjacent houses. A small stone tablet marks the soldier's grave.)

The beaten British force was now threatened with complete dissolution before the relief party under Brig. Gen. Earl Percy could come to its aid. One last effort to restore discipline, however, was made and succeeded in bringing the discomfited troops together until they could reach the protection of their reinforcements. Ensign De Berniere described how it was done. "At last, after we got through Lexington, the officers got to the front and presented their bayonets, and told the men that if they advanced they should die: Upon this they began to form under a very heavy fire."

Lieutenant Gould of the King's Own 4th Regiment, who had been wounded in the ankle at Concord Bridge, was captured at Menotomy by some of the old men who had waylaid the British supply wagons. He

had gone on ahead of Lieutenant Colonel Smith's retreating column, and was riding in one of the chaises borrowed at Concord. About 2 miles back on the road, not far from the Lexington boundary, he had met General Percy and his relief party, and informed them of Smith's pressing need of assistance.

(Lieutenant Gould's captors took him on the present Massachusetts Avenue near Mill Street. The chaise he was in had been taken from the shop of Reuben Brown, the harnessmaker of Concord.)

3 p.m., or shortly before

General Percy opened his ranks half a mile east of Lexington Green to admit Smith's men, "so much exhausted with fatigue, that they were obliged to lie down for rest on the ground, their tongues hanging out of their mouths, like those of dogs after a chase." About a half hour earlier, the rescue party, consisting of the King's Own 4th Regiment, the 23d Royal Welsh Fusiliers, and the 47th Regiment, all without their flank companies who were already in the contest, and the 1st Battalion of Marines, had heard the sound of musketry as the troops retreating from Fiske Hill drew nearer. News of Smith's plight, moreover, had been given Percy by Lieutenant Gould of the 4th Regiment, whom he had met riding toward Menotomy shortly before.

The firing became "plainer and more frequent," and as Lt. Frederick Mackenzie of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers further remarks critically in his diary, "We were ordered to form the line, which was immediately done by extending on each side of the road, but by reason of the Stonewalls and other obstructions, it was not formed in so regular a manner as it should have been."

(The relief party under Earl Percy advanced as far as the former Lexington High School on Massachusetts Avenue, where one of two 6-pound fieldpieces was wheeled into position and opened fire up the road to discourage any closer approach by the groups of militia in pursuit. The other fieldpiece was placed on a rise of ground a quarter of a mile back on the opposite side of the present avenue not far from the Munroe Tavern, where Percy set up his headquarters. A tablet in the shape of a stone cannon occupies the approximate position of the first fieldpiece in front of the high school building, while a simple stone tablet beside the road identifies the site of the second. The Munroe Tavern, already mentioned, is discussed in app. C.)

Colonel Smith's men rested for a half hour or more inside the line thrown out by the rescue party. Meanwhile, General Percy, with the two fieldpieces he had brought along, opened the first cannonade of the Revolution. No Americans were killed or wounded, but the meetinghouse on Lexington Green was struck and damaged. Percy's men, moreover, took pains to destroy any structure that might be used as cover by scattered groups of the rebels for sniping at the British flanks. Three houses and three outlying buildings were both looted and burned, and 200 rods of stone walls in the immediate vicinity hastily torn down. The total losses in Lexington homes were later computed at \$1,761 1s. 15d.

While this destruction was taking place, the wounded were conveyed into the Munroe Tavern, where their wounds were dressed and such refreshment taken as could be found. John Raymond, an unarmed cripple, mixed drinks for the thirsty Redcoats at the bar. When he tried to escape by the rear door, he was shot and killed by two of the soldiers.

Despite the precautions taken by Percy to protect his position during the period of rest, marksmen among the militia crept up in small numbers to woods and meadows on both sides of the road and, from behind trees and the second line of walls at more

than pointblank distance, resumed a fire that had been momentarily interrupted by the British light artillery. About this time, three companies of militia from Newton also entered the fight. The minutemen in pursuit of the enemy had to give up the chase as soon as their ammunition gave out. Their numbers, however, were continually replenished along the way as other citizens in arms, like those now from Newton, arrived at the scene of action.

The renewal of the battle in Lexington was not without effect. Lieutenants Hawkshaw, Cox, and Baker of the 5th Regiment, Lieutenant McCloud and Ensign Baldwin of the 47th, and Captain Souter and Lieutenant Potter of the Marines were all wounded and many privates also injured or killed. One of the wounded soldiers, a German, was left behind at the home of Samuel Sanderson, a member of Captain Parker's company of minutemen. He was well treated and remained to make his home in Lexington for many years.

(The Sanderson House, built in 1689, still stands, the first dwelling south of the Munroe Tavern. Samuel Sanderson's cow was wantonly killed by the British. Across the avenue is the oldest home in Lexington, the Mason House, erected in 1680. It was ransacked by the retreating redcoats and property taken to the value of £14 13s. 4d. The rural setting around these historic structures in 1775 is now largely gone as this section of Lexington has grown residentially.)

3:30 p.m.

The retreat of the British in the direction of East Lexington and Menotomy was resumed as Percy placed Smith's tired men in front and his own fresh troops at the rear and on the flanks. For a while, the forces, thus combined, marched on in impressive array and comparative safety. The flankers prevented the Americans from using any close cover and at the same time they entered and pillaged houses by the roadside without restraint from their officers.

William Heath, one of five generals appointed by the Provincial Congress to take charge of the militia, arrived at Lexington by detours from Menotomy and was soon joined by Dr. Joseph Warren. Both had attended a meeting of the Committee of Safety at Menotomy that morning after receiving news of the baptism of blood at Lexington Green. They now found the populace incensed by the bombardment of the meetinghouse, and the looting and burning of homes. Heath is alleged to have assisted in "forming a regiment, which had been broken by the shot from the British fieldpieces."

4:30 p.m.

The British troops trudged slowly on under the burden of goods they had stolen along the way. After advancing about 2½ miles and soon after leaving the Lexington line, they had to climb Pierce's Hill near the west end of Menotomy, now Arlington Heights, and half a mile farther on came down again to lower ground known as the Foot of the Rocks. There once again they were exposed to a fierce fire as militia from towns to the eastward and nearer the coast began to enter the fray.

(The name, Foot of the Rocks, is carved on a boulder on the north side of Massachusetts Avenue not far from the corner where Appleton Street drops in a steep grade from Arlington Heights. The character of this elevation, which doubtless was once very rocky, is now largely lost as the area has been built up residentially.)

General Heath, who had rushed over from Lexington and probably made what preparations he could to put up a stiff fight, appeared on the scene at this point. He recalled what he saw in his "Memoirs": "On descending from the high grounds in Menotomy, on the plain, the fire was brisk. At this instant, a musket ball came so near to

the head of Dr. Warren, as to strike the pin out of the hair of his earlock. Soon after, the right flank of the British was exposed to the fire of a body of militia, which had come from Roxbury, Brookline, Dorchester, etc. For a few minutes the fire was brisk on both sides."

Beginning at the "Foot of the Rocks," the firepower of the Americans was greatly increased as over 1,700 men in no less than 35 companies began to swell the force of militia that had the Regulars under attack. Companies from Watertown, Medford, Malden, Dedham, Needham, Lynn, Beverly, Danvers, Roxbury, Brookline, and Menotomy itself now thronged the road and roadsides. The British were severely harassed in some of the bloodiest fighting of the day as they retreated over the long stretch of more than a mile and a half on Massachusetts Avenue from the "Rocks" to the center of the present Arlington.

Lieutenant Mackenzie of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, at the end of the withdrawing column, was in a position to observe the pursuing foe: "In the road indeed in our rear, they were most numerous and came on pretty close, frequently calling out 'King Hancock forever.'" Besides firing in the street or from cover, the militia and unattached individuals engaged the Redcoats in hand-to-hand fighting as they moved out of line or approached and entered houses. In this manner, Dr. Eliphalet Downer, who had arrived with the Brookline and Roxbury companies, faced up to a British soldier and killed him in a celebrated duel. The bellicose physician, quickly discovering he was no match for the Regular in the fine points of bayonet play, deftly reversed his musket. Using the butt as a club, he then stunned his adversary with a swift blow before finishing him with 8 inches of cold steel.

General Percy, riding his beautiful white horse, offered a conspicuous target. He escaped death or injury, but a button was shot from his uniform. The increasing number of minutemen brought such pressure on his rear and flanks that Percy finally halted his column not far from the "Rocks" and turned his two fieldpieces upon them. The cannon shot hit no one, but temporarily, at least, scattered his pursuers. The destructive aspect of real war was now fully present as cannonballs blasted the road, smashed into stone walls and trees, and tore jagged holes through houses. Looting by the Regulars continued and they also tried to burn the buildings they had pillaged.

(That all the houses the British set on fire along the route did not burn down was nowhere more uniquely explained than at the Robbins home on the summit of Peirce Hill, where it is said the family had fled before the oncoming enemy, leaving a line of wet clothes hanging in the kitchen to dry. After ransacking the house and destroying a clock, the British flank guard kindled a fire in the kitchen floor. The clothesline soon caught on fire and as it burned off, the wet clothes fell to the floor, putting out the flames.)

At the Tufts Tavern, about half a mile along the road from the "Foot of the Rocks," a gang of soldiers wasted the plunder that could not be carried away, one thrusting his bayonet through a fine mirror, while others, in haste or malice, opened the taps of casks containing liquor and molasses and left them running. As they departed to rejoin their comrades, they set the building on fire, but a loyal slave, watching from a safe distance, returned in time to check the blaze.

(A part of the Tufts Tavern survived up until half a century ago, opposite Mount Vernon Street on the north side of Massachusetts Avenue in Arlington.)

5 p.m.

Deacon Joseph Adams and his family, a quarter of a mile beyond the Tufts Tavern,

had an even livelier time with the Redcoats. The deacon, outspoken in the patriotic zeal with which he had opposed the King's ministry, feared for his life and fled before some flankers who followed him as he ran and fired a volley of bullets, but did not strike him. He reached the barn of his pastor, the Reverend Samuel Cooke, where he hid in the hay. The soldiers came after him, probing the hay here and there with their bayonets, but failed to find him as they dared not tarry long.

Meanwhile, other soldiers broke into Deacon Adams' house and three of them burst into the chamber, where his wife lay on the bed with her youngest child, 18 days old. One of the soldiers, opening the curtains of the bed, pointed his bayonet to her breast and seemed about to slay her. "For the Lord's sake, do not kill me," she begged, but he angrily replied, "Damn you." Another soldier interceded, saying, "We will not hurt the woman if she will go out of the house, but we will surely burn it." Throwing a blanket around herself and with her infant in her arms, Mrs. Adams, painfully weak, made her way out to the cornhouse, while the marauders proceeded with their search for booty.

Five older Adams children, hidden under the bed, watched the feet of the soldiers moving about the room as they emptied the contents of bureau drawers into sheets stripped from the beds. Joel Adams, 9 years old, growing curious to see more of what was going on, lifted a corner of the valance for a better view and was detected by one of the soldiers. The boy came out of his hiding place and followed the soldiers around as they dumped the family valuables and household goods into their sacks. They even took out the works of an old clock and one of them was about to make off with the church communion service, of which the deacon had custody, when the horrified Joel indignantly cried out, "Don't you touch them 'ere things; Daddy'll lick you, if you do." Despite the small boy's admonition, the silver service, including a valuable tankard given to the church in 1769, went back to Boston with the soldiers, where the tankard was pawned to a silversmith and recovered by Deacon Adams after the British evacuated the town.

The depredations on the Adams household came to an end as the British soldiers ignited a basketful of chips on the kitchen floor and left the house to burn. The alert children were able to extinguish the flames with a pot of home-brewed beer and water from a cask outside the door, but not until the floor and ceiling were badly damaged and pewter plates melted on a dresser. The story of Mrs. Adams and her child, with elaborations by orators to suit the purposes of propaganda at the time, was used as a choice specimen of British brutality. In some measure, at least, it offset the atrocity committed by the boy with the hatchet on the wounded soldier at Concord bridge.

(The ell of the Deacon Adams House still stood on the south side of Massachusetts Avenue in Arlington as late as 1912. It was a part of the third house west of Bartlett Avenue, but is not recognizable today. The incidents which befell the family and were so typical of the British retreat were substantiated by its major victim, Hannah Adams, the deacon's wife, in a subsequent deposition taken by order of the Provincial Congress.)

Jason Russell, aged 58 and lame, who lived just beyond Deacon Adams, was one citizen of Menotomy who believed that "An Englishman's house is his castle." After taking his wife and children to a place of greater safety, he had returned to his dwelling and prepared for any forays the British flankers and freebooters might make by barricading his gate with bundles of shingles.

The land rises to a ridge that runs in a westerly direction south of the Russell House

and along the base of this ridge, a flanking party advanced parallel to the main body of the British retreating over the road toward the village from the "Foot of the Rocks." A few minutemen, mostly from Danvers, were posted in back of the Russell House and waiting for the British column to come up the road, when they were surprised by the flanking party in their rear and driven toward the house, where they were caught between the flankers and the main body. There followed the most famous fight at close quarters during the eventful day and the bloodiest encounter associated with any house in the Revolution.

A neighbor, Ammi Cutter, who had helped to capture Percy's wagon train several hours before, had pleaded in vain with Russell to withdraw to a position of greater security than his barricade of shingles. Cutter was climbing over a wall between two fields on his way home when the flanking party suddenly came into sight and directed their fire upon him. He ran, but in crossing an old mill yard stumbled and fell between two logs. The flankers thought they had killed him because he fell as they fired, but he escaped uninjured.

The minutemen, who ran into the flanking party near the foot of the ridge, were not so lucky. As they got to Russell's doorway, Percy's column coming up the road saw them and fired, forcing them to take shelter in the house. The unfortunate Russell, with his disabled foot, was the last to reach the door and was struck by two bullets. As he lay in the doorway, the Redcoats rushing in stabbed him with no less than 11 bayonet thrusts.

In the house, the minutemen who had no bayonets were at a great disadvantage and the Redcoats readily slew all they could reach. Some men from Beverly and others, eight in number, fled into the cellar and, pointing their muskets up the stairway, threatened instant death to any soldiers who should follow. One venturesome Redcoat took a chance and was shot on the stairs. Another was killed in the fight on the floor above.

After the British had gone on, the dead in and about the house were gathered in the room to the left of the front door. When Mrs. Russell came home that evening, she found her husband and 11 minutemen lying side by side on the floor in a common pool of blood. They were the largest number of combatants, either American or British, to give up their lives in any one place and at any one time during the course of the day's conflict.

(The Jason Russell House, commendably saved by the Arlington Historical Society in 1923 under the impetus of suburban growth that had almost totally changed its historic surroundings, stands today not far from its original location near the corner of Jason Street and Massachusetts Avenue, where a stone tablet calls attention to the fight at the house. A more recent metal marker has been erected in front of the house, which possesses architectural features of genuine merit from the late 17th century as well as an illustrious history connected with the first day of fighting in the Revolution. For fuller treatment, see app. C. Jason Russell and the 11 minutemen lie in one large grave in the Old Burying Ground behind the First Parish Church, Unitarian, at the southwest corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Pleasant Street in the center of Arlington. "Seven Young Men of Danvers," who were commemorated in a pamphlet with that title in 1835, were among those killed either inside or near the Jason Russell House. According to one version, they were slain in the house, while in another they are described as being in a "walled enclosure," strengthened by breastworks of bundles of shingles piled on top, when they met death at the hands of a British flanking party.)

5:30 p.m.

The section of the highway leading to the Cooper Tavern from the Jason Russell House was, indeed, the scene of some of the most frenzied and desperate action during the running fight over an almost continuous battlefield. Beginning with the well-directed fire of the "old men of Menotomy," who had stopped General Percy's supply train coming from the opposite direction earlier in the afternoon, the slaughter at the Russell House now added perceptibly to the total of fatalities. No less than 20 Americans and as many or more British were finally slain in this stretch, which deservedly has been called "the bloodiest half mile of all the Battle Road."

A second Adams House lay virtually in the center of the village just west of the Cooper Tavern. As the main body of the Regulars and the following militia passed by, it came in full range first of American and then British fire. It was both punctured by bullets and stained with blood as the dying and wounded were carried inside its doors. When Mrs. Adams returned later in the day, she stepped over the body of a dead British soldier as she entered by the back door. In the front room on a bed lay another soldier, with his mortal wounds pouring out blood on the white sanded floor.

The fury of the fire that filled the Adams House with bullets and blood had begun when the withdrawing Redcoats made themselves a standing target by halting for only a moment in the street between this dwelling and the First Parish Meetinghouse. They stopped long enough, however, to give one of Menotomy's venerable citizens a chance to start his own private little war.

(The spot where the British troops stopped was where the railroad tracks now cross Massachusetts Avenue in the center of Arlington. The Adams House, older than the Deacon Adams House already mentioned, blocked the way on the northerly side of the street and was torn down when the railroad was put through. One man who was surprised in the house while it was exposed to the heaviest fire is said to have "saved his life by climbing up into the big chimney, and standing on the cross-pole from which the kettles were hung.")

The tale of Capt. Samuel Whittemore, 78 years old, defies any distrust of septuagenarian stamina and will to survive. A militia officer in his younger days, Whittemore had been awakened during the night by the tramp of Smith's troops passing through Menotomy on the way to Lexington. His wife made preparations to seek safety at one of their sons' houses, but when the time came for the pair to go, she found her husband "oiling his musket and pistols, and sharpening his sword" with the intention of "going up in town." This he did, arriving well before the British came up the long street from the "Foot of the Rocks."

He found cover to his liking behind a stone wall not far from the Adams House and the Cooper Tavern, but on a street leading off the Mystic River and about 150 yards away from the line of the British retreat. This he regarded as an easy range for his old musket. When the Regulars finally came along and halted nearly opposite his position, he took aim and fired, killing one of them, and repeated with following shots.

The smoke from his gun soon attracted a British flanking party. Too lame to run, Captain Whittemore had no choice but to fight in desperation. Pulling one pistol, he killed one of the five soldiers he saw suddenly approaching him along the wall, and with the second, shot another who "was seen to clap his hand to his breast." As he was about to fire again, a ball from one of their muskets struck him in the head and knocked him to the ground. The remaining flankers then closed in, clubbing him with their

muskets and stabbing him with their bayonets until they were certain he was dead.

The old warrior, however, still had some life left in him. When he was discovered after the departure of the British and borne into the Cooper Tavern, the surgeon, Dr. Tufts of Medford, declared it was useless to dress his many wounds, for a man so aged could not possibly hope to recover. But his wounds were dressed and the tenacious old hero lived 18 more years, dying in 1793 at the age of 96.

Those who had the opportunity to see Captain Whittemore in a condition close to death from his wounds said, "He bled like an ox," and later attributed his new lease of life to the new blood that had to be formed. A woman in Boston the next day is reported to have heard some British soldiers assert, "We killed an old devil there in Menotomy, but we paid too dear for it—lost three of our men, the last died this morning."

(The position taken by Samuel Whittemore for his exploits against the British was near the corner of the present Mystic and Chestnut Streets. It was marked by a stone tablet.)

The buildings along the village street of Menotomy had harbored so many minutemen and made the route of the British retreat so hot and tantalizing, especially over the last mile, that it was inevitable the harried troops would sooner or later in their reckless fury make victims of some of the innocent as well as the guilty. This very thing occurred at the Cooper Tavern as a climax to the warm reception the soldiers had received in the little community.

Jason Winship, 45, and Jabez Wyman, 39, had already tarried too long over their mugs of ale and the landlord, Benjamin Cooper, and his wife, Rachel, were mixing flip at the bar when the redcoats began shooting at the doors and windows and crowded into the taproom. The drinking companions, both of military age but unarmed and apparently expecting not to be harmed, never had a chance. The landlord and his spouse, who escaped for their lives into the cellar, made the incident appear even more merciless and shocking than it probably was. In a later deposition for the Provincial Congress they described Winship and his brother-in-law as "two aged gentlemen * * * most barbarously and inhumanly murdered * * * being stabbed through in many places, their heads mauled, skulls broke, and their brains beat out on the floor and walls of the house."

(A part of the Cooper Tavern was subsequently moved and survived until about 1860, with many marks of bullets still to be seen in its walls.)

The battle had reached the height of its ferocity at Menotomy. More were killed there on both sides than in any other town. At least 40 of the British succumbed, more than half of their fatalities of 73 for the day, while 25 out of the 49 Americans who lost their lives fell in the town that was later to be called West Cambridge and finally Arlington. Homes were put to the torch as at Lexington, but the Regulars were more closely pursued by a greater number of minutemen and others, who deprived them of sufficient time to destroy the village by a wholesale conflagration. Many fires were started, but soon extinguished by the militia and townsmen hovering over the scene.

6 p.m.

The sun was now sinking in the western sky and "Lord Percy thought it best to continue the march." Only an hour remained before complete darkness and the force still had several miles to go before it could reach the comfort and protection of the warships in the Charles and reinforcements at Boston. The troops, therefore, advanced rapidly and without incident beyond the Cooper Tavern and in a little more than a mile and a quarter arrived at the Menotomy River, where

they crossed into the north end of Cambridge.

(The Menotomy River is the present Alewife Brook, a name also used in colonial times. Alewives were fished from the stream and used to fertilize the soil.)

Soon after the hurrying column had crossed the river, Lt. Solomon Bowman, a minuteman who lived back on the Menotomy side near the Black Horse Tavern, overtook a British straggler and fought him in a hand-to-hand engagement of unloaded muskets. The soldier lunged at Bowman with his bayonet fixed, but the lieutenant fended off the thrust and with the butt of his gun knocked his opponent to the ground, taking him prisoner.

A mile beyond the Menotomy River, a small but resolute band of Americans waited for the British under the dubious shelter provided by a pile of empty casks in the yard of Jacob Watson, a blacksmith. Once again the flankers caught their victims by surprise as they got in their rear unobserved and charged with bayonets. Maj. Isaac Gardner, of the Brookline Militia, and the highest ranking officer to be slain on either side during the day, fell in the encounter, and two volunteers of Cambridge, John Hicks and Moses Richardson, both 50 years or more of age.

Near the same spot, William Marcy, a dull-witted fellow, sitting on a fence and loquaciously enjoying the colorful spectacle of the passing redcoats, was picked off by one of them, his harmless and well-meaning cheers being mistaken for hostile insults. The British loss in Cambridge was light, but one man being killed by the shooting at the barricade of casks.

(The site of the above action, marked by a tablet, is on the southerly side of Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge at the corner of the present Rindge Avenue. The John Hicks House, where one of the victims of this slaughter lived, more than a mile away, is now owned and used by Harvard University as a library for Kirkland House. A gambrel-roofed structure of Georgian simplicity built in 1760, it is now situated at Boylston and South Streets in Cambridge. It formerly stood at the southeast corner of Dunster and Winthrop Streets, where it was marked by a stone tablet.)

6:30 p.m.

When General Percy led his troops out of Boston in the morning, it is claimed by one source that he intended to camp that night on Cambridge Common and, with reinforcements to be sent out later by General Gage, lay waste the buildings of Harvard College and others in the town as an example of the swift and terrible punishment King George was ready to mete out to subjects who were rebellious and took up arms to defy his authority.

Any thought of stopping in Cambridge now, however, was far from Percy's mind. In the course of the afternoon's fighting, he had seen what an aroused and hostile countryside could do to an invader. As a result, he was determined to get back to the main army in Boston as soon as possible by taking the shortest and safest route through Charlestown. He had regarded the Americans as "cowards" and "timid creatures," but was now in a position where he had to reverse his opinion. In a report the next day he wrote, "Many of them concealed themselves in houses and advanced within 10 yards to fire at me and other officers, though they were morally certain of being put to death themselves in an instant * * * nor will the insurrection here turn out so despicable as it is perhaps imagined at home. For my part, I never believed, I confess, that they would have attacked the King's troops, or have had the perseverance I found in them yesterday."

General Heath of the Provincial Militia had expected Percy would return over the

same route he had gone out in the morning, and had ordered the Great Bridge over the Charles to be dismantled and ambushed. He had even made hasty preparation to force Percy to take the road to the bridge if he did not choose to do so of his own accord. As a result, Percy's men found "near Cambridge, just as we turned down toward Charlestown" a small body of militia ready to block their advance.

(Percy's column wheeled to the left onto Beech Street from Massachusetts Avenue, a quarter of a mile beyond the spot where the three Americans had been killed in the fight at the empty casks, and came into the modern Somerville at the corner of Beech and Elm Streets.)

The militia were too inexperienced and too few in number to oppose Percy with anything like a frontal attack, but they exposed him to a hot fire from a grove not too far away and killed several of his men. As he had already done more than once on the retreat, Percy was compelled to unlimber his two fieldpieces and with cannonshot frighten and drive off his adversaries.

(This sharp encounter took place at the corner of Elm Street and Willow Avenue in Somerville, soon after the British had turned into Elm from Beech Street. A stone tablet near the corner marks the site of graves of the British soldiers who fell in the skirmish. The graves were dug in the front yard of the farmhouse of Timothy Tufts, which still stood in 1912 but is now gone. When the expeditionary force under Lieutenant Colonel Smith, going in the opposite direction, halted in front of the house in the early morning darkness, the Tufts were awakened by the barking of their dog. Mrs. Tufts and her husband looked out and saw some of the soldiers walking toward their well in the yard for a drink.)

The plan of General Heath to induce Percy to change his route and proceed by the college to the bridge across the Charles, where he would have been long delayed, thus failed. Almost a mile farther on, the redcoats, now moving swiftly in the last moments of daylight, came to a small pond at the foot of the present Laurel Street and Somerville Avenue. Overheated by their exertions and frantic with thirst, many of the soldiers threw themselves into the water to refresh their perspiring bodies and parched throats.

(The pond, like almost all features of what was unspoiled countryside or a small village comprising the west end of Charlestown in 1775, disappeared many years ago. Under the impact of urban growth, this part of Charlestown was set off as Somerville in 1842 and has been largely transformed in the past century.)

Another mile brought the rapidly advancing Regulars to the foot of Prospect Hill, where the Americans had one last great opportunity to train their inefficient weapons on the hard- and long-pressed foe. There were casualties of dead and wounded in the British ranks as volleys of shot and smoke poured off the southerly slopes of the hill. Once again Percy loaded up his two 6-pounders and brought them into play, checking the American fire.

While the British were waiting for the fieldpieces to fulfill their usual objective, some of the soldiers wandered away from the ranks and resumed their old habits of plunder. One of them entering the home of Samuel Shed on the north side of the road got so intrigued by the contents of a highboy and was occupied so long in making his selection of treasures that he was left behind and soon slain by the following militia. Bullets smashed through the window, killing the thief, riddling the highboy, and spattering the victim's blood on both the choice piece of furniture and the floor. Some property in Somerville was destroyed by fire, Ebenezer Shed nearby losing his

house and two other buildings and reporting damage to his fences and crops.

(The highboy was in existence as late as 1910 and still showed bloodstains and three bullet holes.)

James Miller, whose house farther along the road was to be damaged by the wildly firing redcoats, stood on the side of Prospect Hill and fired again and again. When the British spotted him and answered the fire of his musket, a companion urged him to withdraw, saying, "Come, Miller, we've got to go." Miller, 65 years of age, replied, "I'm too old to run," and remained to be struck by no less than 13 musket balls. He was the only American to be killed in Somerville.

(A tablet bearing the words of Miller's immortal reply marks the approximate location where he fell, on Washington Street opposite Rossmore Street, near the Pope School. Prospect Hill, an important fortification of the Continental Army during the siege of Boston that followed, will be discussed in the final report of the Commission.)

The British now left Prospect Hill behind them and a hinterland that never again was to live under the rule of King George or his corrupt and incompetent ministers. The troops sped along the half-mile stretch that was to bring them to Charlestown Common and Charlestown Neck. Once they were across the Neck their worries would be over. The warships in the river could lay down a fire that would rake the narrow isthmus, while any advance by the militia beyond it could be repulsed by a small force of artillery and infantry on Bunker Hill. General Heath appraised the situation correctly and ordered the militia not to proceed beyond Charlestown Common, but "to halt and give over the pursuit, as any further attempt upon the enemy in that position would have become futile."

(The Bunker Hill referred to above is not the eminence where the Battle of Bunker Hill was subsequently fought on June 17, 1775, but an elevation slightly higher and about a quarter of a mile farther to the northwest. The battle took place on what is properly and particularly called Breed's Hill, a title that was not widely known or used in 1775. Both elevations were regarded as part of the same hill or ridge and both of them, to our confusion now, were called Bunker Hill.)

As the Regulars pushed past the east brow of Prospect Hill, the well-trained battalion of 300 minutemen from Salem under Col. Timothy Pickering reached the top of Winter Hill, not more than a mile to the northwest. They saw the last of the running fight, but were too late to play any part in it.

7 p.m.

The last rays of daylight had faded and dusk was falling fast when the British column streamed into Charlestown Common and committed one last outrage to wind up the day's chronicle of violence. Edward Barber, 14 years of age and one of the 13 children of William Barber, a shipmaster, was at home and, from a window, watching the spectacular show made by the passing soldiers. The boy's head, in clear view above the window sill, was an easy mark for a redcoat, who possibly mistook the lad for a sniper. Struck at close range, the boy fell back to the floor and in an instant was dead. This regrettable act by an erratic and indiscriminating foe marked the end of the day's bloodshed. The score was now even. Revenge in full had been exacted for the misdeed of the boy with the hatchet at Concord Bridge.

(The above incident occurred near the present Sullivan Square, where the road to the Penny Ferry across the Mystic River connected the part of Malden that is now Everett with Charlestown. No discernible trace of the site is in evidence today.)

The militia companies that had followed the withdrawing redcoats converged on

Charlestown Common and their officers gathered at the foot of Prospect Hill for a council of war with General Heath. A guard was formed and sentinels posted to cover the road as far as Charlestown Neck.

Bands of minutemen from the farms and workshops of more distant Massachusetts towns now began to appear. The bulk of the increasing force was ordered to Cambridge, where headquarters were established for the first American army. Within the next 24 hours, their numbers were to grow rapidly as hosts of animated yeomen from the neighboring Colonies of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire trickled in to give support to their brothers in the "common cause." Then and there commenced the siege of Boston, an ordeal that was to continue for 11 months.

The last few musket shots flashed in the darkness as General Percy's exhausted troops filed over Charlestown Neck and reached the protection of Bunker Hill. There they flung themselves to the ground and waited, some of them for hours, until arrangements could be completed and boats provided to carry them across the river to Boston. Pickets from the 10th and 64th Regiments were sent over by General Gage to perform guard duty in Charlestown. An armistice was arranged by Percy and the selectmen so that strife was avoided in the town. Removal of the troops over the Charles, beginning with the wounded got underway and proceeded without attacks on either citizens or soldiers or the destruction of property. Thus ended the opening day of battle in the American Revolution.

The British forces, which did not exceed 1,800 at the peak of their strength, had been exposed to an almost continuous fire from an opposition that had no less than 3,700 men. The number pressing them at any one time, however, was never more than half of the total. The British losses were 73 killed, 174 wounded, 26 missing, a total of 273 casualties; while the Americans had 49 fatalities, 41 wounded, and 5 missing, a total casualty list of 95. In spite of the thousands of shots exchanged between the Regulars and the militia, seldom had the musket balls hit their targets. The widespread development of superior marksmanship, like the invention of superior weapons which marksmanship required, still lay in the future and had yet to be demonstrated on other battlefields.

AMERICAN-FLAG CARRIERS OF THE AIR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, a major concern of our Nation is the Berlin crisis. The recent Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva made little progress. Although the Soviet deadline for troublemaking in Berlin—the May 27 deadline—has come and gone without event, the possibility of a new Red blockade remains. By the same token, there is the possibility of a new Allied airlift, like the one in 1948, to keep West Berlin an island of freedom in the heart of Red-controlled East Germany.

The 1948-49 airlift was a notable feat. Backbone of the operation was the DC-4, the Air Force Skymaster. On a good day, the shuttle hauled 5,000 tons of food and fuel into West Berlin. The U.S. airlines that comprise the civil air reserve fleet cooperated in this crucial 11-month operation that kept the good people of West Berlin supplied with the

bare necessities of life and, equally important, was a tremendous morale builder.

The C-54 is obsolete today, and the tonnage landed in Berlin during those 11 months of Red blockade would be hopelessly inadequate. We would have to use much bigger aircraft, carrying bigger payloads. Moreover, our military authorities would have to rely heavily on an air merchant marine for turbine-powered airplanes and fully trained crews not only for emergencies in Central Europe, but in other world trouble spots at the same time.

Consider for a moment the Middle East. A year ago at this time, our apprehensive attention was fixed on the crisis in Iraq, Jordan, and Lebanon. American marines landed in Beirut, in response to the Lebanese Government's plea for assistance. Lebanon's independence was threatened by turbulence in Iraq, whose king was murdered and government overthrown. Jordan also sought help against subversive elements named by King Hussein as adherents of communism and Nasserism. Happily, we accomplished our mission successfully in Lebanon, without bloodshed. In Iraq, a few Americans were slain. Most American families were evacuated by air, thanks to the availability of U.S.-flag airliners which regularly fly into Middle Eastern capitals.

Militarily, last summer's events provided a laboratory for tactical, logistical, and strategic aviation. The Air Force attempted the nonstop movement of U.S.-based squadrons from North America to the eastern Mediterranean, using refueling techniques aloft on the operation. The readiness of the Sixth Fleet was tested and, in a few instances, found wanting for reasons that the Navy is seeking to correct.

It is known, too, that our airlift made possible the logistical support of British troops in Jordan. Without our air transport, no essential supplies—including motor fuel for their armor and other vehicles—would have arrived in Amman.

These events coincided, Mr. Speaker, with the formal ushering in of the U.S. jet age in commercial aviation. Little more than a year ago a Maryland-built propjet, the F-27, was flown from Fairchild's plant in Hagerstown to Baltimore's Friendship Airport for delivery to West Coast Airways, a leading U.S. local service airline that operates in the Pacific Northwest.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report, in keeping with the excellent observations being made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, that the first nonstop air operation between the United States and the Soviet Union will originate at Friendship International Airport on July 22.

I am informed that arrangements will soon be announced whereby the Vice President of the United States and a large party, including the president of Johns Hopkins University, will leave Friendship on a brandnew jet aircraft and will arrive in Moscow 8 hours later.

Mr. Speaker, this is significant for two reasons: Friendship was the first airport on the Atlantic seaboard to be ready for jet operations and Pan American World Airways, which will fly the Vice President in its new 707-321 airplane, made the first jet operation in and out of Friendship.

The Russian aircraft which brought First Deputy Premier Koslov to the United States 2 weeks ago required 11 hours for the trip; Pan American is confident that it can cut that flying time by approximately 3 hours. If this estimate is correct we have at our disposal an infinitely valuable propaganda weapon with which to combat the Soviet Union's boasts and exaggerations.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of competing air service between the United States and Russia. Pan American has a longstanding certificate for operations between the United States and Moscow. Early implementation of that certificate—and, reciprocally, giving equal privileges to the Russian airline, Aeroflot, could conceivably bring about a lessening of the cold war. Travel has long been referred to as a great broadener; travel between the United States and the Soviet Union, by Americans and Russians, would unquestionably be all to the good for all concerned. Let us hope the latest mission to Moscow brings a bilateral air agreement a little closer to realization. When that momentous treaty is finally signed, I can assure you that Friendship Airport will stand eager and able to handle the flights of both airlines in both directions.

Mr. JARMAN. From Oklahoma City, a Boeing 707 pure jet subsequently placed in service on Pan American World Airways' North Atlantic routes to London, Paris, and Rome, flew to Baltimore in something less than 2 hours. The occasion was the 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Subsequently, the Boeing Jet Clipper *America* was christened at National Airport by the First Lady.

Nowadays, we take for granted the daily jet flights between Baltimore-Washington and San Francisco-Los Angeles. We have a choice of competing airlines, American and TWA. A few weeks ago, in Tulsa, American Airlines dedicated a \$20 million jet maintenance base, for overhaul and servicing of pure jets that cost \$6 million complete, and prop-jets priced at \$3 million each.

The relationship of these developments and our military capacity to cope with recurring emergencies around the world is blatantly obvious. We of the Congress have got to amend our attitudes and concepts accordingly. There is room for improvement in achieving a sound partnership of national defense and civil air transport. The growth of the airlines and the strengthening of our security go hand in hand.

We have become accustomed to hearing bigness automatically denounced. The fact remains that the bigger our airlines become in terms of fleet modernization and expansion, the healthier their economic well-being, the greater will be their capabilities in time of mobilization.

As a member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have shared the concern of Senator Mike MONRONEY about the inadequacies of legislative provision for a merchant marine of the air. As chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, he is spurring the development of new types of turbine-powered aircraft ideally suited for air-freight transportation.

This is an appropriate time for such development. As those of us who represent defense production areas are painfully aware, the American aeronautical industries are experiencing sweeping changes in military procurement. The demand is no longer pressing for manned aircraft. But there remains the design-engineering genius of the industry, its productive capacity, and its abilities to equip the one transportation industry that is ready, on a few hours' warning, to convert from normal peacetime scheduled operations to keeping the worldwide supply lines flowing for the Military Establishment and the free world's security.

I am thinking particularly of U.S.-flag airlines on intercontinental routes, Mr. Speaker. The multiengine airliners of these carriers comprise a substantial share of the 250 to 300 aircraft making up the civil air reserve fleet. In the next few years, as Pan American and TWA take delivery of longer range jets, the Military Air Transport Service will be increasingly reliant on them and other U.S. international carriers, such as Northwest, for long-haul transportation to any part of the world. The first of the biggest pure jets, the Boeing 707-321, is inaugurating Clipper service in the Pacific in the near future. By mid-winter the big Douglas DC-8 jets will be in domestic and international service. In the meantime, the air merchant fleet in being—the 250 to 300 airliners now in the reserve—can handle 8½ million ton-miles of personnel or cargo transport daily. Writing in the May issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, William H. Hessler estimates it would cost the Government close to \$400 million annually to keep such a reserve fleet in readiness.

Mr. Hessler is an eminent student of military policy and a staunch advocate of an air merchant marine. He underlines the need for bigger and better U.S.-flag airlines on international routes. The United States can insure the development of these carriers with little or no subsidy in normal times, in his view. What is needed is a consistent and wise policy with regard to international aviation, and a soundly conceived air merchant marine that will not be subject to the wear and tear that the U.S. merchant fleets have known, because of feast and famine cycles.

It costs an average \$125 million annually in overall subsidies to keep the U.S. flag on the high seas. For various reasons, this investment is justified. Even so, in 1957, the United States had more tonnage than any other merchant power, with only a third of these vessels in active service. The rest were laid up in the reserve fleet. In recent days, it has been deemed necessary to scrap scores of World War II-built vessels because it costs too much to keep them

mothballed, and they are much too slow and otherwise uneconomical for present day operations.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma on this foresight and on the wonderful statement he is making. I hope that the gentleman's remarks will alert this Nation to the possibilities of an air-marine fleet. If this Nation were so alerted I think we would be in a better position economically to compete in the world and in case our military air fleet were otherwise engaged in any sort of operation we would be in a better military position.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and compliment him on the study that he has made. I should like to say that I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, the overseas airlines of the United States are off subsidy, but they are competing daily against formidable foreign competition as well as each other. The term "bigness" is hard to define. By most standards, American Airlines is the largest of the certificated carriers. Using other criteria, Eastern might be labeled the giant. There are some who regard Pan American as biggest because of its 65,000 miles of international routes, more than half the mileage that MATS flies in regular scheduled service. TWA is a big domestic trunkline as well as a good-sized overseas airline. But neither Pan American nor TWA can match Air France or BOAC in overall size. Furthermore, Air France has recently joined with Belgium's Sabena, Italy's Alitalia, and Germany's Lufthansa in a joint sales and promotional arrangement that could lead to merger. The move is frankly aimed at whittling down the U.S.-flag airlines' share of the transatlantic traffic which, incidentally, depends on the U.S. traveler.

These four airlines of the European Economic Community, and a fifth, the Royal Dutch KLM, are also seeking more extensive landing rights in the United States, including the use of San Francisco and Los Angeles as terminals on certain routes. The Europeans also compete with British Overseas Airways Corp. and its affiliate, British European Airways, both nationalized enterprises, as are many foreign international airlines.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. May I compliment my colleague on the very comprehensive and fine statement he is making. It is illustrative of the type of work he is doing on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We from the State of Oklahoma are particularly proud of the outstanding job that the gentleman is doing on that great committee.

Mr. JARMAN. I am grateful to the gentleman.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join my colleague from the Third District of Oklahoma in expressing appreciation to our very able colleague from the Fifth District for the remarks he is making today. I think the gentleman is one of the several good reasons why the Oklahoma people are very air-minded today, and why at least two of our cities in Oklahoma lay claim to being the air capital of the world. The gentleman very ably represents Oklahoma City in which our Civil Aeronautics Administration has located some of its most important operations, which play, I think, a great part in the advancement of civil aviation not only in the State of Oklahoma but throughout the entire country. I want to join my colleague [Mr. ALBERT] in commending the gentleman for the fine work he has done in this field and in other fields as well, for our State and the Nation.

Mr. JARMAN. I am grateful to my colleague for his contribution.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I am reluctant to intervene at this moment when various Members representing the State of Oklahoma are joining in this tribute to their native State as well as to the great aircraft industry. I probably would not intervene were it not for the fact that some reference has been made to several cities in Oklahoma as qualified to be the "air capital of the world," when it is generally known and accepted among all well informed persons that Wichita, Kans., for many years has been designated unofficially at least, as the air capital of the world. Further, probably four or five of the best known makes of aircraft are not only presently being produced at Wichita, Kans., but they were originally designed and developed in that city. In respect to the gentleman's remarks, I would like to make one observation. The gentleman now in the well of the House who is addressing us today, as well as many other Members of the House take a very serious view of government subsidies to any form of transportation as well as in other areas of our economy. Certainly, I am a member of that group. I think at such times we are all on the floor debating condemning subsidies to airlines as such, perhaps, we should keep in mind the circumstance that the gentleman from Oklahoma is describing. I refer especially to the fact that our transoceanic airlines are in direct competition with other air services that are not only subsidized but are, in fact, owned by the governments of the various countries under whose flag they fly. That is an entirely separate and distinct situation from the economic format by which our own great air fleet must compete. So, as dedicated as we all are, to removing subsidies as soon as possible, we must keep in mind the economic climate and competition that is always facing the air carriers flying the U.S. flag.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I was just wondering whether or not our good friends, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] have ever heard of an airport known as La Guardia in New York City. I would certainly offer that airport as a leader of aviation in the Nation. But, apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the gentleman from Oklahoma in the statement he is making today both as to the need for a merchant marine of the air and, secondly, what is equally of great importance, the fact that our U.S. air carriers are being whittled down in their routes and in their business by the foreign giants.

Surprisingly enough, these foreign giants are being aided by our own State Department. This is not a matter that started under this administration; the policy was followed in previous administrations. For the life of me, I cannot understand why when our State Department is negotiating with these countries, and we all admit that some amount of give and take is necessary for the maintenance of good diplomatic relations, but why can they not bargain as businessmen and if they are going to give a valuable route why not get a valuable concession in return? Specifically, we all know of one company which was given a round-the-world route by being allowed to cross the United States. At the same time Pan American which happened to be involved in the negotiations was only given a right, for example, to fly from Melbourne to Perth, Australia. Maybe six people commute between those two points in a week.

So it is very apparent to me, and I have been in the forefront of this fight and have made many speeches together with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], to correct this situation. I think the appropriate committee of this House should impress upon the State Department the procedures involved and point out how we are losing our rights in these business practices, the State Department aiding and abetting in the process.

I compliment the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his effective contribution and I hope that our committee in the very near future will ask that there be justification by the State Department and the executive branch for some of these certifications and landing rights that have been granted. For example, the Japanese airline now has the right to land in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, a right that no domestic air carrier enjoys. We hope they will change their attitude, not only explain it.

Additional attention is fixed on the fast-growing Russian carrier, Aeroflot, which will probably be flying between New York and Moscow once the necessary bilateral agreements take effect.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would point to the difference between

American and European business concepts. The Russians do not give a hoot about an airplane's profitability. The prime factor to them is national prestige and the effectiveness of the airline in advancing Russian international policies. The fact that an airplane is uneconomic because of high operating and maintenance cost is inconsequential.

Perhaps you noticed the other day that Soviet First Deputy Premier Kozlov flew nonstop from Moscow to New York in the new Russian turboprop TU-114. Obviously this trip was made to imply that the Russians are leading the way in the construction of commercial jet aircraft. Several weeks before the arrival of Mr. Kozlov in New York, however, a Boeing 707-321 flew nonstop from Seattle to Rome in less time than it took the Russian plane to arrive in the United States.

Unfortunately, some of our press put great emphasis on the Russian accomplishment while relegating the Boeing feat to the department of casual advancement.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. FOLEY. I was much interested in the gentleman's comments with regard to the F-27 plane. I would like to inform the gentleman that the latest count of the DC-3 or the C-47, still being used by the Air Force is 1,083. These planes are from 10 to 20 years old.

If I remember correctly the last C-47 was built 10 years ago.

I am vitally interested in the F-27 and am very happy that the gentleman referred to what is a significant advance in this field of jetprop aviation.

I want to thank the gentleman for his statement.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very much interested in the remarks which the gentleman has made about the comparative attention given to the Russian jet flight over the Moscow-New York route and the achievement of an American jetplane in flying from Seattle to Rome, because I agree with the gentleman that there was a great deal more attention in the press to the Russian accomplishment than there was given to the American accomplishment.

I think there might be some benefit from a full appreciation of the Russian capacity, but at the same time I think we need to be aware of and proud of what American aviation is doing. Any person who has flown on Russian airplanes engaged in civil transportation is aware immediately of one basic and fundamental difference that prevails between the Russian airplane in civil aviation and the American airplane in civil aviation. Even the TU-104-A, which is one of the prize Russian jets operating between Moscow and Prague, while they do a great deal of talking and a great deal of boasting about its accomplishments, falls short in the basic and fundamental proposition of regard for and precaution for passenger safety.

The thing that attracted my attention most vividly in that regard in flying on that plane as compared with flying on the 707 of the United States a day or two later was the fact that in connection with the emergency oxygen equipment for passenger use in case of emergency, the Russian equipment was equipment which required the manipulation of several valves. There were no instructions in English or in any language as to how to make the equipment operative. The stewardess who was on the plane was unable to communicate with anyone except in Russian. On the other hand, the Boeing 707 had oxygen equipment for passenger use which in the event of an emergency dropped down immediately and was operating at the time it came down to the passenger. There was no necessity for a passenger to understand instructions and to understand how to operate machinery in connection with that equipment.

I think that spells out what many might say is a small difference but nonetheless a significant difference that prevails in the Russian approach to aviation and the American approach to aviation. I think the regard which the American aircraft companies and American airlines across this Nation have taken for the passenger, for his safety and for his comfort and for his convenience, is one of the very great selling points for traveling under the American flag.

The gentleman has certainly performed a service today in his remarks and support of our American-flag carriers of the air.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. I know of the gentleman's recent experience in having made the trip to which he refers as recently as last November into Russia. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. Speaker, later this month Vice President Nixon will return the compliment in the form of a visit to Moscow to formally open the U.S. exhibition at the Moscow Trade Fair. It is encouraging good news that Mr. Nixon will make his nonstop flight from Washington to Moscow in the first intercontinental Boeing jetliner to be delivered to Pan American Airways. The use of this commercial jet transport capable of flying the same distance substantially under the time required by the Russian plane will be a dramatic demonstration of U.S. strides in international aviation.

In the democratic countries of the Western World, the airline is also a symbol of national pride and prestige, and often a nationalized corporation in which government runs the show or exercises a major stockholders' rights.

By contrast, our airlines management must account to the stockholder as well as the regulatory authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The international carrier has to go along with the U.S. Department of State as to the terms of bilateral route agreements. Even the domestic airlines chafe under such restraints. The big four in transcontinental U.S. operations were greatly alarmed 2 years ago when Qantas, the Australian line, was granted landing

rights in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York, as part of its round-the-world service with BOAC between Melbourne and London.

In Europe, TWA has long been hobbled by restrictions on one key segment of its service into Germany. This restriction is probably due to British opposition.

Congress has no part in the negotiation of bilateral route agreements, or in sanctioning their terms. Executive agreements do not require Senate ratification. Many of us are fully aware of the fact that U.S. airlines pay far higher salaries than foreign competitors, are subjected to many curbs in generating foreign passenger business, and are losing much of the traffic originating in the United States.

Congress has responsibility for the promotion and stimulation of interstate and foreign commerce and appropriations for the Nation's defense. We can, accordingly, make national policy which will provide for a merchant marine of the air of sufficient vigor, strength and size to serve as an integral part of our national defense and conform with our world leadership role as guardian of Western freedoms.

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

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleagues in their tribute to the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing to the House today this very thought-provoking and important message. Certainly, it is a matter that our Government should not only be interested in but take some action in reference to it. As an example, IATA is the international organization which determines rates that each of the country's airlines should abide by.

But, we find ourselves in an unusual situation where some of the foreign countries do not belong to IATA and consequently they, who are not members, do not adhere to an international rate structure at all. Particularly is that true with reference to a number of our sister republics to the south of us. So, I think the overall situation here, as has been said by other Members, should be considered by those in our Government who have been authorized to protect our own aviation industry, while at the same time we are promoting the best interests of our country with other nations around the globe. I want to join others in thanking the gentleman for bringing this message to the Congress.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER], may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the very sensible comments by the gentle-

man from Oklahoma bring to mind the remarkable achievement of an American pilot the other day who calmly brought a distressed plane to earth with 112 persons aboard.

Everyone watching television or listening to radio last Saturday night will never forget the dramatic story of the Pan American Airways plane which, on its departure for London, disengaged two of its six landing wheels. Just as the giant 707 jet began its climb for altitude, alert observers in the tower at Idlewild Airport quickly radioed Capt. Edward Sommers of his plight.

Immediately Captain Sommers verified his predicament and, as absolute final authority aboard the aircraft, directed the plane's return to Idlewild. That tens of thousands of the morbidly curious descended on the airport is an unfortunate thing; that their curiosity was rewarded by a resourceful and courageous performance by Captain Sommers and his crew is most fortunate.

From all accounts, passengers were told forthrightly of their situation. But the calm and confidence expressed by Captain Sommers were reassuring enough to prevent any panic and, to a large extent, substantially reduce the element of fear. The fact that most of the passengers ate a hearty dinner as the jet circled Idlewild is testimony to the excellent training of the Pan American crew.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma is doing a great service to his colleagues and to the American flying and investing public by bringing these important facts to our attention. I am happy to join with him in his remarks.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma has made a most interesting factual observation concerning the competitive practices of some airlines flying between Europe and the United States. As most Members of this body know virtually all transatlantic carriers flying a foreign flag are owned in large part by their governments. The only truly private enterprise airlines operating between the United States and Europe are TWA and Pan American.

It is an interesting fact, Mr. Speaker, that in the year 1948 more than 70 percent of transatlantic air passengers were being carried by U.S. airlines. Ten years later this figure had been drastically reduced so that in 1958 TWA and Pan American were carrying only slightly more than 42 percent of the air traffic across the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, there is another statistic that bothers me considerably. In 1948 approximately 55 percent of all travelers between the United States and Europe were U.S. citizens. Ten years later this figure had risen to an excess of 73 percent. This is an interesting phenom-

non, Mr. Speaker; more and more Americans are flying to Europe but less and less Americans, apparently, are flying on our own American-flag, privately owned air carriers.

I doubt very much that you would find an Englishman on anything but BOAC, a Frenchman on anything but Air France, or a Belgian on anything but Sabena. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Americans would be just as loyal in supporting their own international carriers.

Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to listen to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma and I concur most enthusiastically in everything he has said to date. The city of Philadelphia is becoming increasingly air conscious. Not only is Philadelphia already an important terminal for transatlantic traffic as well as a great variety of domestic operations, it is hoped also, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Aeronautics Board will continue to expedite the Transpacific Case which would provide Philadelphia with one plane jet service to the Orient bringing Philadelphia within 14 hours of Tokyo.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks following mine on the subject I have just discussed.

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

There was no objection.

HENRY CLAY CASSELL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on one of our former employees of the House of Representatives. Sometimes we lose sight of the contributions of our able and loyal personnel, the men and women who are always ready and willing to assist us in carrying on the duties of this body.

I speak of the gentleman who actually died at his desk carrying on the duties he has so loyally performed over the years. I refer to Mr. Henry Clay Cassell, the clerk of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Cassell collapsed and died of a heart attack at his desk at noon on Tuesday, July 7.

Mr. Cassell, a management authority in Government since 1936 came to Capitol Hill 10 years ago to work for the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. His job was particularly in the area of personnel administrative problems in the Federal Government.

Between the 81st and 83d Congresses, Mr. Cassell served as deputy director of the Industrial Construction Division of the National Production Authority.

He returned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1955 and was named clerk of the committee. During his years with our committee, Henry Cassell became well known throughout the Federal Government for his penetrating knowledge of the civil-service rules and regulations. He was always willing and able to help the many indi-

viduals who daily come to our committee for counsel and assistance in our civil-service program. Henry Cassell's work on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, was respected and appreciated by all its members.

Mr. Cassell was born in Hot Springs, Ark., and attended the Naval Academy and the University of Wisconsin, from which he graduated with a degree in management engineering.

He is survived by his wife, Nathalie, and young daughter, Dixie, at home, and Mrs. J. C. Lashley, of Raleigh, N.C., and Mrs. Kenneth R. Eubanks, of Japan.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the chairman of the committee in comments concerning the late clerk of our committee, Mr. Henry C. Cassell. When I was chairman of the committee in the 83d Congress, he was employed as a special staff investigator and worked on many of the problems that have developed into worthwhile legislation in the field of personnel administration in the Federal Government.

I know that the other members of the committee join with the chairman and me in deepest sympathy for the family that he has left behind.

I know that daily as we go about our legislative duties, we will pass milestones that are based upon some of the initial staff work in the area in which Mr. Cassell was concerned.

ACTIVITY OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the House a progress report of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the most important programs of this Congress and I think it is of sufficient importance to bring to the attention of the House the actions and activities of the committee and to report to you at this time information which I feel will be of interest.

First, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are tremendous responsibilities in connection with an important study and investigation of this kind. I fully realize, as do all members of our committee, that it is a tedious and difficult field in which

to give attention. I realize fully the sensitiveness of it and how highly important it is to the welfare of the country. You are familiar with the program of the subcommittee in the preceding Congress. There was great speculation as to what action our committee would take with reference to the continuation of this important work during this present session.

I. AUTHORIZATION

The Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight was appointed under the authority of section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, 60 Statutes at Large 812, House Resolution 7, 86th Congress, and House Resolution 56, 86th Congress, agreed to January 28, 1959.

II. STATEMENT OF POLICY

The purposes of the subcommittee and the agencies and subjects to be investigated are outlined in a policy statement adopted May 20, 1959, which I would like to quote for your information:

PURPOSES

To examine the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies, administering laws within the legislative jurisdiction of the parent committee, to see whether or not the law, as the Congress intended in its enactment, has been and is being carried out or whether it has been and is being repealed or revamped by those who administer it. The subcommittee will conduct investigations pertaining to the working of these independent regulatory commissions and agencies and pertaining to the adequacy of existing commission and agency laws and regulations and their administration. Such investigations are to assist the subcommittee in making legislative or other recommendations to the Congress and to the administrative commissions and agencies, and to fulfill the duty of legislative oversight and supervision as provided in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In pursuance of the foregoing, the subcommittee will also conduct investigations and make reports concerning matters referred to in the report of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, 85th Congress, 2d session, House Report No. 2711.

AGENCIES TO BE EXAMINED

- (1) Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Aviation Agency, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Food and Drug Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission;
- (2) Bureau of Standards, National Institutes of Health, Weather Bureau; and
- (3) Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Office of Alien Property, Public Health Service, Railroad Retirement Board, and other agencies within legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SUBJECTS TO BE CONSIDERED

- (1) Review and analysis of the laws and amendments, and intent of the Congress when enacted;
- (2) Area of the field regulated by each law, changing circumstances, and growth of the field since enactment;
- (3) Consideration of the legislative standards in the law to determine whether they can be drafted in more precise terms with the view of reducing administrative discretion;
- (4) Consideration of rules and regulations issued by the agency under the discretionary delegations, reconciliation with statutory standards and legislative intent, manner in which rules have been applied in practice;

(5) Administrative interpretations and practices apart from formal rules and regulations, public notice of such interpretations and practices, extent to which in fact administration is by internal interpretations as distinguished from published rules;

(6) Judicial decisions on the administration of the law of the agency, the statutory standards, rules and regulations, and administrative interpretations, enlargement of area of regulation supported by the decisions;

(7) Enforcement of statute, rules and regulations; and

(8) Organization of agency:

(a) Independence and bipartisanship of Commission, as intended in its creation; identification of the regulators with the regulated;

(b) Personnel: Experience, relationship to agency policy, status under civil service; and

(c) Workload, distribution of personnel as to statutory duties or on duties assumed through administrative interpretations, coordination with State and other regulatory agencies, trade, or industry enforcement groups.

III. SUBCOMMITTEE ACHIEVEMENTS AND PENDING MATTERS

Thus far, due to the limitations of time and of the size of its staff, the subcommittee has had to confine the major part of its activities to certain problems in the so-called big-six independent regulatory agencies: Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

The subcommittee in its 1958 hearings heard testimony concerning proceedings before all six agencies. However, the most extensive hearings concerned the Federal Communications Commission. Such hearings pertained, among other matters, to 14 representative comparative TV proceedings before the Commission illustrating the apparent inconsistency of the application of the standards used in granting TV licenses. These 14 cases were as follows:

Channel 10, Sacramento, Calif.; Commission decision of September 29, 1954.

Channel 5, Boston, Mass.; Commission decision of April 24, 1957.

Channel 3, Hartford, Conn.; Commission decision of July 18, 1956.

Channel 13, Indianapolis, Ind.; Commission decision of March 6, 1957.

Channel 11, St. Louis, Mo.; Commission decision of March 27, 1957.

Channel 7, Miami, Fla.; Commission decision of January 18, 1956, as modified by decision of June 20, 1957.

Channel 12, Jacksonville, Fla.; Commission decision of August 29, 1956.

Channel 8, Tampa, Fla.; Commission decision of August 4, 1954.

Channel 7, Denver, Colo.; Commission decision of June 26, 1953.

Channel 7, Seattle, Wash.; Commission decision of July 25, 1957.

Channel 3, Madison, Wis.; Commission decision of December 7, 1955.

Channel 10, Knoxville, Tenn.; Commission decision of January 11, 1956.

Channel 10, Norfolk, Va.; Commission decision of May 29, 1956.

Channel 4, New Orleans, La.; Commission decision of July 11, 1956.

The subcommittee is inquiring into the formulation of feasible proposals to minimize the difficulties inherent in a situation where the Commission is compelled to select one among several equally qualified applicants.

The subcommittee also received testimony on comparative TV cases in which competing applications were dismissed because of merger or other agreement. These cases include the following:

Channel 8, Caribou, Maine.

Channel 8, Presque Isle, Maine.

Channel 12, Clovis, N. Mex.

Channel 62, Evansville, Ind.

Channel 13, Huntington, W. Va.

Channel 8, Muskogee, Okla.

Channel 15, Lebanon, Pa.

Channel 11, Fort Worth, Tex.

Channel 4, San Juan, P.R.

Channel 6, Bluefield, W. Va.

Channel 2, Bangor, Maine.

Channel 83, Wilmington, Del.

Channel 51, Saginaw, Mich.

Channel 40, Sacramento, Calif.

Channel 7, Roanoke, Va.

Channel 35, Erie, Pa.

Channel 5, Fort Smith, Ark.

Channel 42, Topeka, Kans.

Channel 13, Jefferson City, Mo.

Channel 7, Wausau, Wis.

Channel 6, Knoxville, Tenn.

Channel 67, Allentown, Pa.

Channel 8, Des Moines, Iowa.

Channel 13, Portland, Maine.

Channel 36, Atlanta, Ga.

Channel 6, Beaumont-Port Arthur Tex.

Channel 4, Denver, Colo.

Channel 6, Superior, Wis.

Channel 12, West Palm Beach, Fla.

Channel 17, Tulsa, Okla.

Channel 13, Stockton, Calif.

Channel 6, Whitefish Bay, Wis.

Channel 2, Tulsa, Okla.

Channel 2, Klamath Falls, Oreg.

Channel 2, Spokane, Wash.

Channel 4, Sioux City, Iowa.

Channel 52, Erie, Pa.

Channel 8, Charleston, W. Va.

Channel 11, Durham, N.C.

Channel 23, Philadelphia, Pa.

Channel 7, Amarillo, Tex.

Channel 13, Houston, Tex.

Channel 12, Milwaukee, Wis.

Channel 17, Philadelphia, Pa.

Channel 11, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Such cases have raised serious questions as to the good faith and methods of certain applicants. The extent to which procedures designed to promote equitable results are being abused and turned to selfish ends will receive further study by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee also received evidence concerning the length of record and length of time required in 53 TV cases involving nearly all sections of the United States. This study covered the period July 1, 1954, to March 7, 1958, and was introduced into the hearings record on May 15, 1958. It appears that, exclusive of the pages required for pleadings, motions, exceptions, briefs and court proceedings, the pages consumed in Commission hearing transcripts, depositions and exhibits totaled 317,837.

It also shows filing of 10,860 exceptions by parties to the proceedings. The necessity for this tonnage of paper work is being currently investigated by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee also received extensive evidence relating to the nature and scope of the TV station transfer problem whereby, after long and complicated comparative hearings to choose the best applicant for a TV channel, the winning applicant has, in many instances soon after receiving the grant, transferred it to a company which had not undergone a comparative hearing to determine that the license granted to it would be in the public interest. This is another problem being studied by the subcommittee.

Testimony before the subcommittee in 1958 disclosed widespread use of off-the-record communications in contested television license application cases before the Commission. You have all heard of the celebrated Miami channel 10 case in which serious charges of misconduct were made against an FCC Commissioner and an attorney for a license applicant. In addition, other cases in which the subcommittee heard testimony involved channel 11, St. Louis, Mo., May 26 and June 2; channel 4 in the same city, May 26; and channel 2 in that city and Springfield, Ill. In the latter case, known widely as the Sangamon Valley case, hearings were held on May 22, 26, 28, and June 2, 9, and 11. And on June 2, 1958, testimony was heard on the following cases:

Channel 7, Miami; channel 12, Jacksonville; channel 9, Orlando; channel 7, Buffalo, N.Y.; channel 10, Parma, Mich.; and channel 7, Denver, Colo.

A number of cases have been returned to the Federal Communications Commission for reconsideration, either on the Commission's own motion or as a result of remand orders of appellate courts. I have already mentioned the Miami channel 10 case. As a result of disclosures made by the subcommittee, an order awarding a construction permit has been reversed by the court of appeals and the case remanded to the Commission for hearing on specified issues relating to misconduct, possible disqualification of a Commissioner, and improper influence. The Commissioner and an attorney representing the prevailing applicant before the Commission were indicted for conspiracy to swing the Commissioner's vote to the attorney's client. A prolonged trial in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia resulted in a jury disagreement on July 10, 1959.

In the Sangamon Valley Television Corp. case, in which the Commission withdrew VHF channel 2 from Springfield, Ill., and assigned it to St. Louis, Mo., after comparative hearings had been held for the channel license in Springfield, the record of the subcommittee is replete with instances of ex parte contacts between Commissioners and parties to Commission proceedings. On the basis of our disclosures the Supreme Court of the United States vacated an order of the court of appeals which upheld the Commission's order

and remanded the case to the court of appeals for appropriate action. After hearings, the court of appeals vigorously condemned the improper practices resorted to by some of the parties and remanded the case to the Commission for evidential hearings before a special hearing examiner regarding the improprieties disclosed in the subcommittee's records. Conclusion of the remand proceedings is awaited.

Another case remanded because of revelations of improprieties before our subcommittee involved the grant for channel 9 in Orlando, Fla. This, like the Sangamon Valley case, has also been remanded to the Commission for an evidential hearing before a specially appointed hearing examiner. In this case, however, one of the parties has raised a question as to the legality of the action of the court of appeals in returning the case to the Commission, some of whose own members may have been guilty of improprieties. The petitioner contends that the court of appeals alone has power, perhaps through a special master, to consider evidence of possible improprieties at the Commission level. He argues that the FCC cannot be ordered by a court to investigate itself to see if it has acted illegally. Should these contentions be upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, questions of importance would be raised which would require the attention of the subcommittee and of the Congress.

Other cases for reconsideration by the Commission, similar to those mentioned in that they involve issues of improper ex parte influences at the Commission level revealed by our subcommittee hearings, concern channel 7 in Miami, Fla., and channel 8 in Peoria, Ill.

In connection with the FCC investigation, the subcommittee staff prepared a 171-page study in subcommittee print form entitled "Regulation of Broadcasting: Half a Century of Government Regulation of Broadcasting and the Need for Further Legislative Action." The needs indicated in this report are likewise now being studied by the subcommittee.

Our 1958 report recommended further investigating work and study of certain operations of each commission. This is now being done.

It should be emphasized that the subcommittee realizes that the irregularities disclosed by its investigation are in many instances the result of inordinate delay and cumbersome procedures. Our subcommittee is busy studying remedies for this situation. We may not be able to abolish sin, but we do have a responsibility to create an atmosphere where slipshod and unethical practices are no more welcome than a turkey buzzard at a hens' picnic.

As I suggested in reading the subcommittee's statement of policy, much of our ultimate concern is with the statutes administered by the agencies and the strengthening of the administrative process. Our hearings have revealed many instances in which we think the statutes are inadequate. The pace of

technological change casts considerable doubt as to whether the regulatory powers delegated to the agencies are now sufficient. A statute adequate for the technology of a generation ago is obviously not broad enough to provide the power needed by regulatory agencies in the space age.

Some of the recommendations contained in the subcommittee report—House Report No. 2711, 85th Congress, 2d session—concerning legislation needed for these independent regulatory commissions, are contained in H.R. 4800 which was introduced by me on February 19, 1959. In this bill Congress declares that—

It is vitally important in the public interest to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of the independent regulatory agencies and to increase the confidence of the public in the efficient, fair, and independent operation of these agencies, and, to this end, it is necessary to take action—

(1) to guard against the exertion of improper influence upon such agencies, and against improper conduct by members and employees of such agencies;

(2) to insure the observance of proper ethical standards by the members and employees of such agencies, by the parties, by persons acting for or on behalf of such parties, and by other persons;

(3) to preclude the making of communications to members or employees of such agencies, with respect to proceedings before such agencies, in such a way that participants who should be given notice of such communications will not be informed thereof;

(4) to authorize each such agency to choose its own chairman.

(5) to provide for greater assumption of personal responsibility, by the members of such agencies, for the preparation of agency opinions; and

(6) to clarify and make uniform the power of the President to remove members of such agencies for cause.

On April 29, 1959, at the request of the American Bar Association, I also introduced H.R. 6774 which contains provisions intended in certain areas to accomplish the foregoing declaration of policy contained in H.R. 4800. These bills, however, differ in many material respects. In the near future, hearings will be held on each of these bills. As a result of recent hearings to which I shall refer in a moment, it is clear that there is need for amendments to each of these bills. I am confident that such amendments will be formulated after the conclusion of the legislative hearings on the bills.

The subcommittee recognizes the necessity for regulatory commissions to have continuous access to information from the so-called regulated industry, in order to regulate with intelligence. The subcommittee, however, is engaged in the most difficult task of studying where the line should be drawn between ease of access to needed information, and improper influence.

IV. RECENT PANEL DISCUSSIONS

The subcommittee has recently concluded a series of provocative and informative hearings. I sent invitations to

commissioners and selected staff members of the six major independent agencies under our jurisdiction, to practitioners before the agencies, and to representatives of the regulated industry, bar associations, trade associations, and the Federal Trial Examiners' Conference.

The four topics selected for discussion were as follows:

First. What legislative or administrative measures have been or should be taken to preclude attempts to influence Commission members or employees by means which do not afford a fair opportunity to interested persons materially affected by Commission action to present their case, and at the same time preserve the necessary access by the Commission to information from the public, the regulated industry and others?

Second. The role of hearing examiners. Present strengths and weaknesses. What legislative measures should be taken to increase their stature and effectiveness?

Third. The role of commissioners and their immediate staffs and agency staffs, and the division of responsibilities. Present strengths and weaknesses. What legislative or other measures, if any, are needed?

Fourth. The efficiency of the commissions. What changes, if any, in the existing statutory provisions relating to substance or procedure are needed to enable the commissions to cope with the increasingly enormous volume of business coming before them?

The hearings took the form of panel discussions on these broad topics. Each participant was asked to present a written statement of his own individual views on any or all of the selected topics. Readings and oral summaries of the prepared statements were punctuated by questions from members and the chief counsel of the subcommittee and among the panelists themselves. The subcommittee felt that a hearing in which experienced participants in the administrative process would feel entirely free to discuss their divergent views would be a useful medium of information. The response of those invited was gratifying, and the subcommittee's expectations have been amply rewarded.

The primary aim of the panel discussions was to furnish the subcommittee with information from the commissions themselves, practitioners before them, members of the regulated industry, and representatives of bar associations and trade associations as to what steps in addition to those contemplated in H.R. 4800 are required in order to strengthen the fair and efficient operation of the regulatory agencies. By focusing attention on carefully selected, live and controversial issues and encouraging each panelist to present his own views, the subcommittee received much important information.

The panel discussion hearings have developed areas concerning which uniform rules applicable to all the commissions may be feasible and likewise developed certain areas where such uniform rules are not practical. As a result

of these discussions, the subcommittee has been impressed by the conclusion reached by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman in the 1955 Report of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure, page 47:

Much discussion of the administrative process in action suffers from the lack of precise and up-to-date factual information as to how various procedures currently operate.

As chairman of the subcommittee I am instituting a program whereby members of the subcommittee staff and the staffs of the various commissions will, on an agency-by-agency basis, make a study to supply the precise and up-to-date factual information referred to by Judge Prettyman. Such study does not mean, however, that there should be any delay in the holding of hearings on the legislative proposals contained in H.R. 4800 and H.R. 6774. H.R. 4800 is based on a body of factual information compiled by the subcommittee during its hearings in 1958. However, H.R. 4800 does not and was not intended to cover the entire field in which remedial legislation may be necessary. The staff study which the subcommittee is now undertaking is intended to accumulate the information needed to formulate any necessary additional legislative or administrative improvements.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a letter which I sent under date of June 26, 1959, to each chairman of these six regulatory, so-called Big Six, independent agencies of the Government, and also a memorandum in which we outline for discussion with the chairmen of these Big Six agencies material in order to come to an understanding as to what the program would be and what we would undertake to get from them.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

(Letter sent by Chairman HARRIS to James R. Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; John C. Doerfer, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Jerome K. Kuykendall, Chairman, Federal Power Commission; Earl W. Kintner, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Kenneth H. Tuggle, Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission; and Edward N. Gadsby, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.)

JUNE 26, 1959.

During the discussions held before the subcommittee from June 15 to date, panelists representing regulatory commissions, the regulated industry and practitioners agreed that administrative proceedings in many instances are characterized by unreasonable delay, volume of record and expense, and that something should be done to correct the situation. However, it was recognized that there is not enough useful data available to formulate practicable legislative or administrative remedies. This lack of data was referred to by Judge Prettyman in the 1955 report of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure, page 47:

"Much discussion of the administrative process in action suffers from a lack of precise and up-to-date factual information as to how various procedures currently operate."

I am now suggesting to you and each of the chairmen of the five other independent regulatory agencies that we institute and accomplish the following program aimed at producing as promptly as possible a body of

up-to-date factual information which could be used in devising proper remedies for some of the recognized deficiencies.

The chief counsel of the subcommittee and staff members designated by him and the General Counsel of each Commission and Board and staff members designated by the Chairman of same should be constituted as an Advisory Council on Administrative Problems (of which the subcommittee counsel would be Chairman) with directions to:

(1) Formulate and submit to the subcommittee and to the chairmen of the commissions and board an agenda outlining the areas within the sphere of action of each agency which should be inquired into by such Advisory Council for the purpose of accumulating the body of useful data referred to hereinabove.

(2) Following approval of such agenda by the subcommittee, the Advisory Council should proceed to compile on an agency-by-agency basis the information called for in the agenda.

(3) On or before November 30, 1959, the Advisory Council should report to the subcommittee the results of its work, with recommendations as to what legislative, administrative or other measures are needed.

The suggested program will not cause any delay in the hearings, report and action on H.R. 4800. H.R. 4800, which provides against improper ex parte pressures, commission selection of chairmen, and clarification of the power of the President to remove agency members for cause, is based upon factual information developed in the 1958 hearings of the subcommittee. The Advisory Council's work would be primarily directed to areas in the administrative process, such as operational efficiency, which are not covered by H.R. 4800.

I should like to have your views on the foregoing suggestions. You will understand that the proposal is one of a cooperative venture by the staffs of the subcommittee and the regulatory agencies intended to aid in improving the fair and efficient operation of the agencies.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

JULY 6, 1959.

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Advisory Council on Administrative Problems.

From: Robert W. Lishman, Chief Counsel, House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight.

Subject: Draft outline of certain administrative problems to be included in the agenda referred to in the June 26, 1959, letter of Chairman HARRIS to the chairmen of the six regulatory commissions.

The outline below indicates the main points to be reported on by the Advisory Council on Administrative Problems.

It is recognized that while certain principles are uniformly applicable to all six regulatory agencies, there are some areas which require individualized treatment. The outline is to be supplemented by additional headings and subheadings deemed by each commission as appropriate to cover its own particular requirements.

OUTLINE TO BE SUPPLEMENTED BY EACH OF THE SIX REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

1. Case delays—nature, extent, causes, and possible remedies.

2. Excessive length of records.

3. Excessive cost of proceedings.

4. Availability of public information concerning:

(a) rules and regulations;

(b) policy; and

(c) commission's operating procedures.

5. Division of responsibilities between commissioners and staff.

6. Hearing examiners—their recruitment, functions and responsibilities.

The books are full of investigations, studies and reports depicting the ills of the administrative process. However, since passage of the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946, there has been little or no significant remedial action taken by either Congress or the commissions.

The underlying purpose of the Advisory Council is to get some action on constructive proposals aimed at eliminating unreasonable case delays, cumbersome procedures, and unnecessary expense. It will compile factual information on a commission-by-commission basis as to how various procedures currently operate, recommend a program, and assist the Congress and the commissions in carrying the program into effect. If members of the Advisory Council proceed with the necessary vigor, the job of translating this study into action will be done. Outmoded administrative procedures must be changed to meet the needs of the times. The Advisory Council should provide constructive assistance in formulating practical measures for adoption by the Congress and the commissions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I include this memorandum at this point because on yesterday at a luncheon which I arranged with the Chairmen of the so-called Big Six independent agencies, all of whom were present, and incidentally, it was held at the University Club, we sat down and talked about this proposal and how it might accomplish the objective sought for this additional information. I am glad to report, Mr. Speaker, that the response was gratifying and each of the Chairmen of these regulatory agencies entered into it wholeheartedly and enthusiastically and expressed themselves as feeling that such an Advisory Council might accomplish a great deal, but some of them suggested that we work with such an advisory group that is being set up within the bar association itself.

The panel discussion hearings which the subcommittee held from June 15 to June 26, 1959, resulted in a tremendous amount of useful legislative data.

CLIMATE FOR IMPROPER PRESSURES

Our recent hearings indicated factors in the climate surrounding the administrative process which are conducive to the kind of improper pressure we seek to prevent.

DIFFERENCES AMONG THE AGENCIES

One of the most valuable results of our recent hearings is the awareness brought home to the subcommittee of the many ways in which the agencies differ one from the other in their aims and functions. These differences necessitate caution in proposing reforms of general across-the-board applicability. The subcommittee believes that while there is room for improvement of the operations of all the agencies, the important differences in performance between them must not be obscured. Some appear to be more efficient in disposing of their work than others. Some provide fuller disclosure of their policies and operations to the public than others. Some enjoy greater respect than others

from the regulated industry and from practitioners and sister State agencies.

The subcommittee is very much alive to the fact that when it comes to legislating for the agencies, sauce for the goose is not necessarily sauce for the gander. The subcommittee is active now in ascertaining what kinds of legislative remedies can practicably be applied uniformly to each agency and what kinds must be tailored to suit peculiarities in individual agencies.

DELAYS AND HEAVY EXPENSE

One of the commonest complaints aired in our recent hearings concerns the protracted delays and heavy expenses attending many agency proceedings. The virtual unanimity of these criticisms struck the members of the subcommittee very forcibly. This is particularly so because one of the Congress' chief reasons for resort to the administrative process in the first place was the need for specialized, expeditious, and comparatively informal procedures. Supporters of regulation by agencies believed that certain kinds of disputes could be more cheaply and effectively disposed of if they were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of ordinary courts of general jurisdiction.

REASONS FOR DELAY

Participants in our panel discussions ventured a kaleidoscopic variety of reasons for the agencies' inability to dispose expeditiously of their workloads. Inadequate personnel, cumbersome hearing procedures, excessive intra-agency review of hearing findings, obstructionism by parties, inefficient, and bureaucratic staff work, unnecessary formalism, inadequate internal separation of functions, excessive internal separation of functions, lack of authority in hearing examiners to control the record—these and a number of other causes were assigned all or part of the blame for time- and money-consuming delays.

STAFF STUDY

The staff of the subcommittee is engaged in sifting and analyzing the reasons for delays advanced by our panelists. As a part of this study, the staff will conduct a factual and statistical investigation to ascertain what can be done in each agency to bring about the efficient and flexible operations contemplated by its congressional creators and which the regulated industries are entitled to expect.

As I have already stated, the staff is now engaging in a program of investigation and study on an agency-by-agency basis designed to elicit a body of up-to-date factual information which may be used in drafting further measures to improve fair and efficient operation of the regulatory agencies.

Meanwhile, the subcommittee and its staff are also engaging in investigations of specific cases and situations which appear to require more immediate correction.

None of these investigations of these cases, however, will be presented at public hearings until each has been carefully documented and the subcommittee

has determined that the public interest requires such presentation.

CONCLUSION

The subcommittee is making investigations and studies in most delicate and controversial areas. It has been assigned tremendous responsibilities, since its jurisdiction encompasses not only the six independent regulatory commissions but also numerous other legislative agencies. Investigation of any one of these commissions would in itself be a major undertaking. The complexity and enormity of the task is indicated by the testimony before the subcommittee on November 19, 1958, of Dean James M. Landis:

If it takes a good man to do a good job with railroads, trucking, securities, television, or radio, it really takes a genius adequately to cover all these fields.

Notwithstanding the immensity of the job, we believe that in important selected areas the subcommittee is accomplishing a great deal of value in the strengthening of the commissions and in gaining the confidence of the public in their operations. It is already evident that the very existence of the subcommittee and its carefully planned surveillance of the commissions are helping all concerned to a keener appreciation of their duties to serve no master but one—the public interest.

SPAIN'S SUCCESSFUL STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COFFIN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOLYA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MONTOLYA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the well of this House this afternoon to salute the friendly Government and the great people of Spain. I do this with full realization that we in the Congress and the American people appreciate the great contributions that flow from the Spanish people in the maintenance of our military posture within the continent of Europe. Their friendliness and the strategic position of their country as the gateway to the Mediterranean have indeed girded a bridge of common and mutual effort in our fight against communism.

The great struggle of our age is the struggle against Communist totalitarianism. One of the countries in which this struggle first began was Spain. In Spain, leaders in politics, among the military, and in the Catholic Church were among the first to realize the evil implications of communism and to fight it in one of the important wars of history. It is well to recall Spain's contribution, both in this struggle and in innumerable other ways, as the Spanish people celebrate on July 18 the historic date of the initiation of the trial-by-fire of their so-called civil war.

Spain has made contributions of great intrinsic merit to the 20th century world. These Spanish gifts to modern civilization rest on the devotion to certain

ideas which are important to the integrity of the West. When one looks at Spain through the reflecting pools of history, one sees its two great roles in accidentally guiding the destiny of our great country.

On the one hand, we see it as the world power in the 15th century sending its conquistadores in steel armor into strange lands. Trekking along the paths of conquest with these men of armor are the Friars planting the seeds of Christianity in the New World. Little did they realize that their intrepidity and hardship were to constitute the cornerstone of the world's greatest liberty-loving nation. But the fact remains that out of their sweat, toil, and hardship emerged a great composite region within the continental United States.

Spain can truly and historically lay claim to a great part of our early American history. Her Majesty Queen Isabella of Spain gave an attentive ear and material help to the navigator, Columbus. Her spirit and encouragement guided him to the initial discovery of America.

The Spanish conquistadores, Ponce de Leon, Cabeza de Vaca, and Coronado opened up the southern and southwestern part of our country long before the landing at Plymouth Rock. The treasured influence of the Spanish conquest is evidenced today in many of the verdant valleys of our prosperous country.

Now, four centuries later, we as a nation have grown strong, while Spain has seen its great domain shrink. It is no longer a world power; it is struggling for rebirth. Internally its parliamentary Government exists in name only.

The political complexion of the country in 1936 forced a division into right and left. The splinter parties chose sides as the Cortes, the legislative body, was dissolved by presidential decree. The political parties abandoned the political arena and started recruiting armies from within their ranks.

The leftist groups organized for war; the rightists followed. The regular army sided with the rightists. The leftist group which included the Communist Party found a willing ally in Russia; the rightists secured aid from Hitler and Mussolini. Before too long the leftist organization was infiltrated at the policy level by the Communists. As the Communists' position became more secure they began their familiar pattern of removing those who disagreed; elimination and extermination became the fearful consequences of this unsuspecting concession within the leftist camp.

General Franco and the rightist army eventually triumphed in the civil war. Amidst all the tragedy of war, communism had found a formidable foe in General Franco. Spain was no longer a nesting ground for this menace.

As for Hitler's and Mussolini's expectations of concessions, General Franco then assumed the role of statesman and pleaded strict neutrality as World War II started. This proved to be a great contribution to the Allied cause because the Pyrenees became the dead end of the Hitler onslaught. Neutralist Spain was the shield which enabled the Allied armies to enter the Mediterranean and

supply our forces with the sinews of war. If Spain had joined our side it would have been steamrollered by Hitler's hordes, thus giving Germany a beachhead in, and a gateway to, the Mediterranean.

Forgive me for delving into history with such detail, but I felt it necessary to do so in order to piece into proper focus the true contributions which this friend has made possible for our country.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Spaniards and Americans are not strangers. Nothing historically, traditionally, or culturally in the United States is foreign to the Spaniard, simply because it was his ancestors who discovered America—and that communion of interest between our two countries, with a few variations, has been maintained to this very day.

It would be impossible to find an expert, militarily or politically, who would deny the great importance of Spain as a factor in the common resistance to the communistic menace. All one need do, as one of our great military leaders put it, "is look at the map of Europe."

Spain guards the gateway to the Mediterranean; it holds the key to the communications between Europe and Africa, the key to the communications between the Mediterranean basin and the Western Hemisphere and, therefore, the key to the gateway between Asia and America. It is, in fact, the point of contact of four continents. For us to be able to use Spain's naval and air bases on the Atlantic and the Mediterranean is a decided step in the direction of maintaining the peace.

In addition, Spain is blessed with the Pyrenees Mountains, a high and almost indestructible range of mountains which seal off the Iberian Peninsula. The Pyrenees separate Spain and Portugal from the rest of Europe. They would serve as a tremendous military advantage in the event of trouble.

The Iberian Peninsula is important and could prove vital to the defense of the West. The strategic value of Spain for the defense of the western Mediterranean and Atlantic sea lanes that connect Europe with the Western Hemisphere has already been recognized by the 1953 agreement between the United States and Spain. To take advantage of the strategic potential of the Iberian Peninsula, the United States is making a multi-million-dollar investment in developing naval and air bases on Spanish territory.

The Western Allies owe a debt of gratitude to Spain because, even though not a member of the Atlantic alliance and thus not enjoying the advantages and protection that the alliance provides, it has agreed to the establishment of bases on its soil and has thus identified itself with the cause of the West. In the event of war these bases would be major targets of the Communist military establishment.

Our base agreement with Spain entered into September 26, 1953, is regarded as one of the best military agreements we have in the world. As evidence of this statement I wish to incorporate a statement joined in by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles

in a nationwide television program, December 23, 1957, to wit:

President EISENHOWER. Now on his way back from Paris, Secretary Dulles briefly visited in Spain. He conferred with General (Francisco) Franco and others in the Spanish Government. I know you would like him to take a minute to give you a brief summary of that visit.

Secretary DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I was just saying that there are many strands in the fabric of the free world. NATO doesn't represent them all, and they all have to be carefully nurtured because, combined, they make the strength which is going to make the free world safe. My stop-over at Madrid illustrates, I think, that point, because Spain is not itself a member of NATO.

On the other hand, we do have with Spain important arrangements which contribute very greatly to the strength and defense of the free world and of the NATO area.

We have, as a result of agreements which we made about 4 years ago, arrangements for building there a series of airbases, and also a naval base, for the joint use of Spain and the United States—

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico for the fine historical facts he is telling the House and for the excellent presentation he has made. I am in accord with his remarks.

As we look back over history, particularly World War II, when we take into consideration that Germany and the Axis were right at the back door of Spain—no doubt, perhaps, could have crossed the Pyrenees—had not Spain showed the courage she showed by remaining neutral, we can then realize the importance of Spain.

When I think of the contribution that Spain has made to this country, I think of a book that was written by the Honorable Carlton J. H. Hayes, the former U.S. Ambassador to Spain during the war. I would like to quote that part of the book in which he says:

Not only did it assure us as early as February 1943 that it would join us in the war if the Axis should attempt an invasion of Spain. Not only did it permit us to use Spain as the base for invaluable espionage of the Axis activities in France and the Mediterranean, it also accorded us important positive favors. It allowed us to get over 1,200 American airmen safely across the peninsula without any internment. It permitted the transit and exit of over 25,000 members of the French resistance movement as reinforcements for the Allied armies in North Africa. It choked off export of strategic war materials to Germany before any other neutral nation had done so. Spain, too, was the first country to conclude a permanent air agreement with us, and one whereby we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes. ("Wartime Mission to Spain," by the Honorable Carlton J. H. Hayes, Macmillan Co., pp. 91 and 92.)

Further, in the present cold war Spain has given us the right to airbases over there at the most strategic spot in the world. I am in full agreement with the gentleman, and I am more than happy

to join in the statements which he has made.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA] for not only calling to the attention of the Congress but also to the rest of the world that Spain is displaying today the same courage she displayed in the past. She had the courage to stand up and fight against communism; she ultimately won the victory. And, if you want to see something to remind you of those days, just go to Barcelona on a Sunday morning, not only Sunday but any day of the week, and if you are living in a hotel, you will hear the constant drum of the feet of the women on their way to pay tribute to their sons and husbands who were slaughtered at that time. Barcelona was the headquarters of the Communist Party. The women are still in mourning and they still wear the same type of dress. The massacre lasted 3 years. When I think of what we are doing for the rest of the world, I think of the condition Spain was in in those 3 years from 1936 to 1939. We did not dump in much money to give her the hand and the lift that she deserved, but we did do one thing that I can never forget as a Congressman, when this Nation allowed the Lincoln Brigade to go over there. I want to congratulate the women of Spain especially. It sets an example to the rest of the world that they never forget their sons and their husbands. Today they remember them, and I again repeat that while visiting Barcelona, Spain, you stay awake at night waiting to hear them tramp down the street on their way to mass to offer a prayer for their departed sons and husbands. God gave these men the same courage to carry on the fight for freedom as He gave Columbus to chart his voyage into the unknown.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

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

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join in the commendations of my colleagues to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA] in the statements that he has made here today in regard to a great and a friendly power. Certainly, Spain was among the first to shed her blood against the tyranny of communism, and I think it is wonderful that the gentleman sees fit to pay tribute to this great and friendly country which had the courage to stand up and fight for that which she

believed to be right on that occasion. Coming from the State of California, a State, I might say, which owes so much to Spanish culture and to the pioneering spirit and courage of the early Spaniards, I certainly wish to join my colleague in paying tribute to a great people and a people that in my opinion have contributed not only a lot to our country but to my own State and to the security of the free world. It is my hope that in the years to come, through continued cooperation, we will be able to withstand the onslaught of communism. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and to have this opportunity to join with him on this occasion.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman from California for his valuable contribution.

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

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my words of commendation to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico for his historic contribution to the permanent records of the Congress. Among the many contributions of the Hispanic world to this country over the years has been the enriching effect of her literature. Take, for instance, that delightful classic, *Don Quixote*, by Cervantes, which has played its part in molding our culture. I, too, have had the opportunity to visit that ancient and tragic land within the last few years, and I know I express the fervent hope of every one of us here in the Congress that Spain will enjoy a continued liberalization of her institutions, will enjoy peace abroad, and will never again have a recurrence of the bloody fratricidal war which was such a tragic event.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico, my beloved friend, Mr. JOE MONTROYA, on the fine presentation he has made on Spain. I concur in the remarks of my colleague from California, Mr. SISK, in congratulating the great people of Spain on this historic occasion. The world will always remember with pride the great contributions which the Spanish people have made in the progress of human civilization and culture.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to my colleague from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, on this day in honoring the people of Spain. I wish to compliment him on the wonderful speech he has made. I would like to say this also, that my distinguished colleague from New Mexico has made great

personal contributions not only to Spain, but to the other Spanish-speaking nations of this world in his position as a Member of Congress and as a citizen of our great Nation.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTROYA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have both a personal and a statewide interest in the remarks that the gentleman is making. By the accident of time, I happen to have been born on Columbus Day and therefore the voyages sponsored by the King and Queen of Spain to the New World and the development of the New World are not unknown to me.

Unhappily, most of American history neglects the early and important contributions that the Spanish people made to the development of both North and South America. We in Colorado have the interesting phenomenon now of observing the centennial anniversary of the discovery of gold in Colorado and the rush to the Rockies, but we are only talking about that which the "Anglos" made. The Spaniards discovered the true gold in Colorado, the richness of its climate, the beauty of its rivers, mountains, and plains. They had the earliest settlement in Colorado by several hundred years ahead of the first advent of the Anglos, if I may call them that, a century ago. We in Colorado are very proud not only to have one of the few States with a Spanish name, but to have also a rich Spanish population who make a great contribution to the life of the entire State.

I wish to commend the gentleman for reciting bits of Spanish history and I join in the remarks that have been made to this extent. I remember the bitter fratricidal history of the civil war, which was a strange admixture of monarchism against antimonarchism, socialism, syndicalism, and communism, and ultimately fascism joined monarchism. And out of this tragic and complex civil war, with its tremendous intrusion of foreign powers and foreign troops on all sides, the Spanish people were indeed the great sufferers. It is one of the tragedies of Spanish history that they have had to live with all the consequences of this heavy invasion on all sides by all parties in what ought to have been simply a question of the internal operation of that country.

It was a kind of a pretest of World War II for all too many groups and powers.

Certainly I join the other Members here today in expressing the profound wish and hope that, as the years go on, the Spanish people will increasingly taste the full flow of the richness and the heritage of free institutions, and enjoy the free opportunity for their own full development and full flowering. They have demonstrated greatness in the past. We share with them the hope that they will know greatness again in the future and in the meanwhile we welcome

the contributions they have made and are making.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from New Mexico for his courtesy in yielding to me. I rise to express my appreciation and that of many of those of my constituency for his taking the time to point out to the House, as he has on this occasion, the influence of Spain on the world, not only in recent history but in the history of centuries ago.

I am particularly interested in and appreciative of the gentleman's remarks because my State, in the course of her history under five flags, lived under the flag of Spain as well as under the flag of Mexico. The district I represent owes much of her history and culture to the influence of Spain and the period that followed when that contribution toward her culture came largely from Mexico.

This contribution still continues from that part of our population whose ancestry is largely Spanish. We are particularly appreciative of what the gentleman has said, and I congratulate and thank him.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I concur in what the gentleman has said and congratulate him on a very fine presentation. I think the country as a whole is not as familiar as it should be with the great and valuable alliance that we have with this great nation. I am sure that the remarks the gentleman has made here today are going to bring about a better understanding of the advantages of this alliance that we have; and the other things the gentleman has said about this great nation will help us all to realize what the friendship of the Spanish nation means to us and to peace throughout the world.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. LIBONATI. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for taking the initiative on this commemoration of the 23d anniversary of the onslaught of General Franco upon the Communist influence in Spain. I had the privilege to be sent to Spain to inspect the airport under SAC at San Pedro. After being briefed there, and after inspecting the installations there, we realized the contribution that Spain has made to the United States of America, and especially in view of the fact that there was a prejudice against the leadership of Spain and the Spanish people, growing out of the criticisms and stories that were being palmed off by individuals who had a self-serving purpose and, perhaps, a divided loyalty as to the contributions of General Franco to the Spanish cause of freedom.

It was brought to my attention, as you have stated in your analysis, what the locations of the ports and the airfields mean in military advantages enjoyed by the United States of America. And this is a control not only in a military sense, but a control of all of Europe in view of the fact that the Continent at that point sits back in the Atlantic and commands all of the areas including Russia which is only 750 miles from San Pedro. We realize now why Russia is so anxious to have the airdromes and the airbases demilitarized. Certainly, San Pedro stands as a spear at the throbbing throat of Russian activity and at the vitals of the Russian manufacturing and production centers. The gentleman from New Mexico is to be congratulated because of the fact that very few people have ever analyzed the civil war as you have done—to consider all of its consistencies as well as its inconsistencies. Very few have made such a keen study of the alinement of political parties and patriots in Spain. The gentleman, of course, realizes the negative effect of our ordering our ships and sealing them off against the ports of Spain for 10 years which added to their misery and to their poverty. The Communist leaders fled from Spain after the civil war and during the civil war and absconded with some \$550 million in gold. They brought that gold to Russia. The wonderful women of Spain by public subscription sent their jewels to the government for the purpose of establishing a treasury so that Spain could carry on its international commerce. Now this great spirit has been inculcated in these fine and wonderful people with a deep sense of religious belief and a strong spiritual attitude. Now we see the benefit we are getting as a result of the establishment of bases that were to control our destiny and the destiny of Europe and the freedom-loving nations. What great losses we would have suffered if the situation were otherwise. I congratulate the President of the United States and our late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles—God bless his soul—for their comments relative to the strength contributed by Spain to the common cause of liberty-loving nations. I congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico on this day for the thorough study he has made of the problems confronting Spain. I am sure each American as this information is disseminated throughout the country will know that Spain is truly our friend. They will know the great sacrifices she has made for us and that she has forgiven us for the outrageous acts committed against her and the lack of support to her up to 1953. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his valuable contribution.

Now, further continuing with the quotation of Secretary Dulles in his report to the President of the United States, I want to continue reading as follows:

The Spanish authorities when they heard I had accepted their invitation, were gracious enough to suggest that my plane should come down at one of these new bases that we had jointly built, so that I could be welcomed on this new base by the Spanish

Foreign Minister and other Spanish officials. Indeed it is really a wonderful airbase, perhaps the finest I have ever been on. The runway, I understand, is one of the longest in the whole world.

From that airfield I went on to the Pardo Palace, where I had a really good talk with General Franco, the Chief of State. We were together for about 3 hours.

I told him about what had been happening at the NATO Council meeting and of the basic policies and the strategies that were being followed.

I felt that General Franco, by the contribution that his government was making to the defense of Europe, had clearly entitled himself to that kind of information. In turn the Spanish Chief of State gave me his estimate of the Soviet threat, and, incidentally, his estimate and that of the NATO Council were in very close agreement.

Then General Franco and I discussed other problems that were more especially of Spanish and United States concern.

I felt there a very genuine spirit of friendship and cordiality, as indeed had been the case when I was in Spain the previous time, in November 1955.

It is ties like this that hold the free world together, and they provide a striking contrast to the military coercion which alone holds together the countries of the Soviet bloc.

Now, of course, as between free nations, there are from time to time differences and dissatisfactions. That is inevitable, however hard or skillfully we strive. But surmounting all is the sense of fellowship which unites those who are dedicated to a common cause and who sacrifice and risk that that cause may prevail.

I should like to express appreciation for the heroic assistance and cooperation given by the then Spanish Ambassador to the United States, José Felix de Lequerica, who through tact, wisdom, patience, and understanding contributed greatly to the finalizing of our base agreement.

I would also like to incorporate in the Record the concluding remarks of the distinguished and able present Spanish Ambassador, José Maria Arelliza, in a recent speech he made in this country:

To best serve our Spanish and Christian civilization, we are prepared to change our system within the framework of our philosophy and history but we are not ready to curry favor with window-dressing changes. We are not, after all, a nation without background, without a cultural reason for our acts. Our political tradition is strong. In it, and in the example of the world, we shall find reasons for reform and betterment. But this private and internal problem of Spanish life does not affect the position of the nation at the present moment.

We have said that we are prepared to cooperate effectively in the common effort to defend civilization against aggression. We have declared that we are ready to accept whatever system to that end which is in accord with our national dignity and which is inspired by a reciprocal respect between our possible associates and ourselves. It is told of a king of a country no longer existing that, chagrined by the little effectiveness of his soldiers, he said: "I cannot make them fight. I put them in red uniforms, in green uniforms, or in blue uniforms, and yet they run away." Our way of thinking is quite different. We will always do our duty within an accepted formula. We would participate in bilateral treaties with other peoples or in cooperative movements acceptable to us be they called "Atlantic", "Mediterranean", "European", or "planetary". The United States, inspired by its international generosity and clear-sightedness, has initiated

practical contacts with us and Spain has answered in a spirit of good faith and a wish to get something practical done. Some have spoken about the "price" of our cooperation. This is a most unfortunate word. The problem is one of understanding and practical agreement. Once we agree as to our common objective, each side will bring his share and supplement that of the other. Those who, like Spain, are prepared to enter into such an agreement must weigh the consequences of their action and must ask for the means to live up to their commitments, not as victims of aggression but as effective units capable of active defense. We have geography on our side, we have history, we have many soldiers willing to fight wherever necessary. And we understand the danger of the day. Our wish to make our cooperation more effective with the help of the United States is both natural and just—

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

Mr. MONTOYA. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman because I know he is making a very important statement, but the gentleman does a magnificent job of representing the people of his State, which has a fine Spanish heritage.

I would like to note that my State, too, shares in this common heritage. The Spanish people and the French people jointly developed my city and much of my State. As a matter of fact, it was through that heritage that the word "Creole" got into our language, because that represents a combination of French and Spanish culture. That culture still is very dominant in the city of New Orleans and the State of Louisiana, and I am happy to see the gentleman paying the tribute he has to these magnificent people.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his contribution.

Further quoting the Ambassador, he stated:

We Spaniards are not trying to avoid our duty. Of that you can be sure. A strong spiritual affinity complements the political aspects of an understanding between the United States and Spain. Despite the differences in the words used, your principles drawn from the best Christian teaching are both close and dear to us.

The Ambassador's remarks I am sure you will agree bear eloquent testimony to the continuing friendship and moral strength between our two countries.

These recordings of history clearly demonstrate four things which have influenced greatly the strides of success taken by our country, and I emphasize them as follows:

First. Spain forged the cradle of our great continent.

Second. Spain's neutrality in World War II was the great windbreak which blocked catastrophe for the Allies in the Mediterranean.

Third. The Spanish people's resolute determination to fight communism to a point of extermination is a sequel of the civil war which cannot be minimized.

Fourth. Our base agreements with Spain have given us a position of strength and have blessed us with an ally whose blood has flowed through the rivers of history and whose people have so valiantly fought for Christian ideals throughout the centuries.

In conclusion I extend my warm congratulations to the Spanish people on this 23d anniversary of the beginning of their victorious crusade in driving communism from its shores. I also extend my warm congratulations to Spain's great Chief of State, Generalissimo Francisco Franco, who led that crusade and still is the leader of that brave and gallant people.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago, short of a few days, the courageous people of Spain rose up to protest against the ruthless designs of a Red government. Under the able direction of Gen. Francisco Franco, they began their long struggle for the return of law and order and security. Their battle was not an easy one as the Red menace had insidiously penetrated the nation. But with independence as their goal, they staunchly refused to waiver.

We all know what communism is and how it is feared by all of us who desire to lead peaceful, honorable, prosperous, and secure lives. Where communism is concerned, we cannot stand idle. No; we must maintain constantly a watchful, alert guard and vigilance against its threat. Let us realize then that if we are to fight communism successfully, we must be ready on all fronts—particularly the Spanish front, as Spain's strategic military position is conceded to be of great value in meeting the common danger of communism.

As a nation, let the United States never turn its back on Spain. Standing before you today, I ask that we Americans look upon her with respectful eyes. Let us eagerly extend friendly hands to the 30 million men and women of this sturdy country which, for more than 20 years, has stood courageous—upright—never faltering in its valiant effort to banish the plague of communism.

I congratulate and rejoice with the people of Spain and their respected leader, Generalissimo Franco, on the 23d anniversary of their finest hour in world history.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of pleasure that I join my distinguished colleague from New Mexico to express my admiration and offer my sincere congratulations to the Spanish people on the anniversary of the commencement of their great struggle for freedom against the ugly forces of communism that threatened their existence 23 years ago this month.

Under the superb leadership of General Franco the Spanish people survived a long and brutal civil war fomented by the forces of international communism. The free world will forever be indebted to the gallant, heroic, and courageous performance of the Spanish people and their leaders.

That same endurance and courage so clearly displayed by the Spanish nation, its armies, its people, and its courageous leader, in their fight against the Red

menace is clearly apparent in the history of Spanish exploration and settlement of this great American Continent.

Today, the forces endangering our Nation are more insidious than any mankind has ever before faced. The action taken by the Spanish people on the 18th of July 1936, continuing to April 1, 1939, forestalled the infestation of the Communist cancer throughout the Mediterranean world.

This battle-tested ally can be counted upon to stand firmly with the West in the crucial days to come.

The crushing destruction in the wake of the Spanish people's battle against the scourge of Soviet-inspired communism has not sapped their will to resist. Their burning hatred of this evil ideology has only been intensified by knowledge acquired through suffering under the lash of Red subversion.

Stanch, unyielding enemies of communism, such as General Franco and the Spanish people, are desperately needed, as Soviet aggression and intrigue force a crisis in international affairs.

Secure in our mutual bond of friendship with Spain, let us now draw closer the ties of a common heritage calling upon the courage and bravery of these steadfast people to help combat international communism.

I compliment the distinguished senior Member of the House from New Mexico on his moving, stirring, historical presentation of a great people whose sacrifices will forever be enshrined in hearts of freedom-loving people throughout the world. I salute and congratulate the good Spanish people and their great leader and Chief of State General Franco on this the 23d anniversary of their bursting forth from the shackles and tyranny of international communism.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks, if they so desire, immediately following mine on the subject just discussed, and that they be permitted to include extraneous matter with those remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from New Mexico in paying homage to the Spanish people and their leader, General Franco, in commemorating the 23d anniversary, come July 18, of the beginning of their great and successful crusade to exterminate communism within its borders.

Violence, brutality, intrigue, sabotage, and all the despicable devices and techniques known to the Communists were visited upon the proud Spanish victors—all in vain and insuring that people and country an everlasting debt of gratitude.

Spain has come a long way since the termination of her own bloody and barbarous Civil War.

Spain rendered great assistance to us and the Allies during World War II.

Spain is distinguishing herself as a member of the United Nations under the guidance and leadership of my good friend, former Ambassador to Washington, José Felix de Lequerica, who was a tower of strength to our diplomatic and military officials during the arduous and tedious days of negotiations leading to our base agreement with Spain, an agreement that makes Spain one of the strongest and firmest links in our world chain of defense against the common and ever-present danger of communism.

I would like to see the will of the Congress carried out insofar as Spain becoming a member of NATO. In newspaper maps Spain is always given a special neutral color and sometimes omitted, while Luxembourg, Belgium, Iceland, and other countries stand out clearly.

But whether it appears on these maps or not, Spain is a peninsula, part of the Iberian peninsula, with a territory of about half-million square kilometers, with a population of 30 million, a standing army of more than a half-million men, a reserve of nearly another half-million, and a potential of nearly 2 million mobilized men with a warrior tradition for valor and aggressiveness.

If you look at the map you will see that Spain's geographic position is like a platform between Europe and Africa, a center of communications between them, and even between the four continents, if we add Asia and America. Strategically valuable, Spain's coasts are both Atlantic and Mediterranean where, because of the Balearic Islands, it dominates the western portion of the inland sea.

For centuries Spain has taken part in the major campaigns of Europe, from Flanders through Germany and France to Italy. In the continent's most critical hours Spanish troops proved their worth and have been given a just place in the history of the world. Even before they spilled their blood in defense of Spanish soil in the days of Napoleon, Spaniards had discovered and created a new world in the Americas, had fought for the lands of their sovereigns in what today we call Benelux, and had stood beside the House of Austria during the wars of religion on the side of the counter-Reformation.

I hope the President and Secretary of State Herter, who was a distinguished Member of this House, will continue their efforts to urge Spain's inclusion in NATO.

I have been to Spain many times and have carried away the friendliest of feelings for a great and honorable people.

I salute the Spanish people and their Chief of State on this their 23d anniversary of escaping the yoke of communism.

I also extend my congratulations to the Spanish Ambassador in Washington, José Maria de Arelliza, who is noted for his great warmth, friendliness, and appreciation of the United States and our people.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in honor of all the thousands of stalwart Spaniards who—refusing to let their churches and convents be burned; their streets choked with violence; their government threat-

ened with anarchy and communism—marched bravely against an ineffective puppet-government undermined by Red insurgents. More specifically, I direct my remarks in praise of that great military leader, Generalissimo Francisco Franco, without whose guidance Spain's sympathetic and appealing cause may well have faltered.

General Franco was not born for revolution—not trained to be a rebel. True, as a military man he learned to respect authority; but when he took over the command of the national crusade, he was not a man looking for personal or political advantage. He was a professional soldier who had kept away from politics and had declined every request made to him to join this or that party. However, at 33, Franco, the youngest general in Europe, was pressed into leading his own people in their glorious fight for the freedom and honor of his country.

In the difficult years following the Spanish revolt Franco has continued to display the same brilliance in leadership of the government that he displayed as head of the army, and Spain continues to wax strong under his firm and effective guidance. Certainly no words can speak better for the General than those he himself spoke when interviewed a few years ago by the London Press:

I believe, together with the Spanish people—

Spoke Franco—

that the greatest threat to peace, liberty, and the economic and social progress of the world lies in the menace of communism. If England and the Western World also recognize this fact, our common interests would seem to demand closer understanding between us.

It is indeed comforting in times like these to know that a man like General Franco fears not to stand before the peoples of the world and speak of the "menace of communism." It is heartening to hear his plea for understanding between Spain and the Western World. Such courage and honesty of expression cannot go unacknowledged, and I, for one, am happy to pay tribute to Spain's great leader on this most memorable day in Spanish history and to all the brave and resolute people of Spain—I am pleased to join my distinguished friend and colleague from New Mexico in congratulating General Franco and the Spanish people for their heroic contribution to our Christian civilization—I salute one of our great allies; strong, faithful, friendly, dependable.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my esteemed colleague from New Mexico, the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, and our other distinguished colleagues who are today voicing their sentiments on the occasion of the 23d anniversary of the successful effort of the people of Spain, under the leadership of Gen. Francisco Franco, to stamp out Communist domination of their country. Were it not for that effort, Spain would surely have gone Communist and might have dragged along all or most of Western Europe. In that respect, we owe a debt of gratitude to the people of Spain.

Today we all know that Spain is a staunch friend and any of the United States. We have important military bases there which, because of Spain's strategic location, give us a tremendous military advantage in our defense effort. And yet, despite this cooperation on the part of Spain, the North Atlantic nations who are associated in NATO have thus far failed to admit Spain as a member of NATO. This is something to be deplored, for one cannot visualize the logic or the practicability of omitting Spain from this mutual defense setup which is so important to nations on both sides of the Atlantic.

Back in January 1957 I had introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States take the necessary steps to gain Spain's admission into NATO. I thought at the time that this is advisable for reasons of national security and military cooperation—and I still think so. More than 100 similar resolutions were introduced in both Houses of Congress. A resolution advocating Spain's membership in NATO was passed unanimously by the House on March 20, 1957, and subsequently also by the Senate on April 12, 1957. In view of this expression by the Congress, I feel that it is very timely in this moment of international tension that both President Eisenhower and the Secretary of State take immediate steps to have Spain included in NATO.

Such action is just as important for the Atlantic nations as it is for Spain. In fact, recently Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the President of France, has expressed himself in favor of Spain's admission into NATO. Many other statesmen of Western Europe today are showing clear signs in favor of such a step.

In recent years Spain has also been admitted to membership in the United Nations and other important international bodies. There is, therefore, no longer any valid reason for denying Spain rightful membership in NATO or to delay granting her such membership.

It is for the United States to take specific action by lending its prestige and its good offices toward the attainment of this goal. A determined effort on our part to admit Spain into NATO will surely be given very serious consideration by our allies in the NATO organization, whose position and influence will surely be strengthened thereby. The interests of the Atlantic nations—in fact, of the whole free world—demand such action. Spain's admission at this time would serve as a great reassurance to all of Western Europe.

On this historic occasion of the 23d anniversary of the struggle to eliminate Communist domination of Spain we send our greetings to General Franco and to the people of Spain. This greeting, however, would be much more meaningful if we would at the same time launch an earnest effort to obtain a seat for Spain in NATO.

At this point, I should like to quote a few brief sentences from an address by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles pertaining to Spain. This is taken from a radio-television report

to the Nation on December 23, 1957, after Mr. Dulles had returned from a visit to Spain where he conferred with General Franco and other Spanish Government leaders. I quote from his address:

We have, as a result of agreements which we made about 4 years ago, arrangements for building there a series of airbases, and also a naval base, for the joint use of Spain and the United States. The Spanish authorities, when they heard I had accepted their invitation, were gracious enough to suggest that my plane should come down at one of these new bases that we had jointly built, so that I could be welcomed on this new base by the Spanish Foreign Minister and other Spanish officials. Indeed it is really a wonderful airbase, perhaps the finest I have ever been on. The runway, I understand, is one of the longest in the whole world. * * *

I felt that General Franco, by the contribution that his government was making to the defense of Europe, had clearly entitled himself to that kind of information. In turn, the Spanish Chief of State gave me his estimate of the Soviet threat, and, incidentally, his estimate and that of the NATO Council were in very close agreement. * * * I felt there a very genuine spirit of friendship and cordiality, as indeed had been the case when I was in Spain the previous time, in November 1955.

In conclusion, I wish to utilize this opportunity to extend my greetings and sincerest wishes to the Ambassador of Spain, His Excellency José M. de Arelliza, a very able statesman and an excellent representative in Washington of his government and the people of Spain. He is a true friend of the American people and I regard it as a special privilege to know him personally.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in paying my respects to our historic ally, the great country of Spain and to its leader and Chief of State. For almost 25 years now, they have made constant and increasingly strengthened evidence of their friendship and cordiality with the United States. They have been, are, and will continue to be a respected ally of ours. I am further pleased to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to the people of Spain and to their Chief of State on the 23d anniversary of the historic crusade which resulted in victory over their aggressors.

It is generally conceded that international tourism is the most direct and effective route to improved international relations. Such improved relations resulting from enhanced cultural exchange and mutual respect are certain to ease tensions, improve worldwide relations, and the better and more effectively to insure world peace. How a country receives and treats its visitors is an indication of the progress and development within that country. For a number of years, first under the intelligent and effective leadership of former Ambassador José Félix de Lequerica and presently under His Excellency José M. de Arelliza, Spain has undertaken to and, in fact, actually has made, great strides in warmly receiving, cordially treating, and entertainingly accommodating its tourists, especially Americans. The following article which interestingly appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, May 17, 1959, describes the "reign" of "The

American Tourist in Spain." That article is as follows:

THE AMERICAN TOURIST REIGNS IN SPAIN—SPANIARDS LIKE HIM AND SHOW IT, AND HE IN TURN FINDS SPAIN, WITH ITS IMPROVED TRAVEL FACILITIES, A TOURIST'S DREAM—AND EASY ON THE POCKETBOOK

(By Mildred Adams)

MADRID.—All across the plains of La Mancha the old doggerel swung through the memory in time with the clicking of train wheels over the rail joints: "What makes the lamb love Mary so? Why, Mary loves the lamb, you know."

In the new love affair between Spain and the United States (an affair sedulously cultivated by the Embassy and the Air Force) it is a little difficult to know which is Mary and which is the lamb, but of the mutual affection there is no doubt—in spots.

One of the important spots is the new enthusiasm for tourism. From the Spanish Government's point of view, American travel brings needed dollars. From the American point of view, this picturesque old country is the tourist's paradise. Some 300,000 Americans went there in 1957, six times as many as in 1951.

Americans are learning fast what the thrifty French (with more than a million visitors to Spain last year) have known since 1955—that the Iberian Peninsula is a tourist's dream, and still easy on the purse. As one visitor said roundly, "Spain and Portugal are the best places in Europe. The people are friendly, and they don't try to gyp you."

But it is not economy alone that attracts the tourist wave. A few travelers come for business reasons. Some come to visit Air Force relatives, some to see what the new Spain looks like, some because they were told that Spanish travel is easy now. Mostly it is the immemorial lure of the romantic not found at home—castles and cathedrals, bullfights and gypsy dancers, Carmen and El Greco, with always the hope of a find not noted in the guidebooks.

The castles are there in all their pride, some of them as they were in the day when Chaucer in his "Romaunt of the Rose," a translation of a French poem, made them famous. Some are well advertised, like those at Coca and Medina del Campo, others appear suddenly on a lonely hilltop at the bend of a road, unnamed in the guidebook, unvisited except by wandering ghosts. The cathedrals are there, impressive and commanding, as if to prove that, in the medieval world that put them up, the power of the church held equal sway with that of the land. The power of the castles is only a legend now, but the power of the church is one of the bulwarks of the present regime, and visible in every soaring cathedral tower and gleaming shrine.

So is the power of the land, and with this goes a strange attraction which Americans who pride themselves on freedom from agricultural slavery feel very deeply. The upland sweep of Castile and the olive-planted hills of Andalusia still show the ancient spectacle of work by man and beast, with little more machinery than Moor or Roman knew.

Madrid may be choked with motor traffic, but men tread these fields furrow by furrow behind their primitive plows. They sow their wheat by hand, flinging out the seed in the rhythm of their walk. They cut it with sickles in hand, they flail out the grain by hand, they bale the straw by hand. The harvesting of olives, of grapes, or corn, is a hand process, done in company and thereby enjoyed in the doing. The workers chatter and laugh, and with obvious pleasure pose for tourist cameras. The tractor exists, and a few more of them each year, but hand labor

is cheaper and requires neither gasoline nor servicing.

All this, to the American trained to machines, believing that they have made it unnecessary for men to work hard any more, is at once horrifying and comforting. He deplores the hard farmwork while enjoying the sense of superiority which the sight of it gives him. At the same time he is dimly aware that if in his world the machine seems increasingly important, so does man lose stature until he seems in nightmares a slave to objects made to destroy him. In this Spanish world that has not happened, man still looks the visible master of his beast and his land, and however unmodern the sight, it holds reassurance.

Most of the tourists want at least one bullfight—indeed it is argued by some Spaniards, who think that youthful enthusiasm over soccer will put an end to bullfighting, that even now that ancient sport is mostly propped up by foreign interest.

The critics complain that the bulls are slow and heavy, that the matadors lack style, and that nothing will be done about it as long as the breeders dominate the programs and the stands are full of foreigners who, not knowing one fine point from another, start to shout at the wrong moment. None of this dims tourist demand for the best seats in the bullring.

As for gypsy dancing, it can be seen painlessly in Madrid, or with a minimum of effort in Seville and Granada. The ruffled skirts are shorter than they used to be, and languorous grace seems to have yielded to the modern demand for speed and fury, but the tourists love it, and the dancers see that they get it easily. Visitors to Granada find notices in good hotels that a British travel agency can arrange to have one of the famous gypsy troupes dance in the equally famous caves of the Albaicin—50 pesetas if there are less than six in the audience, 100 pesetas apiece if there are more. All as neatly organized and painless as a bus trip to Coney Island.

There is little of the romantic in Spain that is new, but the charms of the old have been long advertised. Those charms were in eclipse for nearly two decades of war and recovery. Before that, the traveler's enjoyment of them used to demand a certain Spartan willingness to brave discomfort, and the legend that Spain is a difficult land to travel in can still be heard. Now it can be reached in a day's plane travel from New York, and less than that when jetplane service to Madrid starts next January.

Within Spain, progress and American loans have made things easier. The airplane and the motorcar make it possible to shun slow trains, though even the trains are better than they were in 1951. The roads have been greatly improved; the timid can take comfortable guided bus tours, and the nonconformist can drive or be driven in private cars between comfortable stopping places.

To satisfy the latter trade, King Alfonso XIII in the early days of motor roads began a string of "paradores" or government inns, the first ones installed in picturesque old buildings such as the convent of St. Francis in Granada or the house of Condestable Dávalos in Ubeda. Others have been added down the years by the Republic and by Franco, until they now serve a web of roads across the country; especially designed for the foreign visitor, they are not meant to compete with the hotel trade, but to lodge and feed the traveler well in regions without inns.

This new ease of tourist travel making it possible to enjoy elements that in the past have been unpredictable and hard to manage on a schedule, is one of the factors that is making postrecovery Spain so popular with visiting Americans. It does not yet go so far as to persuade all trains to run on

time, or every porter in a Spanish hotel to produce whisky and soda with the room key, but the Spanish Tourist Ministry has been learning what it is that Americans want, and the effort shows.

What also shows is the native Spanish warmth and courtesy, reinforced by the present clamorous popularity of Americans in Spain. One feels it in cafes, where the waiters offer strangely assorted English words and are enchanted if a few Spanish words come in reply. Consult a map or a guidebook on a street corner in Salamanca, and an amiable passerby will stop to ask if he can help. Ask a veiled woman in Toledo for El Greco's home and she will hand her prayerbook to her daughter and lead you smiling to the very door. "Americanos? Que gente mas bueno." (What fine people.)

Their warmth of greeting reaches through even to those who have no Spanish, or who commonly travel in such a bustle of activity that they seldom stop to let a strange environment soak in. A housewife in Valladolid, entertaining visitors at lunch, picked up a small matchbox and said, "Americans? They and everything they do are so popular in Spain that if people thought this matchbox was American they would all want it." A taxi driver, having successfully repeated "American Embassy" said hopefully, "American more easy English, I like." An asthmatic guide in Salamanca's new cathedral—new, that is, in 1509—learning that his clients were North Americans, dropped his talk of dates and long-dead monarchs, and seizing an arm with both hands wheezed warmly, "But you are our saviors."

What Americans have done to arouse such popularity, other than what they have done in other countries that show no such enthusiasm, it is hard to see. The inflow of our money began later here than it did in France, where nobody loves us. The building of guardian airfields has won us no such popularity in England. Intellectuals in Spain may question our motives, bishops may fear the contagion of our non-Catholic ways, but for reasons connected, perhaps, with their own internal frustrations, the ordinary Spaniards take us to their hearts, and the gesture, however unexpected or however fleeting, makes the tourist feel warmly welcome.

It is not a gesture which can be ordered from above and there is little danger that it reflects an order from Franco's headquarters. The question of Spanish politics, so controversial in certain American circles, enters very little into the minds of most tourists. Those who are most sensitive to it will look when they first arrive for evidences of a police state, but these, like the Caudillo's dwelling place, are tactfully kept out of plain sight.

The smiling customs inspectors at the Madrid airport pass an American's baggage with few questions, the traffic officers show puzzled drivers an almost operatic gallantry. One of them in Burgos took the time to persuade an American that if he parked on the northwest corner he would be subject to a fine, whereas the southeast corner was free—and this without a word of common language between them. The green-clad civil guards with their patent leather hats still patrol the country roads, two by two on foot; they can be induced to wave as Americans drive by. Customs guards outside the towns still stop all trucks and donkey carts, but with a smiling shout of "turistas." Americans are free to go.

The result is a kind of mental and emotional stalemate, a compromise between remembered ideals and present realities, in which criticism lies dormant unless a spark is struck. Americans of this type cannot love Franco, but neither is it within their power to replace him. Like other visitors who have acquired in the last few decades an inextinguishable aversion to dictators and all their works, they button such biases into

the backs of their minds and comment on the modern absence of donkey carts and presence of state-owned supermarkets in Madrid, or on the extraordinary growth in the city's suburbs.

Nor does anyone talk much in public of wheat or railroad loans, or the ceded right to build airbases and lay a pipeline. Only the rude realist would suggest that Americans have sound strategic reasons for continuing to court the Spaniards, or that the Spaniards would be biting the hand that feeds them wheat and eggs and soybean oil if they failed to love Uncle Sam. As a matter of fact, the surprise is that it all works out happily. Failure to love Uncle Sam for his distributed largesse is so common in other countries that the present state of mutual bliss in Spain is doubly pleasant.

There are, of course, visitors who do not find Spain to their liking. Some of them are Air Force wives to whom the process of living in a museum country, set in ancient ways that are by no means the ways of Peoria or Flushing, has its drawbacks. Oppressed by the daily tasks that go with following Air Force rules for maintaining American standards in a very different land, they would far rather stop boiling water, drinking powdered milk, washing lettuce in detergent, and move back to Colorado Springs.

The Air Force does everything it can to make them happy—provides modern houses far better than some they might occupy back home, supplies commissaries with the familiar branded groceries they knew in American supermarkets, sets up schools that make it possible for Junior, when he goes home, to pick up his grade exactly where he left it. But the Air Force cannot make Spanish maids into linguists, or take over the Madrid television station and telecast home shows; the legend that Don Quixote passed this way does not always compensate for the lack of quiz programs and baseball games.

Meanwhile, Madrid prospers, as do Seville and Granada, while lesser towns burst the boundaries of their ancient walls. The capital has 2 million residents now. It used to be so compact that one could walk across it in an hour; it is now developing its own version of suburban sprawl. Its streets traffic-lighted, its motorists forbidden to sound horns, its populace submissively queuing up for buses, it is no longer the intransigent Madrid of Carlos III, of Unamuno, or of Ernest Hemingway.

At the moment it is, like the rest of Spain, in transition from a dream-bound past to a future geared to the ambitions of a general who for 20 years has decreed all that his country does or says. In the process, he has invoked visible forces which may destroy the old ideas to which he builds new temples. That traffic in the streets, those high tension towers bringing current over the hills, those new factories smoking on the city's rim, those tall apartment houses high above the river Manzanares—like the American airbase at Torrejon, or the Navy base at Rota, they make the tourist feel at home. But, by the same token, they hold within themselves a power that will exert expanding pressure on the future. It is no longer possible to say "nothing ever happens in Spain." Something has, and will.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it was 23 years ago that Generalissimo Bahamonde Franco commenced his military campaign to rid Spain of the communistic scourge that infected every avenue of governmental activity.

It can now be said that his action prevented the domination of the greater part of the Western European nations through Soviet influence.

His critics upon the establishment of a monarchial-republic type of govern-

ment succeeded in destroying our public confidence in his leadership. His fiscal problems in seeking adequate finances for a bankrupt government were many. The Communist leaders had stolen an estimated \$550 million in gold—certainly a nation without gold reserves could not be expected to compete in international trade. The patriots of Spain gave their jewels and treasures to the government to supplement the Spanish treasury. A sum of \$90 million was raised through public subscription—a great nation struggled to establish a balanced economy.

We added to their problems by boycotting her ports for a period of 10 years—it is a miracle that this, the strongest anti-Communist nation, survived. If it had not been for the strong religious beliefs of its people, the fangs of poverty would have destroyed their belief in mankind. Poor as they are today pride and loyalty are their strongest human asset.

We are very fortunate to have Spain as an ally. The three airbases there dominate militarily all of the British Isles, Europe, and Russia. It was my privilege to visit San Pedro—about 30 miles from Madrid. The official American air force personnel briefed us on the superior advantages militarily enjoyed by the United States. Spain today is the most valuable in the protection of the NATO nations. No Communist propaganda or influence can sway her from the liberty-loving nations of the West. She stands supreme as the defender of the United Nations European policy.

One has only to visit San Pedro to realize the tremendous military advantage because of its geographical location in relationship to Russia. The airbase, built on a flat area with mountains encroaching upon it acting as a gigantic protective barrier, unseen the radar and necessary adjuncts for maintaining the military superiority of air and ready for immediate action. San Pedro hides the spear aimed at Russia's heart and vital areas. We were fortunate that Spain remained our friend. We know that her hatred of communism is deep in the hearts of her people. We must do everything to help her gain her proper place among the nations of the world, by solicitously improving the economic condition of her people. The poorer the friend the less can he do to build up strength with which to serve in a common purpose—and it is so with nations.

It is no wonder that Russia fears our airbases in Spain; and asks that we give them up. We are holding the trump cards in our hand. The three airbases in Spain together with our aces and Spanish-trained personnel—together with the strong friendship and complete confidence of its leader, Generalissimo Bahamonde Franco, and his brave people we have a stranglehold on Russian oppression. Spain acts as the eyes, ears, and iron arm of the Western nations and is the watchdog of our military installations in Europe and she sits back far enough in the Atlantic to meet any act of aggression on land, sea, and air. And her radar knows it first. This is a great day for us. We celebrate it with the

Spanish people, our comrades in arms, to protect the free peoples of the world. Generalissimo Bahamonde Franco is the true, loyal, enthusiastic friend of the American people. He deserves our blessing and help.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, JOSEPH MONTOYA, on this the 23d anniversary of the liberation of Spain. I take this opportunity to salute the Spanish people as friends and allies in the great struggle of our time, resistance to communism. Spain has become a valuable partner of the West in its struggle against the Communist East. Some of our most important air bases are located in Spain and their very existence aids in keeping the peace. The deterrent of an effective Strategic Air Force has long prevented the Communist World from indulging in new adventures.

It is significant that on this the 23d anniversary of Spain's liberation that she is embarked on an economic revitalization which will enable her to break out of her post World War II isolation and embark on a program of worldwide economic activity.

Nowhere can be found people who are more genuinely receptive to Americans than the Spanish people. They displayed true friendship and a real desire to welcome visiting Americans. On my visits to Spain, I have always come away with the feeling that I would like to return and this can be attributed to the wonderful qualities of the Spanish people.

They are not only imbued with a strong desire for friendship with this country but they have always displayed a fierce resistance to godless communism.

They long ago clearly saw what we, and the rest of the world, had to painfully recognize through the light of experience that communism is evil by its very nature. And that communism was but a cause to veil the plan for world domination by the Soviet Union.

So, today, let us wish Spain and the Spanish people well. As they celebrate the 23d anniversary of their liberation let us wish them continued peace and real prosperity. The culture of Spain and their contributions to the development of our hemisphere were long part of our common heritage. We renew that feeling of mutual destiny as we join together in our mutual determination that the world will not be engulfed by Soviet communism.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] for yielding to me at this time.

There should be little doubt that Americans in overwhelming numbers, as lovers of freedom, independence, and democracy, have no use for dictatorships, whether of the left or of the right. That is not to say, however, that we have any right to attempt to impose our form of government upon any other people.

We have every right to teach others our way of life and to encourage them to follow in our footsteps.

In doing so, however, we must be careful to respect their views and to learn to live with them.

To the extent that we cooperate with each other in peaceful pursuits, we strengthen our own position.

There was a time when we got along with the Communists. We fell out with them when they sought by subversion and by force to undermine and destroy free peoples. The same may be said of the Nazis, under Hitler.

Spain, under Franco, has during and since World War II proved to be our friend. It has driven the Communists from its borders. It has welcomed and assisted the persecuted and the refugee.

It has, and I hope will continue, to justify our confidence in setting up on her soil American military bases that will help protect the free world from a potential assault by Soviet Russia and its Iron Curtain allies.

On January 24, 1950, I addressed the House as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWS IN SPAIN
(Speech of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, Jan. 24, 1950)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this time to tell the House about the Jews in Spain.

This is not a plea for resumption of diplomatic relations with Spain. Whatever our course of conduct with any country, it should be based upon principle and upon truth.

LOVE OF DEMOCRACY

I love freedom and democracy. I will never embrace any form of totalitarianism. I therefore despise every type of dictatorship, political or religious, vicious or benevolent. But the type of government of any nation is not to be decided by outside sources. One of the fundamental features of the United Nations Charter is the right of each country to determine for itself how it shall be governed. My thoughts and feelings on this subject have been openly and freely declared and publicized.

Accordingly, I had never had any desire to visit Spain. In fact, I felt that my vigorous, if not violent, denunciation of Franco would, to say the least, make me unwelcome there. More than a year ago I had been told that my antagonism against the Spanish Government was engendered by misinformation and that the Jew in Spain was accorded the same privileges as any other Spaniard. I made no effort to hide my disbelief. In fact I said that if that were true, the Jews would be the first to proclaim it. Why not, said I, have one or more of the leaders of Spanish Jewry come to the United States and tell it to us. The response was that such procedure would be derided in the American press as paid propaganda.

I continued to believe the newspaper and magazine articles about the terribly oppressive conditions under which Jews lived in Spain, confined in ghettos, denied the right of religious worship, and the pursuit of the traditional rites of practicing Jews.

When my wife and I planned a trip to the European Continent and the Middle East last year, Spain was not on our itinerary. It was not even once considered as a place we cared to see. My mind was closed on Spain and on the possibility of any good coming out of it. Incidentally, even though I planned and did devote much time on that trip to matters of official interest to me as a Member of Congress, I bore the full expense thereof personally.

WHY I WENT TO SPAIN

On the start of our journey, aboard the *Queen Mary*, I heard much talk from ap-

parently responsible sources directly at variance with my beliefs about Spain. In London and Paris I heard more of the same tenor. I continued to hold to my own ideas on the subject.

In Paris we attended the Rosh Hashana—Jewish New Year—services in the famous Rothschild Synagogue. It overflowed with worshippers. There was standing room only. During the portion of the services devoted to meditation I thought of the fact that here were thousands of free men and women praying according to their ancient tradition in a place but so recently occupied by Hitler's Nazis. Through my mind ran the places where freedom of worship was still proscribed. Communist Russia and her satellites came to mind, some Arab countries, and then Spain. An inspiration struck me. At least some of my colleagues were going to Spain and might be misled by false propaganda into bringing tales to the United States that all was well there with the Jew. I could scotch such tales if I could go there and bring home first-hand knowledge of the true situation.

Fearful that my request for a visa would be denied, I did not present myself at the Spanish Embassy in Paris. Instead I asked the American Embassy in Paris to obtain our Spanish visas. In due course our passports came back with the visas affixed.

From France we proceeded to Spain instead of going to Italy as originally planned. Obviously I had no interest in Generalissimo Franco. I had no desire to see him and I did not see him.

NO DISCRIMINATION, NO GHETTOS

We spent most of our time with the members of the Jewish communities. We conversed in English, Yiddish, and German. We were in their places of business, in their homes, and in their synagogues. We were shown around Barcelona by native Jews who were as proud of their city as any Brooklynite is of his Brooklyn—than whom there is no prouder native son. I know it will sound incredible to the average American but here is the truth and I will document it for you.

There is no discrimination against the Jew in business or in employment in Spain. The Jewish employee and the Jewish employer have the same privileges and the same rights as any Spaniard. No one asks him his religion. It is the only place in the Eastern Hemisphere, outside of Israel, where I observed Jews proudly wearing in their lapels the gold Mogen David, the shield of David, colloquially referred to as the Jewish star. The Jews are engaged in business as merchants, exporters, importers, and manufacturers.

They live wherever they can afford to rent or buy a home. There is no ghetto. No one asks their religion before they rent or sell a home to a Jew.

They make no attempt to hide their Judaism. They are not afraid of persecution because they happen to be Jews.

FREEDOM OF ACTION

I had been told that they were not permitted to acquire Torahs—Holy Bibles, handwritten in Hebrew upon parchment scrolls. Here is a photostatic copy of an original certificate by the Spanish authorities permitting Mr. D. Salomon Romano, as secretary of the Jewish community of Barcelona, to import a Torah, free of duty or other payment.

Shortly after our arrival in Barcelona the local Jewish community tendered a testimonial dinner to me at the Ritz Hotel. Not only was the dinner publicized but the printed menu cards—I hold an autographed copy of one in my hand—said in Spanish that it was tendered by the Jewish community of Barcelona. The place cards carried the names of every person in attendance. Pictures were taken by a commercial photographer.

I have several of them here. That is certainly not the conduct of a minority group of people which is faced with persecution or is fearful of oppression.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, made an inspiring talk at this dinner, which was gratefully acknowledged by those in attendance. I visited their synagogue which is used for daily prayer. Here are the photographs of the interior of that synagogue. One of these shows the rabbi in the pulpit. I worshiped with them at their Sabbath services.

Any Christian entering that place of worship will see at a glance that it is not a Catholic church. Any Jew will observe at once that it is a synagogue.

As in most Jewish communities, the synagogue customarily used for daily prayer is not large enough to accommodate the large number of worshippers on the high holy days. In Barcelona, they solved their high holy day problem by renting a theater which they equipped for use as a synagogue during those holidays. I was there between New Year's Day—Rosh Hashana—and the day of atonement—Yom Kippur. Here are the pictures of the interior of that building as it was prepared for use as a synagogue. Note please that the names of the pew holders appear on every seat.

SPAIN'S ROLE IN RESCUING JEWS

It was in Barcelona that I first learned of the thousands of Jews that were rescued with the aid of Spain from the Nazis. That was told to me by a Jew who had been interned in a concentration camp and who was not only rescued by Franco's men but was given the very job he holds today by one of them.

I later had the fact confirmed to me by a representative of the American Joint Distribution Committee that, during the height of Hitler's blood baths, upward of 60,000 Jews had been saved through the generosity of Spanish authorities who permitted them to enter into Spain and then helped them proceed to places of safe refuge.

Upon my return to this country I contacted the World Jewish Congress and received from its representative a copy of the resolution it adopted in November 1944 in Atlantic City, N.J. Let me quote this sentence to you from that resolution:

"The War Emergency Conference extends its gratitude to the Holy See and to the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and Spain and to the International Committee of the Red Cross for the protection they offered under difficult conditions to the persecuted Jews in Hungary. It is confident that this protection will be continued and its scope enlarged in accordance with the contingency of the situation."

From Barcelona we flew to Madrid. Again we devoted ourselves to the Jewish community. There are only about 500 Jews in Madrid and about 3,500 in Barcelona. I since learned that there are also two very small communities in Valencia and Seville. The total population of Spain is 28 million, of whom between 4,000 and 5,000 are Jews.

In Madrid we attended the Yom Kippur services in their synagogue. I participated in the prayer services, wherein we used torahs which in 1939 had been secreted for safekeeping in a Catholic monastery and later returned by a Catholic bishop to Dr. Ignacio Bauer, as president of the Jewish community in Madrid. Dr. Bauer is a lawyer and a professor of law at the University of Madrid. A teacher of English in a Catholic high school there assured us that the school authorities have known from the day they hired her that she was an orthodox Jewess.

RELIGIOUS RESTRICTIONS

I inquired in both cities about restrictions against the practice of traditional Jewish rites. I was assured that there was no re-

striction against kosher slaughtering of fowl and cattle.

The Jews are required to obtain permits to maintain their synagogues. The same is true, however, of all non-Catholic places of worship. Having in mind that Spain, like certain other European countries, has a state religion, I thought this was an unfair requirement imposed for the benefit of the Catholic Church. England and the Scandinavian countries have state religions, but no such requirement.

Italy, which has no state religion, does have such a requirement. The reason given for the requirement in Spain and in Italy was that the Government desired to be in a position of assuring itself that no religious institution would be used as a cover for revolutionary or antigovernment activity.

While understanding the reason I do not approve the regulation. I think both Italy and Spain stand to gain more in the eyes of the free world by abolishing such regulations.

What bothered me greatly, however, was the fact that although both the Barcelona and the Madrid Jewish communities had been assured by authorities that their applications for permits were in order and that they could function, no written permits had been issued by the authorities. I also learned that in Barcelona the Jews were not permitted to bury their dead, but were required to seal the bodies in vaults in a wall maintained at one side of the civil cemetery. This condition did not prevail in Madrid, where the civil cemetery was divided by a wall into what became two cemeteries, one for the Jews and one for the Protestants.

I was assured by Mr. Enrique Benarroya, president of the Jewish community in Barcelona, and by Dr. Ignacio Bauer, president of the Jewish community in Madrid, as well as by many others in both cities, that they were quite happy with their lot in life, that the Spanish authorities extended every cooperation to them and their coreligionists, and that they suffered no discrimination at the hands of the authorities or of private citizens.

INTERCESSION ON BEHALF OF JEWS

Before leaving Madrid I called on the Foreign Minister. I told him of the things I had learned about the Jews in Barcelona and Madrid. I told him how very glad I was about some of the things I had learned. I also told him about the things I did not like.

I emphasized particularly that, while I did not approve of the regulations requiring permits to maintain places of worship, at least the written permits should be issued if governmental requirements were met. I also said that the cemetery situation was not only intolerable but irreligious.

I was most agreeably surprised to find that the Foreign Minister was in accord with my thinking on both subjects. While he knew that both Jewish communities were maintaining synagogues, he professed not to know that written permits had not been issued by the local authorities. He assured me he would inquire into the matter and see that they were promptly issued. He was disturbed to learn about the cemetery situation, and promised me that if my facts were correct those regulations would be rescinded at once.

After discussing these matters with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], he suggested that we discuss them with the Spanish Ambassador at Large, José F. de Lequerica. Upon our return to Washington, D.C., we did just that, and the Ambassador offered to follow the matter with his Government to a satisfactory conclusion.

RESTRICTIONS ABOLISHED

I am happy to announce today that I have before me confirmation of the fact that formal permits have been issued by the prop-

er Spanish authorities for the maintenance of the Jewish synagogues, and for the burial of Jewish dead in accordance with orthodox religious requirements.

This confirmation comes to me from many sources. Ambassador de Lequerica has so advised me orally and in writing. An American friend in Spain, who has nothing to fear from any source, has so advised me in writing. The World Jewish Congress and the American Joint Distribution Committee have likewise confirmed those facts.

The World Jewish Congress wrote me:

"We received direct confirmation from our friends in Spain that the Barcelona community was granted official recognition, and that the communities of Barcelona and Seville were given permission to maintain their cemetery."

Dr. Bauer wrote me from Madrid:

"I am certain you are already aware of your great personal success. Thanks to your intervention, the Barcelona community is already officially recognized, and we hope that the Madrid community will also be approved shortly. I consider this as being really a great feat."

The American Joint Distribution Committee wrote me under date of January 12, 1950:

"The efforts you made while in Madrid apparently have borne early and productive fruit."

Mr. Benarroya wrote me from Barcelona, as follows:

"Since your visit things have been happening very fast and in our favor. On the part of the civil governor and in accordance with instructions from Madrid, we have obtained official recognition for our community, which puts us in the same situation as all other communities in other countries. We are under the impression that this was due to the influence of the United States of America, and knowing that you, dear Mr. MULTER, had something to do with this, we send you our thanks, and ask that you send same along to the other people who intervened."

I take this occasion to extend such thanks publicly to all those who lent their good offices to the excellent results obtained and especial thanks to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to commend my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] for his typically intelligent address. He has been overly generous in his treatment of me for which, of course, I am grateful. My knowledge of the matters about which he has spoken leads me to observe that he has rendered our country a great and courageous service, in addition to which he has been an important factor in further removing some of the real or fancied differences that have tended to separate us from the people of Spain—a separation which, if removed, would better serve the interests of all peaceful and freedom-loving people. You have listened to a well-documented report from one of our most energetic and capable Members from New York. The longtime effect of his conscientious and successful efforts to improve the situation of the Jews in Spain will become the greater as time goes on. He has well served the cause of peace and has well served the Spaniards of Jewish faith.

On February 24, 1955, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item, as follows:

COMMUNITY HEAD STATES SPAIN NOT ANTI-SEMITIC

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 24, 1955)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the

following news item which appeared in the Jewish Advocate newspaper in Boston, Mass., on February 10, 1955:

"COMMUNITY HEAD STATES SPAIN NOT ANTI-SEMITIC"

"MANILA.—Newspaper accusations in the United States and Britain that Spain has been intolerant of Jews and anti-Semitic were denied here this week by Daniel F. Baroukh, president of the Jewish community of Madrid, who is currently in the Philippines.

"In a statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Sr. Baroukh noted that 2 years ago he was granted an audience by the Spanish Chief of State, the first such interview granted a Jew in Spain in 450 years. He said he came away from the meeting impressed with General Franco's words and message to the people of Israel.

"Sr. Baroukh recalled that 2 years ago the Spanish Government gave its permission for the holding of public high holiday services in a Madrid hotel and that a Spanish Government representative attended the services, as did leading Spanish Catholics, representatives of the American Embassy, and American Jews. In a reference to the refusal to grant a permit to hold similar services in a Madrid hotel this past Rosh Hashonah, Sr. Baroukh said a mistake was committed by his secretary in Sr. Baroukh's absence.

"The head of the Spanish Jewish community stressed that during the Nazi regime many Jews were saved by being admitted to Spain. He listed various other gestures by the Spanish Government toward the facilitating of religious services and instruction, and acknowledged its presentation of a magnificent collection of books for the projected Sephardic Library in Jerusalem. Sr. Baroukh said that there are now 35,000 Jews in Spain."

It has been my happy privilege to become rather well acquainted with the former Spanish Ambassador to the United States and present chief of the Spanish mission to the United Nations, His Excellency José Felix de Lequerica and his successor as the Ambassador to our country, His Excellency José Maria de Arelliza. They are both able and distinguished diplomats and truly great statesmen. They have improved relations between our countries, while at all times working for world peace.

I hope that the people of our two countries can continue to work and live together in harmony.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico has delivered an address on Spain and the Spanish people which deserves the commendation of all who love freedom and who realize the never-ending threat of Communist treachery.

In eastern Kansas, Mr. Speaker, are many citizens of Spanish ancestry who constitute an important segment of our society and who are honest, hard-working, and interested in our Government. These Americans despise communism, are devout churchmen, and love our way of life. Many of them fought under our flag to preserve it and many proudly wear decorations won in conflict.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Speaker, upon a splendid tribute to a great people.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the statement again today by the Premier of the Soviet Union, in his junket through Poland, that communism will eventually take over the whole world through the free choice and selection of the people in the countries involved is another in-

stance of the blindness of the Soviet leaders to how people really feel about the brutal doctrine of communism. Of course, the statement he made is nonsense. In no country in the world have the majority of the people freely chosen communism except in one lone province of India, where they have lived to regret the decision. Communism has no appeal to people aware of the meaning of this doctrine.

The defenses we have helped to erect throughout the non-Communist world against a spread of this political disease must be maintained. As we all know, our bases in Spain now provide an important part of that defense effort.

The Khrushchev pronouncements today reinforce our determination to keep our defenses secure against Communist aggression and subversion.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues by joining in paying tribute to the people of Spain on this 23d anniversary of their defeat of the Communist attempt to take over their country.

St. Augustine, Fla., in my district, the oldest town in the United States, was settled by Spain nearly 400 years ago. Many of the descendants of the original settlers still live among us. We have always maintained a warm feeling for Spain, and were particularly gratified when the Communist revolution was quelled. The valor of those who fought to save their native land has been a landmark in the history of that great country. Our people are proud of their Spanish heritage, and rejoice with the people of Spain on this notable anniversary.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate indeed that Congress should recognize the 23d anniversary of the original effort of General Franco to eradicate Communist infiltration in Spain and check the Communist conspiracy in that historic country.

In our own country, we are irrevocably committed to the principles of free constitutional government, because we feel that, under this form of government, man has achieved a greater measure of freedom, as well as a larger measure of prosperity, than under any other system. It could be said, therefore, that as Americans we unalterably favor free, representative, democratic institutions.

Notwithstanding that fact, most of us must be deeply impressed with the determined fight that General Franco and his government have made against the organized, world Communist conspiracy that was so intent upon fastening its ruthless talons on the Spanish people. Theirs was not an easy task. It was fraught with bloodshed, sacrifice, and internecine strife characterized by brutal and bloodthirsty outrages against human decency and by persistent schemes and plans to impose the Communist system upon the entire Spanish people.

This campaign employed every means of stratagem and trickery, deceit, misrepresentation, and violence to destroy the forces of religion, order, and stability in the Spanish Government and Nation. If it had succeeded, Spain and its noble people with their great heritage of faith and devotion to the spiritual values of Western civilization would have been forcibly taken into the fold of the Communist world movement and would have been unceremoniously dragged behind the Iron Curtain, so to speak.

This result would have been tragic, not only for Spain, but for the world. We can, therefore, express our gratitude to those who successfully beat off the attempts of Communists to infiltrate and capture Spain.

We have other reasons for gratitude in that since that time the Spanish Government, although it is not modeled on the lines of democracy that we ourselves embrace, has loyally stood by our side in the great world conflict against communism which will determine the destiny of free men and decide whether or not mankind will henceforth live under institutions of liberty or in a state of debased serfdom.

Spain is strategically located on the European Continent. It has wholeheartedly collaborated with us in establishing necessary defenses against Communist encroachment and aggression. Our Nation has, in turn, done much to bolster the military and economic strength of Spain and thus we not only have a willing ally, but an ally that is possessed of growing power and strength to withstand Communist infiltration and attack, and to join with the other free nations in checking the gigantic scheme to make all peoples of the world captive to Marxist domination.

I join with other Members of the House in congratulating General Franco and the Spanish Government upon its successful fight against communism and upon its undeviating loyalty and allegiance to the cause of the free world which our own great Nation represents.

I desire to express my compliments and appreciation also to my esteemed, able, and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONROYA], for arranging, on July 16, the special occasion upon which the Members of the House might express their views on this subject matter.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION URGENTLY NEEDED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today as I did in the last Congress in the interest of labor-management reform legislation. I earnestly believe this to be one of the most crucial legislative issues facing the 86th Congress.

I have introduced both the original Kennedy-Ervin bill and the bill as

amended by the Senate which passed that body by the overwhelming margin of 90 to 1. It is my hope that after the committee and the House have worked their will, similar legislation will be approved by the House with a margin no less overwhelming than that given in the Senate.

There can be no doubt that the American people are united in their earnest desire for the Congress to pass without further delay urgently needed labor reform legislation.

No reasonable person wants us to pass legislation to cripple or destroy the labor movement. Neither are we called upon to pass legislation that would interfere with the legitimate relationships of the employer to his employees.

What the Nation does expect is a reasonable bill designed to end the corruption, racketeering, and undemocratic practices that have crept into a small but highly significant portion of an otherwise honest labor-management field.

The American people, the rank and file of organized labor and nearly all of labor's leadership are disgusted with the Dave Beck type of union leader, as well as the shadowy management operators characterized by Nathan Shefferman.

In some unions the members are wondering what has happened to their dues and the union treasury. Others are concerned about the breakdown of democratic election procedures. Still others are embarrassed to see important leadership posts go to convicted felons. In some instances local unions are chafing under overextended trusteeships.

There are other equally disturbing and unwholesome relationships which have developed over loans by employers or unions to union officers, conflict-of-interest situations and the underhanded activities of some management middlemen whose function is to keep out honest unions that cannot be bought off by management.

Congress can take a long stride in the direction of cleaning up these abuses by enacting with necessary modifications the labor reform bill which was passed with near unanimity by the other body. I realize that this legislation which I introduced in the House following its passage by the other body is not perfect. There are parts of the bill that need to be revised to eliminate loose wording, possible inconsistencies, contradictions, and needless redtape. These parts are largely confined to that section of the bill which was added in the heat of debate on the Senate floor rather than being carefully studied and evaluated in the committee room. With minor changes, however, the legislation passed by the Senate and H.R. 3028 and H.R. 6752, which I have introduced, are sound and workable measures that will meet the need for legislation to end shabby and dishonest labor-management practices.

Labor and management both have some legitimate complaints against all of the reform proposals thus far made, but if we wait for the perfect bill we will be granting a permanent license to

the racketeers to continue their outrageous conduct. The Kennedy-Ervin bill is a compromise settlement that will not satisfy anyone entirely. But who can deny that it moves substantially in the direction of more responsible and cleaner labor-management relations?

As Walter Lippmann, the distinguished columnist, put it in his column of April 30 following passage of the Senate measure:

The main debate (in the House) will be on whether the amended Kennedy bill should be toughened or softened. In fact, however, the overriding national interest is that a bill should be passed which establishes the principle, as does the Senate bill, that there is a public interest in the internal management of labor unions, and that the right to regulate them is legally recognized and universally accepted. This is ever so much more important than any specific provision of the bill.

It would indeed be tragic if the 86th Congress should repeat the failure of the last Congress by dissipating the opportunity to make a constructive beginning in the field of labor reform because of bitter arguments as to exactly what kind of provisions such a bill should contain.

I said at the close of the 85th Congress that the two greatest failures of that Congress were the lack of constructive action to meet the mounting crisis in agriculture and the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill.

I feel those convictions even more strongly today. It was a tragic mistake last year when a few shortsighted but powerful business lobbies and a very small minority of labor's leadership joined hands to bury labor reform in a flood of propaganda. Senator Ives summed up the defeat of the bill which he had cosponsored as follows:

The Kennedy-Ives bill was a good bill. It would have put Hoffa out of business, for example, but a lot of House Members were misled by false propaganda.

To its lasting credit, the AFL-CIO took a courageous stand in favor of the labor reform bill of last year. Although the AFL-CIO has objected to the wording in some of the hastily drafted floor amendments added to the Kennedy-Ervin bill, I am confident that these responsible labor leaders are as anxious now as they were a year ago to see wholesome reform legislation enacted.

I have no sympathy for those loud critics in other quarters who are shouting as they were a year ago that the legislation before us is worse than no bill at all. These are the same narrow groups who deliberately set out to destroy the efforts of those of us in the 85th Congress who did our best to secure passage of a reasonable reform bill.

For years, the earnest wish of the American people for legislation to end racketeering has been choked in a vise set up by those who say the particular bill goes too far and those who say it does not go far enough. The real issue is whether or not the Congress will resist the pressures from extremists on both sides and enact into law a reasonable measure which will put us on the road toward union-management relations free from racketeering, graft, and

undemocratic procedures. My pride in cosponsorship of the Kennedy bill does not extend to resisting those amendments which thoughtful men can demonstrate will strengthen the legislation. Unfortunately there are those who may try to kill labor reform legislation by loading it down with extreme, controversial amendments. These cynical efforts must be defeated.

The following is a summary of the basic provisions of the bill based on some of the remarks of Senator KENNEDY, the chief architect of the legislation:

First. It guarantees the basic rights of all union members, including their freedom of speech and assembly, freedom to set union dues, provides safeguards against improper disciplinary action, and protects the rights of a member to sue in Federal courts for the enforcement of his basic rights.

Second. It sets up strong barriers against the control of unions by unreformed convicted thieves, racketeers, and thugs, or their service as union officers. It prevents union officials from using union funds to perpetuate themselves or their friends in office.

Third. It sets up safeguards in court proceedings so that members of unions can protect themselves against arbitrary control by large international unions through the device of the trusteeship.

Fourth. It guarantees America's working men and women the fundamental right of the secret ballot in selecting their union officers and permits the majority of the members of a local to remove crooked officials at any time.

Fifth. It provides workable machinery for contesting in Federal courts crooked or rigged union elections and insures fair election procedures, regular elections, due notice of all union elections, and real opportunity to nominate opposing candidates.

Sixth. It puts the spotlight of publicity on middlemen racketeers and unscrupulous antiunion employers.

Seventh. It compels comprehensive detailed reporting of union economic and administrative data so that the members and the public can really know what is happening.

Eighth. It strikes hard at the "sweet-heart" contract by penalizing both the giver and the taker of a bribe in labor-management relations.

Ninth. It requires union officers to reveal personal financial transactions which might conflict with their responsibilities as union officers.

Tenth. It places strong power in the Secretary of Labor, with adequate safeguards of individual rights, to compel compliance with the provisions of the act and imposes heavy criminal penalty for violations.

Eleventh. It requires that all union officers or employees handling union funds be bonded in sufficient amount to protect their membership.

Twelfth. It prohibits picketing for 9 months where a union has had an election and lost it.

Thirteenth. It outlaws the vicious hot-cargo clause in the trucking industry and prevents the enforcement of existing contracts containing such clauses.

Fourteenth. It imposes criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries on books, failure to report, or destruction of union books.

Fifteenth. It prohibits loans by employers or unions to union officers.

Sixteenth. It authorizes suits by union members for recovery of funds embezzled or misappropriated by union officers.

Seventeenth. It prohibits picketing for extortion or to secure payoff from employer.

Eighteenth. It prohibits the solicitation or payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers.

In short, it is a strong, effective bill. It will enable all union members to know how their dues are spent, instead of having them carried around in a little black box by Anthony Doria, the friend of racketeers, or used to purchase an air-conditioned Cadillac by the secretary-treasurer of the garbage local in New York. It will require minimum standards of union democracy, with elections at regular intervals by secret ballot or by a convention of delegates elected by secret ballot, and prevent Johnny Dio from setting up fake paper locals and casting votes in the names of persons who did not even know they were members of the union, much less council delegates. It will bar convicted felons from serving as union officers, so that Herman Kierdorf could no longer go straight from his prison cell in the Ohio State Penitentiary to an appointment as business agent for the Teamsters in Detroit.

It will limit and supervise union trusteeships, so that the vice president of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers cannot again appoint himself trustee of two Chicago locals whose funds he misused on his personal hobbies to the tune of some \$40,000 in 5 years. It will require union officials to completely disclose all possible conflict-of-interest transactions, so that Teamster members urged to buy lots in a so-called model Teamster community in Florida would know that Jimmy Hoffa had arranged the financing of this development through coercion on the union's banks, had placed the promoter on the Teamster payroll, and stood prepared as a hidden partner to reap a large hidden profit.

It will prohibit loans by either employers or unions to union officers, so that the president of the old Bakery Workers would not again be able to borrow heavily from one of their employers to buy expensive homes in Washington and Palm Beach, and then negotiate a substandard union contract with his benefactor without consulting the local members. And it will expose and prevent the undermining of honest unionism through management collusion, middlemen, and union-busting techniques, operations of so-called consultants like Nathan Shefferman, who promised employers he could keep out the responsible unions which could not be bought, through his various techniques of anti-labor committees, company unions, payoffs, and teamster collusion.

I do not say that the Kennedy-Ervin bill, or any law, under our Constitution, can eliminate Jimmy Hoffa. He is en-

titled to the same rights as any other citizen, including the protection of the fifth amendment and trial by jury. But we can eliminate the evil practices by which he and his associates rose to power, their conflict-of-interest transactions, their destruction of union books, their manipulation of trusteeships, their rigged elections and conventions, their appointments of ex-convicts as union officials, their use of management middlemen, their use of union funds to build personal financial empires, their private arrangements with employers, their shakedowns and tribute for unloading interstate trucks, their falsification of union reports, their reprisals against honest members, their insistence of hot-cargo clauses in trucking contracts and their strong-arm picketing of plants where the union has already lost an election.

Labor reform legislation is long overdue. Passage of a proper bill will be in the best interests of labor, management, and the American public.

Although I am no longer a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I keenly appreciate the difficult task which faces that distinguished committee in drafting an acceptable bill. I testified before the committee on June 4 urging that they act with all reasonable speed in bringing solid legislation to the floor for House action. The committee has been working diligently to offer such legislation for our further consideration before we adjourn. I am sure that no one of us wants to see this present session of the Congress close until we have passed a workable labor-management reform bill.

HOW TO FIGHT INFLATION: IKE WAS RIGHT THE FIRST TIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on two vital economic issues of the day, the President's first reaction has been a sensible one. But then he is worked over by his advisers. He changes his mind. And the Nation suffers.

Here is example No. 1. At his June 17 press conference, the President was asked by an alert reporter whether, in effect, he approved the principle of H.R. 6263—the Clark-Reuss bill—which seeks to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price increases, and associated wage increases, in such concentrated industries as steel:

Question (Raymond P. Brandt, St. Louis Post Dispatch). Mr. President, both the steel management and the steel unions are issuing self-serving statistics which are in great conflict. Is there any way that Government can bring out impartial figures on profits and wages and productivity so the people can understand the issue and make their own decisions?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I think you have asked about the most intelligent question on this particular question, particular matter; and I haven't thought about it in this particular way, to put these statistics together, you might say in columns right down the line and seeing what the judgment is.

I don't know whether this would be helpful or not, but I'll take your suggestion, and I'll have it studied. It's one that I just

wouldn't want to shoot too rapidly on for the simple reason that, that they are tough questions, they are people that are bargaining right now, and it's not my business to try to influence them.

But I do say, this is a matter that affects the public, and I do have a public duty to do what I can, as long as I don't get into the business of the bargaining itself.

Question (no name). Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT (continuing). Therefore, if I can do anything, why, you can bet I will.

In other words, the President was saying that the people of this country have a right to an expert Presidential judgment on the confusing mass of statistics with which management and labor have been bombarding us. Had the President given the public such a judgment, he might well have prevented today's disastrous steel strike.

But he has not given us such a judgment. His advisers went to work and talked him out of his sensible first reaction.

Yesterday, at his press conference, in response to a question from William McGaffin of the Chicago Daily News as to whether the President felt that he could have done anything more to avert a steel strike, the President replied:

As far as a factfinding board is concerned, I believe that all the facts are pretty well known. There was a question asked here a few weeks ago, whether the Government had anything in this line, and I find that in all our reports, in the Labor Statistics and the Commerce and the other figures that are published, some quarterly, some monthly, they are all there. So the facts are there and the public knows them, if they want to take the trouble to read them.

I do believe that I have done what should be done, which is to keep urging on both sides statesmanship and a readiness to negotiate, and I will still continue it.

Of course, it is not just a question of the public taking "the trouble to read" the elaborate statistics on wages, prices, profits and productivity. The analysis of these statistics takes judgment. Who is better able to make such a judgment than the President, as guardian of the national economy, and his staff?

Example No. 2: On July 8, the House Committee on Ways and Means reported out the administration's request to raise the 4½ percent interest ceiling on U.S. bonds, with the Metcalf amendment—in which I heartily concur:

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve, while pursuing its primary mission of administering a sound monetary policy, should to the maximum extent consistent therewith utilize such means as will assist in the economical and efficient management of the public debt, and that the System, where practicable, should bring about needed future monetary expansion by purchases of U.S. securities, of varying maturities.

The Metcalf amendment does three things:

First. It reasserts the power of Congress, under its constitutional duty to coin money and regulate the value thereof, to instruct the Federal Reserve System in the exercise of the power over credit which Congress has delegated to it.

Second. It tells the Federal Reserve that, when in the Fed's good judgment it wishes to expand the money supply, it should do so in a way helpful to the

management of the public debt, by purchasing U.S. securities, rather than in the other way, by further lowering bank reserve requirements. This helpful way saves millions for the taxpayers, prevents unlimited downward fluctuations of U.S. securities, and reduces the problem of attrition which occurs when security holders demand cash.

Since 1954 the Federal Reserve has consistently used the unhelpful way, that of lowering bank reserve requirements. It has added \$4.3 billion to bank reserves by this method. It has recently publicly announced that it intends to continue this unhelpful method of increasing the money supply, rather than to help in the management of the public debt.

Under the Metcalf amendment, the Ways and Means Committee very properly directed the Fed to use the helpful method, and to stop using the unhelpful method. The Metcalf amendment leaves to the Fed, as before, complete discretion as to how much new money to create, or whether to create any new money at all.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on an item that appeared in this morning's Wall Street Journal commenting on this entire rate question. I am quoting from an observation made by the paper. It goes on to say:

The Metcalf amendment will be interpreted both at home and abroad as a sign that the United States is going to resort to what Mr. Martin called "printing press money."

I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin would be kind enough to discourse on that particular comment?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I will comment on that. It seems to me that the quotation from the Wall Street Journal, and the quotation from Mr. Martin on which it is based, is hogwash of the purest ray serene. There is not a word of truth to it. The Ways and Means Committee's directive is sound, sensible, hardheaded, and noninflationary. It simply directs the Fed to stop using the indefensible policy it has been using and instead, when it wants to create money, do so in a sensible manner that will help in the management of the national debt.

The Metcalf resolution—let the Wall Street Journal note this and let Mr. Martin note this—does not say one single, solitary word about easy money, printing presses, creating money at an accelerated rate, or anything of the sort. It simply accepts whatever rate of money creation the Federal Reserve in its judgment thinks is sound.

The Federal Reserve has recently testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency that, in order to lubricate an expanding economy, it should create money from here on out at the rate of around 3 percent a year. Even though I happen to think that a 4 or 5 percent a year increase would be a more reasonable rate of increase, I am delighted to hear them say that they are willing to increase the money sup-

ply at the rate of 3 percent, since, in fact, during the last 4 or 5 years, they have increased it at the niggardly rate of only about 1.5 percent, thus contributing to the two recessions we have had and playing a leading role in the continuing stagnation that our economy has enjoyed.

The Metcalf amendment shows admirable restraint in not asking the Fed to adopt any particular rate of monetary expansion. What it says is that the rate of monetary expansion that is in effect adopted by the Fed should be achieved by the method helpful to the national debt, of purchasing U.S. securities.

I wish that the fellows who either write for the Wall Street Journal, or, I suspect, back in the home office redo the stories that the excellent and accurate Wall Street Journal reporters around here send in, would tidy up their copy a little bit. When Mr. Martin says something which is so palpably at variance with the facts as that the House Ways and Means Committee is advocating "printing press money," I wish that they would at that point in their news story insert a little parenthetical expression showing that Mr. Martin is dead wrong and is talking through his hat, and set him straight.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. Would the gentleman be willing to comment on the notion that perhaps the interest rate program that has been suggested by our distinguished colleague [Mr. METCALF] in the Committee on Ways and Means, somehow or other would cause a flight of gold from the country, or possibly would be responsible for a change in the balance of trade in this country?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I notice a lot of talk, that I can only stigmatize as unpatriotic, by the leadership in the Federal Reserve, that there is going to be a disastrous flight of gold if the Ways and Means Committee directive is adopted. I personally resent very much the suggestion that my colleagues in the majority on the Committee on Ways and Means—and this includes both Republicans and Democrats, because I understand the vote in favor was bipartisan—by their directive are about to cause a disastrous flight of gold from this country.

Mr. Martin and his colleagues are forever talking about what the directors of world central banks tell them in New Delhi and Hong Kong and various other out-of-the-way places. I would like to tell the Members of this House that last fall I was a member of a mission sent by the Joint Economic Committee to all the countries of Western Europe to discuss with the central bankers of those countries the economic problems of their countries and to see if they had any observations about the conduct of our own economic affairs. And I am here to testify that the one worry in the minds of the central bankers I talked to was that the policies of the U.S. Federal Reserve have become unduly wooden, unduly restrictive, unduly inelastic, and

would cause the economic growth of this country to stagnate. And that, they say, will be the worst possible thing for the free world. So if it comes to quoting hearsay statements by central bankers, I can do that too.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to comment on another problem that has plagued me. Just exactly what right have we, as Members of this Congress, to invade the prerogatives of the Federal Reserve by directing them to do certain things? By what right do we do this?

Mr. REUSS. We have not only a right but a constitutional duty to exercise the inalienable power of Congress under the Constitution both to coin money and to regulate the value thereof. That means we have complete control over the credit system of this Nation. Quite properly, under the leadership of the late Carter Glass, we delegated this power to the Federal Reserve because the day-to-day administration of our monetary system is a task beyond the immediate competence of the Congress, just as we delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission so much of our power over interstate commerce, and to other executive agencies and independent bodies the day-to-day administration of so many of our other constitutional powers. But, of course, Congress has not only the right but the duty to tell the Federal Reserve how it shall work and the path wherein it shall walk, particularly where the Federal Reserve has openly and notoriously announced it is going to keep right on pursuing the same reckless and foolish policies that have gotten us into this monetary and debt management mess. Congress would be derelict in its duty if it failed to give the Federal Reserve the benefit of the sound judgment which the Committee on Ways and Means by a majority vote a week ago Wednesday is giving it, and which I trust one day the entire Congress will be able to give it.

But there is a confusion in the minds of some people because the Federal Reserve is said to be independent of the administration. I will buy that doctrine of their independence, and I always have bought it, if what is meant by independence is that the Federal Reserve Governors are appointed for a 14-year period, and they are supposed to have a spinal column, so that if a weak-kneed President tells them to turn on the printing presses and print money in excess of the economic needs of the economy, I would want them to stand up and tell the President—no, they were not going to do it. I want them to maintain their independence of judgment, even though I think the administration since 1953 has been extremely remiss in failing even to recommend measures to the Federal Reserve, and in failing even to comprehend monetary problems within the ambit of its economic recommendations.

But let us be very clear on one thing. The independence of the Federal Reserve, such as it is, is an independence from the President and the executive branch. It is in no sense an independence from the Congress. The framers of our Constitution, I say to the gentle-

man from California, did not set up a quadripartite system of government in which they created the executive, the legislative, the judicial branch and the Federal Reserve branch. You can read the Constitution all day long without finding any such nonsense in it. The Federal Reserve and the administration of our monetary policy belong to the Congress.

As the Federal Reserve freely admits, they are the servant of the Congress. However, what galls the gentleman from Wisconsin is that when the master upon occasion, hat in hand, and in the most delicate and genteel way, offers after long thought and debate by the very able Committee on Ways and Means some advice to its servant, the servant engages in the kind of activities I am about to describe and thumbs its nose at the master.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I am just curious to know, in view of the long and tremendous effort put forth in this field by the Committee on Banking and Currency, if they have come up with a reason why there has never been a public audit of this quasi-agency that the gentleman has just discussed, this agency that is a supergovernment in itself. If it is an agency of this Government and was created by the Government, then they should have a public audit just as every other agency of the Government created by the Government has. Would the gentleman care to comment on that point?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, the reason there has never been an audit by the Congress or an instrumentality of the Congress of the affairs of the Federal Reserve System is that, unfortunately, the law setting up the General Accounting Office apparently excludes the Federal Reserve from the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office. That does not mean that the Congress itself could not audit the affairs of the Federal Reserve System. And, in my opinion, this would be a salutary thing.

The good light of publicity never hurt anybody. I think it is high time that a candle be lit which will light up some of the dark recesses of the marble hall down at the other end of Constitution Avenue.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. Am I correct in understanding that there would have to be additional legislation for an audit of their books?

Mr. REUSS. I do not believe so. It would be necessary to have new legislation to enable the General Accounting Office to go into the Federal Reserve and take a look at the books. However, the Congress itself, whether it be through the instrumentality of the Banking and Currency Committee, whether it be through the instrumentality of the Committee on Government Operations, or some other committee, is, of course, enabled, as master, to visit its child and see that the child's books are in order.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I compliment the gentleman on the fine analysis he is making.

I am distressed that the press should be reporting that the proposal of the Ways and Means Committee should be labeled "printing press money." It seems to me that one of the tragedies of the debate and the public discourse in this whole area is that partisans apply slogans rather than sober and candid analysis as the gentleman is here doing.

In order that the record may be more precisely correct on this point following the first question of the gentleman from California, would the gentleman care to suspend a moment to identify more precisely the difference between the various ways in which this country can increase its total money supply so that we may know what printing press money really is and what the difference is between that and the supply of gold or silver and the supply of credit through the expansion of the banking system, to which the gentleman alluded just a moment ago, through the expansion of bank credit?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, although the gentleman does me too much credit in considering me as an expert on these matters. But let me say that in general there are two ways in which the money supply can be increased.

The money supply means currency outside of banks and bank credit, the latter, of course, being much the larger. Far from there being anything wrong with the notion of bank credit expanding the money supply, this is the essence of our private enterprise capitalistic economy. This is what makes the mare go.

All bank credit, of course, if you want to call it that, is printing press money. When a bank has a reserve of \$100 it has a lending capacity of \$600 or \$700. Far from being evil, far from being an instrument of the Devil, this is a wholesome thing, and I wish the Federal Reserve, which is supposed to be the finest expression of American banking, would stop calling names, stop stigmatizing that which every banker knows is the lifeblood of our credit system.

I come from a long line of bankers, and I resent this imputation that bankers are engaged in the business of issuing printing press money, as I deeply resent the suggestion that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and the fine people on his Committee on Ways and Means are wild-eyed inflationists, hellbent on turning our monetary system into an engine of inflation, hellbent on wrecking our economy. I deeply resent the invective that comes out of the Federal Reserve these days.

One method, then, of creating additions to the money supply is by lowering bank reserve requirements, either by lowering percentage requirements or by permitting the counting of vault cash.

The other method is by purchases by the Federal Reserve System, through the Open Market Committee or directly, of U.S. securities. When the Fed purchases a thousand dollars' worth of U.S. securities, this automatically creates

around \$6,000 worth of lending power by the banking system; it automatically creates a reserve of \$1,000.

Similarly, when the Federal Reserve lowers bank reserve requirements, such as to increase reserves by \$1,000, it thereby also increases the system's reserves by \$1,000 and permits lending of around six times that much. We have these two principal methods of increasing the total amount of money supply.

The import of gold into this country also increases the monetary supply, as it increases bank reserves. To a degree, the import of gold into this country can be a willed thing, representing the judgment of the Treasury. To a degree also, it can be an unwilling thing, representing the judgment of hundreds or thousands of traders throughout the world and investors throughout the world as to where they want to keep their money.

But the two main methods, as I have said, are the method of one, lowering bank reserve requirements; or, two, purchasing U.S. securities. As I have indicated, the second is immeasurably helpful to the management of the national debt.

The first is of practically no help.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the gentleman has summarized very admirably the situation and I trust this will help to put to rest the reckless charges of printing press money. I think the gentleman's comments point up the essence of the debate upon the Ways and Means Committee proposal and the Administration's response. The administration position is clear. Over the past several years the Federal Reserve has only lowered reserve requirements, it has not increased them. They have indicated a complete preference for this one alternative.

But the Congress has provided the Federal Reserve with other alternatives. Among those other alternatives is the power to buy bonds in the open market. If I understand the Metcalf amendment to the Ways and Means Committee proposal, we say to the Federal Reserve, we gave you more power than to lower the reserve requirements and we think at the moment the use of another method would contribute materially to the problem of diminishing the burden of the public debt. Am I correct?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman's understanding is tidy and precise, and I would feel that if a freshman Congressman can understand the Metcalf amendment as tidily and as precisely as the gentleman has, the editorial writers of the Wall Street Journal could do so too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I would hope that would be true, not only with reference to the Wall Street Journal writers but also members of the President's Cabinet.

Mr. REUSS. I am afraid the gentleman is expecting too much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The fact of the matter is, then, that inasmuch as the powers which the Federal Reserve have are derived by an act of Congress,

which act is in pursuance of the congressional responsibility under the Constitution, it is within the realm of reason to assume that if the Congress feels an agent of the Congress is behaving in a manner contrary to best public policy, a mild offer of a bit of advice by the Congress would not be an unreasonable addition to share, which would be totally unnecessary if the Federal Reserve were using the other alternatives which we have already provided them. Is that correct?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So the whole argument boils down to the simple proposition that the public is being led to believe that the alternatives are either high interest or printing press money.

The only candid evaluation of the economic and legal situation is that this is not the alternative at all. No one is proposing printing press money, neither the gentleman from Wisconsin nor myself nor the Ways and Means Committee. Instead, we are suggesting that the Congress has already given the Federal Reserve another alternative device by which it can perform its statutory duty, and we wish they would get on with it. Is that correct?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Most of the time the distinguished gentleman has taken has been in critical statements as to certain practices, critical of things that are happening in the Federal Reserve.

Mr. REUSS. I was not being critical of the President's first reactions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I did not mention the President.

Mr. REUSS. My statements are critical of his position after his advisers got through advising him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I did not mention the President. After the distinguished gentleman from Colorado made his remarks, it seems clear that the Congress has control of the Federal Reserve System, but a good deal of the discussion here has been along the lines of objecting to things that the Federal Reserve System has been doing and statements that they have been making. The gentleman is here making these remarks and I am wondering if as a member of the distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency he has forwarded his criticism to the people down there at the other end of Constitution Avenue, as a Member of the Congress. They are a creature of the Congress. To talk to us about it is one thing, but to go down there and get to the root of it is another, and that would be the most constructive way of going about it.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from Nebraska is so right. I could not agree with him more. It is the duty of a Congressman, particularly one who happens to be on a relevant committee such as I, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to present his views in a quiet and orderly fashion to the administrative agency concerned before he takes the floor.

I would say to the gentleman that I have been presenting these views to the Federal Reserve at hearings, by letters, by telephone calls, by personal visits almost ever since I have been down here, and I have not gotten so much as the time of day from them. I therefore hope that by exposing these issues on the floor in a give-and-take, democratic debate, maybe some others, including the American people, will make their views felt, so that the Federal Reserve will stop pursuing wrong policies and start pursuing right policies, so that the taxpayers may be encouraged, and so that the national debt may be managed in an economical and efficient manner.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am wondering if the gentleman is alone on the committee or does he have the support of the chairman and the majority of the membership of the committee. I am sure, if he has and he has made these representations to the Federal Reserve Board, they would certainly listen with a great deal of interest and concern.

Mr. REUSS. I am sure that I have the support of all right-thinking members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That, I believe, includes the majority of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, because he is not only a distinguished member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and obviously qualified by training and experience to speak knowledgeably in this area, but the gentleman is also a member of the Joint Economic Committee and has sat through many hearings and has had many opportunities, and I will witness here to the House that I have been present in the gentleman's office when the conversations, at least one of the conversations, to which he alludes took place, and I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska on my own behalf that I, too, have been in conversation or correspondence with the responsible administrative agencies. I served in an official capacity previous to my coming here, and I am well aware of the obligation of a Member to make his representation there. Unhappily, the argument is not confined to the privacy of the rooms of the top officials of the Federal Reserve or the Treasury, but it becomes a subject of Presidential news conferences, as the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin will bear testimony; it becomes a subject of newspaper stories, editorials, editorials which demean not only the integrity but the patriotism of Members of the Congress who are doing their heroic best to look after the rest of the American people. And, I would call to the attention of the Members that the issue with which we deal is one of great moment.

In the message to the Congress on the 8th day of June of this year the President in a short paragraph—one paragraph before the end—says in effect: "Oh, by the way, the increase in the interest rates since I prepared the budget which I sent you in January has already raised the cost of carrying the public debt by \$500 million, and therefore I am calling for an additional appropriate

tion." I heard no cries by Members on this floor about budget busting when that message was received by the Congress, and yet when we tried to get \$50 million to clean up the streams to meet human needs, that becomes budget busting; when we try to erect buildings, schoolrooms, homes for the aged, the President vetoes it because it is budget busting; when we try to build adequate airfields to take care of the needs of the American people, this is budget busting. But, when we increase the carrying cost of the Federal debt to pay interest to persons not contributing 1 cent's worth of service to the American people by the amount of \$500 million, this is not budget busting. And, if we grant the request which the President made in the earlier paragraphs of the same message, I predict, not the least bit cheerfully, that we will boost the budget for next year by a billion dollars. In addition to this burden upon the taxpayers of America, we are also raising the burden upon State and local governments. I am in receipt of communications from members of governing bodies of local governments in my district that they cannot get bids upon bonds which are needed to build the necessary water supply systems, sewage disposal programs, and schools and that these Federal Reservists are failing their responsibility in this regard. Now, there are other matters in addition to the question of their purchase of Government bonds which must be a portion of a total program of sound and prudent fiscal management, and the administration might very well be benign in other matters. The so-called Clark-Reuss bill, which has been reported by the committee, would do something to help in connection with the present steel controversy, to do something about the steel price problem and the steel wage dispute and the present strike. The administration might very well be restricting consumer credit. The same Wall Street Journal, which speaks of printing press money, noted just a few days ago that there was an increase in consumer credit in the amount of \$874 million last month. That is private deficit spending and printing press money, to use their phrase, at the rate of \$10 billion a year. If we want to grapple with inflation, you cannot cut down consumer credit by raising interest rates. You have got to raise the downpayment and shorten the amortization period. We would like the administration to make recommendations to us for necessary authority, if they do not now have it, as they say they do not have it. Then let them come and ask us for that authority. This Congress will act responsibly. But it will act responsibly it seems to me, if given a full program which spells out all of the alternatives and let the Representatives of the people choose which are the best among those alternatives.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. Now, to get on: There is a third thing that the Metcalf amendment does:

Third, it directs the Fed to drop its self-denying "bills only" policy, and instead to purchase whatever U.S. securities it can best purchase—whether bills, certificates, notes, or bonds—without

any artificial limitations as to the type of security to be purchased. In other words, Congress is telling the Fed that the Fed has presented no good reason for its "bills only" policy, and should heave it in the ashcan.

Once again, the first reaction of the Eisenhower administration to the Ways and Means Committee's sound and sensible directive was favorable. Both the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times reported that the administration accepted the Metcalf amendment. Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson was quoted in the New York Times as saying:

We would have preferred the original proposal, but this legislation accomplishes for the most part the objectives of the legislation we sought.

Treasury officials, the New York Times story went on, "indicated that they could live with" the Metcalf amendment.

But then Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., went to work. According to the Wall Street Journal, he spent last Monday closeted with the President, scaring him out of his wits with tales that the Metcalf amendment would introduce "printing press money." The Federal Reserve is supposed to be independent of the White House. But apparently the White House is not to be independent of the Fed.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that any time the Federal Reserve creates new money—whether by lowering bank reserve requirements or by purchasing U.S. securities—it is creating "printing press money" in the sense that something is created out of nothing. Either way, it is the system we have of creating money under capitalism today. There is not a thing wrong with it, and there should be no mystery about it. What William McChesney Martin, Jr., really means is that he prefers his own method of "printing press money" to the method that will help in the management of the national debt, the method chosen by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

This McChesneyism does neither the Federal Reserve or the country any service. It is a pity that the President has apparently fallen for it. At yesterday's press conference there was the following colloquy:

Question (John R. Gibson, Wall Street Journal). Mr. President, on the subject of interest rates for Government bonds, there is considerable discussion these days on the Hill and within the administration on the so-called Metcalf amendment which would say that the Federal Reserve should buy bonds as a manner of increasing the money supply. What is your view of this amendment and would you favor perhaps no bill at all rather than have this amendment tacked on or would you go along with it?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I wouldn't here announce a final decision. I say this, these two amendments, there is two of them, that are very bad we think—one, the 2-year limit and the other one, that implies that we should embark on what we would, and I think the Federal Reserve would count, would call unsound financial operations. And the first thing that I believe that's in the Federal Reserve Act is that its duty is to see that the finances of the United States are handled on a sound basis.

So we wouldn't—we are concerned deeply about these two amendments. Now I cannot give you any prediction on what I will do.

This inspired the following comment from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], as reported in this morning's Wall Street Journal:

House Speaker RAYBURN (Democrat, Texas) summed up current Democratic sentiment, though what he said publicly was mild to what others were saying privately. "If they don't want us to put in language that does some of the things we think should be done," Mr. RAYBURN declared, "it's someone else's responsibility. We can sit here and wait. We don't have to hurry."

I believe that President Eisenhower is sincerely against inflation. If he would stick to his first reactions, he might well be able to do something effective about it. If he had stuck to his first reaction on administered prices, he might have been able to avert a steel strike and to prevent further inflationary movements in the steel industry. If he had stuck to his administration's first reaction on interest rates, he might have been able to introduce a measure of rationality into debt management, and to moderate the upward movement of interest rates.

Instead, the native hue of Presidential resolution has been sicklied over by the pale cast of the thought he receives from his advisers. And our economy is the worse for it.

FOREIGN AGREEMENTS ON NUCLEAR INFORMATION AND EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on this subject following my own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, it should not go unnoticed that a serious effort was made in this body to disapprove the executive agreements with seven foreign countries that will provide them with certain nuclear information and equipment suited to military purposes. Because of the limitations of time and parliamentary procedure, we were unable to bring the issue before the House for debate and vote.

This points out the danger of passing legislation which permits agreements or anything else to go into effect unless the Congress votes to disapprove them. Many of us object to backdoor legislation which permits the Executive or the administration to, in effect, legislate or commit the Congress and the American people. A sincere effort was made to get the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to recommend against the agreements. This effort was not successful, but our attempts were treated with consideration and courtesy. Every possible effort was made to get a rule to bring the matter to the floor of the House.

The Committee on Rules was most courteous and most cooperative. But, for the technical reasons, we could not get a rule. The leadership of the House could not see fit to accept my request for permission to make a unanimous-consent request to consider concurrent resolutions opposing the agreements.

Therefore, as of July 16, we have no way to get time for debate and a vote on this issue. The House will not be in session prior to July 18, when the agreements with France and the United Kingdom become effective.

Mr. Speaker, I only hope that we will not be sorry that such a serious step that may have a profound effect upon the future of the world was more or less taken by default. I cannot agree with such a method. I do hope that we can find a way to debate and vote on the five remaining resolutions and agreements.

More than 40 Members of this body have indicated in writing that they are interested, and I estimate that up to 100 prefer to have some discussion.

The American people did not know about this issue for a long time, but during the past few days they certainly have indicated their concern by writing, visiting, and so forth.

Will we never stop the spread of the nuclear club and curb the danger of a possible war of terrible dimensions. How can we be sure that these agreements will not lead to further agreements and "give-aways" of nuclear secrets and weapons? How can we be sure that the allies of today may not become less friendly and turn against us or even by mistake place us in jeopardy by hasty action? How can we find peace by extending the risk of war by accident? How can we find a way to limit nuclear testing; or to negotiate for peace and disarmament if we spread nuclear information and weapons systems to country after country? Will competition in ways of war lead to cooperation in the ways of peace?

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

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have been in contact with the gentleman from Vermont on this problem. I do think it is unfair to say, as the gentleman mentioned, that this is backdoor legislation, which permits the executive to legislate because, as the gentleman well knows, this matter was before the Congress last year authorizing this particular program. There were 12 of us who voted against it. I was one. For the RECORD the others were Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. BENNETT of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOWDY, the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. WHARTON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, and Mr. WINSTEAD. I do not know that I opposed these agreements for the same reason the distinguished gentleman from Vermont does. I voted against this legislation which permits these agreements last year for the simple reason that I thought our atomic and nuclear knowhow was the greatest strength we had to preserve the peace of the world. I do not think we ought to be sharing it with anyone else, realizing the unstable governments we

have in the world and realizing, for example, that we have had so many different governments in France, we know that the largest bloc of deputies in their Chamber of Deputies is a Communist bloc. We share these secrets with the French Government today which is friendly. Tomorrow, it may be an unfriendly nation and these secrets will be in unfriendly hands. But, my main reason for being among the 12 who opposed this congressional action last year, which sets this up, which is the thing the gentleman is talking about, is I thought we ought to retain these secrets within this country because it was our bulwark against aggression and our greatest guarantee of peace. I do think the gentleman has done a service to the country in calling this matter to the attention of the Congress. I, too, would be hopeful that these agreements at least could be brought before this body for debate. Evidently that is not possible, at least for some of the agreements. I do hope that some of the other agreements will be brought before us so that the Congress can express its will.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska. I knew about the 12 Members who voted against this. I feel sure that if other Members had examined this as closely and deeply as the 12 did, we would not today be faced with the situation with which we are faced.

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

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASEM. As one of those who signed the petition requesting debate on this issue, I might state that perhaps my inclination was in favor of the agreements. However, I do feel that a gross wrong was done in precluding an open discussion.

I was not so firm in my conviction that I did not want to have the value of learned discussion on such a widely important matter. The gentleman from Nebraska has advanced what to me seem to be very cogent reasons in this matter. I know the reasoning of the gentleman from Vermont, and I think it is sound. However, there are considerations on the other side.

It was imperative for the Congress to discharge its responsibility conscientiously, and each Member of the Congress bears that responsibility, that we should have had learned and adequate discussion; and I feel seriously deprived of an opportunity to perform my function as a Member properly. It certainly seems that we are able to devote time to many other things of far less consequence, and I want to join with the gentleman in what may be a gentle reproach to the leadership on this policy of forced legislative procedure.

Mr. MEYER. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sorrow.

I do not believe I can recall during my lifetime ever hearing a major address by a President of the United States or a

candidate for the Presidency, or a leading statesman which did not include at some point a fervent prayer for peace. I recall so well the wonderful statements during and prior to World War II as, for example, the Atlantic Charter. One of the purposes of the Charter was to reduce the crushing burden of armaments.

We are today, in a few moments, passing a milestone in world history. We as a Nation are sharing at least a part of our atomic arsenal, our atomic weaponry, with two of our great allies.

At midnight on Saturday, a week from now if this House and Senate have not acted, we will share with four more of our allies; and on the 10th day of August an agreement with another major ally will go into effect.

These agreements were released to the Congress for our approval or disapproval at the very time when the United States was presuming to negotiate with other great powers the possibility that we might have an end to nuclear testing. This was to have been a prelude perhaps to nuclear disarmament. We were also negotiating with other great powers the possibility that the leaders of the great nations would meet together to try to reconcile some of the differences between these great nations.

Many years ago President Roosevelt said:

If war comes it will not come because we jumped into it, but it will be the result of day-by-day decisions.

We are at that point, Mr. Speaker, that we are making some of those day-by-day decisions. I think they deserve the full consideration of the House and Senate.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to state publicly my displeasure that Congress was not given an opportunity to debate and vote on these nuclear agreements involving the NATO countries.

It is very unfortunate that so little attention has been given to this matter that many, many Congressmen were not even made aware of the agreements.

Has our parliamentary system become so complicated that now vital issues can be foreclosed completely by parliamentary ruses? If so, then we have come to a terrifying place in the road of representative democracy.

I believe if this is true, and it was true here, we had better overhaul our machinery involved in the committee system so that the wishes of all Congressmen may be felt on major issues in spite of the fact that a few men on a certain committee may be of a unanimous opinion which could conceivably be at variance with many Members of Congress.

Saturday of this week could very well turn out to be a tragic day for civilization.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 5196.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE NEWSPAPERS WILL NOW HAVE TO ADMIT THE DEMOCRATS HAVE AN ISSUE

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President took a public stand on the big issue which has for several months now generated so much congressional heat and so much newspaper silence. This is the issue whether the Federal Reserve shall make it possible for the private banks to create more money to acquire more Government bonds, and pocket the interest payments, or whether the Federal Reserve will itself acquire more bonds and return the interest payments to the Treasury.

It is not surprising that the President came out openly on the side of bigger and better subsidies for the bankers, and on the side of more interest costs to be paid by workers, consumers, farmers and small-business people. The President announced his stand in connection with the administration's bill to repeal the 40-year-old ceiling on interest rates at which the Treasury can issue bonds. Or more specifically, the President objected to the amendment to this bill which is sponsored by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

THE ISSUE: TREASURY REVENUE VS. INCREASED BANK PROFITS

It is also reported that Secretary Anderson expressed the view, yesterday, that the Metcalf amendment might be more dangerous than keeping the interest-rate ceiling. Personally, I am delighted with this appraisal of the Metcalf amendment. I had not realized that the amendment would be so effective in causing the Federal Reserve to do what it should do. The amendment only states that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve System shall buy bonds, where feasible, to permit increases in the money supply. The amendment expresses no views whatever as to monetary policy. It does not condemn the tight money policy, nor suggest an easy money policy. It does not suggest that the Federal Reserve ought to permit the money supply to increase any more or less rapidly than it sees fit. In other words, the amendment does not touch upon what the Federal Reserve is doing, or imagines that it is doing, to control the business cycle through monetary policies.

The amendment only expresses a view as to how the money supply should be increased, if and when it is increased, though of course future growth in economy will make it certain that the Federal Reserve will bring about substantial increases in the money supply by one method or the other. The amendment merely expresses a view as to how

the Federal Reserve should divide the benefits of its power to create money and its power to make it possible for the private banks to create money. These powers have been delegated to the Federal Reserve by Congress, and Congress will be expressing the view, in this amendment, that these powers should be used somewhat more for the benefit of the taxpayers, and somewhat less for the benefit of the private banks. The same amount of money will be made available to the private banks for extending business and consumer credit in either case. Monetary policy is not interfered with. So far, Congress has refrained from making any expression about monetary policy during this administration. It refrained from doing so just this past week, when it passed the so-called vault cash bill, although it did express a firm and clear view on a scheme proposed by the bankers and the Federal Reserve to have the private banks acquire more Government securities, without cost, and to have the Federal Reserve acquire less Government securities.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE METCALF AMENDMENT AND DEFEAT THE INTEREST RATE REPEAL BILL

It has been my view for a long time that Congress should express itself on monetary policies, and I believe the time will shortly come when it will have to do so. But the big issue at stake now is not tight money or easy money policies, but whether, when the Federal Reserve decides to bring about a given increase in the money supply, it will acquire Government securities in the process, or whether it will reduce required reserves of the member banks and thus make it possible for the banks to create the money to acquire these securities. The administration and the Federal Reserve seem now to think the Metcalf amendment effectively makes the suggestion that the Federal Reserve should do the former.

Frankly, I had not realized that the Metcalf amendment, which merely expresses the sense of Congress would be interpreted as being quite so binding upon the Federal Reserve to do the right thing by the taxpayers. But apparently the administration and the Federal Reserve both think the amendment comes dangerously close to doing so.

This is most heartening. I am now encouraged to believe that Congress should pass the amendment and not pass the bill. This would be of even more benefit to consumers, farmers, and small-business people. Certainly this is an idea worthy of very deep consideration by the Members: Pass the amendment and defeat the bill. The Metcalf amendment is good; the bill is bad.

DR. LEON KEYSERLING'S RECOMMENDATION

For the Members' consideration I would like to call attention to two recent and important writings on this subject. One is a brief quotation from a new study issued by the Conference on Economic Progress titled "Inflation: Cause and Cure." This study was directed by Dr. Leon H. Keyserling, who was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers during President Truman's administration. Here is the con-

clusion which Dr. Keyserling and his associates have reached about the tight-money and high-interest rate policies:

The so-called tight-money policy is both repressive and inflationary. The Federal Reserve System should resume sufficient support of the Government bond market to stabilize interest rates at lower levels, and to facilitate the management of the national debt. The inflation attributed to such policies during wartime was due to other causes. If necessary, the Federal Reserve System can counteract any inflationary effect of bond support by lifting bank reserve requirements. A more selective system of credit controls should be instituted. The overall tight credit approach restrains those activities which are in need of expansion, long before it touches those which need restraint. It is also hurtful to economic growth.

To those Members who have not read all of Dr. Keyserling's study, may I say that I believe they will find it to be most worthwhile. Those who do not care for the programs and policies which Dr. Keyserling recommends will at least find the study helpful in this respect: It cuts through all the mystical fog and gobbledygook which have been built up around the tight-money and high-interest policies and examines the claims which have been made for these policies against the factual results which the policies have produced. This examination reveals that the policies have done a great deal more than merely enrich the bankers and the moneylenders at the expense of the great majority of people. These policies have done great harm to our whole economic system.

PROFESSOR BUCHANAN EXPLAINS "FAKE" DEBT

A second reference which I believe the Members will find most worthwhile relates to the more narrow issue—whether the Government shall make it possible for the private banks to create more money to buy more Government obligations. This is from an article titled "The Real Debt" by Prof. James M. Buchanan appearing in the July 1959 issue of *Challenge*, which is published by the Institute of Economic Affairs, New York University. This is most interesting. We have heard quite a lot about "printing press" money, "rubber" money, "fake" money, and so on. It will now be worthwhile, I think, for the Members to give their attention to the distinction which Professor Buchanan has drawn between the "real" Federal debt and what he calls the "fake" Federal debt, as follows:

THE REAL DEBT

(By James M. Buchanan)

PAYMENT OF INTEREST OBLIGATIONS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONSTITUTES THE ONLY REAL BURDEN OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

The financial cost of fighting World War II is still with us. In fact, this burden represents the major portion of a national debt that last year approached \$282.9 billion. Until someone uncovers a logical reason why we should attempt to retire all or a substantial portion of that figure now, the likelihood is that the public debt will be with us for a long time to come.

The annual interest paid on the Federal debt now amounts to more than \$8 billion, constituting the second most significant expenditure of the Federal Government. The real burden of the national debt, as with any debt, lies in the paying of this interest. To

what extent, however, does the mere payment of interest represent "a burden"?

To answer this question, it is first necessary to distinguish between "real" and "fake" debt. The creation of real or genuine public debt involves an exchange in which government acquires purchasing power by obliging itself, to some individual or institution, to pay a specified sum of money in the future. The individual or institution sacrifices some purchasing power or liquidity in exchange for this promise of future payment.

This is totally different from "fake" debt creation, wherein modern governments print money through "borrowing" from the banking system with the assistance of the central bank. Insofar as new money is created, no voluntary sacrifice of purchasing power or liquidity takes place. The payment of interest on such currency ("debt") is wholly unnecessary from an economic point of view, and such interest payment is dictated solely by reason of existing institutional constraints. Discussion of public debt has been seriously marred by a continuing failure to keep these two essentially contrasting operations distinct. We commonly call both of these operations "debt creation." No wonder the confusion.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], may extend his remarks at this point in the Record in four instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LIBERIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend greetings to the people of Liberia, President William V. S. Tubman, and His Excellency, George Arthur Padmore, Ambassador of Liberia, on the occasion of this country's 112th birthday on this coming July 26. Liberia, as its name suggests, will ever stand as a reminder of the enslavement of Africa's children in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries and as a monument to the fighters for Negro freedom, white and black.

Throughout Africa, history for other people is at last approaching the progress in independent self-government that Liberia has known for over a century.

Though born of a desire to escape the grinding oppression of the slave system in the United States during the early 19th century, Liberia, nevertheless, transplanted to Africa the first historical and cultural roots of American culture and throughout her existence that country has been the only nation on the continent of Africa which the United States has been able to rely on as an ally beyond question. On the American side there has been consistent concern for Liberia's economic development and social advancement.

Liberia has exhibited courage in her determined stand on the side of the Western World during the recent period of intensified struggle between the East and West which developed following World War II. A greater test of her leadership ability will arise as she seeks to apply her resourcefulness to the establishment of a *modus vivendi* for the

emerging nations throughout the continent of Africa. What Liberia can do to stabilize conditions there will ever find concern among Americans who are racially, economically, and politically intertwined with the people of the Liberian Republic.

ETHIOPIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to salute the Ethiopian people, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, and His Excellency Zaudez Gabre Heywot, on the occasion of the Emperor's 77th birthday anniversary, July 23, 1959.

The conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Elect of God, Emperor of Ethiopia is a descendant of the oldest and longest line of royalty in recorded history and the reigning monarch of the oldest Christian nation in the world—his line having been founded by the union of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba nearly 3,000 years ago.

Except for a few years under the heels of Italian fascism, Ethiopia represents the longest line of continuous government in the world and stands as a monument of independence to peoples throughout Africa now struggling against foreign domination.

Like her African neighbors elsewhere, Ethiopia has been hit by the same overwhelming desire to progress technologically and economically. Thus ancient Ethiopia is turning greater attention to ways and means of speeding her movement into the modern world.

Our relationship with Ethiopia has been consistently good, and to the extent that we resolve constructively the difficulties in the African and Middle Eastern areas to that way, we expect to strengthen our country's position in Ethiopia.

INDONESIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to greet the Indonesian people, President, Dr. Achmed Sukarno and His Excellency Moekarto Notowidigdo on the occasion of the celebration of the 14th anniversary of the independence of Indonesia on August 17.

In terms of population and wealth Indonesia ranks among the Asian big powers. The transition in government administration which occurred last year though naturally of interest to the American people should await a later date for final judgment.

In all attempts to understand the evolution of that country or any others, we of this country must apply sympathetic rules of measurements. Out of past experiences Americans know firsthand the uncertainties and conflicts that oftentimes follow revolutions against outside control. Foreign policy with these emerging new nations cannot be assayed along simple lines of Communist and anti-Communist.

Writing in Foreign Affairs last October Benjamin and Jean Higgins noted:

To describe the rebellion as an anti-Communist revolt is too simple. Certainly the rebel leaders were eager to see Indonesia on a non-Communist line; but there was not a single Communist in the legal Indonesian Government and communism could still be sought by constitutional means.

The authors reviewed that issue pertaining to increased regional and local autonomy, desire to launch an effective economic development program, desire to rid the Central Government of the abuse of party politics and incompetence and general dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the democratic process. Economic aid to Indonesia in terms of developing industries and meeting immediate consumer needs including light military equipment would be interpreted as a vote of confidence on the part of Americans in Indonesians and their government. The political effectiveness of U.S. policy would be greatly enhanced if we also supported Indonesia on the issue of West Iran—New Guinea—and help persuade them that what we offer is not merely to buy them from the Communists.

Holland's insistence upon remaining in New Guinea and Australia's support in self-interest of that demand poses a problem for the Western World—a problem ultimately a dilemma which we must face or offer some creative alternative. The Higgins insist that if the present leaders fail, the chances that Indonesia can be saved from turning to the other path—the path of China—will be slim. In this breathing spell the West should offer Indonesia economic and political support in exchange for adoption of a development plan and a scheme for decentralization of powers that show promise of success. This will make it possible for the Indonesian Government to choose the path of mature democracy.

EGYPT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the people of Egypt, President Gamal Abdel Nasser and His Excellency Dr. Mostasa Kamel, on the occasion of their celebration of the fourth anniversary of Egypt on July 23.

As we approach ultimate realization in this nuclear age of one world or none, tensions such as exist in the Middle East will demand more and more enlightened sympathetic and humane attention than has sometimes characterized our policies and actions. It may well be appropriate on this anniversary of Egypt's independence that we clear our minds of all preconceived notions about that changing nation, seek out new information, examine fact for fact until a more creative policy adaptable to a new world order of equal partners can be arrived at. Seven years of independence, I am informed, finds Egyptian national aspirations as determined as ever not to relinquish one iota of its independence to any outside power—East or West. For our Government's real difficulties arise and seemingly impossible dilemmas face those who now struggle to establish a *modus vivendi* in the Middle East, particularly with Egypt. I would like to restate for the RECORD a few reasons why we often feel the situation is impossible as drawn from Paul L. Hanna in Middle Eastern Affairs for May 1959.

First, America's European culture, its historic background of isolation and self-sufficiency, its economic wealth under a system of successful capitalism, and its sense of cultural superiority contrast with the Middle East's non-Euro-

pean cultures, its recent background of colonial or semicolonial subordination to the European West, its poverty and need for rapid economic development by state action, and its virulent and xenophobic nationalism. These diverse and often antagonistic traditions make mutual understanding difficult.

Second, disunity and antagonism within the Middle East make difficult the implementation of American policy. Turkey and Greece have disagreed violently over the disposition of Alexandretta. Iran and the Arabs both claim sovereignty over Bahrain. Egypt and Iraq, whether under Farouk and Faisal or under Nasser and Kassim vie for leadership in the Arab world and bitterly attack one another. How can the United States be friend and ally to all of these contending countries at the same time? The Arab-Israeli problem further complicates the situation. American aid and support for Israel arouse Arab anger and enmity, while any withholding of aid creates fear and resentment in Israel.

Third, America's worldwide interests and commitments as leader of the Western alliance make consistent and successful action in the Middle East difficult. If the United States supports its Western allies in conflicts with Middle Eastern states or with colonial peoples anywhere in the world, it antagonizes the Middle Eastern peoples. If it supports the colonial peoples, it puts strains on its European alliances. If it assumes an attitude of strict impartiality, it offends everyone and abdicates its position of leadership in the Western World. This is the dilemma in which America found itself during the Suez crisis in the autumn of 1956 and in which it is involved today with regard to French policy in Algeria and British policy in Aden and Oman.

Finally, there is an unresolved conflict within the third objective of American policy itself. The creation of a peaceful, stable, and prosperous Middle East, impervious to Communist propaganda, must involve an economic, political, and social revolution in large areas of the region. Levels of living must be raised, governments must be reformed, special privileges must be eliminated. Yet the forces of stability and order in many countries of the Middle East have been the forces of privilege and the status quo. Out of the desire for stability the United States has been inclined to support these forces. Their continued dominance, however, can lead in the long run only to popular unrest and the possible spread of communistic influence such as seems to be taking place in Iraq today.

If, for example, the United States fostered the creation of a Middle East defense pact, American refusal to join the alliance made little sense. It annoyed and alarmed the member states and failed signally to placate the non-members. If America was committed to the emergence and survival of Israel, the apparent vacillations in American purpose contributed not to stability in the Middle East but to disorder. They encouraged in Arabs futile hopes of the destruction of the Jewish state with

American acquiescence, and still did not win Arab approval of American policy. If the United States were concerned with the economic upbuilding of the Middle East, the amount of economic aid offered, as opposed to military and defense assistance, was pitifully small in terms of the need. Furthermore, American mixing of economic and politico-military considerations, as in the extension and subsequent withdrawal of aid to Egypt for the Aswan high dam, was inept and nearly disastrous.

If the celebration of Egyptian independence from colonialism does nothing else but remind us that there is a great deal more that we need to know and understand if we are to rewin lost friendship in Egypt and thereby guarantee ourselves a place in the hearts of the Egyptian peoples and perpetuate our position in the minds of all members of the Afro-Asian bloc as standing unalterably for the freedom we fought for in 1776.

In evaluating the Middle East policy of the United States, however, it is not enough to recognize the inherent difficulties in implementing policy in that region. Nor is it sufficient to examine the tactical errors that have been made in the application of the policy. It is also necessary to question the value and appropriateness of the policy which has been pursued.

If the United States is to pursue its objectives successfully in the Middle East it must understand that the decisive social and political force at work there is Arab nationalism, and must come to terms with it; and it must also accept realistically the fact that the Soviet Union now plays an important role in Arab affairs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS, for 45 minutes, today.
Mr. POWELL, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, for 60 minutes on Tuesday next.
Mr. MEYER, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for 10 minutes on July 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. COAD.
Mr. WALTER, to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 6118 and to extend his remarks and include an editorial.
Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CARTER, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO.
(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SCHERER.
Mr. DORN of New York.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 162. An act for the relief of Henri Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 484. An act for the relief of Ma Bong Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 696. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Voisin Whitley, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Pak Jae Seun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1173. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to provide that the existing restrictions on the amount and maturity of real estate loans made by national banks shall not apply to certain loans which are guaranteed or insured by a State or a State authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Mrs. John M. Cica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1500. An act for the relief of Yee You Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1558. An act for the relief of Theopli Englezos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1648. An act to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1669. An act for the relief of Evagella Eliopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1681. An act to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Skogen Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1719. An act for the relief of Lushmon S. Grewal, Jeat S. Grewal, Gurmale S. Grewal, and Tahlil S. Grewal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Tse Man Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1773. An act for the relief of Alan Alfred Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Lilia Alvarez Szabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1798. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to eliminate the payment of premiums on deposits of trust funds by fiduciary banks in uninsured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1837. An act for the relief of Marguerite Fueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1946. An act for the relief of Vicente Soliva Empleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2013. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for the flag of the United States to be flown at half-staff on the occasion of the death of the last surviving veteran of the War Between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 269. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain allowances and benefits to personnel of the Veterans' Administration who are U.S. citizens and are assigned to the Veterans' Administration Office in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey;

H.R. 3269. An act to authorize the payment of veterans' benefits to certain veterans who were discharged as aliens;

H.R. 4693. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to consolidate the referees' salary and expense funds;

H.R. 5446. An act to provide for the recovery of costs of building space utilized by the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 5447. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee;

H.R. 6054. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6435. An act to amend section 105 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, with respect to the disposition upon the death of a Member of the House of Representatives of amounts held for him in the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and of other amounts due such Member; and

H.R. 7789. An act to amend paragraph (b) of section 401 of the National Housing Act, as amended.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 602. An act authorizing the Boy Scouts of America to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia to honor members and leaders of such organization, and for other purposes; and

S. 1120. An act to amend the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits and to eliminate the classification "central Reserve city."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 15, 1959:

H.R. 5676. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; and

H.R. 7567. An act to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the armed services of the United States on duty abroad.

On July 16, 1959:

H.R. 269. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain allowances and benefits to personnel of the Veterans' Administration who are United States citizens and are assigned to the Veterans' Administration Office in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey;

H.R. 3269. An act to authorize the payment of veterans who were discharged as aliens;

H.R. 4693. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to consolidate the referees' salary and expense funds;

H.R. 5446. An act to provide for the recovery of costs of building space utilized by the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 5447. An act to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee;

H.R. 6054. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6435. An act to amend section 105 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, with respect to the disposition upon the death of a Member of the House of Representatives of amounts held for him in the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms, and of other amounts due such Member; and

H.R. 7789. An act to amend paragraph (b) of section 401 of the National Housing Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 20, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1206. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 9, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Wells Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved September 3, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 202); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1207. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1959 (June 30, 1959), pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1208. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected phases of the low-rent housing operations of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1209. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed supplemental agreement No. 2 to extend through December 31, 1962, operating permit No. 14-10-0100-419, under which the Rainier National Park Co. is authorized to provide facilities and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1210. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the court's opinion in the case of *The F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Company v. The United States* (Congressional No. 15-55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and

House Resolution 287, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1211. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the court's opinion in the case of *Desoto Lead and Zinc Company v. The United States* (Congressional No. 4-55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1212. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to clarify the authority of the Postmaster General to provide for the expeditious, efficient, and economical transportation of mail, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1213. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1214. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Peter Pliskunoff, A-2323922, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1215. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Morris Cooper, A-5631916, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1216. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1217. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Chung Dick-Chih, A-8938697, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7072. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank; with amendment (Rept. No. 678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7244. A bill to promote and preserve local management of savings and loan associations by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. House Concurrent Resolution 166. Concurrent resolution providing the express approval of the Congress under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, of the disposal of rough cuttable gem-quality diamonds, cut and polished gem-quality diamonds, osmium, rhodium, ruthenium, and zircon concentrates from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8186. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code,

with respect to Reserve commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2331. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 5196. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 8259. A bill to protect the users of tobacco products from misleading advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8260. A bill to amend section 4456 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the method of paying the tax on playing cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8261. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco and tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 8262. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 8263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 (or \$3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 8264. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8265. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 8266. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 8267. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8268. A bill to amend section 411 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to relationships between freight forwarders and other common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 8269. A bill to authorize marketing agreements and orders under section 8(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Act

of 1937), as amended, with respect to honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 8270. A bill to prescribe limitations on the power of the States to impose income taxes on business entities engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H.R. 8271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an additional tax on cigars manufactured with processed or reconstituted tobacco wrapper sheets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 8272. A bill to authorize the President to mobilize at some place in the United States an adequate number of outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of preventing and curing cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to suspend the manufacturers' excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8274. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 8275. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the Arlington National Cemetery and to provide that certain land heretofore reserved for other purposes shall be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army as a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 8276. A bill to amend section 4821 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the requirements for entrance into the U.S. Soldiers' Home; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution designating the 1st day of August as Marcus Garvey Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 307. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim a Water Conservation Week during 1959; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 308. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 310. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 311. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 312. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Greece for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution stating that the Congress does not favor the proposed Agreement Between the United States of America and the Government of Turkey for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 320. Resolution to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of the bill H.R. 4630; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 8277. A bill for the relief of Harold William Abbott and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8278. A bill for the relief of Isidor Sturm and his wife, Olga Sturm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 8279. A bill for the relief of Benarsi Dass and wife, Gyano Peganyee Dass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 8280. A bill for the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 8281. A bill for the relief of Francisco Fustero Briz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 8282. A bill for the relief of Dr. Harbajan Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anti-Communist Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the unselfishness and eagerness of Dr. Leon F. Nadrowski in his efforts to fight communism on our homefront deserve the attention of my colleagues.

Dr. Leon F. Nadrowski is a physician. He has devoted his life to fighting disease. He is now launching a move to fight the greatest disease of all—communism. He suggests that everyone be thoroughly educated, beginning in the classrooms, as to what the Communist doctrine and threat means to all of us. Dr. Nadrowski believes that Americans should be as aware of the Communist menace as they are of cancer and polio. Periodic medical checkups are advised to catch the cancer cell early—but we

have no checkups to alert us to the budding Communist cell. We have the Salk vaccine as a precaution against polio—our only vaccine against the evils of communism is education.

Ignorance and apathy are the great allies of the Communists. To overcome these, the free world must arm with a new weapon—enthusiasm and interest. Dr. Nadrowski has suggested an Anti-Communist Week—a week devoted to alerting and educating the peoples to the great disease of communism.

Early this year a successful anti-Communist rally was held in Greenpoint, sponsored by the St. Stanislaus American Legion Post. It met with such enthusiasm that it was suggested that an Anti-Communist Week should be promoted on a national scale, starting appropriately enough on the 23d of October each year, the anniversary of the Hungarian uprising. This week should be spent by all Americans to further their knowledge of communism and its grave threat to our existence. This should not, of course, substitute for our daily vigil against communism, but serve as a special reminder of our alertness against communism.

Time To Stop Defamation of Millions of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Italian descent are very much incensed over the recent campaign of abuse which is being directed against them because of a few criminals who have besmirched the good name of the Italian community in this country. A whole community numbering some 12 million people of Italian origin is being blamed for the sins committed by a few. This is not in the tradition of American justice and American principles of fair play.

Organizations of American citizens of Italian descent, the Italian-American press in this country, and many distinguished citizens are now conducting a countercampaign to remove this