

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 923. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in governmental matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation

extending financial aid to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for purification of the waters of the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to defeat the civil rights bill now before that body for consideration; to the committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give sole and sustained consideration to the location of the NASA Electronics Research Center in the Delaware Valley area of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware

without being distracted by region rivalries; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H.R. 9959. A bill for the relief of Harold A. Saly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 9960. A bill for the relief of Lt. Donald Henry Gehring, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement on Conference Report, S. 298,
Adopted Today, February 8, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is good legislation. It was reported unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The small business investment companies program is one of the best ever adopted by the Congress in the economic field. Money that would not have been available to small businesses came within their reach. It is a wonderful program—a gesture of faith in the ability of small business to serve this Nation.

Basically, the bill facilitates investment in small business investment companies and in investment by small business investment companies.

First of all, it raises the limit on the amount of debentures of small business investment companies that may be purchased by the Small Business Administration from \$400,000 to \$700,000, and permits such purchase for a period of 5 years after the date of enactment.

Secondly, it eliminates the dollar limit of small business investment companies investment in a single concern, but it retains a limitation that not more than 20 percent of assets would be reflected in a loan to any single company.

Thirdly, it permits small business to invest idle funds in insured savings and loan associations up to the amount of insurance.

Finally, it gives SBA specific authority to participate with banks and other lending institutions to make loans to small business investment companies.

HAS ALREADY PASSED SENATE

This bill will make it possible to continue this program of assistance to small business. Present funds are all tied up in prior investments. As a result, if the program is to continue, we must have this additional authorization. It is a bill that has been gone over carefully. It has passed the House without opposition. It has passed the Senate. And the

two houses have come to an agreement in conference.

I urge immediate enactment of this bill, S. 298.

A. Philip Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, several times I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report taken from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which showed that the director of the march on Washington, A. Philip Randolph, in years past had been cited by that committee many times as being affiliated with subversive or Communist organizations. I am not alleging that he is a member of the Communist Party, as I do not know; but his background ought to be closely scrutinized and examined. He was cited on 20 occasions for associating with, or sponsoring groups that had been determined to be subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or by the U.S. Attorney General.

The designs of the Communist conspiracy to bore from within and undermine America may be found in the ranks of both the marchers for freedom and the outspoken element which has called for a simultaneous demonstration to counter the August 28 assembly. The overzealous extremists on both sides of the civil rights movement could fall easy prey to Communist infiltration. That is the thing that needs to be guarded against as the underlying aim of the Reds is to foment discord, bitterness, and division among our people. The Washington marchers have a right to peaceably assemble and ask redress of their complaints. It seems to me that it would be most desirable that the group meet in a stadium and air their charges instead of taking over so many of the Capital's busy arteries of traffic and interfering with vital and necessary governmental and business functions.

A. Philip Randolph was coeditor of the Messenger, which was published from 1919 to about 1925. The masthead of the Messenger referred to it as the only radical Negro magazine in America.

In order to portray the principles and philosophy of that magazine, I am quoting some excerpts from the Messenger:

"Soviet Government proceeds apace. It bids fair to sweep over the whole world. The sooner the better, on with the dance" (the Messenger, May-June 1919).

"We want more Bolshevik patriotism. We want a patriotism represented by a flag so red that it symbolizes truly its oneness of blood running through each one's veins. We want more patriotism that surges with turbulent unrest. That is Bolshevik patriotism, and we want more of that brand in the United States" (from the Messenger, May-June 1919).

"You next take to task the editors of the Messenger, A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen, for being Bolsheviks. While you are generally adept at distortion of facts and misrepresentation of circumstances, you have not greatly misrepresented us.

"The sword of Damocles dangles over your so-called white man's domination. Rumblings of revolution are heard in the distance. Nemesis is at hand" (the Messenger, October 1919).

Since the Messenger discontinued operations, Randolph has been furthering integration objectives. Here is a 1948 news item from the Washington, D.C., Times Herald, June 27, 1948:

JIM CROWISM FIGHT OPENED AGAINST DRAFT—
DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE URGED BY AFL LEADER

New York, June 26.—A rebellion against the Draft Act was launched today by A. Philip Randolph, Negro AFL leader. Determined to fight Jim Crowism in the armed services, he announced a nationwide drive to urge Negroes and whites to refuse to register or be inducted and, if need be, to resort to such trickery as feigning illness and faking dependents. It was a daring step, but Randolph was prepared to face the consequences. "The drive," he said, "will get underway throughout the country unless President Truman issues an Executive order against segregation before August 16. "It will be conducted," he said, "by the League for Non-Violent Civil Disobedience Against Military Segregation," whose formation he announced. The civil disobedience was threatened by Randolph at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington March 3. Senators Morse of Oregon, and Baldwin, of Connecticut, warned that Randolph and his followers would face treason charges if they carried out their threat. "Field campaigners of the league will start visiting ma-

for cities Monday," Randolph said. "Adherents subject to the draft registration after August 16 will be urged," he said, "to take any of four main courses of action: (1) open refusal to register; (2) quiet ignoring of registration; (3) refusal to be inducted; and (4) feigning illness—and other subterfuges."

Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all of us to be on guard in this country and find out the kind of company that certain civil rights leaders keep.

The NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal sponsors of civil rights legislation is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A few years ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the various members of the board of directors and the official family and committees of the NAACP to determine their affiliation, if any, with organizations which had been determined by either the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General as being subversive.

On July 29, 1963, public records from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities covering 59 officers, directors, and members of committees of the NAACP were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by me. This material filled 29½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On February 23, 1946, when the original insertion on this subject was made by me, it consisted of 77 persons who were in some official capacity of the NAACP organization.

There was a three-phase purpose in bringing this information to the attention of the public, one being that many years had passed and there was a likelihood of quite a number of personnel no longer holding official positions in the organization; a further reason being that the 1956 RECORD had become practically extinct; and finally to enlighten anyone, including the President and the present Attorney General about the activities of a large number of the leaders of the NAACP. All of those who were not in 1961 associated with the NAACP as revealed by the publication, "NAACP in Action—Report for 1961" have been deleted from the material incorporated in the RECORD.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities in compiling the material with respect to each individual used this language at the outset: "The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is

not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated."

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the Reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote a small part from his address which I feel sums up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extreme folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house.

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as the Tuskegee machine. Dr. DuBois was the leader of the leftwing element of American Negro society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N.Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement. The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement. Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washington group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up nine pages single spaced.

Many of the present-day NAACP officials have been cited many, many times as being affiliated with groups that have been declared subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General.

Statement of the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes Before the Senate Commerce Committee on Firearms Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, February 8, 1964

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, testified January 23, 1964, before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The gentleman from Florida, Representative SIKES, appeared before the committee in opposition to certain firearms control legislation. In an excellent statement he dealt with almost every argument used in favor of the proposed legislation, and countered each proposition with strong logical assertions in opposition to them.

One of the prized possessions throughout our history always has been to bear and own arms. This attitude toward firearms has become a historical tradition in the United States. Convictions on the right of reputable citizens to own and use firearms for lawful purposes were so strong that the Bill of Rights contains an amendment to the Constitution providing that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

In the light of this fundamental principle, the gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES, concluded his remarks with the following quote:

By calling attention to a well-regulated militia for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important.

That quoted statement was made by the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

I commend to you the reading of his testimony which, with pleasure, I include as an extension of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, JANUARY 23, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my feelings on the subject of additional gun laws now before this committee for consideration.

During the years that I have had the privilege of holding elected office, the subject of the right of the law-abiding citizen to keep and bear arms, as guaranteed by our Constitution, has been, and continues to be, a subject of interest and deep concern to me. It is a matter of particular moment now, because of renewed agitation for tighter gun laws.

The tragic and senseless assassination of President Kennedy quite naturally resulted

in a wave of hysteria against weapons and the ownership of weapons. However deplorable this inexcusable act was, it scarcely follows that a crime committed by one man should cause 35 million gun owners to be persecuted. I seriously question that the legislation now proposed would have prevented the purchase of a gun by Lee Oswald or would have resulted in tighter security measures than those which were in effect.

There is already a Federal law that requires anyone selling guns interstate by mail, or otherwise, to buy a Federal firearms license. This law further requires that every sale be recorded and this record retained on hand for a period of 10 years. This record contains a detailed description of the gun, including the name and address of the buyer as well as the serial number.

These records are available to any law-enforcement officer. The fact to be remembered here is that this law is already in effect, and since the records are kept by the people in business, it does not cost the taxpayers one red cent. That this is an effective system is demonstrated by the fact that the information concerning the gun purchased by Lee Oswald was announced by the Dallas police on Saturday, the day after the assassination. The ballistic information on the bullet taken from Governor Connally was announced on Monday. In other words, it would seem that the gun controls we already have may be more effective than some law-enforcement agencies of the State and Federal Government.

We do not measure loss of human life in dollars and cents. Nor would we decry the cost of a gun-control law which effectively prevented crime. Nevertheless, it is well to remember that any form of registration or control will cost tax dollars to operate and enforce. This is a burden which will be shared by all the people.

You cannot legislate against human inconsistencies. The person who shot President Kennedy was the instrument of his death; a gun is an inanimate object and, by itself, can harm no one. The only people really affected by gun restrictions are the honest people. A man who needs a gun to commit a crime will get one by some method or another.

If anyone is convinced that antigun laws will reduce crime, and be a guarantee against violence and murder, then he is worse off than the ostrich. New York State has the toughest gun laws in America and probably the highest crime rate.

Great Britain, after Dunkirk, had only a few thousand small arms available in the entire country, and was requesting the people to contribute swords and crossbows for defense. This was the dilemma they faced because they did not have an armed civilian population to fall back on. Britain has tight gun laws.

During the German occupation of Norway and Denmark, in World War II, the Germans were required to keep one soldier for every 10 square miles of territory because of the partisan groups effective resistance. These people fell into the roles of guerrilla fighters easily because these were nations where gun ownership was encouraged. In other countries where government gun registration was required, the Germans had a handy list of all gun owners and were able to effectively disarm the entire nation.

When I purchase a weapon which is delivered in Washington, even though I own a Federal firearms license, I must go personally to the express office to receive it, and I must fully identify myself and sign several forms. Thus I would assume that Washington is one of the stricter cities on ownership of firearms. But during a recent period when crime increased in the United States as

a whole 14 percent, crime was increasing 41 percent in Washington. Gun laws are not the answer.

In a study by the FBI made in 564 cities during August 1960, involving a total population of 69 million people, the following statistics were compiled:

Out of 7,348 aggravated assaults, 44 percent of the offenses were committed by cutting or stabbing—24 percent by blunt objects; 12.7 percent by shooting; 12.3 percent by hands, fists or feet and 1.2 percent by use of poison.

Now, if it follows that crime will be reduced or eliminated by doing away with all the criminal's weapons, then it is reasonable to assume that these weapons should be dealt with and eliminated according to their frequency of use. Since 44 percent of the above assaults were the result of "cutting and stabbing," then all knives and ice picks should be registered. Since "blunt objects" accounted for 24 percent of the mayhem, then naturally rocks, hammers, baseball bats, rolling pins, etc., should be serialized and registered. Under the "shooting" heading should be included all weapons which propel any object—whether by compressed air or rubber bands.

I do not question that there is a need for improvements. My statement simply is designed to show that we can easily go too far. The National Rifle Association, the leading organization of American sportsmen, has stated that it has no objection to legislation aimed at preventing the misuse of firearms, but that it opposes general registration of firearms and proposals to license the possession or purchase of firearms by law-abiding citizens.

Specifically, the association has said that it does not oppose legislation designed to prohibit possession of firearms by persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, drug addicts and habitual drunkards; or making the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

In the event this distinguished committee feels that legislation is necessary, it is my belief that the amendments submitted by Senator Dobb, which would provide notification by the shipper to the local responsible police agency when a firearms order has been placed, would provide adequate additional security and permit proper action to be taken to limit or prevent ownership of weapons by criminals, or those incompetent or irresponsible.

Now, let's look at the broader picture of firearms controls.

In recent years, seldom has a session of any State legislature or of Congress met without the introduction of at least one bill that would curtail the legitimate use and possession of firearms by citizens of good repute. The vast majority of these bills are introduced with the intention of curing some social ill, or to limit such use and possession by the juvenile delinquent and the criminal element.

While I do not take issue with the purposes for which these bills are intended, if administered correctly and given the proper emphasis, I certainly decry the efforts of some people or governmental agencies to severely limit the peaceful employment of firearms by lawful citizens.

As the committee well knows, thousands of Americans who own and enjoy firearms for defense and sport now feel strongly that the continuation of this ownership and enjoyment is in jeopardy. Much of this came as the result of the assassination of President Kennedy. Before that took place, however, concern had been caused by the enactment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The contents of this

act and executive policy on this subject generated much publicity and reaction throughout the country. The general grounds for criticism have been that the implementation of this law could place the United States in a dangerous political, economic, and military position vis-a-vis the Communist bloc. In order to make it absolutely clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act did not include the elimination of private firearms as part of the proposed disarmament program, I introduced a bill that will protect such rights of the citizen from encroachment by the Disarmament Agency. The language of my bill is identical to one introduced by Senator HICKENLOOPER and is now contained in Public Law 88-186, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. That language is as follows:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any policy or action by any Government agency which would interfere with, restrict, or prohibit the acquisition, possession, or use of firearms by an individual for the lawful purpose of personal defense, sport, recreation, education or training."

We consider it sound insurance in a good cause.

I have heard criticism from some quarters about allowing the free possession and use of firearms in modern American society. Arguments that this contributes to crime and constitutes a menace to free Government are completely fallacious.

Our forefathers knew what they were doing when they approved the second amendment to the Constitution, which states that "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." Then, as now, an armed citizenry is less likely to be cowed by criminal elements or oppressive government. Rather than restricting freedom, the right to possess arms guarantees it by instilling independence and strength in an enlightened people.

The United States is facing a critical period in its history. The years to come will decide the desperate battle between communism and freedom, individualism and totalitarianism. If we are to win this struggle, we will need to preserve and use every element of strength that is available to us. Americans are fighting in farflung corners of the world. Some of them will survive because of lessons in marksmanship and acquaintance with firearms gained as boys in a free society. The emphasis placed on small-arms marksmanship for survival in Vietnam bears out my long-held personal belief that there is a continuing need for men in the Armed Forces skilled in the use of basic firearms. As the lawmakers for this great Nation, we would be derelict in our duties if we allowed the right to keep and bear arms by responsible, law-abiding citizens to be curtailed.

I have read the statement of Senator Magnuson concerning the scope of the activities of this committee and have been informed of the proceedings that occurred during your previous hearings. I am strongly in favor of the intentions of the committee to study in detail any problems that may have arisen as the result of the ease of accessibility of firearms to the undesirable elements of our society through mail-order channels. Such problems, if allowed to go unchecked, could result in further restrictions on the law-abiding citizens.

If upon completion of your investigations, you deem it necessary to the continuing good of our society to recommend additional controls on firearms, I urge that the legislation be developed in the spirit of Senator Magnuson's statement of December 10, 1963, when he said:

"Any legislation, State or Federal, must consider the constitutional right of our citi-

zens to bear arms. Responsible citizens have the right to possess firearms for purposes of self-protection, security of the Nation, hunting, and recognized sporting activities."

Let me assure the committee that I will support legislation in keeping with these thoughts—legislation that will make it more difficult for criminals or those inclined toward criminal activities, mental incompetents, drug addicts, habitual drunkards and juveniles to obtain firearms, and which will severely penalize those persons perpetrating

crimes while armed. But let me urge caution in the enactment of these laws, lest they go much further than is needed or intended.

In the April 1960 issue of *Guns* magazine, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wrote the following:

"By calling attention to a well-regulated militia for the security of the Nation, and the right of each citizen to keep and bear arms, our Founding Fathers recognized the essentially civilian nature of our economy. Although it is extremely unlikely that the fears

of governmental tyranny, which gave rise to the second amendment, will ever be a major danger to our Nation, the amendment still remains an important declaration of our basic military-civilian relationships, in which every citizen must be ready to participate in the defense of his country. For that reason I believe the second amendment will always be important."

The man who wrote that was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, the late John F. Kennedy.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in a tense and strained world so agitated and divided, we would seek the peace which is the gift of Thy love and grace to all those who, with true purpose of heart, turn unto Thee.

At the beginning of a new week, with tangled human problems pressing for solution, we humbly bow at this wayside shrine to which, across the long years, a pathway has been worn by those who with a sense of the eternal have here served the Republic. We come praying that to Thy servants in the high functions of governance there may be given open ears, that they may hear voices calling to high endeavor; open minds, ready to receive and welcome new light and truth as it is revealed to them; open eyes, quick to discover Thine indwelling in all this wondrous world which Thou hast made; open hands, ready to share as they hold all good things in trust for Thee, and through Thee, for Thy other children.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 7, 1964, was dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and request its immediate consideration.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Thursday, February 13, 1964; and that immediately after convening on said day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare a recess of the Senate until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 17, 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when the Senate concludes its session today, it will take a recess until Thursday, for a pro forma session only; and from Thursday, it will take a recess until the following Monday.

It is possible that the period of recesses may be extended several days beyond that time, as well.

The leadership has decided on this schedule, for several reasons: First, it will allow Senators from across the aisle to travel the length and breadth of our land, to espouse the glories of the Republican Party's great and colorful history; second, it will allow the conferees on the tax bill time in which to arrive at the final form of that important legislation.

It is my hope that the chairmen of all Senate committees will take advantage of this period of inactivity on the Senate floor to move forward as rapidly as possible the business of the committees. That would apply not only to the essential business of the Appropriations Committee and the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration, but also to the work of all other committees. Controversial legislation will soon demand the attention of all Senators; and it is likely that committees will not be able to meet during extended periods when such proposed legislation will be before the Senate. As it is also of some importance for Congress to adjourn at a reasonable time in this election year, so that the issues of the campaign can be presented to the American people, we must do now the work we have to do. I hope the chairmen of all the committees will use the time at their disposal to the best advantage.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that a part of the reason for the schedule is to enable Members on the Republican side of the aisle to have an opportunity to travel the length and breadth of the land, to extoll the virtues of the Republican Party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a part of the reason.

Mr. MILLER. But is there not also to be an opportunity during the following week for the Members on the other side of the aisle to extoll the virtues of the Democratic Party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not necessarily, because we do that day in and day out, 365 days a year, Sundays included.

Mr. MILLER. If that is so, do I correctly understand that there will be no Jackson Day dinners this year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They will come along in the course of events. But we feel that our Republican brethren should have a special dispensation, so to speak, so that at the time of Lincoln's birthday they will be able to rally their cohorts as well as they can.

Mr. MILLER. We appreciate that consideration.

But in order that it may be understood that the Republicans feel the same way about their Democratic friends, let me say that I am sure the majority leader will have no difficulty in obtaining concurrence by the Republicans in connection with the Jackson week activities of the Democratic Party, because we know that while they are doing that job 365 days a year—just as the Republicans are doing—they, too, feel that they should have an opportunity to travel the length and breadth of the land to extoll the virtues of their party at a special time of the year—namely, the Jackson Day period; and we would not want the Democrats to feel that the Republicans are not in sympathy with according to them that opportunity likewise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we take that for granted, just as the Republicans take their Lincoln Day goings-on for granted. We understand and appreciate the spirit of comity which prevails between the two parties; and we wish the Republicans every success—up to a point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to get a clear understanding of this situation. It is now my understanding that members of the Republican Party will go across the land, extolling the virtues and the glorious history of the Republican Party; and that at a little later time the Members across the aisle will follow their tracks, and will extoll the virtues and accomplishments of the Democratic Party. But do I correctly understand that under no circumstances will the members of one party use the opportunity to refer to the mistakes and shortcomings of the other party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be asking too much.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad the world has not changed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?