

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, under the canopy of Thy grace and goodness, we gather in faith and fellowship, bringing our sins and shortcomings to Thy forgiving love and our littleness and weakness to Thy greatness and power.

We thank Thee for the memories and message of Holy Week, proclaiming the glad tidings that when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save, then, in the fullness of time Thou didst send Thine only begotten Son, who offered Himself as the Great High Priest and laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the sins of the world.

Grant that we may also seek to share in His redemptive ministry and be inspired by His spirit of love to help meet the needs of humanity and enable all men everywhere by the power of the resurrection, to rise with Him unto newness of life.

To the memory of our greatly beloved patriot and hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, we offer, in praise, the words from Tennyson's "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington":

"Great in council and great in war,  
Foremost captain of his time,  
Rich in saving commonsense,  
And, as the greatest only are,  
In his simplicity, sublime."

Hear us in the name of our crucified Saviour and risen Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 26, 1964, was read and approved.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 20, 1964:

H.R. 9637. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1964:

H.R. 4681. An act for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig; and  
H.R. 5584. An act for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin.

On March 26, 1964:

H.R. 950. An act to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950;

H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;

H.R. 2189. An act for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department;

H.R. 2724. An act for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Siegel;

H.R. 6748. An act for the relief of J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7967. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii;

H.R. 8280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Razor and Dr. Robert W. Razor;

H.R. 8470. An act for the relief of Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik; and

H.R. 8930. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On March 27, 1964:

H.J. Res. 962. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. CON. RES. 74

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered by Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army of the United States, the remains be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol from April 8 to April 9, 1964, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction and supervision of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.*

S. CON. RES. 75

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives are each hereby authorized and directed to purchase a floral wreath to be placed by the catafalque bearing the remains of the late General of the Army of the United States, Douglas MacArthur, which are to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States from April 8 to April 9, 1964, the expenses of which shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively.*

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

H.R. 1794. An act to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegheny Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2701. An act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to public Law 88-271, had appointed Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. KUCHEL to serve as

alternate members for the Senate members of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

APRIL 1, 1964.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 25, 1964, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following messages:

That the Senate passed S. 2701, entitled "An act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.";

That the Senate passed with amendments the bill (H.R. 1794) entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegheny Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,  
RALPH R. ROBERTS,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

## THE LATE GENERAL DOUGLAS ARTHUR MACARTHUR

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a gallant and heroic soldier, a world statesman of major accomplishments, a renowned patriot who gave his life to the service of his country has gone home to rest. From the time of his outstanding career as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point to his last gallant and unrelenting fight with death in Walter Reed Hospital during the past few days, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has brought new glory and new renown to the uniform that has signified "honor, courage, and loyalty" since the days of Valley Forge.

Every minute of his life Douglas MacArthur was every inch a soldier. He had that bearing and demeanor which made him a model in uniform. He had that valor and determination that made him a hero in battle. He had that comprehension and intellect which numbered him among the great military tacticians and strategists of all time. He was one of the first Americans to understand the importance of the Pacific to the future and to the security of our country. In his lifetime he laid the foundations for American policy in the Far East for years to come.

The amazing story of his life is one monumental triumph after another. In World War I he was our youngest and one of our most brilliant generals. In World War II he was one of our oldest

but one of our most vigorous and fearless heroes of the line. In Japan following the war he not only engineered one of the most spectacular reconstruction jobs of all time but almost single-handedly reoriented a vast and dynamic people to a democratic direction.

As one of the tens of thousands of men in uniform who had the privilege of following General MacArthur from Australia to New Guinea to Leyte to Luzon and ultimately to Japan, I have a sense of personal pride in my humble career as one of his soldiers. I had the honor early in the war of serving General MacArthur's able and dedicated assistant, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney. At that time I was a second lieutenant and the then Major Whitney was my immediate superior.

Like all of General MacArthur's troops I feel this loss individually. Like all Americans I am thankful that in so many hours of need over such a span of years God gave us this great American who in truth and in fact was a soldier's soldier. Americans will be grateful for his sacrifices, his contributions, for years to come. We all extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur and to their son.

May I close, Mr. Speaker, by paraphrasing the stirring words of the brilliant, colorful general himself in this very Chamber on his return from Japan in 1951, which in his case should read:

Old soldiers never die—nor do they ever fade away.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns the loss of a valiant son in the death of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

He was the greatest soldier this Nation has produced in its long and colorful military history.

As a military strategist and as a courageous fighter, General MacArthur had no equal. Veteran of three wars, this distinguished son of an outstanding military family added new honor to the name for his lifetime of valiant service.

His career in the service of his country will never be forgotten. His winning back of Asia for the free nations will be a landmark in military history. His administration of defeated Japan was a model of dedication and effectiveness.

It was my high privilege to be an intimate friend of General MacArthur for many years. This friendship made it possible for me to know the greatness and the goodness of this man.

I met him for the first time at a chowder dinner that Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, of New York, gave for him and for me while Mr. La Guardia was serving in Congress.

Even then, MacArthur's knowledge of Asia was remarkable, and it grew with his long experience. He could relate in detail the history and economics of every country in Asia, and he could predict its future prospects with uncanny accuracy. It was a rare pleasure for me on several occasions to hear him describe the different countries.

In the days when we were trying to win the favor of Asiatic peoples, we neglected to make full use of General MacArthur's unique knowledge of that part of the world. Yet his knowledge and experience were always available to his country.

To the people of Asia, he was looked upon as the savior of their freedom. During a trip to Japan, it became clear to me that the heroes they revered the most were General MacArthur and Joe DiMaggio. Through the efforts of General MacArthur to teach the people of Japan the American way of life, they had even come to love our national pastime and our sports hero.

The general was mentioned often as a possible candidate for President. He never really had much of an inclination that way. But he was a staunch Republican and believed thoroughly in the principles of that party. On one occasion, he told me he would not be a candidate because he was convinced that the honor of leading the party at that time had been earned by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio.

General MacArthur was a devoted family man. His love for his wife and his son were much in evidence whenever I saw him.

I think I speak for all of his friends and for the country he loved so well when I say "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

To General MacArthur's family go our deepest sympathies.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Massachusetts who have just spoken, for the wonderful tributes they have paid to General MacArthur. Particularly do I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], because I have known, as all of us have known, for many, many years, of his very great friendship and close personal acquaintance with General MacArthur.

As I remember, it was largely through the efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that General MacArthur was invited to address a joint session of the Congress of the United States on his return from Japan. Agreeing with everything that has been said about one of the greatest Americans, not only of this time but of all time, I would like to add this word: As one who sat here and heard that magnificent presentation of General MacArthur, as I look back on it, I do not believe any event here ever impressed me as much. It was magnificent, and it was delivered as only he could have delivered it. It touched the hearts of every one of us.

General MacArthur is now gone from among us, but he will never fade away in our memories. Certainly those of us who have followed with concern his last battles in the hospital appreciate the fact that right to the end he was the gallant, courageous American he had proved himself in the past.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the remarks they have just made. Gen. Douglas MacArthur was one of the greatest Americans of our Nation's history. He was a leader in every respect, a man of deep faith, a man of confidence in himself, a man who made a promise to the people of the Philippines and, under his leadership, our country kept that promise. He dedicated his entire life to the service of our country, giving it his great capacity, his great ability, and his great courage in the national interest of our country and in the preservation, the stability, and the progress of our country. He will always be remembered as one of our Nation's outstanding citizens as well as one of our Nation's great military leaders and heroes.

I extend to Mrs. MacArthur and their son my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur has passed to his reward.

It was my great pleasure and privilege about 5 years ago to call on General MacArthur along with two of my colleagues in the House, both Democrats, by the way, at his suite in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. At that time the general explained to us his version of his recall from Korea. Without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, his memoirs will explain that matter quite in full.

General MacArthur was not only one of America's and possibly America's greatest soldiers and greatest military leaders but, when he put on his military uniform, he did not lay aside the uniform of a civilian. He was not only a great military leader, he was a great American patriot. He was steeped in the finest American tradition. He had his own great principles of government which he adhered to strictly and he never failed to expound his conservative philosophies of government. For 3 hours he and his able aide, General Whitney, left us spellbound by giving us his heartfelt feelings not only about military matters and worldwide problems, but also about the future of our great Nation.

We visited about our mutual friend, Gen. Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, who fought with him. He told us much about him. He remarked "what a fighting man." The minute General MacArthur reached Australia after he had been ordered there by the President from the Philippines, he immediately called General MacNider and pleaded with him to come to Australia to carry on with him that great fight to recapture the Pacific islands, the Philippines, and Japan. General MacNider did just that. While in Japan, General MacArthur spearheaded the establishment of a new form of government there, patterned after our U.S. Constitution under which the Japanese people have greatly profited to this day.

He said when he left the Philippines, "I shall return," and he did return triumphantly. That was a great moment in the life of General MacArthur and the people of the Philippines as it was for every peace-loving person in this



world when General MacArthur stepped ashore in the Philippines and said, "I promised you I would return, and I am here."

Then we talked of Col. Perc Lainson, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, who also fought side by side with General MacArthur in World War I in France. He had great praise for Perc, who, I am sorry to say, now is lying ill at his home in Council Bluffs. Along with his multitude of friends, I wish him Godspeed for a quick recovery.

I know General MacArthur would want me to say these things about his esteemed fighting friends because he was such a genuine American. When he found a true friend, he bound him to his heart with hoops of steel.

I was honored to have the privilege of visiting with this great and good man. In that brief 3 hours I learned the heartbeat of General MacArthur. I sat here on the floor of the House when he delivered that great speech that ended "old soldiers never die, they just fade away," and as those who have preceded me in eulogizing this great man have said, he did not fade away, he has gone to his reward. He will remain in the hearts of grateful people everywhere. God rest his soul. My heart goes out to his good wife and son. May the same God who took General MacArthur to his heavenly home give his wife, his son, and his loved ones strength to bear the great loss they have suffered.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has lost one of our greatest military leaders and most revered national heroes. There is genuine sorrow over the land today over the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Without doubt he will be recorded in history as one of the outstanding generals and military strategists of all time.

The brilliant military career of General MacArthur will be a challenge and an inspiration to young men in this country for generations to come. It is without parallel in the history of our Nation. It is generally recognized that General MacArthur was a military genius and this Nation will be forever grateful to him for his superb leadership during World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict.

His service as Supreme Allied Commander in Japan after World War II added luster to his brilliant military record. He earned the respect and gratitude of the Japanese people for the fair and impartial manner in which he handled their affairs, and was largely responsible for the rejection of communism by Japan.

The most dramatic moment I have seen in Congress was on April 19, 1951, when General MacArthur addressed a joint session of Congress on his return from Japan. I do not believe there was a dry eye in the Chamber at the conclusion of his message, when he mentioned he was going to fade away like the old soldiers mentioned in the West Point ballad. However, he will never fade from the memory of the American people.

General MacArthur richly deserves all of the honors that can be bestowed upon him by a grateful nation. The people

will pay fitting tribute to the five-star general when he lies in state in the rotunda of the Capitol later in the week.

I extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur and their son.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, America's loss is great today; Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, has passed from this world to the next and, in a mood of solemn reverence, the Nation mourns. For here was a man of the century; a storybook hero, in real life form; a man to be counted on in moments of peril; a genius in his own right, and a patriot of the highest order.

Born at Little Rock, Ark., in January 1880—the son of a distinguished lieutenant general in the U.S. Army—Douglas MacArthur was, throughout his lifetime, associated with Army traditions of the highest caliber.

His career began in 1899, when he was admitted to West Point. As a cadet, he established a remarkable record, attaining the highest scholastic average of any student in 25 years, and graduating first in his class. In August 1917, with the rank of colonel, he became chief of staff of the 42d—"Rainbow"—Division, which he helped to form. During World War I he served in the Champagne-Marne and Aisne-Marne defenses, and in June 1918, after being made brigadier general, he commanded the 84th Infantry Brigade in five separate offensives.

Following his service in World War I—a service worthy of his name, in every particular—General MacArthur returned to the United States where he further distinguished himself in the role of superintendent at his alma mater, the U.S. Military Academy. From there, he moved on, serving in various Philippine commands, returning home, once more, where, in 1930, he became Chief of the General Staff of the U.S. Army, with the rank of general—the youngest officer to hold that rank since the days of General Grant.

And yet it seemed that destiny continued to draw him back, repeatedly, to the Far East. In 1935, at the request of the Philippine President, he was appointed military adviser to the Philippine Commonwealth government, for which he organized the defenses of the islands and built up a native army. Voluntarily retired, in 1937, he was recalled to active duty on July 26, 1941, commissioned lieutenant general and appointed commanding general of the Far East Command. In this capacity, he led the valiant defense of the Philippines, in 1941, against the furious assault of the Japanese. Falling back to Bataan, in the face of overwhelming enemy force, he nonetheless made clear to the world that every backward step he took was to be paid for in terms of a thousand enemy lives.

Ordered from Bataan to Australia, he became commander in chief of Allied forces in the Southwest Pacific area. In this capacity, he engineered the end of the Allied retreat in the Pacific, rallied his forces, and directed the counter-offensive, that in time would retake everything in the Pacific area and threaten the very shores of Japan itself, prior to the advent of the atomic bomb

and the close of hostilities. In August 1945, General MacArthur, on the orders of President Truman, arranged the terms of Japanese capitulation, and on September 2, 1945, aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri*, in Tokyo Bay, he accepted the formal surrender of Japan to the Allied forces.

Following the close of World War II, General MacArthur became Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Japan, and did a magnificent job of reorienting the Japanese people, and establishing Japan in the forefront of the nations working for the preservation and promotion of democratic ideals.

In the Korean conflict, General MacArthur was once again engaged, and once again revealed himself a fighter of distinction.

Indeed, in all his acts, the General seemingly was motivated by one sentiment alone: a love for his country; a love which has in turn, won for him the respect and devotion of all the American people, in this era and in every era to come.

His death is a great loss to our country.

I extend to Mrs. MacArthur and her son my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that Gen. Douglas MacArthur is no longer with us but as he so aptly put it "answered the last roll-call." He was a man of positive and strong convictions but it never can be said of him that he practiced what he preached because he never preached. The times were few and far between when General MacArthur ever made a speech but whenever he did, he proclaimed a message that was worthwhile, that people remembered and always associated with him and his character. With it all, however, he had a very keen sense of humor which frequently showed itself in conversations with people he met. The respect which he had for honest thinking and honest living was indigenous with the man. He hated sham and hypocrisy and he never compromised with what he believed in.

His contribution to American prestige and honor throughout the world was prodigious. He was respected by friend and foe alike who realized the integrity of his thinking and the granitelike strength of his moral rectitude. The like of him will not soon be seen again and America is a greater nation and a finer country because of him.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the people of Norfolk and Virginia's Second District join the entire Nation in mourning the loss of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

Throughout history the names of many Virginians stand out for their accomplishments and their contributions to our Nation. Although General MacArthur was not a native Virginian, his mother was born in Norfolk and grew up there, and we claim him as one of Virginia's truly great for his military genius, his courage, his patriotism, and devotion to duty throughout a long lifetime of achievements in the interest of America and in the cause of freedom and justice.

General MacArthur's mother spent her early life in Norfolk and the roots of her ancestry were embedded in Virginia from early colonial days.

The people of Norfolk followed the achievements of Douglas MacArthur throughout his entire distinguished career with admiration and pride, and they decided to convert the stately old Norfolk city hall into a memorial to him.

On January 26, the general's last birthday, the public was permitted to view this beautiful memorial which now houses General MacArthur's papers and memorabilia. The formal dedication of the building had been planned for Memorial Day, and we had hoped that the general would still be active and present for that occasion.

There are now overtones of sadness, for next Saturday this memorial building will become his final resting place. As we recall with pride and gratitude his immeasurable contributions we extend sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur and their son.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur embodied in fullest measure the code he proudly espoused: duty, honor, country.

His career as soldier-statesman was unique in American history; his military record is unmatched.

Yet, paradoxically, the future may be witness of his greatest service and victory—if this and succeeding generations finally heed the wisdom he bequeathed.

That we have had our last chance, since the possibility of nuclear war brings Armageddon to our door.

That if war is forced upon us, in any form, there can be no substitute for victory.

That the way of appeasement leads only to a sham peace and, ultimately, to new and bloodier war.

And finally that "It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Americans do well to mourn the neglect of this wisdom even more than the passing of this great patriot.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was one of those rare men who demonstrated the highest degree of competence in highly complex assignments. The Pacific war, the American occupation of Japan, and the war in Korea—these were only some of the things that attested to the magnificent accomplishments of this quite remarkable man.

He had an intensely alert mind, one that grasped the intricacies not only of the military—in which his life was centered—but of the geopolitical, the social, and the political as well. And all of this was blended in with a true sense of the dramatic and a flare of eloquence.

General MacArthur was a man of many great parts and, still, he was greater than the sum of all of these parts. There can be little question that history will record him as a truly outstanding man of these times, one whose genius was successfully dedicated to the security and welfare of his country.

America suffers a great loss in the leaving of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur—indelibly so because of the great gain that was ours while he was in our midst.

A salute to a grand soldier and a superb citizen.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for more than six decades the name, the fame, and the inspiration of General MacArthur have been to me a patriotic strength. It has been a name, a fame, and an inspiration shared by two General MacArthurs, father and son.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur was still a young man, another General MacArthur was one of the war heroes of our Nation, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, to whose military genius and understanding touch had been entrusted the fortunes of our Republic in the early years in the Philippines. This was in the period of the Spanish-American War, and the trying and challenging days, weeks, and months of Aguinaldo's insurrection. Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur was a military hero of my young days as he was of my comrades in the Spanish-American War. It was he who after defeating Aguinaldo won his heart and his confidence.

It is said that until her death in 1935 at the age of 82, Mary MacArthur, wife of Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur and mother of the future General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, was the most powerful influence in her son's life. She never let him forget that his father was one of America's most illustrious soldiers and that his job was to be an even greater soldier.

Mr. Speaker, today with grieving hearts we pay to the memory of Gen. Douglas MacArthur the tribute of affection and appreciation of a grateful nation. To that tribute may I, for the veterans of the Spanish-American War and for myself, add another tribute, a tribute to a great father and a noble mother. To these three Americans, the two General MacArthurs and the wife of one and mother of the other, our country forever will be indebted.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, this country has lost one of the most eminent public figures of our age. During a brilliant and dedicated lifetime, he had become a living legend among the freedom-loving peoples of the world. It is with a deep sense of grief that we realize this great soldier and patriot is no longer with us.

But the light of a man, who has accomplished so much and inspired so many, does not go out with death. Rather the glow of his lifetime, the confidence, the courage and the leadership which he infused into a dark world struggling to maintain freedom and human dignity during the horrible days of World War II and his statesmanship and patriotism in the years that followed, will remain a luminous part of this Nation's history.

Son of a famous Civil War general, Arthur MacArthur, who was born in Chicopee, Mass., in my congressional district, MacArthur began his career of service to this country in 1899 when he entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Four years later he graduated first in his class, a prelude to the remarkable career that followed.

He became the youngest brigadier in the American Expeditionary Forces, then

Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, then Supreme Commander in the Pacific during the most crushing war the world had yet seen. He became the hero of St. Mihiel, Bataan, Corregidor, New Guinea, Manila, Tokyo, Inchon and a symbol of hope and strength for a frightened world. Then, in later years, he became the Supreme Allied Commander in the Korean war.

General MacArthur is possibly the most decorated soldier in American history. He exemplified the ideals of "duty, honor, country"—words which he said "reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be." For him, they dictated he become a determined and devoted American, brilliant leader and military strategist, and an honored and eloquent patriot of the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Few men have accomplished so much in a lifetime, and, like all great men, he engendered controversy. But he left us a legacy of moral courage which will not be forgotten. As he stated last month in reminiscing of his beloved West Point:

The Military Academy taught me many things—last, but by no means least is courage—moral courage. The courage of one's convictions, the courage to see a thing through.

On MacArthur's 84th birthday this last January, President Johnson called him "one of the authentic American heroes of this century"—and we feel deeply his loss.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, no words have better expressed the stature of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and the esteem with which he is regarded by the American people than the Chicago Tribune editorial which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD. General MacArthur is indeed one of our great Americans who will live in the minds of men for generations to come. The Nation deeply mourns his passing.

#### DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur gave his country a lifetime of courageous, brilliant, and devoted service. He was one of the great captains of history, a military genius unmatched in his day. To say as much is only to say what has been universally acknowledged. But to leave the assessment at that would be to ignore the essence of an American who held a unique place in the hearts of his countrymen.

For it was a quality of mind and spirit which, more than anything, made MacArthur a man apart. His was a patriotism of such purity that in the annals of this country only George Washington could offer a comparison of selfless service and abiding faith. In an age which has seen the gilt peel with amazing rapidity from those who consciously struck the pose of greatness, General MacArthur possessed those authentic and familiar qualities of patriotism which have lighted the corridors of a long past.

"Duty, honor, country," the creed of the cadet corps at West Point—these were the precepts that guided him through a long life and were ever in his mind, as he himself said, amid "the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefields."

To the responsibilities of command he brought the gifts of a shining intellect, a family tradition of great valor, and a daring of imagination which, in such operations as the planning of the Inchon landing in Korea, are likely to be recorded as unrivaled in the history of generalship.



His father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, had as a young officer led his Wisconsin troops through withering fire to plant the regimental flag at the crest of Missionary Ridge in the Civil War. For this he won the Congressional Medal of Honor—an award which was also to go to the son after the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor in World War II. The strain of heroism was inbred in the MacArthur line.

MacArthur was a hero in two World Wars and had lost none of his fire and genius when, at the age of 70, he was called to active service in the field once more as commander of all forces in Korea.

With victory there within reach, after the smashing of the North Korean Communist army, a massive intervention by the Chinese Communists called for new political decisions if the fruits of a brilliant campaign were not to be lost. MacArthur was committed to the conviction that "there is no substitute for victory." He could not conceive that American soldiers are expendable.

He was frustrated and hamstrung by President Truman, by the Washington appeasers who had adopted the policy of stalemate lest the Communists be affronted, and by the timorous allied politicians whose token contributions of troops had been enrolled under the United Nations banner in Korea. Finally it was decreed that MacArthur must go. He was a man who would not fight for less than victory; therefore, he was relieved and recalled.

In a triumphal homecoming, he appeared before a joint session of Congress and there, with matchless eloquence, pronounced his valedictory: "The world has turned over many times since I took the oath on the plain at West Point, and the hopes and dreams have long since vanished, but I still remember the refrain of one of the most popular barracks ballads of that day, which proclaimed, most proudly, that old soldiers never die; they just fade away. And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away, an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty."

But he did not fade. His life did not consist of one career, but of half a dozen. It is unparalleled that a general, having reached the highest station in the Army as Chief of Staff, should then build a new army as field marshal for the future Republic of the Philippines; should then be recalled to active duty as supreme commander of Army forces in the Far East during World War II; should then conduct the war against Japan as commander of all allied forces in the Southwest Pacific; should accept the surrender of Japan, and for 6 years, as supreme commander, preside over the occupation and rehabilitation of that country; should afterward take the field again as commander in Korea; should, upon a second retirement, embark upon a new career in industry, and finally, in the closing days of his life, write an autobiography which for simplicity and eloquence of style and for emotional impact is beyond compare.

Such a man is a lasting inspiration to all his countrymen, the repository of an ideal kindled in the campfires of Valley Forge. As long as America proves that it can produce such men, this country will be safe from all enemies, domestic and foreign, and from the more subtle and slow decay that attends meanness of spirit and poverty of vision.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Nation suffered the loss of one of the greatest military leaders in our history.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was born on an Army post at Little Rock, Ark., and lived his early boyhood at western frontier posts at a time when his father was fighting Indians, lived to see the 2,000-mile-per-hour jet airplane and

the nuclear bomb revolutionize modern warfare.

After a brilliant record at the U.S. Military Academy, General MacArthur served his country with honor and distinction during two world wars and also in additional active combat in Mexico, the Philippines, and Korea.

It is significant that all three of our living former Presidents joined in paying tribute to this great man, even though two of them had had personal differences with him.

Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower returned from service in the Philippines after a disagreement with General MacArthur in the late 1930's. And President Harry S. Truman dismissed General MacArthur from his Korean command in 1951. Yet they joined with President Johnson and former President Hoover in paying tribute to General MacArthur.

I believe that these outstanding tributes by former President Truman and former President Eisenhower to General MacArthur are tributes not only to his greatness but also to their greatness as well.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the article from today's Washington Post containing the tributes President Lyndon B. Johnson and former Presidents Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Herbert Hoover paid this outstanding and dedicated American.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 6, 1964]

#### PRESIDENT LEADS WORLDWIDE TRIBUTE TO ONE OF NATION'S GREAT HEROES

President Johnson led a list of worldwide tributes to the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur yesterday with the simple words: "One of America's greatest heroes is dead."

"But in the hearts of his countrymen," said the President, "and in the pages of history his courageous presence among us and his valiant deeds for us will never die."

"For the man that he was and the success he achieved, this Nation gives thanks to God for the 84 years he lived and served."

The three living former Presidents under whom General MacArthur served joined in tribute.

Former President Harry S. Truman, who dismissed General MacArthur from his Korean command in 1951, said at his home in Independence, Mo., "I am deeply sorry at the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur who has given of himself with exceptional strength and valor and will be remembered as one of the great military men in our history."

Former President Herbert Hoover said in New York, "I have known General MacArthur intimately since I appointed him Chief of Staff in 1930. He was one of the world's outstanding military commanders. He was also a statesman for peace."

"The world is a finer place for his having lived in it and for the standards of courage and character he set," said Mr. Hoover. "Truly his watchword was: duty, honor, country. He was a great man, a great general, and a great patriot. I join our Nation in heartfelt sympathy to his family."

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who served under General MacArthur in the early 1930's said "the entire Nation will stand in sad salute" at the death of "one of the outstanding military leaders of American history."

From his vacation home in Palm Desert, Calif., Mr. Eisenhower said "through a long time of service," General MacArthur "earned the admiration and respect of his fellow

citizens and the personal devotion of those he led in battle."

"As one of those privileged to serve for some years under his direct supervision," said Mr. Eisenhower, "I share with all his friends a feeling of special loss and sorrow and send deepest sympathy to his family."

I would also like to include the following editorial from the same newspaper paying high tribute to this heroic wartime leader.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 6, 1964]

#### GENERAL MACARTHUR

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a field commander in the old tradition of the American Army and a public administrator in a new tradition. He brought to both military command and military administration unusual qualities of mind and spirit and will which would have made him outstanding in any field of public life.

His success in a military career was foretold by his brilliant performance in early youth. The promise of his academic years was fulfilled in one of the most extraordinary records in the history of American arms. He had the voice, the presence, the aura, and the mystique of command. His striking appearance both reflected and supported the inner resources that he brought to public life. He looked the part of a commanding officer and a pro-consul. He had both a dramatic flair and a dignity of bearing.

His success in the Pacific war added to his already lustrous career. He handled the command problems of a combat almost logistically impossible with great administrative capacity and he filled the responsibilities of direct combat command to military perfection. The country could not have picked a better military leader for that arduous, destructive, and dangerous war. In the knowledge of what did happen, Americans may underestimate the risks and dangers of what might have happened. History has given to the war against Japan an aspect of inevitability that did not enshroud that conflict before it reached a climax. There was plenty of opportunity for error; but MacArthur did not err in the crucial decisions of the war.

As the administrator of the occupation, the General achieved a new and different kind of success. History affords no precedent for the American occupation of Japan. For all the difficulties, the occupation was extraordinarily successful in terms of day-to-day administration, and in the larger terms of its reformation and rehabilitation of Japan.

The war in Korea demonstrated anew his great talents as a field commander. He was ill served by his own intelligence forces and compelled to conduct a hazardous retreat back to the 38th parallel when Chinese "volunteers" poured in upon the United Nations forces. He differed with Washington on the desirability of extending the war into China. Since history never divulges its alternatives, his partisans and his critics never will agree on whether he did indeed wish to conduct the "wrong war, in the wrong place at the wrong time."

His departure from Japan, in a curious and ironic way, came under circumstances that demonstrated the lesson in democracy which he had been trying to teach Japan: despite his military power, he left his command at the direct order of his civilian superiors.

It is no doubt fortunate that the circumstances of his recall did not produce a political reaction in the United States even though its failure to do so disappointed some of the general's friends.

One can wonder what his destiny might have been if his public life, from the beginning, had been laid in the political arena. He had a sense of public issues and a flair



for summarizing them rare in military men. He had a mind fascinated by the larger issues of geopolitics. Above all, he had a gift for forceful expression. And as his very latest writings disclose, he had a fine English style that few men in public life possess. But it is difficult to imagine him in any other role.

To the millions who fought under his command he alone was "the general," quite as explicitly as to the veterans of the Civil War that bloody rectangle at Antietam alone was "the cornfield." That he was sometimes ambitious for other titles may be true. In the midst of the great tides of popular adulation that swirled about him, he must have dreamed his dreams. In any other country or time any imaginable title might have been his. As the postwar years went by, however, he must have become increasingly content to be what he had so long been—"the general."

Notwithstanding that insightful and witty remark upon his return from Japan, the old soldier, at long last, did die, but he did not and will not "fade away" as long as men remember his battle triumphs enshrined forever in the annals of the U.S. Army.

I am proud to associate myself with President Johnson, our three living former presidents, this eminent newspaper, the Idahoans I represent and Americans everywhere in stating my appreciation for the life of service that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has given to our beloved Nation and at the same time extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today this Nation mourns the passing of a great American, a great patriot and one of the greatest military geniuses in all history, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

During a lifetime spent in dedicated public service, both in war and peace, General MacArthur has been accorded many honors by his countrymen. However, I deeply regret that a final and, I believe, a crowning honor was withheld from this distinguished American, in the failure of Congress to authorize and direct the President to appoint Douglas MacArthur to a six-star status as General of the Armies of the United States.

On December 18 last, this legislation was introduced in the Senate, sponsored by the following Senators: SYMINGTON, BEALL, BYRD, CARLSON, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DODD, EASTLAND, FONG, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HARTKE, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, KEATING, KUCHEL, MCCLELLAN, MILLER, MUNDT, PROUTY, ROBERTSON, SIMPSON, THURMOND, TOWER, WALTERS and YARBOROUGH. These add up to a total of 28 Members of the Senate, 16 Republicans and 12 Democrats, and certainly represent wide nonpartisan support.

Regrettably, I am informed that small-minded men in positions of authority in the Department of Defense have up until now succeeded in blocking action on this legislation in the committee.

I would hope this honor could be awarded posthumously. However, the damage has already been done, in that it obviously too late to pay this final tribute to a great man while he was alive. In this connection, I believe the administration has made a serious mistake by its opposition. Certainly, if the American people General MacArthur served so

well and so faithfully could be heard, I am sure the answer would be unanimously in support of the legislation.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in expressing my sorrow over the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I had the privilege of serving on General MacArthur's staff during World War II as a naval combat intelligence officer throughout the island-hopping campaign in the Southwest Pacific, and also for a time in Japan.

In my judgment General MacArthur will go down in history as one of our greatest military geniuses. His strategy in the Pacific was sound and the tactics with which he pursued it were most effective. In fact, he took pride that the victories he won and the territory he took away from the Japanese were done with a minimum loss of American lives.

It was my privilege in Tokyo in November 1945, shortly before leaving to come back home to the United States, to have the opportunity to meet General MacArthur personally. Although I was only a naval lieutenant, a very subordinate officer on his staff, and although I had asked only for a brief opportunity to meet him and to pay my respects to him, I remember the general's courtesy and kindness in receiving me and chatting informally with me for more than half an hour.

Two years ago, shortly after Congress had passed the resolution honoring General MacArthur, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] entertained the general at a luncheon here in the Capitol, and I had an opportunity to renew my wartime association with the general. Although his vigor and health had failed somewhat, his mind was as keen as ever and he clearly remembered our earlier meeting. I mention this example to show that General MacArthur was certainly not remote or inaccessible. Of course, reference is often made to General MacArthur's personal courage and the numerous citations for bravery he received during his long career. During the Pacific campaign General MacArthur made it a point of personal pride to wade ashore on every one of his island-hopping landings in the Southwest Pacific. Although the theater commander could hardly be expected to go ashore in the first wave, General MacArthur not only came ashore just a bit behind the combat troops themselves, but conducted his inspection of the beach area with complete disregard for his own personal safety. He never wore a helmet. Indeed his familiar gold-braided cap made him an easy target for any enemy sniper. He did not even carry sidearms. On many of these expeditions he went almost as far forward as the frontline troops themselves, and more often than not, shortly after the general had left enemy troops would be discovered still lurking in the area.

It was my privilege, shortly after the war, to interview General Yamashita, commander of all Japanese forces on the Philippines. General Yamashita was amazed to learn that when General MacArthur waded ashore at Leyte he had come to stay.

We saw those pictures of MacArthur going ashore at Leyte—

General Yamashita told me:

but we thought it was just a publicity stunt. We didn't dream that he actually stayed ashore. If we had known that, we would have sent in a whole squadron of kamikazes to destroy his headquarters.

But General MacArthur had re-deemed his pledge to return to the Philippines, and he was not about to leave just because of his own safety or convenience.

Two instances come to mind, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate General MacArthur's amazing ability in making detailed military decisions. For one, it was he who sold President Roosevelt on the soundness of taking the Philippines instead of bypassing them. He made this appeal during the Pearl Harbor Conference of 1944, and the soundness of his decision was justified, of course, not only by the smashing victory which we were able to secure in the Philippines but also by the political mileage we gained throughout the Far East in having honored our commitment to that island republic.

I might also mention General MacArthur's role in the selection of a landing beach for the Lingayen Gulf operation in the Philippines. His staff officers, virtually to a man, had recommended against the beach on which the landing eventually was made and had proposed instead an alternative to the northeast. General MacArthur flatly rejected this proposal. He insisted that the beach favored by his staff would be subject to heavy enemy fire. The staff officers had proposed it because they believed that the surf on the westerly beach would be too heavy. But in spite of their opposition MacArthur held to his own intuition on this detail. The landing took place at the beach that he directed. The surf was heavy and it did result in the loss of several landing craft. But the Japanese artillery had completely zeroed in on the alternate beach which the staff officers had favored and a landing at that spot would have been disastrous. MacArthur was right and his staff experts were wrong.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur will be remembered for his administration of Japan. Not much seems to have been made of the fact that it was largely the result of General MacArthur's vision and persistence that Japan was never occupied on a divided basis as was Germany. Our occupation of Japan was also an Allied occupation and the Soviets tried hard for a time to be allowed to send their troops into the northern portion of the Japanese homeland. But General MacArthur vigorously opposed any such move and his superiors in Washington backed up this decision. So Japan was able to develop as a single country and today she stands as a glowing star in the free world firmament.

General MacArthur's administration of Japanese affairs was unique. He provided the basis for sweeping economic and social reforms in Japan without destroying those traditional patterns whose emotional impact provided the cement for the whole Japanese nation.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of General MacArthur we bid farewell to one



of history's real giants. This is not of course to say that General MacArthur did not make mistakes or that all his decisions were wise ones. But the sum total of his career is a record of accomplishment and dedication rarely matched in our military history. His dedication to public service and his eloquent devotion to the soldierly ideal will stand as an inspiration to the people of this country as long as the Stars and Stripes continue to wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, he would be a brash man indeed who would think that any words he might write or speak could possibly add one shade of luster to the name of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I do not address myself to add anything to that name. I come before the Congress only to pay my own personal tribute, and through me the tribute of the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania to Douglas MacArthur.

He was a lonely man.

He stood above the century like a Colossus, and in the rarified atmosphere of greatness, there were few who were his equal, none his superior.

Indeed it is almost beyond understanding to note how often his greatness shone in this century. When he was only a young officer in the Philippine insurrection, MacArthur was one of the most significant voices coming out of that tragic combat.

When America sent its troops to fight in our first major international commitment, the First World War, MacArthur had grown in stature and was one of the most significant figures of that war.

When Japan sent its troops in great waves across the Pacific in December of 1941, it was MacArthur who held out in the Philippines till the last bitter moment when he was ordered off the islands. His voice, his cry of, "I shall return" became the rallying cry of hundreds of thousands of Filipinos who knew him, who loved him, and who heard in his words the pledge of this whole Nation that the Philippines would not be forgotten. They died in the jungles, on the mountains, in war camps. They died slowly often, but in death they knew that someday the General they loved so much would come striding back out of the ocean, and that he would not return alone.

They were on the beaches of Leyte and Luzon when MacArthur returned. They heard his voice in the voice of 10,000 American shells poured from hundreds of battleships. They came out of the jungle and wept when finally MacArthur literally came striding up out of the sea to stand on the beaches he knew and loved so well, to push the rumbled hat back on that high forehead, to take his old cornucop from his mouth, and to smile for the first time in 3 years as he said: "I have returned."

Behind him the sea was shaken with the ships of the American Navy. Around him the beaches were dark with a tide of American soldiers and Marines. Above him the sky was black with American planes. It was the ultimate proof of the faith the people of the Philippines had in MacArthur and, through him, in America.

When Japan surrendered at the end of the Second World War, there were two men who sat at that table and received the surrender document who were watched by the whole world. One was a slight man they called "Skinney" Wainwright, the general who had surrendered nearly 3½ years before on the island of Corregidor, and who had languished in a Japanese prison for those years. He sat next to the man who had left Corregidor reluctantly, who had vowed to come back with victory, and who in the hour of victory called on General Wainwright to sit beside him to wipe the taste of defeat from his lips. That man was Douglas MacArthur.

Histories will be written and MacArthur will loom as one of the truly great military men our Nation has produced. Eulogies will be spoken, each trying, as this is trying, to say one word of tribute to the greatness of this man. But in the final run, no words will equal the words he spoke himself at West Point on May 12, 1962, when, for the last time, he reviewed the troops he loved so well, and received on that occasion the Sylvanus Thayer Award for service to his Nation.

I know of no words more eloquent than his words, words he spoke from the heart, with no notes, no prepared text.

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory, always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and reechoes: Duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps, and the corps, and the corps.

I bid you farewell.

Now his farewell is final. Now the old soldier has faded away.

But he spoke one more thought I would remember when he addressed the cadets at West Point on that May afternoon.

The long gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from their white crosses, thundering those magic words: duty, honor, country.

Now that voice is gone from this world. But a Nation will pay tribute to that voice and that heart this week in solemn mourning. And on Saturday, when he is laid to rest in his final bed, the bugles will sound over his grave and they will echo in this world the sounds of another world, where the million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, will shake the dim battlements of eternity with the old cheers, the old songs, to know that out of our times has come a new man to stand at the head of the long, gray line of heroes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, the free world, and my native State of

Arkansas mourn the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the outstanding military leaders of all time. I refer particularly to my native State of Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, because all Arkansians take deep and sustaining pride in the fact that General MacArthur was born in Little Rock, Ark., while his father, the late Gen. Arthur MacArthur, was stationed for a tour of duty there, and we claim him as one of our own.

The tributes which have been paid to this great military tactician, patriot, and statesman, by the leaders of the free world are indicative of the respect and admiration with which he was held by all the free peoples of the world. His life was an outstanding example of high patriotism, devotion to duty, and utmost integrity. It would take many words and more time than is available to me here to undertake to enumerate the deeds of valor performed by this great American in a single lifetime. He has been long recognized as one of this Nation's most distinguished soldiers, and his life of service spans many decades in our Nation's history. He has given our Nation added luster and he will take his place in our history as one of the great heroes and military leaders of all time. My deepest sympathy to his wife and son.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow citizens of a grateful Nation in paying tribute to General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, who died yesterday, April 5, 1964, at Walter Reed Army Hospital.

General MacArthur was a great American, an able military leader, a loyal and dedicated citizen. Throughout his life, he prepared himself for service and for further service to his country when his country needed him. He served with honor and distinction in three wars and reflected credit upon the highest traditions of the military service of the United States of America.

In World War I, as the youngest division commander of the American Expeditionary Forces, it was said of him that on a field where courage was the general order that he displayed the greatest courage of all.

Between the wars he served as Chief of Staff of the Army. In time of war he was awarded every decoration of the United States, including the Medal of Honor. In addition he received highest awards and decorations from Allied Powers.

In World War II he directed the strategy and tactical operations which led to total victory in the war in the Pacific.

As commander of the occupation forces in Japan after World War II, he achieved the outstanding occupation and rehabilitative objective of all time. He performed this assignment with the dignity and firmness which characterized him and his country. At the same time he performed great service to his vanquished foe: through his help and leadership, he restored the nation and the people of Japan to a position of economic, industrial, and political strength. He won their admiration and respect. He understood the minds and thoughts of the

people of the Orient as few, if any other, Americans have ever understood them.

In the Korean war he exercised the functions and responsibilities of Supreme Commander of the forces of the United States and our allies. Some may have disagreed with his position which resulted in his relief from command, but none ever doubted his loyalty, his patriotism, or his devotion to duty.

Mr. Speaker, I am one who agreed with General MacArthur in the position which he took in the Korean war. I believe that if his position had prevailed, that many serious facets of the cold war during the past decade would have been averted. However, like General MacArthur, I recognize and respect the right of the President of the United States to relieve him from command.

After being relieved from command in 1951, he returned to the United States to receive ovations in many cities of a grateful Nation, unequaled in our history.

He closed his military career on April 19, 1951, with an address to a joint session of Congress which has taken its place as a part of the history of our country. He stated his position succinctly in these words:

I address you with neither rancor nor bitterness in the fading twilight of life with but one purpose in mind—to serve my country.

War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory.

His closing words of that historic address will never be forgotten by anyone who heard them while present in the House of Representatives or listening on radio or television. He stated his case; he left no doubt of his sincerity of purpose and of his devotion and dedication to his country. He opened his heart to his countrymen and closed with these words:

I still remember the refrain of one of the most popular barrack ballads of that day which proclaimed most proudly that:

"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away."

And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodbye.

A military commander of the highest order, he was at the same time a man considerate of others. He possessed a strong faith and belief in Almighty God to whom he often prayed for guidance and direction.

He was the author of many splendid remarks and writings, one of which has always been my favorite. With his permission I have included it as my selection in two editions of "the Congressional Anthology." It follows:

(Submitted by Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., Georgia)

Build me a son, O Lord,  
Who will be strong enough to know when  
he is weak,  
And brave enough to face himself when he  
is afraid;  
One who will be proud and unbending in  
honest defeat,  
And humble and gentle in victory.  
Build me a son

Whose wishbone will not be where his backbone should be;

A son who will know Thee—

And that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray,

Not in the path of ease and comfort,

But under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge.

Here let him learn to stand up in the storm;  
Here let him learn compassion for those who fall.

Build me a son

Whose heart will be clear,

Whose goal will be high;

A son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men;

One who will learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep;

One who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray,

Enough of a sense of humor,

So that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously.

Give him humility,

So that he may always remember the simplicity of true greatness.

The open mind of true wisdom,

The meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper,

"I have not lived in vain."

—GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Douglas MacArthur lived a rich, full, and abundant life—a life of service to honor, duty, country. The United States is greater and stronger because of the contributions of his life and his work. He did not live in vain.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, as a military genius, has no superior in the history of the English speaking world. General MacArthur ranks with the Duke of Marlborough, the Duke of Wellington, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson. MacArthur, like Stonewall Jackson, passed away quietly on a beautiful Sunday at almost the same time of the afternoon, and only a few miles distant. Like Jackson and Lee, MacArthur's remains will rest in the soil of Virginia.

General MacArthur was himself a product of a reunited Nation. His mother was a Hardy, a member of a noble Virginia family dedicated to the ideals and principles of that great Commonwealth, the "Mother of Presidents." Gen. Arthur MacArthur, his distinguished father, won the Congressional Medal of Honor, at age 18, as the youngest colonel in the Union Army when he led his troops to victory up the rugged slopes of Missionary Ridge in Tennessee. It is fitting that General MacArthur, a product of both the North and the South, should lead the armies of a united nation in three world wars.

Douglas MacArthur, as commander of the Allied Forces in the Pacific during World War II, performed one of the greatest military feats in the history of the world. MacArthur's role, as ordered from Washington in the initial stages of the war, was to hold Australia and the South Pacific while the Allied Forces crushed Germany and then all would unite in the final drive on Japan.

General MacArthur, with only a small fraction of American manpower and supplies, by genius and daring, had destroyed Japanese power in the Pacific

when Germany surrendered on May 9, 1945.

His grand strategy in the Pacific of bypassing and isolating Japanese strong points saved thousands of lives while leading to total victory over a world power, immensely powerful on land, on sea, and in the air.

Douglas MacArthur followed in the footsteps of his father in his devotion to and confidence in the Filipino people. He aided in the birth of a nation—the Republic of the Philippines. He and his father laid the foundation stones for a lasting friendship between the United States and the Philippines. They contributed greatly to the formation of this lighthouse of freedom in the Orient, saying to all nations "it can be done." The United States has no stronger ally in the world today than the Republic of the Philippines.

Gen. Carlos Romulo, around my fireplace in South Carolina, late one night in the fall of 1959 dispelled one of the myths of World War II—that MacArthur coined the famous phrase, "I shall return." General Romulo told me that he, himself, coined the phrase "I shall return" for General MacArthur and that MacArthur preferred "America shall return" or "freedom shall return" or some similar phraseology. Romulo told me that he insisted upon "I shall return" because the Filipino people looked upon MacArthur as a demigod. They believed in him implicitly and their faith had never faltered not even during the days of Bataan and Corregidor, but that the Filipino people had doubts about the United States in the Pacific. "The United States shall return" meant nothing to them at that time, but for MacArthur to return elicited from the Filipino people the utmost in confidence, courage, endurance, and support. Therefore, Romulo's suggestion, "I shall return," was finally accepted by MacArthur and this phrase thrilled the Filipino people and inspired them to endure the dark days.

General MacArthur understood the importance of the Far East more than any American of his time. He was aware of the reported Lenin statement that "The road to Paris is the road through Peking." MacArthur knew that if the Japanese, or later the Communists, should completely dominate Asia, with its vast manpower and untapped resources, then eventually Western Europe would fall. He realized that indeed the road to Paris is the road through Peking, Calcutta, Dahan, and Alexandria.

MacArthur, as occupation commander of Japan, performed a miracle. He won the love, admiration and esteem of the Japanese people and thus won them to the cause of freedom. The vast Japanese industrial potential and skilled manpower is thus today enlisted in the cause for freedom. From the day MacArthur set foot on Japanese soil, he awed and then won the hearts of the Japanese people. MacArthur stepped ashore in the familiar uniform, open at the collar with no sidearms, exhibiting a fearlessness and confidence in the Japanese people which was reciprocated in the years



to follow. MacArthur simply understood the oriental mind. He knew the importance of "face."

In Japan there was no joint occupational forces with Red Russia. No talk was permitted of a corridor to Tokyo. MacArthur was the Supreme Occupation Commander in the name of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I am in a unique position among Members of this Congress in evaluating the events surrounding the recall of General MacArthur as our commander in chief during the Korean war. I talked with General MacArthur approximately 98 hours prior to his recall on April 11, 1951. It was my pleasure to spend 2 hours with him then at his headquarters in Tokyo.

By MacArthur's brilliant flank attack at Inchon, South Korea had been saved, whole Communist armies liquidated, making possible an advance to the Yalu River. Unfortunately, Red China, at this moment entered the war with overwhelming forces and one of the most skillful retreats in all the history of the world was accomplished by General MacArthur and his gallant forces. They dug in on the 38th parallel where they destroyed the cream and the flower of the armies of Red China. Another advance to the Yalu was in order to secure the victory and unite Korea, but total victory was denied the American and Allied Forces and MacArthur was recalled. When I talked with him, he had no inkling of his removal a few hours later. In advocating complete victory in Korea, MacArthur only reflected the thinking of every single naval officer and seaman, every Air Force general and airman, every soldier, every Marine and Army general in Korea when MacArthur said, "There is no substitute for victory in war."

For 2 weeks prior to the time I talked with General MacArthur, my time was spent in airbases, naval bases and in the field in Japan, Okinawa and in Korea. I mixed with the American combat forces at every level. I did not find a single person who did not feel that we had destroyed not only North Korea, but that we had liquidated the only Red Chinese armies of any consequence and therefore total victory was in easy reach not only in North Korea but over Red China.

MacArthur and his commanders outlined to me the plan by which the bridges of the Yalu River could be cut, the railroads in Manchuria could be smashed overnight, Chiang Kai-shek landed in the south of China and that the balance of world power in three months would be tipped forever in favor of the cause of freedom. Russia could not possibly intervene in behalf of Red China with one railroad and no stockpile of nuclear power. Russia at that time was helpless to aid her faltering Red ally in China. This opinion was voiced by every member of the Japanese Diet with whom I talked.

MacArthur was only stating a basic elemental fact of war and was looking into the future with uncanny reality. His belief and that of his men at that time was that world war III was well underway. We had every advantage and all that remained was to seal the victory.

He and his men felt that it would be much better to do so then at little loss of life than to wait 10 or 20 years when Red China and Russia were fully ready to strike at a time of their own choosing. Time was on the Communist side and we gave them the precious time they desperately needed. Without question, when the hordes of Red China attack Southeast Asia, as they will do, we will see the correctness of MacArthur's foresight.

General MacArthur was keenly interested in politics. He was the best political analyst I have ever known. As I sat with him in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York upon one occasion, I asked him about his predicting the Labor Party victory in Australia at the close of World War II. I recalled that he was the only prominent figure that predicted such a victory. MacArthur admitted a keen interest in politics and then, almost State by State, he went over the U.S. senatorial and gubernatorial races then underway and predicted the outcome. I was amazed in November of that year to find his predictions virtually 100 percent accurate.

At the time of this visit, June 19, 1954, General MacArthur revealed to me, for the first time, and I have kept it confidential, the nature of his conversation with President-elect Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles at the Waldorf in December 1952. MacArthur revealed that he suggested to Eisenhower and Dulles that they see Stalin somewhere on neutral ground in Europe almost immediately. Stalin was old and would not live long; and if an agreement was to be made with him, it would have to be done at once. MacArthur said that this summit with Stalin should be held as soon as Eisenhower was inaugurated President. At that time Eisenhower was a glamorous world figure. Everybody was seeking his favor. His prestige was at an alltime high, having been overwhelmingly elected President. With this enormous prestige, MacArthur felt that this was the psychological time to face Joe Stalin with the united power at that time of the allied world. Eisenhower could have faced Stalin with a proposition which would have been difficult for Stalin to refuse. The plan suggested by MacArthur to President-elect Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles was to threaten Russia with a complete rearmament of Germany and Japan, possibly including nuclear power, unless Stalin agreed to live up to his promise of the self-determination of the peoples of Poland, East Germany, and Central Europe. MacArthur believed and suggested to the President-elect that Stalin had no alternative but to accept. On the other hand, if Eisenhower waited 6 months, the luster of his prestige would wear away in political strife and allied suspicions and this opportunity would be lost forever.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, to me, is unquestionably the greatest American of our time. His courage, integrity, character, and nobility are reminiscent of George Washington and the Founding Fathers.

The people of the United States, Japan, free China, the Philippines, and the people of the entire free world will always revere and love the name of Mac-

Arthur. The enemies of the free world will always admire his military genius and respect the name of MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a warm personal friend. I have lost one who has been an inspiration to me in this Congress and in my daily endeavors. Mrs. Dorn, my family, and the people whom I represent join me in extending to his lovely and devoted wife and to his fine son our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy. They join me in extending my deepest sympathy also to his dedicated and noble friend, Gen. Courtney Whitney.

Mr. Speaker, the following prayer of General MacArthur for his son will always be an inspiration to the youth of our country:

#### A FATHER'S PRAYER

Build me a son, O Lord,  
Who will be strong enough to know when he  
is weak,  
And brave enough to face himself when he  
is afraid;  
One who will be proud and unbending in  
honest defeat,  
And humble and gentle in victory.

Build me a son  
Whose wishbone will not be where his back-  
bone should be,  
A son who will know Thee—  
And that to know himself is the foundation  
stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray,  
Not in the path of ease and comfort,  
But under the stress and spur of difficulties  
and challenge.  
Here let him learn to stand up in the storm;  
Here let him learn compassion for those who  
fall.

Build me a son  
Whose heart will be clear,  
Whose goal will be high;  
A son who will master himself before he  
seeks to master other men;  
One who will learn to laugh, yet never forget  
how to weep;  
One who will reach into the future, yet never  
forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray,  
Enough of a sense of humor,  
So that he way always be serious, yet never  
take himself too seriously.

Give him humility,  
So that he may always remember the sim-  
plicity of true greatness,  
The open mind of true wisdom,  
The meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper,  
"I have not lived in vain."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the long procession of the years of the 20th century rolls inexorably on. The United States of America emerges from the obscurity of a provincial power and gains a stature unmatched in human history. Its population doubles, and the vigor and ingenuity of its citizens grow hour by hour. Science and industry are in ferment. Brilliant figures light the scene, generating power and plenty and magnanimity. Intricate machines take over labor, both human and animal, and pour forth a stream of wealth for the service of man. Intelligence is cultivated and put to useful work. "There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard." Dominant citizen-kings unfold the mysteries of democracy, and disappear into the mists of the past.

Through all the convulsions of a civilization forging a re-creation of the world,

a military star of the first magnitude glows with undimmed splendor. The United States is, by instinct and by deliberate choice, not a military nation. But growth brings conflict, and the United States could not escape the fate of its waxing economic and political power. There have been wars in rapid succession, and in all of them the name of MacArthur stands out with a solar light that cannot be extinguished. A valorous father spread luster on the name. The son added grandeur and glory and nobility.

The record of the days of the long years of the service of Douglas MacArthur to the Nation is written. The details are too familiar to all of us. The record began on the Plains of the Hudson before the dawn of the century. It ended on the deck of the Missouri in a Japanese harbor.

Or did it end there? No, the culmination came when the superb warrior turned into a sagacious statesman. Stern necessity compelled Douglas MacArthur to overwhelm the military ambitions of a Nation deluded by false promises. Nobility of character urged him to rebuild that Nation on a grander scale, with rightness and good will as its foundation stones.

Honors have been heaped upon Douglas MacArthur to the limit of our feeble power to bestow. General of the Army, wearer of the Congressional Distinguished Service Medal, the adulation and hero worship of millions.

We are most thankful that length of years was granted to our general. That gave him time to stamp his personality on the hearts of his compatriots. His name and his deeds will inspire his followers with a zeal and devotion equal to his own. For it is impossible to believe that America can produce only one true patriot and wise leader.

In those who come after him, then, may his career go on. And for their encouragement and guidance, may they diligently con the books in which his record is written, wherein "lies the soul of the whole past time, the articulate voice of the past when the body and material substance of it has altogether vanished like a dream."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Sixth District of Pennsylvania join their fellow Americans and citizens throughout the free world in mourning the death of one of America's great soldiers, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

General MacArthur's life was dedicated to the service of his country and to the defense of freedom. As a World War I frontline commander, as liberator of the Philippines, as commander of the Allied Powers in Japan and an architect of the free political system of that great and friendly country, and as commander of the United Nations forces in Korea, he was one of America's great heroes.

I know of no more fitting words to serve as his epitaph than those contained in President Johnson's proclamation of April 5:

We will forever be indebted to him for his integrity, his courage, and his brilliant accomplishments as a soldier and citizen; we

will never forget that his ultimate goal was peace among men.

My deepest sympathies go to Mrs. MacArthur and their son.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the great captains has died but has left a memory in history that will long be remembered, revered, and studied by students of not only military history but of the chronicles of all time.

General MacArthur was an inspiration not only to those who knew him but to those whom he led and served and to those who knew and studied his accomplishments.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur was a soldier's soldier. His early life left no doubt of the illustrious future he would enjoy. He is the proof of the greatness of America because our system must produce General MacArthurs in order to maintain our leadership of the world. We must build leaders and to this end General MacArthur devoted an ever increasing amount of time in his last years. He was dedicated to West Point and to the military leadership that our free society demands.

He wrote a prayer, which might be called a father's prayer, during the trying battle for the Philippines in 1942. It is not only a message to his son but it is a message to all sons of America. I quote it here as one of the great contributions of one of the great captains:

Build me a son, O Lord, who will be strong enough to know when he is weak, and brave enough to face himself when he is afraid; one who will be proud and unbending in honest defeat, and humble and gentle in victory.

Build me a son whose wishes will not take the place of deeds; a son who will know Thee—and that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray, not in the path of ease and comfort, but under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge. Here let him learn to stand up in the storm; here let him learn compassion for those who fail.

Build me a son whose heart will be clear, whose goal will be high, a son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men, one who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray, enough of a sense of humor, so that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously. Give him humility, so that he may always remember the simplicity or true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, and the meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper, "I have not lived in vain."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, another era of the fighting MacArthurs ended Sunday with the passing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In less than 5 months, our Nation is again plunged into deep mourning over the death of an outstanding citizen.

Born at an Army post on the American frontier on January 26, 1880, MacArthur followed in the footsteps of his forefathers who, as early as the 14th century, were noted warriors then serving under Robert the Bruce for the independence of Scotland.

His destiny was guided by a deep sense of devotion to duty, honor, and country. The importance he placed on these

words is related in an address he made at the U.S. Military Academy 2 years ago.

Those three hallowed words—

He said—

reverently dictate what you want to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying point to build courage when courage seems to fail, to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith, to create hope when hope becomes forlorn.

Fifty-two of his eighty-four years were dedicated to the profession of arms and the art of war. His military career carried him through three major wars, and his ability won high praise from leaders throughout the world. The British Chiefs of Staff sent the following message to MacArthur shortly after the successful landing of troops at Inchon, Korea:

We believe that the brilliant conception and masterly execution of the Inchon counterstrike which you planned and launched whilst holding the enemy at bay will rank among the finest strategic achievements in military history.

He was very much aware of changing times and changing situations.

The old methods and solutions no longer suffice—

He told the American Legion gathered in Los Angeles in 1955—

We must have new thoughts, new ideas, new concepts, just as did our venerated forefathers when they faced a new world.

In an address at the U.S. Military Academy before the 1962 graduating class, he continued this theme:

You now face a new world, a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellite spheres and missiles marks a beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a more abrupt or staggering evolution.

We deal now not with things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We speak in strange terms of harnessing the cosmic energy, or making winds and tides work for us \* \* \* of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but, instead, to include his civil population; of ultimate conflicts between a united human race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy, such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all times.

General MacArthur is no longer amongst our ranks. As if writing his epitaph, he also told the graduating cadets at West Point:

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished—tone and tints. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen then, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and re-echoes: duty, honor, country.



Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps, and the corps, and the corps. I bid you farewell.

With bowed heads, our Nation bids Gen. Douglas MacArthur a very sad farewell.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the last and most difficult battle, Douglas MacArthur demonstrated the courage that marked his entire career. With the knowledge that this last battle could not ultimately be won, he nevertheless fought gamely, and once again, the American people fought with him.

His career spanned the international confrontations of the 20th century, a century marked by two major world wars and the terrible 37-month long Korean crises. In every instance—from his brilliant undergraduate days at West Point to the highest pinnacles of military strategy—Douglas MacArthur remained first and last a soldier; a very brave and valiant soldier.

Despite his famous saying that "old soldiers never die" the inevitable has happened. With Shakespeare, we may now say that "the valiant never taste death but once."

His last days, as well as his entire life, amounted to a case study in courage. I will miss him greatly, and the country has lost one of its truly great heroes. My deepest sympathies and those of the entire world go out to his wife and son on this day, and we can say with certainty that Douglas MacArthur now belongs to the ages.

Many great things have been said about the late general here on the floor of the House, where many friends of the general have extolled his memory.

On Monday, April 6th, the New York Herald Tribune editorial described the career of General MacArthur titled "A Great Captain Passes." I am pleased to make this article a part of the permanent RECORD. The editorial follows:

#### A GREAT CAPTAIN PASSES

The stresses of a long life, the agonies of its last gallant days have ended for General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. His great feats in battle belong to history; the memory of his services, his electric personality belong to the American people.

General MacArthur's whole career was invested with authentic drama, heightened by his own panache, an aura that was as tangible as the white plume of Henry of Navarre.

The general came by his military bearing naturally. He was a soldier by career and by inheritance—a product of West Point's strongest traditions and the son of that Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur whose military experience extended from the Civil War to the Philippines insurrection. Douglas MacArthur held high command in three great wars, as well as the highest peacetime offices in the Armies of the United States and the Philippines Commonwealth.

Had General MacArthur possessed less than authentic genius, his commanding manner might not have served him well with the American people, who generally prefer their generals to have the outward simplicity of a Stonewall Jackson, a Grant, or an Omar Bradley. The strategic brilliance of Douglas MacArthur was too real to be obscured by such considerations, as the massive and virtually unprecedented welcome he received on his return from Korea demonstrated.

Yet the pride and affection in which Americans held the soldier had their limits. Though the General's views on domestic and international politics received a full and respected hearing, they did not markedly affect the Nation's course.

General MacArthur's broad ideas on global strategy in World War II and after will doubtless long be debated. Many controversies survive those stormy days. But the superb mastery of the complex technology of warfare he displayed is undeniable.

In the long defense of Bataan and Corregidor—foredoomed but presenting a striking contrast to the swift collapse of so many other Pacific bastions before the Japanese tide—General MacArthur was a symbol of dogged resistance. His promise to return was a kind of individual pledge of a national resolve.

But neither symbol nor resolve of themselves could have accomplished the tremendous feat of taking fleets and armies some 2,500 air-line miles through the tangled archipelagoes that lay between the advanced Allied bases at Port Moresby and Manila.

The Pacific war was fought on many fronts, from the foggy Aleutians to hot, pestilential Guadalcanal. No one effort can be given sole credit for the final result. But General MacArthur's drive, against carefully selected links in the Japanese chain, was an operation for the textbooks, a model of coordination, deception and boldness.

As Lord Alanbrooke, who has termed MacArthur the "greatest general and the best strategist that the war produced," pointed out, the General not only left "masses of Japs to decay" behind the points he chose to hit, but picked for those points the ones "best suited for the efficient use of the three services." MacArthur waged triphibious war at its most deadly.

This is the more striking when it is remembered that the general had received his initial training at a time when armies moved on the feet of men, horses and mules, when cavalry still carried sabers and were expected to use them in a charge, when magazine rifles, smokeless powder, machine guns and quick-firing artillery were all relatively new in war. His first experience in combat was in the mired simplicities of World War I, during which he rose to brigade and, at the war's end, divisional command.

That his triumphs in the Pacific war should lead to General MacArthur's central role in accepting the surrender of Japan on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* was natural. That this in turn led to a masterpiece of imaginative administration in the rebuilding of Japan under the general's supreme command may be ironical. But the sturdy foundations that General MacArthur laid for America's principal Far Eastern alliance testify to the fact that if he was primarily a military man, he was both broad-gauged and farsighted.

The Communist attack upon the Republic of Korea thrust General MacArthur into his third war in his 70th year. It included the great stroke at Inchon—worthy to be considered his most striking single maneuver—and the anticlimax of his recall by President Truman.

Though it shadowed his last years, the recall was not in any sense a judgment upon his career. That judgment is far better expressed by divisional command in 1918, Chief of Staff under President Hoover, Field Marshal of the Philippines Commonwealth, General of the Army in the world's greatest war, Supreme Commander in Japan, Commander in Chief of the United Nations in Korea and many decorations, including the highest, the Medal of Honor.

Repeated heavy responsibilities, brilliantly discharged, show the confidence the Republic reposed in its great captain and the reasons for its gratitude to him.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the great soldier who fired his first shot in battle 61 years ago and served with distinction as a fighting general in three wars, has lost his final battle to death.

The death of the five-star general, senior ranking officer in the U.S. Army, removed from the American scene a public figure who had written himself brilliantly into the history of his time not only as a soldier but a statesman.

As United Nations commander in the occupation of Japan, he became the first foreigner to govern that country.

The impact of his personality alone has made him an outstanding world figure since he came dramatically out of retirement and into field command in the Philippines when the Japanese started World War II.

In World War II, as commander of the Southwest Pacific Theater of Operations, General MacArthur often was under fire as he landed along with his troops on invasion beaches. The planning and execution of his campaign that led allied forces from Australia back through jungled islands and through the Philippines has been called masterly by military critics.

The audacity and calculated chance taking of some of his maneuvers caught the enemy completely off balance. In the Korean war, in which he was United Nations commander, he conceived and carried out the Inchon amphibious landing in 1950 despite opposition from his field commander and initially from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The operation recaptured Seoul, the capital city, and sparked the routing of the North Korean Communist army.

His words "I shall return," and "I have returned," will long be remembered by all Americans and all free people in the world. But most of all we will remember the words he spoke to the joint session of Congress from one of the most popular barracks ballads "which proclaimed most proudly, that old soldiers never die, they just fade away. And like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away."

The memory of Gen. Douglas MacArthur will never fade away in the hearts of free people of this world.

To his widow, his son, his family, we extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. Speaker, from the plains of the U.S. Military Academy to the decks of the battleship *Missouri*, through two World Wars, and Korea, up the beaches of Corregidor and across the Peninsula of Bataan there stands a trail blazed by an American patriot—a man who served his country and labored in her name.

Many in New Mexico have a very special knowledge of that man, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for during World War II there served on Bataan two battalions of the New Mexico National Guard. It was to men such as those that he triumphantly returned in 1944. For the accomplishment of that remarkable feat alone, we shall be forever in the general's debt.

Little more than a week ago, the tired warrior opened his eyes after major surgery; and, while having barely regained

consciousness, he whispered, "I will do my best." As 20 years ago he kept his promise of, "I shall return," we may feel secure in the knowledge that he did no less than "his best" throughout his years. May we who have benefited from his courage, determination and dedication always walk in his footsteps doing nothing less than our best.

Americans have had good reason to take pride in their country. But now, we have been given new reason for pride in this Nation by the thoughts, words, and deeds of this General of the Army, for we are able to hold dear the same land to which he dedicated his life.

Each of us, as citizens of America and as citizens of the world, can honorably toil in the service of his ideals, and while emulating his devotion to peace, may we withstand with equal fortitude the gales of war should those ill winds ever again surround us.

In the annals of history, there still live many men who no longer walk among us. Yet, death and the passage of time have illuminated their deeds and elevated the memory of their lives as a source of mankind's hope. Like those men, Douglas MacArthur is a man whose memory will serve as a wellspring of hope. But, unlike them, it was during life and not in death that he became a legend. In repose, he can serve only to make us realize the great depth of our loss, for already we realize that we have sustained a loss.

May we learn from his passing of our great need to bring from the generations of today and tomorrow men, who like him, will live with dignity and integrity. May we recognize that what many have thought beyond human ability is surely not so, for by his death, Douglas MacArthur has again manifested his greatest quality, his humanity.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, like an old soldier who never dies, Gen. Douglas MacArthur faded away Sunday leaving behind a great legacy for those who loved and cherished him. His passing, though anticipated for some time, brings deep bereavement to our countrymen everywhere for he has long been the symbol of a great father to all of us, as he fought for our country and protected our homesteads and our American ideals.

The legend that Gen. Douglas MacArthur created for our Nation and our people is almost unparalleled in the records of American military history. He became a living embodiment of the West Point Academy code which he himself so eloquently expressed many times during his long distinguished career: That of duty, honor, and country.

To many young boys, as well as those who grew up alongside of him during the war period, General MacArthur was the hero who could never die. He also became the idol and beloved hero of other countries and peoples around the world.

General MacArthur exhibited both courage and physical strength during his military service that made people everywhere admire and respect him, yet he also had a deep-seated devotion to spiritual values. During the desperate early days of the war in the Pacific, General MacArthur wrote a credo, which his family joined in to repeat during

early morning devotions. It is a simple legacy from a father to a son, and I would like to submit it here in memoriam to his fine aspirations:

Build me a son, O Lord, who will be strong enough to know when he is weak, and brave enough to face himself when he is afraid; one who will be proud and unbending in honest defeat, and humble and gentle in victory.

Build me a son whose wishes will not take the place of deeds; a son who will know Thee—and that to know himself is the foundation stone of knowledge.

Lead him, I pray, not in the path of ease and comfort, but under the stress and spur of difficulties and challenge. Here let him learn to stand up in the storm; here let him learn compassion for those who fail.

Build me a son whose heart will be clear, whose goal will be high, a son who will master himself before he seeks to master other men, one who will reach into the future, yet never forget the past.

And after all these things are his, add, I pray, enough of a sense of humor, so that he may always be serious, yet never take himself too seriously. Give him humility, so that he may always remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, and the meekness of true strength.

Then I, his father, will dare to whisper, I have not lived in vain.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we have become only too familiar in recent months with the sense of loss that is felt when a great man and a great national figure dies. Men who possess the rare quality that is called leadership hold a special place in the affections of their countrymen. Their departure occasions therefore a very deep, a very genuine, and a very unique kind of grief.

Everyone is familiar with the history of General MacArthur's life, and now we are sorrowfully familiar with the circumstances of his calmly courageous death. He died as he lived, a hero to the end.

In this stalwart and romantic figure, the great hopes, dreams, and ideals of the United States came to life and found fruition. In his full life of superlative leadership, of patriotic service, and of dedicated achievement, General MacArthur gained a deep and penetrating wisdom which found utterance in his public statements.

Rather than attempting the impossible task of reviewing the major triumphs of a life so full of achievement, it may perhaps be appropriate to repeat some of the words of Douglas MacArthur, words that his fellow Americans may remember in the years to come when his presence and counsel will not be here to guide and sustain us.

He stated his dedication to the cause of his country and of freedom thus:

I shall raise my voice as loud and as often as I believe it to be in the interest of the American people. I shall dedicate all of my energies to restoring to American life those immutable principles and ideals which your forefathers and mine handed down to us in sacred trust. I shall assist in the regaining of that moral base for both public and private life which will restore the people's faith in the integrity of public institutions and the private faith of every man in the integrity of his neighbor. I shall set my course to the end that no man need fear to speak the truth. I could not do less,

for the opportunities for service my country has given me and the honors it has conferred upon me have imposed an obligation which is not discharged by the termination of public service. I am animated by the sole desire to help restore, preserve, and advance those great American principles and ideals of which we have been beneficiaries ourselves and are now trustees for future generations.

Following the surrender of the Japanese on the battleship *Missouri* he said:

Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start, workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.

This is the manner in which he described our crisis and prayed for the future of his country:

There are those who seek to convert us to a form of socialistic endeavor leading directly to the path of Communist slavery. As a counterbalance to those forces is the deep spiritual urge in the hearts of our people—a spiritual urge capable of arousing and directing a decisive and impelling public opinion. This, indeed, is the great safeguard and resource of America. So long as it exists we are secure, for it holds us to the path of reason. It is an infallible reminder that our greatest hope and faith rests upon two mighty symbols—the cross and the flag; the one based upon those immutable teachings which provide the spiritual strength to persevere along the course which is just and right—the other based upon the invincible will that human freedom shall not perish from the earth. These are the mighty bulwarks against the advance of those atheistic predatory forces which seek to destroy the spirituality of the human mind and to enslave the human body. Let us pray for the spiritual strength and innate wisdom to keep this Nation to the course of freedom charted by our fathers; to preserve it as the mighty instrument on earth to bring universal order out of existing chaos; to restore liberty where liberty has perished; and to reestablish human dignity where dignity has been suppressed.

In one of his last speeches, his farewell to the Cadet Corps at the Military Academy when he was presented the Sylvanus Thayer Award for service to the Nation, he spoke these moving words:

The long, gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from under their white crosses, thundering those magic words: duty, honor, country. \* \* \* The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished, tone and tint. They have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears and



coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday.

I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll.

In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange, mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and reechoes: duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river, my last conscious thoughts will be of the Corps, and the Corps, and the Corps.

I bid you farewell.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and the Nation in paying tribute to a great man.

Douglas MacArthur was one of those star-crossed individuals who not only had the great fortune of living in this Nation at a time when great history was in the making, but who also took a major role in the shaping of that history. He was one of our rare soldier-statesmen.

As a soldier he led this Nation to overwhelming victory in the Pacific. Then after the conflict had passed and the guns of war had fallen silent, he lifted the vanquished from the ashes of defeat, and almost single handedly built them into the great democracy they are today.

This is but one of the many examples that could be used to illustrate his ability.

From his first campaign in the Philippines to his last battle in Korea, he served this Nation with every fiber of his body and every thought of his brilliant mind.

His military genius and administrative brilliance will long continue to set the example for the young men in this Nation who will graduate from our military academies in the years to come.

I was privileged to hear his farewell address to the Congress in which he used that now famous phrase:

Old soldiers never die, they just fade away.

Now, after his passing, I cannot help thinking that no statement he made could be more mistaken.

For as long as history continues to record the deeds of men, the memory of Douglas MacArthur will never "fade away" from the minds of the American people.

We can never repay you, Douglas MacArthur, for all you have done for your country. I hope it will suffice to say, "Thank you and God keep you."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the many Americans who is profoundly sad because of the passing of one of the greatest soldiers, one of the greatest statesmen, and one of the greatest men in all respects, General MacArthur.

In January 1946, it was my privilege, along with several other Members of the House of Representatives, to visit with General MacArthur at his headquarters in Tokyo, Japan. His great Pacific victory had just been won; however, he was modest to the last degree.

It was clear to all of us he was working night and day to try to assist a group of people who had vigorously fought America; the Japanese. We are all

aware of his unusual success in bringing order out of chaos in Japan.

When the proper evaluations of all great leaders in the history of America are made, we all are aware General MacArthur will stand with and by the very highest.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some heroes are accidents of history. Through a quirk of circumstance not of their own doing, they happen to be in the right place at the right time and do the right thing.

But there is another brand of hero, the sort of hero typified by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur whose death we mourn today.

Time after time and on occasion after occasion, General MacArthur deliberately placed himself in the path of history and dared it to run him down.

I do not think General MacArthur ever played it safe in his life.

He never compromised principle for expediency.

He lived the life he wanted to live, and he lived it to the fullest.

His dedication to his Nation will be remembered as long as there is a United States.

Words came easily to General MacArthur, because he believed fervently in what he said, and he lived what he believed.

His speech before the Corps of Cadets at West Point on May 12, 1962, deserves to be remembered forever. It was delivered without notes, from the heart.

In speaking of the motto of the U.S. Military Academy, "Duty, Honor, Country," he said:

Unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase.

But these are some of the things they build. They build your basic character. They mold you for your future roles as the custodians of the Nation's defense. They make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid.

They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success; not to substitute words for action; not to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm, but to have compassion on those who fail; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh, yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future, yet never neglect the past; to be serious, yet never take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness; the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength.

What more can I say, what more can anyone say about this man who was born to heroism, lived life nobly and died with dignity and honor.

If each of us in this Chamber today could have done one of his deeds, each of us would be a hero.

We will never forget General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, either here in the United States, in the Philippines, or in Japan.

He was a magnificent soldier, a magnanimous victor, and a matchless man.

Let us hope and pray with all our hearts that the good Lord will give us more men like him in the future.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the gray skies and misting rain we have witnessed in Washington give sad expression to the sorrow we all feel as Gen. Douglas MacArthur, one of the most vivid public servants of our age, lies in honored state under the dome of this Nation's Capitol.

It is a tribute reserved for the great of this country, and the greatness of Douglas MacArthur, a dedicated patriot of freedom, a brilliant military strategist, and a commander of our forces in three wars, was recognized long ago.

During the black hours of World War II, the rugged face, the tarnished hat, the determined look of self-assurance gave hope and confidence to a frightened world. His courage and strong sense of duty, honor and country gave inspiration and valor to the men he led in sacrificing service to this country and the cause of freedom. His own sense of duty is characterized by his uncompromising statement:

The man who will not defend his freedom does not deserve to be free.

MacArthur was a serious and eloquent man. His high sense of purpose and indomitable moral courage clung to him throughout a lifetime. After the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, when the Filipinos were left alone under cruel enemy occupation, it was to him a moral duty to return.

As Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo reminded us:

For him to say "I shall return" was to wave the flag of hope, of determination, of undying faith. The guerrillas in the swamps and in the mountains would continue fighting because MacArthur, they were sure, was coming back. The personal pronoun "I" was MacArthur. His word was his bond.

And MacArthur did return. With moral courage, and a genius for strategy, he led victorious troops across the Pacific into Japan.

Perhaps his great success as a military leader came from his genuine respect for the men he was called to lead. Of the American man of arms he said:

My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many, many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then, as I regard him now, as one of the world's noblest figures; not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless \* \* \*. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thousand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his stature in the hearts of his people.

This respect that MacArthur held for the average foot soldier has been returned twofold, not only from those who served under him, but from the hearts of people throughout the world who esteem the example he set before us. We may not be able to express it in the same eloquent manner, but our feelings are as deep and as genuine.

General MacArthur was born to military life. The son of Arthur MacArthur, a lieutenant general and one of the outstanding figures of our Civil War, he learned well his lessons in patriotism and love of country. In 1899 he entered his beloved U.S. Military Academy at West

Point, and the years spent there were among his dearest memories of a full lifetime.

Four years later he graduated as first in his class. From that point on, the fact that he was outstanding among men was seldom questioned. He became the youngest brigadier in the American Expeditionary Forces of the First World War. He was then made Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, again the youngest in history, and was retained for an unheard-of second term under the directions of President Roosevelt.

Then came Pearl Harbor and the devastation of World War II. He was entrusted as supreme commander in the Pacific and brought exceptional leadership to the fight for freedom. He became, as President Johnson said, "one of the authentic American heroes of this century."

At the outbreak of the Korean conflict the free world turned to him as their supreme allied commander. His decision, made against great opposition, concerning the Inchon landing in Korea in 1950, proved to be a brilliant victory. Some historians have expressed the opinion that it may be among the greatest examples of military strategy in history. But MacArthur's dictum, that "There is no substitute for victory," brought him squarely in conflict with the leader of our country. After years of noble service to this Nation he was retired from active military life.

The words he spoke in that memorable and touching farewell speech to Congress point up the great moral courage of the man. He held a strong conviction and, in the face of what he considered to be disgrace—held on to it. It is not for us to judge who was right—future generations will do that for us—but those closing lines expressed the dedication and the courage of an exceptional man, a man whose passing deeply grieves the world. Those lines were:

Now I close my military career and just fade away—an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goodbye.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation mourns General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, we find ourselves united once more in shared sadness and reflection.

The lives of us all have been lifted by the force of this man's character.

We who live in Texas are glad that our State contributed to the formation of his life, as his life later contributed to ours.

As a boy in his teens, Douglas MacArthur spent in the State of Texas what he called in his memoirs, "the happiest days of my life." Later he served in Texas as a young officer in the Army of the United States.

General MacArthur recounts in his life story that his first memories are of a tour of duty his father Gen. Arthur MacArthur, served on the Rio Grande River at Fort Seldon near El Paso.

At 13, Douglas MacArthur was enrolled at the newly established West Texas Military Academy in San Antonio. There he achieved high scholastic stand-

ing and honors. He was quarterback of the football team and a tennis champion.

Writing of his years at the West Texas Military Academy near Fort Sam Houston, General MacArthur said:

It was here that a transformation began in my development. There came a desire to know, a seeking for the reasons why, a zest to learn the facts. Gradually an overwhelming thirst for knowledge seized me.

That the late General MacArthur regarded Texas with the same esteem with which the State of Texas and its people regard this great national hero is reflected in his words:

It was a wrench to leave San Antonio. My few years there were without a doubt the happiest of my life. Texas will always be a second home to me.

In Texas the past is important. The soldier whose body lies in state here today will be remembered.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Members in expressing my sorrow over the death of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. As one of the millions of American servicemen who served under General MacArthur during the Pacific campaigns of World War II, I have personal recollection of some of his greatest triumphs.

Certainly, in the proper judgment of military observers, General MacArthur has earned a place in history as one of our greatest military geniuses. His World War II strategy was almost flawless in its development and was especially noteworthy for the fact that his plan produced effective recovery of territory from the Japanese with a minimum loss of American lives.

We are all mindful of the frustrations to which General MacArthur was subjected during his command of the forces in the Korean war. He was one of the first victims of foreign policy decisions which prevented clear-cut victory in the war against communism. The American people still remember his logical and dramatic emphasis on the fact that the purpose of war is victory.

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur served our country in his military capacity for over 50 years, and his service was one of dedication, honor, courage, and, above all, triumphant accomplishments of American military forces.

A nation joins us in paying tribute to this great soldier. This Saturday when he is laid to his final rest, bugles will sound over his grave, and his soul will take its place at the head of a long line of heroes who have served our country so well.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, America has lost one of its great captains in the passing of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

His service in 20 campaigns and on a hundred battlefields represents—in the highest sense—his dedication to the creed of the long gray line: "Duty, honor, country."

As Supreme Commander of the occupation of Japan, MacArthur's leadership wrote an inspiring chapter in American-Japanese relations; creatively and sensitively encouraging Japan down the road of social and economic reform—and

firmly toward democracy. Above all, he laid the foundations for a Japan committed to the principles of the United Nations; dedicated to peace; and determined to play an important role as a leader of the free world.

He was to say of his service in Japan:

If the historian of the future should deem my service worthy of some slight reference, it would be my hope that he mention me not as a commander engaged in campaigns and battles, even though victorious to American arms, but rather as that one whose sacred duty it became, once the guns were silenced, to carry to the land of our vanquished foe the solace and hope and faith of Christian morals.

Could I have but a line of a century hence crediting a contribution to the advance of peace, I would yield every honor which has been accorded by war.

Of the United Nations he said:

It represents perhaps the noblest effort man has yet made to evolve a universal code based upon the highest of moral precepts. It became the keystone to an arch of universal hope.

In time of war his rallying cry on leaving Corregidor on February 22, 1942, "I shall return," was a covenant with the Filipino people and an earnest determination of the United States to pursue the war in the Pacific with all our resources and to a successful conclusion.

MacArthur's brilliant strike at Inchon on September 12, 1950, will stand as a master stroke of amphibious operations in the hostilities against North Korea.

His admonition to military commanders at that time and to the corps of cadets on May 12, 1962, "that in war there is no substitute for victory," will be remembered by all those who serve our country in "the profession of arms."

May our generation of men and officers in the armed services remember even more his additional stricture that moving day at West Point:

This does not mean that you are warmongers. On the contrary, the soldier above all other people prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war.

We have lost a soldier great in war and enlightened in peace. MacArthur now belongs to history.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all Members of this House in extending my deepest sympathy to Mrs. MacArthur, Arthur MacArthur, and members of the family.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our revered leader, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, saddens us all. For over a half century, he played a heroic role in the life of our Nation as his words and deeds have been woven into the enduring fabric of our country's greatness. So sincere has been our admiration, so genuine our affection, so deep our gratitude that he has become our symbol of dedicated service. His masterful power of expression employed infrequently, but always effectively, spelled our eternal goals of national aspiration. His actions have been marked with judgment and courage. He moved through a lifetime of outstanding service to this Nation with a dignity and purpose that inspired and strengthened.

Such a noble spirit will live on. The cadets at West Point will forever cherish



him. The Army will forever claim him as its own. The people of our Nation will forever enshrine him in hallowed memory. Those of us who have seen and heard him will never forget his commanding presence. The impact of this great American will continue as we remember those ideals for which he lived, for which he fought, and for which he would have gladly died. We honor his memory best by renewed devotion to our country and the preservation of our heritage as a free people.

We thank God for men like Gen. Douglas MacArthur. We are richer for his noble gift of self. We share the grief of his loved ones and sense their pride.

A grateful nation salutes a gallant soldier and courageous patriot. Now, he, too, belongs to the ages.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the life and service of the late General of the Army of the United States Douglas MacArthur.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### BODY OF LATE GENERAL OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES DOUGLAS MACARTHUR TO LIE IN STATE IN ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) authorizing the remains of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol from April 8 to April 9, 1964.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 74

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in recognition of the long and distinguished service rendered by Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army of the United States, the remains be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol from April 8 to April 9, 1964, and the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction and supervision of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take all necessary steps for the accomplishment of that purpose.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WREATH TO BE PLACED AT REMAINS OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR IN THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) authorizing the purchase of a floral wreath to be placed by the catafalque bearing the remains of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Capitol rotunda.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 75

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives are each hereby authorized and directed to purchase a floral wreath to be placed by the catafalque bearing the remains of late General of the Army of the United States, Douglas MacArthur, which are to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States from April 8 to April 9, 1964, the expenses of which shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1964, FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 976) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask our good chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if he will explain in some detail the handling of the said \$50 million and how it is to be handled by the President of the United States. I ask the chairman or anyone else who cares to do so to give us a brief explanation as to how the President handles disaster relief funds.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, namely:*

#### FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

##### Disaster relief

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are traditionally sympathetic and helpful in all major disasters at home and abroad—

and have from the beginning of our Government provided help and food, clothing, medicine, and money—and every encouragement and assistance toward recovery relief and rehabilitation.

In earlier days Congress authorized specific grants of money on such occasions but in 1950 systemized procedure by giving the President authority to provide immediate assistance through all departments of Government to disaster areas including money—and appropriated a lump sum for the purpose. From this sum relief has been provided on direction of the President without the necessity of waiting specific action by Congress.

Under this act the President has by Executive order designated the Office of Emergency Planning to coordinate all Federal assistance under the terms of the law—and Congress has from time to time replenished the funds available for the purpose.

This fund, originally \$50,000,000 has now been reduced to a minimum and, as result of recent disbursements in the alleviation of flood damage in five Ohio Valley States, has dropped to \$19,021,121 as of April 1, 1964.

The Alaska earthquake disaster is of such huge proportions and of such urgent character that—urgent necessity—the amount left in the disaster fund is wholly inadequate and it becomes necessary to provide another \$50,000,000 to meet the situation. Accordingly we are submitting the pending resolution.

As will be noted the appropriation is not specifically for Alaskan relief but is to replenish the Federal disaster fund from which Alaskan relief—as all other relief—contributions are drawn.

From this fund expenditures have been made for every conceivable character of disaster—fire and flood, hurricanes and earthquakes, explosions and droughts, and every form of uncontrollable misfortune that can beset mankind.

Relief funds from this sum have been disbursed to over 20 States and territories—including the 2 largest, New York and California. It has been ever present in time of need—and the response has been prompt and adequate.

This resolution merely assures continuation—as heretofore—of the wise and benevolent policy for which our people and our Government is noted.

As will be observed this resolution is not a proposal to provide money for Alaska relief specifically, but to appropriate \$50,000,000 to replenish the fund from which will be drawn the amounts necessary to alleviate the most urgent needs of this deplorable situation.

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for 5 additional minutes in order to yield to the minority leader.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we are all conscious of the situation which the gentleman has explained. I have just one question. I think probably his remarks provide the answer, but in order that it may be very clearly understood, am I correct that this is simply a matter of replenishing a fund that has heretofore been available, a fund which is now almost depleted, and that there is no change at all in the manner or method by which the fund will be expended; and that there is nothing in the resolution which indicates any preference for one State as against any other State?

Mr. CANNON. That is true, and this fund will be hedged about with all of the safeguards which have been provided in such cases from time to time since the fund was established.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority leader of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should read into the RECORD that part of the law which states specifically for what this fund is to be used.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include that part of the law which deals with this subject as a portion of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

H.R. 8396

[Public Law 875, 81st Cong., ch. 1125, 2d sess.]

An act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That it is the intent of Congress to provide an orderly and continuing means of assistance by the Federal Government to States and local governments in carrying out their responsibilities to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters, to repair essential public facilities in major disasters, and to foster the development of such State and local organizations and plans to cope with major disasters as may be necessary.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, the following terms shall be construed as follows unless a contrary intent appears from the context:

(a) "Major disaster" means any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States which, in the determination of the President, is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government to supplement the efforts and available resources of States and local governments in alleviating the damage, hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and respecting which the governor of any State (or the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia) in which such catastrophe may occur or threaten certifies the need for disaster assistance under this Act, and shall give assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or

other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe;

(b) "United States" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

(c) "State" means any State in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

(d) "Governor" means the chief executive of any State;

(e) "Local government" means any county, city, village, town, district, or other political subdivision of any State, or the District of Columbia;

(f) "Federal agency" means any department, independent establishment, Government corporation, or other agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, excepting, however, the American National Red Cross.

Sec. 3. In any major disaster, Federal agencies are hereby authorized when directed by the President to provide assistance (a) by utilizing or lending, with or without compensation therefor, to States and local governments their equipment, supplies, facilities, personnel, and other resources, other than the extension of credit under the authority of any act; (b) by distributing, through the American National Red Cross or otherwise, medicine, food, and other consumable supplies; (c) by donating to States and local governments equipment and supplies determined under then existing law to be surplus to the needs and responsibilities of the Federal Government; and (d) by performing on public or private lands protective and other work essential for the preservation of life and property, clearing debris and wreckage, making emergency repairs to and temporary replacements of public facilities of local governments damaged or destroyed in such major disaster, and making contributions to States and local governments for purposes stated in subsection (d). The authority conferred by this Act, and any funds provided hereunder shall be supplementary to, and not in substitution for, nor in limitation of, any other authority conferred or funds provided under any other law. Any funds received by Federal agencies as reimbursement for services or supplies furnished under the authority of this section shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation or appropriations currently available for such services or supplies. The Federal Government shall not be liable for any claim based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a Federal agency or an employee of the Government in carrying out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 4. In providing such assistance hereunder, Federal agencies shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with each other and with States and local governments, relief agencies, and the American National Red Cross, but nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to limit or in any way affect the responsibilities of the American National Red Cross under the Act approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat. 599), as amended.

Sec. 5. (a) In the interest of providing maximum mobilization of Federal assistance under this Act, the President is authorized to coordinate in such manner as he may determine the activities of Federal agencies in providing disaster assistance. The President may direct any Federal agency to utilize its available personnel, equipment, supplies, facilities, and other resources, in accordance with the authority herein contained.

(b) The President may, from time to time, prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act, and he may exercise any power or authority conferred on him by any section of this Act either directly or through such Federal agency as he may designate.

Sec. 6. If facilities owned by the United States are damaged or destroyed in any ma-

for disaster and the Federal agency having jurisdiction thereof lacks the authority or an appropriation to repair, reconstruct, or restore such facilities, such Federal agency is hereby authorized to repair, reconstruct, or restore such facilities to the extent necessary to place them in a reasonably usable condition and to use therefor any available funds not otherwise immediately required: *Provided, however,* That the President shall first determine that the repair, reconstruction, or restoration is of such importance and urgency that it cannot reasonably be deferred pending the enactment of specific authorizing legislation or the making of an appropriation therefor. If sufficient funds are not available to such Federal agency for use in repairing, reconstructing, or restoring such facilities as above provided, the President is authorized to transfer to such Federal agency funds made available under this Act in such amount as he may determine to be warranted in the circumstances. If said funds are insufficient for this purpose, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to any Federal agency repairing, reconstructing, or restoring facilities under authority of this section such sum or sums as may be necessary to reimburse appropriated funds to the amount expended therefrom.

Sec. 7. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, any Federal agency is authorized to accept and utilize with the consent of any State or local government, the services and facilities of such State or local government, or of any agencies, officers, or employees thereof. Any Federal agency, in performing any activities under section 3 of this Act, is authorized to employ temporarily additional personnel without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States by contract or otherwise for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials, and supplies for shipping, drayage, travel and communication, and for the supervision and administration of such activities. Such obligations, including obligations arising out of the temporary employment of additional personnel, may be incurred by any agency in such amount as may be made available to it by the President out of the funds specified in section 8. The President may, also, out of such funds, reimburse any Federal agency for any of its expenditures under section 3 in connection with a major disaster, such reimbursement to be in such amounts as the President may deem appropriate.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President a sum or sums, not exceeding \$5,000,000 in the aggregate, to carry out the purposes of this Act. The President shall transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report covering the expenditure of the amounts so appropriated with the amounts of the allocations to each State under this Act. The President may from time to time transmit to the Congress supplemental reports in his discretion, all of which reports shall be referred to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Sec. 9. The Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233, Eightieth Congress), entitled "An Act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe", is hereby repealed.

Approved September 30, 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask permission to include a fact sheet on the President's relief fund and a tabulation showing the amounts that have been expended by the President out of his relief funds since 1952.

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

There was no objection.



The matter referred to follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES: FUNDS APPROPRIATED  
TO THE PRESIDENT  
DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "disaster relief," \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended; provided, that not to exceed 3 percent of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

Office of emergency planning

This supplemental request would appropriate \$50 million to the President's disaster relief fund primarily to assist the State of Alaska and other areas damaged by natural disasters. The destructive power of the Alaskan earthquake was so great that early estimates of the total damage have varied from \$350 million to \$500 million and more.

Public Law 81-875, which established the President's disaster relief fund, authorizes financial aid to the States to protect life and property and to repair essential public facilities when a major disaster is declared by the President. The President has recently declared major disasters in five Ohio valley States as a result of severe flooding and on March 28 the State of Alaska was declared a disaster area.

In regard to the earthquake damage in Alaska and elsewhere, an on-the-scene survey by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and reports received to date indicate that the damage eligible for Public Law 875 assistance is considerable. There is eligible work in every category permitted by Public Law 875 including debris clearance, protective health and sanitation measures, the emergency repair of roads, streets and bridges, water and sewer systems, public utilities and public buildings and equipment. The eligible damage to the utility system of Anchorage alone is estimated at \$25 million. Extensive damage has also occurred in Kodiak, Seward, Whittier, Valdez and Cordova.

There is a current balance of \$19 million in the President's disaster relief fund. After taking into account the eligible earthquake damage in Alaska and elsewhere, the flooding damage in the Ohio Valley, other pending allocations and future requirements, we have concluded that the President's disaster relief fund should be replenished in the amount of \$50 million.

This supplemental appropriation will not solve all of the problems arising from the Alaskan earthquake, but it will go a long way towards meeting the immediate and emergency requirements for help. The citizens of the 49th State are a hardy and pioneering people and there is no doubt that Alaska's stricken communities will be rebuilt through their hard work and sacrifice. This request for supplemental funds is submitted on an urgent basis to demonstrate that the Federal Government and the people of the United States stand ready and able to furnish all possible assistance in this great task.

Disaster relief fact sheet

1. Background

Prior to Public Law 81-875 Congress authorized specific grants of money when a great disaster occurred. In 1947, in response to heavy hurricanes in the gulf coast area and the flooding of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, Congress authorized the loan or transfer of surplus Federal property to disaster areas. This in turn led to the Federal Disaster Act approved September 30, 1950, giving the President his present authority to provide immediate assistance through all departments of Government to disaster areas including financial aid. The President, by Executive order, has designated the Office of Emergency Planning to coordinate all Federal assistance under the terms of the act.

2. Major allocations since inception of program

States	Calendar year declared	Disaster	Gross allocation
California.....	1955	Flood.....	\$9,500,000
Texas and Louisiana.....	1957	Hurricane Audrey.....	5,950,000
Texas.....	1961	Hurricane Carla.....	8,000,000
Delaware, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, Maryland, and Virginia.....	1962	East coast floods.....	31,850,000
Guam.....	1962	Typhoon Karen.....	16,900,000

3. History of appropriations

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Net allocations from President's fund	Balance in President's fund
1952.....	\$55,800,000	\$35,695,000	\$20,105,000
1953.....	0	114,204	19,990,796
1954.....	0	-1,059,667	21,050,463
1955.....	0	13,926,509	7,123,954
1956.....	28,500,000	15,640,935	19,983,019
1957.....	6,000,000	16,179,594	9,803,425
1958.....	25,000,000	14,879,883	19,923,542
1959.....	0	4,519,852	15,403,690
1960.....	0	6,427,757	8,975,933
1961.....	0	2,828,143	6,147,790
1962.....	46,000,000	25,869,360	26,278,430
1963.....	25,000,000	31,631,135	19,647,295
1964 (9 months).....	20,000,000	20,626,174	19,021,121
Total.....	206,300,000	187,278,879	19,021,121

4. Current status of President's fund

Balance, start of fiscal year 1964.....	\$19,647,295
Appropriation.....	20,000,000
Total.....	39,647,295
Allocations to date in 1964:	

State	Disaster	Date declared	Allocation
Mississippi.....	Chlorine barge.....	Oct. 10, 1962	\$1,792,000
Guam.....	Typhoon Karen.....	Nov. 12, 1962	14,900,000
California.....	Storm and floods.....	Feb. 25, 1963	845,000
Washington.....	Floods.....	Mar. 2, 1963	85,000
Kentucky.....	Storm and floods.....	Mar. 13, 1963	1,250,000
Guam.....	Typhoon Olive.....	Apr. 30, 1963	100,000
Trust territory.....	do.....	do.....	1,055,000
Wyoming.....	Flooding.....	July 4, 1963	300,000
Nebraska.....	do.....	July 17, 1963	395,000
Arkansas.....	do.....	Aug. 2, 1963	150,000
New York.....	do.....	Aug. 23, 1963	750,000
Texas.....	Hurricane.....	Sept. 24, 1963	500,000
Vermont.....	Drought.....	Nov. 27, 1963	128,000
California.....	Reservoir.....	Dec. 21, 1963	500,000
Vermont.....	Flooding.....	Mar. 17, 1964	105,000
Kentucky.....	Storm and floods.....	do.....	250,000
Indiana.....	do.....	do.....	250,000
West Virginia.....	do.....	Mar. 20, 1964	100,000
Ohio.....	do.....	Mar. 24, 1964	250,000
Arkansas.....	do.....	do.....	250,000
Gross allocations through Apr. 1.....			23,955,000
Net adjustment for administrative expense allocations and returns.....			-3,328,826
Net allocations.....			20,626,174

Balance, Apr. 1, 1964..... 19,021,121

Mr. CANNON. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa the material which he includes is very much in point.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much in favor of this appropriation. At least we are doing this for our own people.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that if a disaster of this magnitude had occurred across the pond, we would not be asked to appropriate only \$50 million today. It is quite possible we would be asked to appropriate a lot more, perhaps a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that we appropriated this much to Yugo-

slavia not so long ago when that country suffered an earthquake disaster.

Mr. CANNON. And, also, as the result of an earthquake in Chile in South America we likewise appropriated a considerable sum.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

I, of course, hope, and I know, that the Red Cross will do their wonderful work in Alaska, along with the civil defense organization. The people not only of Alaska who did not suffer disaster, but the people of America, all over America, and no doubt some of our friends across the seas, may send contributions to Alaska. I hope that those contributions will amount to millions upon millions of dollars. Certainly the people of Alaska are in dire need of a lot of assistance.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I shall close with these short remarks by again saying that I am very much in favor of appropriating these funds.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, as the gentleman understands, the amount made available for Alaska under this bill is inconsequential in comparison with the total need. The destruction there amounts to millions of dollars beyond anything which we here propose or which we can supply. However, it contributes to the more immediate needs which must be taken care of in order to start recovery and rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the resolution will have general support.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished minority leader, and the gentleman from Iowa in support of this resolution.

It has been estimated, according to reports which I have read, that the damage in Alaska and in other areas may have exceeded a half billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, that we should take this action now, of course, is entirely appropriate and in line with precedent. I commend our great President for the initiative he has taken in requesting Congress to appropriate funds to replenish the Federal Disaster Assistance Fund which is down as I understand it now to something like \$19 million.

I also commend the Members of the House including minority Members and particularly the distinguished minority leader for cooperating in bringing this matter to the floor.

It is a tribute to all Members that this matter has been made an order by unanimous consent.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and other members of his committee. As soon as the President called the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he immediately took this matter up and made arrangements for it to be the first order of business today.

I commend our fine colleague whose people are suffering, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS] who flew up to Alaska in order to be on the ground to take such action as he could and to learn what the circumstances were. I commend him for the fight he is making here today.

I understand the gentleman from Alaska appeared before his legislature. This, of course, is the kind of action that any conscientious Member of this House would on such occasions take on behalf of his constituents. I commend both the Senators from the great State of Alaska also.

This earthquake has caused untold tragedy to one of our newest States. I am sure that the American people are solidly behind the action we take here today. The needs in Alaska obviously exceed the present capacity of our Federal fund if it is to be available for other emergencies. Funds also are needed in other areas on the west coast.

Only recently the Ohio River Valley floods resulted in Federal disaster assistance fund expenditures of \$6 million. We do not know what other demands may be made on this fund before the end of this fiscal year. Of one thing we may be certain: The American people want to help our fellow citizens in Alaska in their time of disaster and suffering. We must replenish this Federal fund to carry out the will of our humanitarian people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to observe that certainly it is very much in order to bring forth this resolution. I compliment the two Senators from Alaska for going up there and looking over the situation, and the Member of the House for looking it over also.

I think the majority leader states it very properly when he said that this is a matter of support by all of the American people. The taxpayers are going to have to put up this \$50 million. They are going to be Republican taxpayers and they are going to be Democratic taxpayers.

Certainly the gentleman understands, and I think the record ought to show that this resolution is brought up by unanimous consent. One single objection could have prevented consideration of this matter today.

Mr. ALBERT. I did make that clear.

Mr. HALLECK. That is clear, but while we Republicans are in the minority we are not lacking in solicitude for people who are hit by these great disasters. Certainly we have the same interest in those sections of the country as the President and the Representatives from that area have.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

It will be paid for by Democrats and Republicans alike, and the disaster has fallen on Democrats and Republicans alike. Whenever there is a disaster affecting Americans anywhere I think the Congress always responds within the precedents which are before us.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I deeply appreciate the support that has been given to this resolution and the constructive step that has been taken by the leadership in bringing this up for consideration at this time, and asking that unanimous consent be granted.

With mingled sadness and pride and the utmost urgency, I plead for affirmative action upon the pending proposal for immediate replenishment of the Federal disaster fund. Ten days ago and 4,000 miles from here a monstrous earthquake was shattering and devastating Alaska's principal city of Anchorage, after which a ring of seashore towns and villages within a radius of 200 to 300

miles were either badly crippled or destroyed by tidal waves precipitated by the overwhelming force of the earthquake. As reported, the ground at Anchorage pitched like an ocean, leaving gaping crevasses and gullies into which buildings tumbled and during which destruction reigned. Loss of life, not yet fully ascertained, will be found to exceed 100 and may equal 200. From personally viewing the scene at the stricken areas of Anchorage and Seward and Kodiak in addition to seeing pictures of Cordova and Valdez and certain native villages on Kodiak Island, I concluded that it is virtually miraculous that the toll of dead is not two or three times as large as it appears to be. From my on-the-ground inspection last week, I also became painfully aware of the stunning magnitude of the loss of property in terms of both real estate and personal property including both community facilities at all levels of government and private holdings in the categories of both homes and businesses and personal possessions, aggregating in terms of dollars an estimated amount of one-quarter to one-half billion.

I can best emphasize the significance of what I have said in the words uttered by Alaska's Governor, William A. Egan, in his speech last Friday to the Alaska Legislature:

In all of our history there has never been a natural disaster to equal the one Alaska suffered. Many disasters have caused great loss of life. Many have resulted in millions of dollars in damage to property, but the Alaska earthquake is unparalleled for its impact on a single State's population, homes, businesses and commerce.

In a separate message to the Alaska State Legislature, the Governor has requested legislation authorizing the State to issue general obligation bonds to raise \$50 million for use—along with a much greater amount of Federal money—in reconstruction and restoration in the stricken areas, thus proving to you, my colleagues, that Alaskans are willing to exert themselves to help themselves as well as asking for disaster assistance from the Federal Government. Some of the money needed will, of course, be used to repair damage to Federal assets and facilities such as military bases and the Alaska Railroad.

Alaska, as the corridor between Siberia and North America, populated by rugged patriotic Americans from all the States and used as a bastion of our national defense and the situs of the distant early warning system to safeguard against manned enemy bombers and the ballistic missile early warning system to flash 15 minutes' warning to our whole country in the event of the approach of enemy missiles, along with the fact that it is a vast storehouse of natural resources which will become increasingly important to America and to the free world as time goes by, is much too important to our Nation to be neglected or treated in a hardfisted manner, for all of which reasons the first step proposed for action by this body today should be taken forthwith. This



would also bolster the courage and strength of all Alaskans.

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

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I want our colleague from Alaska to know that the Representatives of this House who come from the Pacific Northwest share to some extent the feeling of catastrophe. We have very close economic ties. I think in the public sector there are agencies of Government and programs which can be of great assistance, but I do not know how in the private sector there will be any means by which we can fully help the people of Alaska. I do not think that \$50 million is going to be enough. I for one am hopeful the Congress will look further into this matter to see if we can look after our sister State and see that they are able to be on their feet again.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The first problem is to take care of the community facilities. Of course, the private sector needs particular consideration, because there was practically no earthquake insurance coverage upon the homes and business properties which were destroyed or seriously damaged property. However, that is a problem that will have to be solved in the near future. The \$50 million under consideration will apply to restoring community facilities.

As the gentleman from Washington has indicated to us, sorrow and sympathy does extend beyond one's own State. I take this opportunity of extending my heartfelt feelings of sympathy to the people of Crescent City, Calif., which was stricken by the tidal wave caused by the Alaska earthquake. My sympathy also goes to any others along the shores of the Pacific who suffered loss on account thereof.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Crescent City, Calif., join the people of Alaska in saying thank you for your expeditious consideration of the problems of our areas. Having just returned from the community, I am happy to say the rebuilding and rehabilitation of Crescent City and the immediate area is on its way toward a business-as-usual objective. With Crescent City being my home community, I can appropriately say I am proud of these people who in the face of total devastation of their homes, businesses, and their life savings, have rallied to accept the challenges facing them. The appropriation for disaster relief is most urgently needed. Funds allocated to the area by the President for restoration of public properties damaged or destroyed will do much to restore the confidence of our stricken community. The damage inflicted by the tidal wave will be difficult to measure because of the corrosive effect of the salt water. The 10 lives lost can never be replaced, but an immediate effort to reinstate pub-

lic facilities to normal will do much to stimulate confidence in the business and political leadership of the city. With the core of the city's tax base literally gutted by this disaster, one can appreciate the urgency for positive action. The President and now the Congress has responded magnificently to our request—for this quick action, we shall be forever grateful. We can only hope that none of you will be subjected to a similar fate.

Mayor Bill Peepe, his fellow councilmen of Crescent City, Chairman Harold Del Ponte and members of the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors, and Chairman Carl Brower and his harbor commission members are all to be commended for their quick action in adopting early resolutions and providing rapid political leadership to meet the public and Government demands in implementing the emergency disaster programs.

It was not a case of these people asking "What can Government do for us?" but rather a question of the Federal agency representatives asking "What will you let us do to help?" This spirit was truly refreshing. It was simply a matter of community spirit responding and uniting immediately to "pick themselves up by their bootstraps"—a reminder of the pioneer spirit that built this great country. The Nation can be proud of Crescent City and its people.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the appreciation of the State of California for the action of the House in providing these funds. The State of California at Crescent City and the people there were struck by this great disaster and part of these funds will be used for the rehabilitation of the city and the repair of that destruction in Crescent City.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow to file a privileged report on the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1965.

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

There was no objection.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1965 SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON THURSDAY, APRIL 9

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations will report the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1965 on tomorrow. The leadership has scheduled it for floor consideration on Thursday of this week.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider that bill on Thursday, April 9.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss briefly one of the important questions facing the Nation—a question which I think the Congress should face now. That is the question of converting our defense oriented economy to peacetime purposes. It is becoming more and more apparent that accumulating greater and greater stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery systems in an ever spiraling arms race does not necessarily bring greater national security. Under President Johnson the defense budget has been cut \$1 billion this year. It has been suggested by former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, that by 1970 it can be reduced by 25 percent. This new look at defense spending means we must really have forward-looking planning and a program for the conversion of activity and resources presently devoted to defense to constructive peacetime goals.

Mr. Speaker, the closing of obsolete bases and the reduction in military spending emphasize the need for present planning. At the same time we must continue to strive for disarmament under effective international control and the removal of the "nuclear sword of Damocles." Although it is sometimes argued that disarmament will have an adverse economic impact, intelligently planned conversion will create a richer and more productive life for all of us.

Twenty Members of the House, including myself, and 11 Senators have introduced a bill to create a National Economic Conversion Commission which would study these problems, and which would report to the President and the Congress.

H.R. 10608 establishes a National Economic Conversion Commission in the Executive Office of the President composed of various cabinet officers, including the Secretaries of Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior. The other members of the Commission would be the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The Commission would convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth to "consider the problems arising from a conversion to a civilian economy, and to encourage appropriate planning and programming by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion capability." The Commission would also consult with the Governors of the States to "encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local, and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion capability."

H.R. 10608 requires that each defense contract or grant entered into by the Department of Defense or the Atomic Energy Commission provide that the contractor set up an industrial conversion committee to plan for conversion to civilian work arising from the possible entailment or termination of the contract or grant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hold hearings on this proposal to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission and that the Congress itself take prompt action.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS, FOREIGN AID ARE OPPOSED

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while the House of Representatives has already acted on the so-called civil rights bill, an interesting poll was conducted by six newspapers in Missouri recently, and the poll shows that the readers of those newspapers are about 2½ to 1 opposed to the civil rights bill which is being considered in the other body. The same poll indicated opposition to the manner in which the foreign aid program has been operated and indicated that the people call for a better operation of that program.

I insert in the RECORD a short article from the daily Sikeston Standard, under date of Friday, March 27, showing the results of this poll.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS, FOREIGN AID ARE OPPOSED

Six Missouri newspapers announced results of a combined public opinion poll today, showing readers within a 150-mile area

are against the proposed civil rights bill and expanded foreign aid.

Most of the nearly 1,000 persons responding to the poll also voted against the sale of wheat to Russia and more money to put a man on the moon. But a majority favored the Peace Corps and a toughened anti-Communist position.

The poll was conducted by Sikeston Standard, Rolla Daily News, Warrensburg Star-Journal, and semiweekly Star Journal, Fort Gateway Guide, and Scott County Democrat.

The results:

Civil rights bill: 239 for, 637 against.

Wheat sale to Russia: 99 for, 781 against.

More moonshot money: 122 for, 671 against.

Peace Corps: 504 for, 338 against.

Toughened anti-Communist policy: 831 for, 39 against.

#### CHARLES F. CARPENTIER

Mr. McLOSKEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, today in my native State of Illinois, and in the congressional district I am privileged to serve, a fine public servant and a great individual is being put to rest.

Republicans and Democrats alike are saddened on this occasion, because it is on this day—almost at this hour—that Secretary of State Charles F. Carpentier receives the final burial rites.

The untimely death of Charles Carpentier leaves a void, and the Illinois political scene will not seem the same without the ruddy-faced, scrappy Belgian.

The death of this great American came as a real shock, because most of us believed him well on the road to recovery from the heart attack which first struck on January 20.

Blunt, outspoken, never one to duck an issue, he nevertheless was highly respected for his honesty and political acumen. Leaders of both political parties respected his ability as a political leader.

Charles Carpentier, with all his rough mannerisms, was kindly and courageous, a true friend in time of need, and one who was always dependable.

While I shall miss him as a friend, his family and the State of Illinois will miss him more. To both he gave his very best throughout his lifetime.

Mrs. McLoskey joins with me in extending our sincere sympathy to the family.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. I join the gentleman from Illinois in his expression of sympathy at the passing of this fine man, the present secretary of state of the great State of Illinois, Charles Carpentier. For many, many years I have had the privilege of knowing him and calling him my friend.

He was an outstanding individual, a great American, in addition to being a

truly wonderful public servant in our State of Illinois. He was widely known throughout the State and the country. Unfortunately, as a result of having suffered a heart attack, he was forced to withdraw as a candidate for nomination on the Republican ticket for Governor of our State. I feel certain that not only would he have received the nomination but also, would have been elected this fall.

He was a tireless individual, devoted to his job of serving the people of the State to the very best of his ability. I repeat, I was proud to call him my friend.

I join with the gentleman from Illinois Congressman McLoskey in extending to his family my most sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. McCLODY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois in paying tribute to Charles F. Carpentier, Illinois secretary of state, who passed on last Friday morning.

Charles Carpentier was a longtime friend with whom I had the privilege of serving in the Illinois General Assembly, and with whom I had a long association during his distinguished service as secretary of state of Illinois.

Mr. Carpentier's sponsorship of highway safety legislation led to the saving of many thousands of lives on our highways. His support of measures to establish a modern driver's license law has resulted in saving both lives and money to Illinois citizens.

Mr. Carpentier's protection of the interests of investors in securities was demonstrated in the modern Illinois securities law, the passage of which he encouraged actively.

These measures are mere examples of the constructive legislation which resulted from Mr. Carpentier's efforts and vision. In addition, Mr. Carpentier gained a reputation for integrity and impartiality in the administration of these and all other laws which came within his jurisdiction as secretary of state.

At this hour it is appropriate to recall not only Charles Carpentier's public service which was climaxed by his brilliant career as secretary of state, but to meditate also on his life as a husband, father, and friend.

Charles Carpentier was a loving and beloved husband and father. He was a valued friend, and a man upon whose loyalty and fidelity men came to rely both in and out of public life.

In expressing my personal sorrow as well as the great loss sustained by the people of Illinois on the occasion of the death of Charles F. Carpentier, I want also to offer my sympathy to his bereaved widow, Alta Carpentier, his son, Donald Carpentier, his daughter, Mrs. Edward J. Piper, and other members of the family.

Mr. RUSMFELD. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from Illinois [Mr. McLOSKEY and Mr. ARENDS] in expressing my deepest regret at the loss of our outstanding secretary of state, the Honorable Charles Carpentier. He was a great American, a dedicated and respected public official, and a fighting Republican. The respect in which he was held by the people of the State of Illinois bears testimony to his ability, diligence, and concern for good government. It is with a great sense of loss that I rise today to pay my respects and express my sincere sorrow.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. 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 gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing tribute to a good friend and devoted public servant of Illinois—Secretary of State Charles F. Carpentier. "Mr. Republican," as he was often called, spent 40 years of his life in public service beginning as an alderman for the city of East Moline in 1924 and working upwards to mayor of that city and later State senator until he finally became secretary of state in 1952—a position to which he was reelected twice.

His high standards for traffic safety and driver's license laws were a major contribution to the welfare of the citizens of Illinois, and he established a record of performance that will be difficult for his successors to match.

I am grateful for his friendship that I was privileged to share, and I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy to his family in this hour of loss and sadness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join with my distinguished colleague from Illinois in his expression of deep grief at the passing of the Honorable Charles F. Carpentier, one of the great and beloved sons of Illinois. I assure my dear colleague that every Democratic heart in Illinois is deeply touched with sadness as I know is every Republican heart. As a soldier in World War I, as the five-term mayor of East Moline, as a distinguished member of the State Senate of Illinois, and as the always helpful and able secretary of state of Illinois, Charley Carpentier gave a life of service, devotion, and dedication to the people of his community, State, and Nation. We all, Democrats and Republicans, weep at his passing.

#### REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from

the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I am sending for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1964.

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TRAINING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 18(c) of the Government Employees Training Act (Public Law 85-507, approved July 7, 1958), I am sending to the Congress forms supplying information on those employees who, during fiscal year 1963, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over 120 days in duration and those employees who received training in non-Government facilities as the result of receiving an award or contribution.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1964.

#### REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 277)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed with illustrations.

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b) 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I am sending for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1964.

#### SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS FOR FISCAL 1963—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 108(b) of Public Law 87-256, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, I transmit herewith the First Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions for the fiscal year 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 6, 1964.

#### PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 294)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, and by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending to the Congress the 19th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1963.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1964.

#### WORK PLANS, WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MARCH 27, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provision of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State, watershed, executive communication number, committee approval:

Kansas and Oklahoma, Big Caney, 1399, February 4, 1964.

Mississippi, Town Creek, 1399, February 4, 1964.

Ohio, Rush Creek, 1399, February 4, 1964.

Wyoming, North Fork of Powder River, 1399, February 4, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,

Member of Congress,

Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of

Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N.H.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 102) to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 439) to provide for the establishment of the John Muir National Monument.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE 70TH INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CONGRESS

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 120 providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 70th International Publishers Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

A joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the Seventeenth International Publishers Congress.

Whereas the United States has, for the first time, been accorded the honor of receiving several hundred delegates from more than twenty countries throughout the world in May and June 1965 to participate in deliberations on the challenges and opportunities of international book and music publishing: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Congress hereby extends its official welcome to the book and music publishers from abroad who will attend the Seventeenth Congress of the International Publishers Association in Washington, District of Columbia, May 30-June 5, 1965, under the sponsorship of the American Book Publishers Council, Inc., and the Music Publishers Association, Inc. The President is authorized and requested to grant recognition, in such ways as he may deem proper, to the International Publishers Congress, calling upon officials and agencies of the Government to provide such assistance, facilities, and cooperation as the occasion may warrant.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LAND MANAGEMENT—MULTIPLE USE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5159) to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That it is the policy of the Congress that (a) the public lands, (b) the reversioned Oregon and California and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, and (c) all other Federal lands, including those situated in the State of Alaska, which are exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management, shall be managed for (1) domestic livestock grazing, (2) fish and wildlife development and utilization, (3) industrial development, (4) mineral production, (5) occupancy, (6) outdoor recreation, (7) timber production, (8) watershed protection, (9) wilderness preservation, and (10) other beneficial purposes. Nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to these lands.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to develop and administer the lands described in section 1 for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtainable there-

from. In the administration of such lands due consideration shall be given to all pertinent factors, including, but not limited to, ecology, priorities of use, and the relative values of the various resources in particular areas.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the following terms shall have the following meanings:—

(a) The term "public lands" means any lands (1) withdrawn or reserved by Executive Order Numbered 6910 of November 26, 1934, as amended, or 6964 of February 5, 1935, as amended, or (2) within a grazing district established pursuant to the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, or (3) located in the State of Alaska, which are not otherwise withdrawn or reserved for a Federal use or purpose.

(b) "Multiple use" means the management of the various surface and subsurface resources so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people; the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; the use of some land for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

(c) "Sustained yield of the several products and services" means the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of land without impairment of the productivity of the land.

SEC. 4. The purposes of this Act are declared to be supplemental to the purposes for which any of the Federal lands in section 1 of this Act have been designated, acquired, withdrawn, reserved, held, or administered. This Act shall not be construed as a repeal, in whole or in part, of any existing law, including, but not limited to, the mining and mineral leasing laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: That, consistent with and supplemental to the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269; 43 U.S.C. 315) and pending the implementation of recommendations to be made by the Public Land Law Review Commission—

"(a) The Secretary of the Interior shall develop and promulgate regulations containing criteria by which he will determine which of the public lands and other Federal lands, including those situated in the State of Alaska exclusively administered by him through the Bureau of Land Management shall be (a) disposed of because they are (1) required for the orderly growth and development of a community or (2) are chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, industrial, or public uses or development or (b) retained, at least during this period, in Federal ownership and managed for (1) domestic livestock grazing, (2) fish and wildlife development and utilization, (3) industrial development, (4) mineral production, (5) occupancy, (6) outdoor recreation, (7) timber production, (8) watershed protection, (9) wilderness preservation, or (10) preservation of public values that would be lost if the land passed from Federal ownership. No such regulation shall become effective until the expiration of at least thirty days after the Secretary or his designee has held a public hearing thereon. Before such public hearing is held, a notice of at least thirty days



shall have been given through publication in the Federal Register and notification to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, both of whom shall receive with the notice a copy of the proposed regulation.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as possible, review the public lands as defined herein, in the light of the criteria contained in the regulations issued with this section to determine which lands shall be classified as suitable for disposal and which lands he considers to contain such values as to make them more suitable for retention in Federal ownership for interim management under the principles enunciated in this section. In making his determinations the Secretary shall give due consideration to all pertinent factors, including, but not limited to ecology, priorities of use, and the relative values of the various resources in particular areas.

"(1) None of the land subject to this Act shall be given a designation or classification unless such designation or classification is authorized by statute or defined in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 2. At least sixty days prior to taking the following actions the Secretary of the Interior or his designee shall give such public notice of the proposed action as he deems appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land:

"(a) Classification for sale or other disposal under any statute of a tract of land in excess of two thousand five hundred and sixty acres.

"(b) Classification for management by the Bureau of Land Management of an area in excess of two thousand five hundred and sixty acres when the action will exclude from the area permanently, or for a substantial period of time, one or more uses enumerated in section 1 of this Act.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall develop and administer for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtainable therefrom those public lands that are determined to be suitable for interim management in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to this Act.

"Sec. 4. Publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior of a proposed classification under this Act shall have the effect of segregating such land from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other formal disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, except to the extent that the proposed classification or subsequent notification thereof specifies that the land shall remain open for one or more of such forms of disposal under the public land laws. The segregative effect of such proposed classification shall continue for a period of two years from the date of publication unless classification has theretofore been completed in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations to be promulgated hereunder, or unless the Secretary of the Interior shall terminate it sooner. Lands classified for sale or other disposal shall be offered for sale or such other disposal within two years of the date of publication of the proposed classification and if not so offered for sale or other disposal the segregative effect shall cease at the expiration of two years from the date of publication. The proposed classification or proposed sale or other disposal may be continued beyond the two-year period if notice of such proposed continuance, including a statement of necessity for continued segregation, is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and published in the Federal Register not more than ninety days nor less than thirty days prior to the expiration of the two-year period specified

herein; and thereupon the segregative effect shall be extended for such additional period as is specified in the notice, not exceeding two years; unless Congress or the Secretary of the Interior terminates the segregation at any earlier date.

"Sec. 5. As used in this Act, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

"(a) The term 'public lands' means any lands (1) withdrawn or reserved by Executive Order Numbered 6910 of November 26, 1934, as amended, or 6964 of February 5, 1935, as amended, or (2) within a grazing district established pursuant to the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, or (3) located in the State of Alaska, which are not otherwise withdrawn or reserved for a Federal use or purpose.

"(b) 'Multiple use' means the management of the various surface and subsurface resources so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people; the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; the use of some land for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

"(c) 'Sustained yield of the several products and services' means the achievement and maintenance of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of land without impairment of the productivity of the land.

"Sec. 6. The purposes of this Act are declared to be supplemental to the purposes for which any of the Federal lands in section 1 of this Act have been designated, acquired, withdrawn, reserved, held, or administered. This Act shall not be construed as a repeal, in whole or in part, of any existing law, including, but not limited to, the mining and mineral leasing laws.

"Sec. 7. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as—

"(a) Restricting prospecting, locating, developing, mining, entering, leasing, or patenting the mineral resources of the lands to which this Act applies under law applicable thereto pending action inconsistent therewith under this Act.

"(b) Restricting the entry and settlement of lands open to entry and settlement under the public land laws pending action inconsistent therewith under this Act.

"(c) Restricting the Secretary of the Interior from disposing of lands under applicable statutes after the land has been classified in accordance with this Act.

"(d) Affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to the lands referred to herein.

"Sec. 8. The authorizations and requirements of this Act shall expire June 30, 1968, except that the segregation prior to June 30, 1968, of any public lands from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws shall continue for the period of time allowed by this Act."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in full at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be classified in order to provide for their disposal or interim management under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING TEMPORARY AUTHORITY FOR THE SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5498) to promote the sale and beneficial use of public lands by amending section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2455. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2357 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 678) and of the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391), the Secretary is authorized to sell any public lands which he classifies as proper for disposition and as not needed for Federal program requirements or the long-range administration of the public lands, in tracts not exceeding five thousand acres each, to qualified governmental agencies at the fair market value of the lands or to qualified individuals at public auction at not less than their fair market value. The Secretary may provide by regulation, under such terms as he deems appropriate, that owners of land contiguous to the land offered for public auction under this section and authorized users of such offered land may have a preference right to buy the offered land at the highest bid price, considering such factors as extent of contiguity of the offered and privately owned land, duration of ownership of the privately owned land, legitimate historical use, and topography of the offered land, and desirable land pattern and use.

"(b) The Secretary shall administer this section to promote the beneficial use and disposition of public lands. Proposed classifications and sales under this section shall be considered in the light of their effect upon the conservation of natural resources and upon the welfare of the individuals and communities involved, and their consistency with local governmental laws, ordinances, plans, and programs.

"(c) The notation in the proper land office of a proposal to classify lands under this section, or the classification of lands under this section shall segregate the lands from further application to make entry, selection, or location, and from settlement and location under the public land laws, including the United States mining laws, but not the mineral leasing laws, to the extent the Secretary considers appropriate, but all segregations under this section shall be subject to valid rights existing at the time of segregation. No application shall be filed to purchase lands under this section except lands which have been opened thereto by the Secretary.

"(d) For the purposes of this section—  
"(1) The word 'Secretary' means Secretary of the Interior.

"(2) The term 'public lands' means any public lands which are withdrawn by Executive Order Numbered 6910 dated November 26, 1934, as amended, or by Executive Order Numbered 6964 dated February 5, 1935, as amended, or pursuant to section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), and not otherwise reserved, or which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands in Alaska.

"(3) The term 'qualified governmental agency' means any of the following, including their lawful agents and instrumentalities: (A) the State, county, municipality, or other local government subdivision within which the land is located and (B) any municipality within convenient access to the lands if the lands are within the same State as the municipality.

"(4) The term 'qualified individual' means (A) any individual who is a citizen or otherwise a national of the United States (or who has declared his intention to become a citizen) aged twenty-one years or more; (B) any partnership or association, each of the members of which is a qualified individual as defined in subparagraph (A); and (C) any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, and authorized to hold title to real property in the State in which the land is located.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this section."

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to consider and proceed with the applications filed and transactions initiated under section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), prior to the effective date of this Act which were valid and subsisting on the effective date of this Act, as if this Act had not been enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That pending the implementation of recommendations to be made by the Public Land Law Review Commission, in addition to any other authority that he may have, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to dispose of public lands that have been classified for disposal in accordance with a determination that (a) the lands are required for the orderly growth and development of a community or (b) the lands are chiefly valuable for residential, commercial, industrial, or public uses or development. Such disposals shall be in tracts not exceeding five thousand one hundred and twenty acres each to qualified governmental agencies at the appraised fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary of the Interior or to qualified individuals through competitive bidding at not less than the appraised fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

"Sec. 2. At least ninety days prior to offering lands for sale in accordance with this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall notify the head of the governing body of the political subdivision of the State having jurisdiction over zoning in the geographic area within which the lands are located or, in the absence of such political subdivision, the Governor of the State, in order to afford the appropriate body with the opportunity of zoning for the use of the land in accordance with local planning and development. Nothing herein contained, however, shall be construed as requiring the Secretary of the Interior to withhold sale of the lands until zoning action has been completed.

"Sec. 3. At least thirty days before entering into an agreement with a governmental agency or of the opening of bids from individuals, notice of the offering of lands for sale in accordance with this Act shall be furnished by the Secretary of the Interior through a newspaper of general circulation

in the area in which the lands are situated and by publication of the notice in the Federal Register.

"Sec. 4. All patents or other evidences of title issued under this Act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits which shall thereupon be withdrawn from appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws. Patents and other evidences of title shall also contain such conditions, reservations, and reasonable restrictions as the Secretary of the Interior considers necessary in the public interest including but not limited to such conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary to insure proper development of the lands after they have passed from Federal ownership.

"Sec. 5. For the purposes of this Act the following terms have the following meanings—

"(a) 'Public lands' means any public lands which are withdrawn by Executive Order Numbered 6910 dated November 26, 1934, as amended, or by Executive Order Numbered 6964 dated February 5, 1935, as amended, or pursuant to section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), and not otherwise reserved, or which are vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands in Alaska.

"(b) 'Qualified governmental agency' means any of the following, including their lawful agents and instrumentalities: (A) the State, county, municipality, or other local government subdivision within which the land is located and (B) any municipality within convenient access to the lands if the lands are within the same State as the municipality.

"(c) 'Qualified individual' means (A) any individual who is a citizen or otherwise a national of the United States (or who has declared his intention to become a citizen) aged twenty-one years or more; (B) any partnership or association, each of the members of which is a qualified individual as defined in subparagraph (A); and (C) any corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof, and authorized to hold title to real property in the State in which the land is located.

"Sec. 6. The authority granted by this Act shall expire June 30, 1968, except that sales concerning which notice has been given in accordance with section 3 hereof prior to June 30, 1968, may be consummated and patents issued in connection therewith after June 30, 1968."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND ACTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8305) to provide that until June 30, 1968, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior, or his designee, may not effect the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, or change in use designation or classification involving more than two thousand five hundred and sixty acres of public lands until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts, including but not limited to the following information, concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

(1) the officer or agency proposing the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification;

(2) the agency having administrative jurisdiction over the lands;

(3) the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used or, if the purpose is classified for national security reasons, a statement to that effect and, if publication in the Federal Register has been withheld for security reasons, a statement to that effect;

(4) the location, acreage, and legal description of the area;

(5) the period during which the proposed withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification will continue in effect;

(6) description of any contamination which may result;

(7) effect on any nonpublic lands within the exterior boundaries of the described area and, if acquisition of nonpublic lands is proposed, citation of authority for acquisition;

(8) detailed discussion of the effect that the proposed action will have on the operation of the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and laws and regulations relating to the conservation, utilization, and development of mineral, timber, and other material resources; grazing, fish, wildlife, and water resources; and scenic, wilderness, recreation, and other values;

(9) a statement of the leases, licenses, or permits in force, indicating those that would be terminated after the proposed action is consummated; and

(10) whether the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used involves the use of water.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture may not effect any formal classification or designation of national forest lands involving five thousand acres or more when the action will exclude from the area one or more major uses for a considerable period of time or request the Secretary of the Interior to effect a withdrawal or reservation of lands involving five thousand acres or more in conjunction with national forest use until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The reports submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture shall contain the information set forth in section 1 of this Act.

Sec. 3. The filing of an application by a department or agency of the Federal Government with the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal, reservation, or restriction, or the publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior of a proposed designation or classification of public lands shall have the effect of segregating such land from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, unless the application or the publication or a subsequent modification of such application or publication specifies that the land shall remain open for one or more such forms of disposal under the public land laws. Such segregative effect



shall continue for a period of two years from the date of application or publication, unless withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification has theretofore been completed in accordance with the provisions of this Act or unless the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency shall terminate it sooner. Not more than ninety days nor less than thirty days prior to the expiration of such two-year period, the proposal may be renewed and notice of such renewal, including a statement of the necessity for continued segregation shall be given to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and filed for publication in the Federal Register whereupon the segregative effect shall be extended for an additional period not exceeding two years, unless Congress, or the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency, terminates the segregation at an earlier date.

Sec. 4. The provisions in this Act shall not apply to proposed withdrawals, reservations, and restrictions of public lands for defense purposes requiring an Act of Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27); and nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as superseding or amending that Act.

Sec. 5. As used in this Act, the term "public lands" includes (a) the public domain of the United States, (b) reservations, other than Indian reservations, created from the public domain, (c) lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under the public land laws, including the mining laws, and (d) the surface and subsurface resources of all such lands.

Sec. 6. The requirements of this Act shall expire June 30, 1968.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That pending the implementation of recommendations to be made by the Public Land Law Review Commission the Secretary of the Interior, or his designee, may not effect the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, or change in use designation or classification involving more than two thousand five hundred and sixty acres of public lands until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts, including but not limited to the following information, concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

"(1) the officer or agency proposing the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification;

"(2) the agency having administrative jurisdiction over the lands;

"(3) the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used or, if the purpose is classified for national security reasons, a statement to that effect and, if publication in the Federal Register has been withheld for security reasons, a statement to that effect;

"(4) the location, acreage, and legal description of the area;

"(5) the period during which the proposed withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification will continue in effect;

"(6) description of any contamination which may result;

"(7) effect on any nonpublic lands within the exterior boundaries of the described area and, if acquisition of nonpublic lands is proposed, citation of authority for acquisition;

"(8) detailed discussion of the effect that the proposed action will have on the operation of the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and laws and regulations relating to the conservation, utilization, and development of mineral, tim-

ber, and other material resources; grazing, fish, wildlife, and water resources, and scenic, wilderness, recreation, and other values;

"(9) a statement of the leases, licenses, or permits in force, indicating those that would be terminated after the proposed action is consummated; and

"(10) whether the purpose for which the area is proposed to be used involves the use of water.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture may not effect any formal classification or designation of national forest lands involving five thousand acres or more when the action will exclude from the area one or more major uses for a considerable period of time or request the Secretary of the Interior to effect a withdrawal or reservation of lands involving five thousand acres or more in conjunction with national forest use until after the expiration of sixty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed action is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The reports submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture shall contain the information set forth in section 1 of this Act.

"Sec. 3. The filing of an application by a department or agency of the Federal Government with the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal, reservation, or restriction, or the publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior of a proposed designation or classification of public lands or the publication of notice in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Agriculture that he has, in accordance with section 2 hereof, notified the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of his intention to request the Secretary of the Interior to effect a withdrawal or reservation of public lands shall have the effect of segregating such land from settlement, location, sale, selection, entry, lease, or other form of disposal under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, unless the application or the publication or a subsequent modification of such application or publication specifies that the land shall remain open for one or more such forms of disposal under the public land laws. Such segregative effect shall continue for a period of two years from the date of application or publication, unless withdrawal, reservation, restriction, designation, or classification has theretofore been completed in accordance with the provisions of this Act or unless the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency shall terminate it sooner. Not more than ninety days nor less than thirty days prior to the expiration of such two-year period, the proposal may be renewed and notice of such renewal, including a statement of the necessity for continued segregation shall be given to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and filed for publication in the Federal Register whereupon the segregative effect shall be extended for an additional period not exceeding two years, unless Congress, or the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the requesting agency, terminates the segregation at an earlier date.

"Sec. 4. The provisions in this Act shall not apply to proposed withdrawals, reservations, and restrictions of public lands for defense purposes requiring an Act of Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27); and nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as superseding or amending that Act.

"Sec. 5. For the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'public lands' includes (1) the public domain of the United States; (2) reservations, other than Indian reservations, created from the public domain; (3) lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn from

the public domain and reserved or withheld from private appropriation, and (4) the surface and subsurface resources of all such lands.

"(b) The term 'withdrawal, reservation, or restriction' includes withdrawal actions taken under (1) the authorities included in Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952 (17 F.R. 4831); (2) the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388; 43 U.S.C. 416); (3) the Act of April 16, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 116; 43 U.S.C. 561); (4) section 1 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1269; 43 U.S.C. 315); (5) section 10 of the Act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 413; 48 U.S.C. 464); (6) the Act of May 24, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 728; 49 U.S.C. 211-214).

"(c) The terms 'change in use designation and use classification' includes (1) classifications under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1272; 43 U.S.C. 315f); (2) classifications under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (44 Stat. 741; 43 U.S.C. 869, 869 1-4); (3) classifications under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 609; 43 U.S.C. 682a-e); (4) classifications under the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U.S.C. 364a-e); (5) orders to prevent issuance of leases, licenses, or permits; (6) orders to prevent cutting of timber or removal of other materials; (7) orders closing public lands to applications under the public-land laws; (8) mineral classifications of public lands; and (9) water-power site classifications of public lands.

"Sec. 6. Notification by the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives shall not be required under this Act if notification of classification or proposed classification has been furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives under any other statute within two years of the withdrawal, reservation, restriction, or change in use designation, or classification of the same lands under procedures specified in this Act.

"Sec. 7. The requirements of this Act shall expire June 30, 1968, except that the segregation of any public lands under this Act prior to June 30, 1968, shall continue for the period of time allowed by this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CLAIMS SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4149) to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, except for military bounty land warrants, all claims and holdings recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 534, 535), which are not satisfied in one of the ways hereafter set forth, shall become null and void on January 1, 1970, or at the termination of any transaction initiated pursuant to this Act, whichever is later.*

Sec. 2. Prior to July 1, 1966, holders of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to have conveyed to them, in satisfaction of their claims, such lands as they may, in their applications, designate. The Secretary shall thereafter convey the selected

lands if he finds them to be proper, under existing law, for such disposition, and if the claim upon which an application is based is determined to be valid.

SEC. 3. Prior to January 1, 1967, the Secretary shall classify lands which he finds can properly be sold at public sale under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682a-e) or other public sale laws as suitable for selection in satisfaction of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955. Holders of recorded claims may apply for reasonably compact areas of land so classified, and, upon his determination that the claim upon which an application is based is valid, the Secretary shall convey such lands to the applicant.

SEC. 4. Prior to January 1, 1968, the Secretary shall, by registered mail or certified mail sent to the address of record of each person having an unsatisfied claim, offer in satisfaction of such claim lands which in the opinion of the Secretary shall have a fair market value per acre not less than the average price received for lands sold under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682a-e) during the three years prior to the date of the appraisal of the offered lands. Upon the acceptance of the offer, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the claimant, if he determines that the claim is valid.

SEC. 5. Prior to January 1, 1970, any person who has a claim recorded pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1955, by written notice to the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer of the Department of the Interior to whom authority to receive such notice may be delegated, may elect to receive cash instead of public land in satisfaction of his claim, at a rate per acre equal to the average value of the lands offered by the Secretary under section 4 of this Act. Upon a determination that the claim is valid, the Secretary or his delegate shall certify the claim to the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to pay the claim out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Acceptance of the money shall constitute a full and complete satisfaction of the claim or holding for which the money is paid: *Provided*, That no agent or attorney acting on behalf of another to procure a payment under this Act shall demand, accept, or receive more than 10 per centum of the payment made, and any agreement to the contrary shall be null and void.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That, except for military bounty land warrants, all claims and holdings recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 534, 535), which are not satisfied in one of the ways thereafter set forth, shall become null and void on the later of the two following dates: (a) January 1, 1970 or, in the case of soldiers additional homestead claims, January 1, 1975; (b) at the termination of any transaction initiated pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 2. Prior to July 1, 1966, holders of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to have conveyed to them, in satisfaction of their claims, such lands as they may, in their applications, designate. The Secretary shall thereafter convey the selected lands if he finds them to be proper, under existing law, for such disposition, and if the claim upon which an application is based is determined to be valid. As used in this Act, the terms 'lands' and 'land' include any rights or interests therein.

"SEC. 3. (a) Prior to January 1, 1967, the Secretary shall classify, for conveyance and exchange for each type of claim recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, public lands in sufficient quantity so as to provide each holder of such a claim with a reasonable choice of public lands against which to

satisfy his claim. The public lands so classified shall be of a value or not less than the average fair market value, determined by the Secretary as of the date patent issued, of those public lands actually conveyed in exchange for each type of claim since August 5, 1955.

"(b) Holders of recorded claims may apply for reasonably compact areas of land so classified, and, upon his determination that the claim upon which an application is based is valid, the Secretary shall convey such lands to the applicant.

"SEC. 4. Prior to January 1, 1968, the Secretary shall, by registered mail or certified mail sent to the address of record of each person having an unsatisfied claim, offer in satisfaction of such claim lands of a value of not less than the average fair market value of those public lands actually conveyed in exchange for each type of claim since August 5, 1955. Fair market value shall be determined in the manner prescribed in Section 3 of this Act. Upon acceptance of the offer, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the claimant, if he determines that the claim is valid.

"SEC. 5. In respect of any type of claim recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, not more than three conveyances of public lands in exchange for which have taken place since that date, the Secretary shall determine the type of claim which it most nearly resembles, and at least four conveyances in exchange for which has taken place since August 5, 1955, and shall, for the purposes of this Act, treat it in all respects as if it were such type of claim.

"SEC. 6. Prior to January 1, 1970, or, in the case of soldiers additional homestead claims, January 1, 1975, any person who has a claim recorded pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1955, by written notice to the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer of the Department of the Interior to whom authority to receive such notice may be delegated, may elect to receive cash instead of public land in satisfaction of his claim, at a rate per acre equal to the average value of the lands offered by the Secretary under section 4 of this Act. Upon a determination that the claim is valid, the Secretary or his delegate shall certify the claim to the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to pay the claim out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Acceptance of the money shall constitute a full and complete satisfaction of the claim or holding for which the money is paid: *Provided*, That no agent or attorney acting on behalf of another to procure a payment under this Act shall demand, accept, or receive more than 10 per centum of the payment made, and any agreement to the contrary shall be null and void."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House, H.R. 4149, is, in the overall scheme of Government affairs, a minor bill. In another sense, it has significance because it marks a milestone in our public lands history.

H.R. 4149 will provide for the final settlement and satisfaction of scrip and

other rights and claims other than military bounty land warrants in which the United States has promised the holders that they could select public lands in payment of some service to the Government or land relinquished to it.

Most of these scrip and selection rights came into existence before the turn of the century. A few have been created since 1900, with the latest coming into existence in 1927.

The act of August 5, 1955—69 Stat. 534—required that all holders of scrip and similar rights record their claims within 2 years and that all claims not presented for recordation should not thereafter be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior as a basis for the acquisition of lands. The Department of the Interior has recommended the enactment of legislation to set a final termination date as to when these recorded scrip rights may be satisfied and H.R. 4149 will carry out that objective by providing that rights not exercised by January 1, 1970, or in the case of soldier's additional homestead claims, by January 1, 1975, shall be subject to cash settlement. All scrip and similar rights would be retired not later than January 1, 1975.

During the pendency of this legislation the exchange of scrip for land has continued. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, accordingly, has obtained from the Department of the Interior a current listing as of March 1, 1964, of remaining outstanding scrip that had been recorded under the 1955 act. Under leave previously granted I include these data as part of my remarks at this point, together with a listing of the applications for exchange that were pending on March 9, 1964.

TABLE I.—Showing, as of Mar. 1, 1964, the kind, number, and acreage of recorded scrip which would be affected by H.R. 4149

Kind of scrip	Approximate acreage recorded	Number of pieces of recorded scrip
Valentine certificate.....	2,119	65
Soldier's additional rights.....	5,117	260
Forest lien selection rights.....	2,083	14
Sioux halfbreed certificates.....	520	6
Wyandotte certificates.....	210	7
Porterfield warrants.....	436	11
Isaac Crow.....	80	1
Railroad lien selection rights.....	542	18
Merritt W. Blair selection right.....	80	1
Gerard certificates.....	440	11
McKee certificates.....	200	5
Total.....	11,827	399

TABLE II.—Showing, as of Mar. 9, 1964, the pending applications for exchange of scrip for land

State	Type	Number	Acreage
Alaska.....	SAH.....	32	207
Arizona.....	SAH.....	1	160
California.....	Forest lien.....	1	164
	SAH.....	4	635
	Forest lien.....	2	880
	Valentine.....	5	261
Nevada.....	SAH.....	9	451
	Valentine.....	3	100
Oregon.....	Forest lien.....	1	320
	Railroad lien.....	1	40
Wyoming.....	Forest lien.....	1	40
Total.....		60	3,258



# AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SAXMAN, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8523) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Saxman, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the trustee for the city of Saxman, Alaska, appointed under the provisions of section 3 of the Act of May 25, 1926 (48 U.S.C. 355c), shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, convey to such city all right, title, and interest held by such trustee to all lands within the townsite of such city which on the date of enactment of this Act are unoccupied and not held in trust for an Indian or Eskimo under the provisions of such Act of May 25, 1926.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# TERMINATING A RESTRICTION ON USE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN LAND CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8654) to terminate a restriction on use with respect to certain land previously conveyed to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and to convey to said city the mineral rights in such land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the restriction on use for other than school purposes and the reservation of mineral rights with respect to lot 1, block 115, in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to transfer lot 1 in block 115, city of Fairbanks, Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska", approved June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 283), are hereby respectively terminated and conveyed to said city.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# INCORPORATING THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the National Aviation Hall of Fame.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following persons: Stanley C. Allyn, Oakwood, Ohio; J. L. Atwood, El Segundo, California; C. M. Pat Barnes, Oakwood, Ohio; Robert J. Barth, Oakwood, Ohio; Donald H. Battin, Dayton, Ohio; Milton A. Caniff, New City, New York; Robert S. Chubb, Oakwood, Ohio; Albert N. Clarkson, Dayton, Ohio; Frederick C. Crawford, Cleveland, Ohio; Don L. Crawford, Dayton, Ohio; Donald W. Douglas, Senior, Santa Monica, California; Charles S. Draper, Cambridge, Massachusetts; John G. Fitzpatrick, Oakwood, Ohio; John P. Fraim, Junior, Oakwood, Ohio; Courtlandt S. Gross, Burbank, California; James W. Jacobs, Dayton, Ohio; Thomas D. Johnson, Xenia, Ohio;

Gregory C. Karas, Oakwood, Ohio; John W. Kerchner, Oakwood, Ohio; Eugene W. Kettering, Kettering, Ohio; William G. Klefaber, Dayton, Ohio; Gerald H. Leland, Centerville, Ohio; John A. Lombard, Dayton, Ohio; G. I. MacIntyre, Kettering, Ohio; Fred F. Marshall, Cedarville, Ohio; Robert W. Martin, New York, New York; James S. McDonnell, Junior, Saint Louis, Missouri; Karl B. Mills, Dayton, Ohio; John B. Montgomery, Murray Hill, New Jersey; John H. Murphy, Kettering, Ohio; Larry E. O'Neil, Kettering, Ohio; Mundy I. Peale, Farmingdale, Long Island, New York; Louis F. Polk, Oakwood, Ohio; A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine; Edwin W. Rawlings, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Robert G. Ruegg, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; Alden K. Sibley, Grosse Pointe Shores, Michigan; Igor I. Sikorsky, Stratford, Connecticut; Robert J. Simons, Dayton, Ohio; James H. Straubel, Washington, District of Columbia; Charles V. Truax, Kettering, Ohio; John P. Truner, Junior, Oakwood, Ohio; Gerald E. Weller, Kettering, Ohio; Charles W. Whalen, Junior, Oakwood, Ohio; Bernard L. Whelan, Fairfield, Connecticut; Thomas D. White, Washington, District of Columbia; Gill Rob Wilson, Claremont, California; Louis Wozar, Oakwood, Ohio; and their associates and successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the National Aviation Hall of Fame (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

## COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, not inconsistent with the Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

## Purposes of the corporation

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be—

(A) To receive and maintain a fund or funds, and to use and apply the whole or any part of the income therefrom, and the principal thereof, exclusively for charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, either directly or by contributions to organizations duly authorized to carry on similar activities, but no part of such income or principal shall be contributed to any organization whose net earnings or any part thereof inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, or any substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation. The detailed purposes hereinafter set forth shall at all times be subject to and in furtherance of the provisions contained in this paragraph.

(B) To honor citizens, aviation leaders, pilots, teachers, scientists, engineers, inventors, governmental leaders, and other individuals who have helped to make this Nation great by their outstanding contributions to the establishment, development, advancement, or improvement of aviation in the United States of America.

(C) To perpetuate the memory of such persons and record their contributions and achievements by the erection and maintenance of such buildings, monuments, and edifices as may be deemed appropriate as a lasting memorial.

(D) To foster, promote, and encourage a better sense of appreciation of the origins and growth of aviation, especially in the United States of America, and the part aviation has played in changing the economic, social, and scientific aspects of our Nation.

(E) To establish and maintain a library and museum for the collection and preservation for posterity of aviation pictures, paint-

ings, books, papers, documents, scientific data, relics, mementoes, artifacts, and other items and things relative to aviation.

(F) To cooperate with other recognized aviation organizations which are actively engaged and interested in similar projects.

(G) To engage in any and all activities incidental thereto or necessary, suitable, or proper for the accomplishment of any of the aforementioned purposes.

## Corporate powers

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have the power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property; and

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws.

## Principal office; scope of activities; District of Columbia agent

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Dayton, Ohio, or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of trustees, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, territories and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

## Membership; voting rights

SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the bylaws of the corporation may provide.

(b) Each member of the corporation given voting rights by the bylaws shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the voting members of the corporation, which vote may be cast in such manner as the bylaws may prescribe.

## Board of trustees; composition, responsibilities

SEC. 7. (a) Upon enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of trustees of the corporation shall be elected from those persons named in the first section of this Act, their survivors and such additional persons, if any, as shall be named by them.

(b) Thereafter, the board of trustees of the corporation shall consist of such number (not less than eighteen), shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of trustees shall be the governing body of the corporation, and, during intervals between the meetings of members, shall be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation and for the control of all funds of the corporation. The board of trustees shall appoint a board of nominations from the membership of the corporation; may appoint committees which shall have and exercise such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws or by resolution of the board of trustees, and which may be all of the powers of the board of trustees.

#### *Officers; election and duties of officers*

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a president, one or more vice presidents (as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation), a secretary, a treasurer, and such other officers as may be provided in the bylaws.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

#### *Board of nominations: composition, responsibilities*

SEC. 9. (a) The board of trustees shall appoint a board of nominations from those persons named in the first section of this Act, their survivors and such additional persons, if any, as shall be named by them, not concurrently serving as a member of the board of trustees, and consisting of such number (not less than twenty-four); and shall serve for such term as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

(b) The board of nominations shall be the designated body of the corporation to nominate United States citizens or residents to be honored by the corporation and recommend such persons to the board of trustees for consideration as prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

#### *Use of income; loans to officers, trustees, or employees*

SEC. 10. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, trustees, members of the board of nominations, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers and employees of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of trustees of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, trustees, members of the board of nominations, officers, or employees. Any trustee who votes for or assents to making of a loan or advance to a member, member of the board of nominations, officer, trustee, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

#### *Nonpolitical nature of corporation*

SEC. 11. The corporation and its members, members of the board of nominations, trustees, officers, and employees as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

#### *Liability for acts of officers and agents*

SEC. 12. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

#### *Prohibition against issuance of stock or payment of dividends*

SEC. 13. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

#### *Books and records; inspection*

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of trustees, board of nominations, and committees having any of the authority of the board of trustees; and shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

#### *Audit of financial transactions*

SEC. 15. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians, shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expenses, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

#### *Use of assets on dissolution or liquidation*

SEC. 16. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of trustees of the corporation and in compliance with the charter and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

#### *Duration of corporation*

SEC. 17. The duration of the corporation shall be perpetual.

#### *Acquisition of assets and liabilities of existing corporation*

SEC. 18. The corporation may acquire the assets of the National Aviation Hall of Fame, a general, not-for-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Ohio, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such corporation.

#### *Reservation of right to amend or repeal charter*

SEC. 19. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

No. 1. On page 2, line 25, delete the words "associates and".

No. 2. On page 3, line 3, delete the word "National".

No. 3. On page 3, line 7, delete "The" and insert "A".

No. 4. On page 3, line 14, change the colon to a dash and renumber the paragraph in section 3 from A to G to 1 to 7.

No. 5. On page 4, delete lines 18 through 22 and insert the following:

"(5) To establish and maintain a library and museum for collecting and preserving for posterity, the history of those honored by the organization, together with a documentation of their accomplishments and contributions to aviation, including, but not limited to, such items as aviation pictures, paintings, books, papers, documents, scientific data, relics, mementos, artifacts, and things relating thereto."

No. 6. On page 5, line 10, after the word "officers," insert "trustees."

No. 7. On page 6, line 18, after the word "States," insert the following: "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the".

No. 8. On page 9, line 13, after the words "payment of" insert the word "reasonable".

No. 9. On page 11, line 11, after the word "corporation" insert the words: "and necessary to facilitate the audit".

No. 10. On page 11, delete lines 16 through 22, and on page 12, delete lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

"(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements, as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including (1) the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, and (2) a schedule of all contracts requiring payments in excess of \$10,000 and any payments of compensation, salaries, or fees at a rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum. The report shall not be printed as a public document."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### INCORPORATING THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON RADIATION PROTECTION AND MEASUREMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10437) to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

C. M. Barnes, Rockville, Maryland;  
E. C. Barnes, Edgewood, Pennsylvania;  
V. P. Bond, Setauket, Long Island, New York;

C. B. Braestrup, New York, New York;  
J. T. Brennan, Bethesda, Maryland;  
L. T. Brown, Bethesda, Maryland;  
R. F. Brown, San Francisco, California;  
F. R. Bruce, Oak Ridge, Tennessee;  
J. C. Bugher, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico;  
D. R. Chadwick, Upper Marlboro, Maryland;  
R. H. Chamberlain, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

J. F. Crow, Madison, Wisconsin;



R. L. Doan, Idaho Falls, Idaho;  
 C. L. Dunham, Washington, District of Columbia;  
 T. C. Evans, Iowa City, Iowa;  
 E. G. Fuller, Bethesda, Maryland;  
 R. O. Gorson, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;  
 J. W. Healy, Chappaqua, New York;  
 P. C. Hodges, Chicago, Illinois;  
 A. R. Keene, Richland, Washington;  
 M. Kleinfeld, Brooklyn, New York;  
 H. W. Koch, Silver Spring, Maryland;  
 D. I. Livermore, Washington, District of Columbia;  
 G. V. LeRoy, Chicago, Illinois;  
 W. B. Mann, Chevy Chase, Maryland;  
 W. A. McAdams, Schenectady, New York;  
 G. W. Morgan, Kensington, Maryland;  
 K. Z. Morgan, Oak Ridge, Tennessee;  
 H. J. Muller, Bloomington, Indiana;  
 R. J. Nelsen, Rockville, Maryland;  
 R. R. Newell, San Francisco, California;  
 W. D. Norwood, Richland, Washington;  
 H. M. Parker, Richland, Washington;  
 C. Powell, Bethesda, Maryland;  
 E. H. Quimby, New York, New York;  
 J. C. Reeves, Gainesville, Florida;  
 R. Robbins, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;  
 H. H. Rossi, Nyack, New York;  
 E. L. Saenger, Cincinnati, Ohio;  
 T. L. Shipman, Los Alamos, New Mexico;  
 P. J. Shore, Patchogue, New York;  
 J. H. Sterner, Rochester, New York;  
 R. S. Stone, San Francisco, California;  
 L. S. Taylor, Bethesda, Maryland;  
 E. D. Trout, Corvallis, Oregon;  
 B. F. Trum, Boston, Massachusetts;  
 Shields Warren, Boston, Massachusetts;  
 E. G. Williams, Jacksonville, Florida;  
 H. O. Wyckoff, Silver Spring, Maryland;  
 and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate, by name of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (hereinafter called the corporation), and by such name shall be known, and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions contained in this Act.

#### Completion of organization

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

#### Objects and purposes of corporation

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to collect, analyze, develop, and disseminate in the public interest information and recommendations about (a) protection against radiation (referred to herein as "radiation protection"), and (b) radiation measurements, quantities, and units, particularly those concerned with radiation protection;

(2) to provide a means by which organizations concerned with the scientific and related aspects of radiation protection and of radiation quantities, units, and measurements may cooperate for effective utilization of their combined resources, and to stimulate the work of such organizations;

(3) to develop basic concepts about radiation quantities, units, and measurements, about the application of these concepts, and about radiation protection;

(4) to cooperate with the International Commission on Radiological Protection, the Federal Radiation Council, the International Commission on Radiological Units and Measurements, and other national and international organizations, governmental and private, concerned with radiation quantities, units, and measurements and with radiation protection.

#### Powers of corporation

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—  
 (1) To sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) To adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal.

(3) To choose such officers, directors, trustees, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require.

(4) To adopt, amend, and alter bylaws not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or of any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs.

(5) To make contracts.

(6) To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest, or by any other method, any property, real or personal, necessary or proper for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State or the District of Columbia (a) governing the amount or kind of such property which may be held by, or (b) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of any such property by a corporation operating in such State or the District of Columbia.

(7) To transfer and convey real or personal property, and to mortgage, pledge, encumber, lease, and sublease the same.

(8) To borrow money for its corporate purposes and issue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, or lien, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law, or of the laws of the District of Columbia.

(9) To do any and all such acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of the corporation.

#### Principal office; scope of activities; District of Columbia agent

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and in other areas throughout the world.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

#### Membership; voting rights

SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the bylaws of the corporation may provide.

(b) Each member of the corporation, other than honorary and associate members, shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

#### Board of directors; composition; responsibilities

SEC. 7. (a) Upon enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall be those persons whose names are listed in section 1 of this Act.

(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall be selected in such manner and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall, during the intervals between corporation meetings, be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation. The board shall be responsible for the control of all funds of the corporation.

#### Officers; election of officers

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a president, one or more vice presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, and such other officers as may be prescribed in the bylaws. The duties of the officers shall be as prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

(b) Officers shall be elected annually at the annual meeting of the corporation.

#### Use of income; loans to officers, directors, or employees

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

#### Nonpolitical nature of corporation

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its officers, directors, and duly appointed agents as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for office.

#### Liability for acts of officers and agents

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

#### Prohibition against issuance of stock or payment of dividends

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare nor pay any dividends.

#### Books and records; inspection

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having authority under the board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

#### Audit of financial transactions

SEC. 14. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those

statements, as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus, or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including (1) the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, and (2) a schedule of all contracts requiring payments in excess of \$10,000 and any payments of compensation, salaries, or fees at a rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

#### Use of assets on dissolution or liquidation

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto. Such distribution shall be consistent with the purposes of the corporation.

#### Acquisition of assets and liabilities of the existing association

SEC. 16. The corporation may and shall acquire all of the assets of the existing unincorporated organization known as the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements, subject to any liabilities and obligations of the said organization.

#### Reservation of right to amend or repeal charter

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This completes the call of bills on the Consistent Calendar.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Alger	Carey	Fulton, Pa.
Ashbrook	Casey	Gallagher
Ashley	Clawson, Del.	Garmatz
Auchincloss	Collier	Gary
Avery	Colmer	Gilbert
Baring	Conte	Glenn
Barrett	Corbett	Grabowski
Barry	Corman	Gubser
Bass	Curtis	Gurney
Becker	Davis, Tenn.	Halpern
Bennett, Mich.	Denton	Hanna
Betts	Derwinski	Hansen
Blatnik	Devine	Harris
Boggs	Diggs	Harrison
Bolton	Donohue	Hawkins
Frances P.	Dowdy	Healey
Bonner	Duncan	Hébert
Brademas	Dwyer	Henderson
Bray	Elliott	Hoeven
Brock	Fallon	Hoffman
Bromwell	Farbstein	Hollifield
Brown, Calif.	Felghan	Holland
Buckley	Findley	Horton
Burleson	Finnegan	Huddleston
Burton, Calif.	Fino	Ichord
Burton, Utah	Flynt	Jennings
Byrnes, Wis.	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Cahill	Frelinghuysen	Karh

Kee	Montoya	Roudebush
Keogh	Moorhead	Ryan, Mich.
Kilburn	Morgan	St. Onge
Kirwan	Morrison	Short
Kluczynski	Multer	Sibal
Kunkel	Nix	Sikes
Kyl	O'Brien, Ill.	Skubitz
Laird	O'Brien, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Leggett	O'Konski	Snyder
Lesinski	O'Neill	Springer
Libonati	Osmer	Staebler
Lindsay	Pepper	Staggers
Lipscomb	Phillips	Taft
Lloyd	Pillion	Talcott
Long, La.	Powell	Teague, Calif.
McDade	Quile	Tuten
Martin, Calif.	Quillen	Udall
Martin, Nebr.	Rains	Vanik
May	Randall	Van Pelt
Meador	Reid, N.Y.	Whalley
Michel	Rivers, S.C.	Wickersham
Miller, Calif.	Roberts, Ala.	Willis
Miller, N.Y.	Rodino	Wilson
Minish	Rogers, Tex.	Charles H.
Minshall	Rooney, Pa.	Winstead
Monagan	Rostenkowski	Wright

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes", approved October 24, 1962 (Public Law 87-883; 76 Stat. 1245), is amended as follows:*

(1) In subsection (a) strike out the colon and the words "Provided, however, That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only".

(2) Add the following new subsection:

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of \$13,553.23."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] opposed to the bill?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill. I am for the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which, as amended, will provide the sum of \$13,553.23 of the amount that was used for the purpose of celebrating

the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that my reputation in this House is that of a spender. As a matter of fact, I believe that probably my reputation would be more to the effect that I am reactionary, instead of being a spender.

Mr. Speaker, this particular celebration occurred just about as far from where I live as it possibly could have occurred and still remain within the continental boundaries of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the actual facts in this case are these: In 1961 the Ohio delegation, Members of this body, as well as the distinguished Senators from that State were interested in celebrating the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie. The particular bill as I recall it provided that the expenses for that celebration would be paid by the Government, and the sky was the limit insofar as expenses were concerned.

That bill passed the Senate and came over to the House and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. It further was referred to the particular subcommittee of which I have the honor to serve as chairman.

We exercised the economy that we feel we have exercised over the years. We were against the wholesale appropriation of Federal funds, that is, making them unlimited as to the amount to be expended. This occurred at the end of that session of Congress. We amended the bill to provide that they could have the celebration but the money would have to be raised through private donations.

Then the next year the Senate passed a bill in which that body provided that \$25,000 would be appropriated for this purpose. I was for that bill and I was for that provision. I thought it was reasonable, I thought it was fair, and I thought it ought to be done. I feel that we probably may have been just a little dilatory and if that be true, I suppose I am the one who is responsible for that.

Unfortunately I was in the hospital last year for approximately 4 months. The time came on where these people had to have the 150th anniversary celebration or not have it—one of the two. They chose to have it. There were some people up there who went ahead with the celebration and thought the Federal Government ought to pay for it, but they said if the Federal Government does not pay it we will pay it out of our own pocket because we think this is an event in American history that should not be forgotten. When I got up and came back to be with the subcommittee we found that they had the celebration and they had confined the spending to the amount set out in this amendment, the sum of \$13,553.23.

So this bill, as amended, Mr. Speaker, is simply to reimburse them for the sum that has been paid out on account of having this celebration. I sincerely hope the House will go along with this measure, and will suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.



Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman say this would constitute a precedent for the Federal Government by act of Congress to make contributions for the celebrations of similar historical events?

Mr. FORRESTER. No, it certainly would not be a precedent.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Here is the reason I asked the question: There are several other such commissions in existence. I know of one which was established for the purpose of celebrating the Battle of New Orleans. The act which established that Commission provided that the funds which must be raised by public donation.

Mr. FORRESTER. How?

Mr. ABERNETHY. By public subscription. There was no Federal money authorized, but there is Federal money involved in this bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. I handled that Battle of New Orleans legislation. My recollection is there was money appropriated but it was done in this manner: My recollection is that the Department of the Interior who was responsible for the park over there, and the celebration, came in and said:

If you pass this legislation we will use money that we already have appropriated for that purpose.

I think that those are the actual facts in the matter of the New Orleans Battle Celebration. I was for it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the gentleman is correct but I am reasonably certain he is mistaken.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But my recollection is that the expenses of the celebration of this particular battle are to be borne by public subscription. I am simply making inquiry to determine whether or not this would be a precedent. If it is a precedent then I think we can anticipate these other commissions will be in for a comparable amount of funds.

Mr. FORRESTER. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude. This is no different from others that have been considered ever since I have been in Congress, and perhaps a long time after. This one is about as far removed from my district as it could be. But I am interested because, if my recollection of history serves me well, during the War of 1812 we were getting the life whipped out of us. Every time the British met our land forces our land forces threw down their guns and ran. I think the people got a shot in the arm by winning this battle. The gentleman thinks as I do. The gentleman takes pride in the history of this country, but there are a lot who feel differently.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I feel flattered by the remarks of my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], this would create a precedent. There is no question about it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I might say I am not complaining about it. It just happens I serve as a member of that New Orleans Commission, and we might be in for our share. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of.

On October 10, 1962—3 days before the adjournment of Congress in 1962—the celebration authorization bill came to the floor of the House. I am surprised to find the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] here today in support of this bill, or anyone else, for that matter, in the light of what he said on October 10, 1962. I then asked him this question:

Do I correctly understand there is no money provided in this joint resolution?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, there are no funds authorized. There were some funds provided in the resolution, when it came over from the other body, but there is a House amendment striking out that provision.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the gentleman on accomplishing the difficult feat of saving the taxpayers a little money.

Mr. FORRESTER. Thank you, sir.

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

Does the gentleman from Georgia think for one single moment that if he had not given me the assurance on the House floor on October 10, 1962, that this celebration would be financed by local funds he would have gotten his proposition through under unanimous consent? That is the principle involved here. I do not like to be told one day on the floor of the House that a bill is not going to cost any money. I do not care whether it is 15 cents or \$15 or \$1,500 or \$15,000. I just do not want to be told by anyone that the bill is not going to cost any money, and then with the greatest of ease the same person or persons come in a year or so later and present a bill such as this. This is the issue involved. This \$13,000 will not break the Federal Government. The issue here is whether you mean what you say when you tell us what you do on the House floor.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am a little surprised that the gentleman would say I would say one thing at one time and another at another. Of course I do not do that. At that time the gentleman asked me if the bill carried any amount of appropriation, and I told him it did not.

Mr. GROSS. This is the bill that provided for the celebration of the Battle of Lake Erie, is it not? This is the bill that was before the House on August 10, 1962, under unanimous consent, is it not?

Mr. FORRESTER. No; it is not.

Mr. GROSS. What is it, then?

Mr. FORRESTER. This is the bill that came up in 1963 over on the Senate side and came here to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; to provide for this authorization, but the bill providing for the celebration of the Battle of Lake

Erie came up on August 10, 1962. That was the bill for which this \$13,000 is now being provided.

Mr. FORRESTER. It is for the same thing, but not the same bill. The first bill was for an unlimited amount, and this is for \$13,000-some.

Mr. GROSS. Whether unlimited or for \$13,000, the gentleman put the House on notice that this celebration would not cost the Federal taxpayers any money. This is the point I am making. No other point.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. If the gentleman is confused about that, he is the only one who is confused.

Mr. GROSS. I am not confused about a single thing.

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes, you are.

Mr. GROSS. No, I am not.

Mr. FORRESTER. I told you at that time that that bill would not cost any money. I did not tell you that a bill might not come up some year or two later that would not cost some money.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now wait a minute. This is to provide the funds to pay for the celebration.

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. All right, the resolution authorized a celebration but it did not authorize the spending of a dime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what that resolution authorized and you said then, on October 10, 1962, the celebration would not cost the taxpayers any money. Today you are on the House floor with the greatest of ease asking for money that you said would not be spent.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman from Iowa is confused. I did not say that there would not ever be any money spent. And I am doing this with the greatest of ease and I hope the bill will pass because I think it is a bill that ought to pass and I wish the gentleman from Iowa would vote for it.

Mr. GROSS. What did the gentleman mean when he said that there were some funds provided in the resolution that came over from the other body but the House amendment struck out that provision? Why did he take the money out?

Mr. FORRESTER. We took it out because it called for a tremendous amount of money and it was not for the pitiful small sum of \$13,000 and some odd that some good patriots spent because they wanted to have this celebration.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman, you took the money out because you knew that you did not have the chance of a snowball in Haiti to get the bill through the House at that time with any money in it. That is why you took it out.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman from Iowa is against it now as he was then. You were against it then and you are against it now.

Mr. GROSS. You said this was not going to cost any money, and on that basis I did not oppose the bill, it passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. FORRESTER. I did not say that. I said that that bill at that time did not provide any money.

Mr. GROSS. Read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It shows what you said.

Mr. FORRESTER. I know what I said and I quoted myself correctly. I told my colleagues when I was addressing the House what I said, and the RECORD will show that I am right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa. He has spoken about precedents and consistency. I am reminded of the saying, Consistency sometimes is like a stagnant pool. It breeds reptiles of the mind.

We should not worry today about consistency, if the bill at hand is worthwhile. Mr. Speaker, this bill at hand is worthwhile.

Lake Erie and the Battle of Lake Erie are great guideposts in our history. The hero of that event, Commodore Perry, became a national figure because of that momentous victory which sealed the doom, as it were, of our adversary in that war. It is well to celebrate that victory because of its great importance not only to us but because of its importance to Canada and, therefore, its international importance.

The sum that is asked for is quite modest. It amounts to \$13,000. Those who inaugurated this project had every good intention to get the funds by private donations and most of the funds they did get by private donations. But it just so happened that they spent beyond their budget \$13,000 which sum they are now asking for. It is a small price that we are asked to pay in commemoration of this great victory.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a very eloquent statement made before the subcommittee presided over by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]. Incidentally, might I say, Mr. Speaker, that our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, is just recovered from a serious illness and we wish him well and we hope that he will not have any relapse so that he can remain on the floor to pursue his duties which he always performs magnificently. We hope that our colleague will be free from any of the anxieties of illness.

In the subcommittee presided over by this distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], Mr. MOSHER said:

The Federal observance at Put-In-Bay, Ohio, South Bass Island in Lake Erie on September 8 at the foot of the 355 foot Perry International Peace Memorial, was more than just an ordinary celebration or commemoration of a famous battle or event in the history of our United States.

More important, Mr. Chairman, this historic occasion was one of great international significance. It marked the anniversary of

our 150 years of peace with Canada along almost 4,000 miles of unfortified border between our two great nations. Where else in the world, Mr. Chairman, does such a situation like this exist in our present-day world of constant international turmoil and chaos. Indeed this most significant fact of history is in sharp contrast to the walls which the totalitarian nations raise to keep their citizens under control. The Federal celebration of September 8, and as articulated by representatives of both our Government and the Dominion of Canada, emphasized this reality to the world.

I repeat: For all that, \$13,000 plus is a small sum to pay. I hope, therefore, the bill will pass by a substantial majority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI].

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to shed a little bit of light on the question as to why adequate finances were not raised for this celebration.

The House passed House Joint Resolution 208 during the 87th Congress to establish this Commission to develop and execute plans for celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie in September 1963. This resolution had previously been adopted by the Senate and was amended by the House to provide for the use of donated funds only. The Senate agreed to the House amendments.

The resolution was signed by President Kennedy on October 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87-883. It provided for the appointment of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, one representative of the Department of the Interior, and four members, including the Chairman, to be appointed by the President of the United States.

The appointments by the House, by the Senate, and by the Department of the Interior were made in due course, as this celebration was to be held to coincide with Perry's victory on September 10.

For reasons known only to the White House, President Kennedy did not make his appointments until April 24, 1963, and the last of his appointees, Mr. Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., of Pittsburgh, Pa., was not sworn in until May 20, 1963.

The first meeting of this Commission was held on May 22, 1963, and its committees were not announced until June 6 of that same year.

Mr. Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., of Pittsburgh, Pa., was assigned the impossible task of raising donated funds with which to finance an international celebration within 3 months, at a time when publicity was given to a Senate effort then underway to pass a bill to provide \$25,000 for this same event.

Needless to say, this gentleman raised an insufficient amount of funds; and the Chairman, rather than see this international celebration fail—I stress that point; an international celebration—which would have been an affront to our friendly neighbor to the north, Canada, proceeded with the plans for the celebration with the hope that the Congress would see its financial responsibility in this matter and act accordingly.

An appropriate and fitting celebration was held, in which both Canada and the United States participated. During this celebration, the years of peace enjoyed

between Canada and the United States were stressed, as well as the victory of Admiral Perry. An address was made by I. V. MacDonald, Consul of Canada, together with an address by Victor Longstreet, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Naval vessels, the U.S. Marine Corps School Band, and the SAC Drill Team participated. The highlight of the festivities came with the unveiling of the Canadian and United States bronze peace plaques signed by Prime Minister Pearson and President Kennedy which had been installed in the Perry Victory and International Peace Monument.

The U.S. plaque reads as follows:

#### UNITED STATES PLAQUE

This single column commemorates the end of a battle and the heralding of a lasting era of peace between Canada and the United States—two neighbors dedicated to brotherhood and progress within the family of free nations throughout the world. It provides lasting testimony that our common values of freedom and diversity can be attained and strengthened through mutual respect and regard.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,  
White House, 1963.

The Canadian plaque reads as follows:

#### CANADIAN PLAQUE

This plaque is dedicated to the 150 years of peace which followed the War of 1812, in which so many lost their lives, and to the hope that this harmony between two neighbors may be a symbol of international co-operation in a world striving toward the goal of lasting peace.

LESTER B. PEARSON,  
Ottawa, Canada, 1963.

I am advised that the use of Federal funds for such purposes is not new. I am informed that \$100 million was provided for the Wilson Centennial in 1955 and as much as \$532,500 for the Lincoln Sesquicentennial in 1958.

In the case at hand, only the modest amounts actually expended are requested and I sincerely ask that the House consider this matter and approve it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to join my colleagues, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], and my colleague from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], in support of the motion. I want to make it clear that I am not a member of the Commission and have no personal interest in the matter. But I am of the decided opinion that if there was ever any justification for the expenditure of Federal funds for purposes such as this, this is one of those cases. Almost 50 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I heard, with great pride, my school-teacher tell of Perry's victory on Lake Erie; how we were outnumbered in ships and men, and how his maneuvering of the few ships that we had and the valor of these men brought to America one of our great naval victories of all time.

I remember my teacher reading the message of Commodore Perry to General Harrison. I am still thrilled by it and I shall quote it for the RECORD now. Commodore Perry, in language not unlike that of the great General MacArthur,



reported the battle and its outcome in these laconic words:

We have met the enemy and they are ours; two ships, two schooners, two brigs, one sloop.

Mr. Speaker, that victory sealed the fate of that part of the world in our favor. Thereafter, came the peace between Britain and the United States of America which has seen two great nations live side by side with, as our chairman has said, with 4,000 miles of international border between us, without a fort or without a soldier on guard on that long border.

Mr. Speaker, if the Voice of America wants to tell of our love for peace, our neighbor's love for peace, and the possibility of insuring peace between men of good will, there is no better story in all the world than the story of Perry's victory on Lake Erie and what has happened for more than a century and a half, in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the House to vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is not alone a question of the Battle of Lake Erie or the Battle of Bunker Hill or any other battle. This is a question of whether the Judiciary Committee is going to come to the House floor and say that legislation is not going to cost the taxpayers of this country any money, and then, a few months later, say in effect we did not mean what we said at all.

The Committee cannot have it both ways, and I wonder how much credence we can place in the statements of those who appear on behalf of the Judiciary Committee in the future?

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding too that last year the city of Erie, Pa., staged an observance of the Lake Erie battle, and it cost them in the neighborhood of \$50,000. They have not come to the taxpayers of the United States for help, so far as I know.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEAVER. Erie, Pa., last year celebrated the 150th anniversary of Perry's sesquicentennial victory.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of the House that a 3-month sesquicentennial celebration was held at Erie, Pa., where the ships were built under the direction of Daniel Dobbins. The crews trained and the fleet was built here and sailed forth to meet the enemy. At Put-in-Bay, off the shores of Ohio, they defeated the British fleet in a historic sea battle.

Mr. Speaker, we spent many thousands of local dollars. We are now \$90,000 in debt. The people of Erie are not complaining. We are glad to have been the focal point for the celebration of 150 years of peace with our neighbor, Canada.

I simply want to call this to the attention of the Members of the House. The people of Erie, Pa., did not come to the House of Representatives asking for Federal funds for this particular celebration. They are proud to have been

the home port for the victorious fleet and so have played a part in reminding all America of their heritage.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I am surprised that the State of Ohio and the city of Sandusky are in such condition that they cannot take care of their own celebration, as the House assumed, under the terms of the legislation which was passed, that they would do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. I would like to also point out to the gentleman that the various cities in Ohio, including Sandusky which the gentleman mentioned, had their own celebrations and they picked up their own tab for such celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, this celebration, however, about which we are talking today was authorized by Congress. A good way to confuse the Members of the House is to talk about something other than what we have under discussion.

These other celebrations were carried on by interested areas at their own expense. The celebration about which we are talking today was the official one authorized by this Congress. The celebrations which the gentleman from Iowa and other gentlemen have discussed were independent celebrations whose activities were coordinated by the official commission.

Mr. GROSS. But Members of Congress were assured that the celebration would not cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEAVER. The celebration which was held in Erie, Pa., was one in which representatives of the Canadian Government participated together with representatives of the United States and also officials of Ohio, Rhode Island—the birthplace of Commodore Perry—New York and Kentucky.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this measure because Perry's victory on Lake Erie was a significant and inspiring event in our early history and it seems to me there is no wiser use of our money, within reasonable amounts, as is the case here, than that expended in the observance of historic anniversaries that make the past part of the present and give to living generations something of a personal touch with the national heroes whose deeds have set the pattern of our dreams and aspirations as a people.

This modest amount of money will clear the debt remaining of the observance of the 150th anniversary of Perry's victory. I trust that the celebration of this 150th anniversary will linger in the memory of those who witnessed it, at least some of them, as long as the memory of the 100th anniversary has remained with me.

Chicago observed the 100th anniversary on a grand scale, temporary stands having been erected in Grant Park on the lakefront to seat a mammoth crowd. I had the honor and the thrill of attending with a direct lineal descendant of Admiral Perry, Chesley Perry, who in the Spanish-American War had carried on in the spirit of his famous ancestor and who, with his wife, had been prominently active in the good works of United Spanish War Veterans and its auxiliary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1828).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 80, noes 7.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 39, not voting 161, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—233

Abele	Edmondson	McClary
Adair	Edwards	McCulloch
Addabbo	Ellsworth	McDowell
Albert	Everett	McFall
Anderson	Evins	McIntire
Andrews,	Fascell	McLoskey
N. Dak.	Feighan	Macdonald
Arends	Fisher	MacGregor
Aspinall	Flood	Mahon
Auchincloss	Ford	Mailliard
Ayres	Foreman	Marsh
Baker	Forrester	Martin, Mass.
Baldwin	Fraser	Mathias
Bates	Friedel	Matsunaga
Battin	Fulton, Tenn.	Matthews
Beckworth	Gathings	Milliken
Belcher	Gialmo	Mills
Bennett, Fla.	Gibbons	Moore
Berry	Gonzalez	Morse
Bolland	Goodell	Morton
Bolling	Goodling	Mosher
Bow	Gray	Moss
Brooks	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Brotzman	Griffin	Murphy, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Murray
Broyhill, Va.	Grover	Natcher
Bruce	Hagan, Ga.	Nedzi
Burke	Hagen, Calif.	Nelsen
Burkhalter	Halleck	Norblad
Byrne, Pa.	Hanna	O'Hara, Ill.
Cameron	Harding	O'Hara, Mich.
Cannon	Hardy	Olsen Mont.
Cederberg	Harsha	Olsen, Minn.
Celler	Harvey, Ind.	Ostertag
Chamberlain	Harvey, Mich.	Passman
Chelf	Hays	Patman
Chenoweth	Hechler	Patten
Clancy	Hemphill	Pelly
Clark	Horan	Perkins
Clausen,	Hosmer	Pickle
Don H.	Hull	Pike
Cohelan	Hutchinson	Pilcher
Conte	Jarman	Pirnie
Cooley	Jensen	Poage
Cramer	Joelson	Pool
Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Price
Dague	Johnson, Pa.	Pucinski
Daniels	Johnson, Wis.	Purcell
Davis, Ga.	Karsten	Reid, Ill.
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Reifel
Delaney	Keith	Reuss
Dent	Kelly	Rhodes, Pa.
Denton	Keogh	Rich
Derounian	King, Calif.	Riehlman
Dingell	King, N.Y.	Rivers, Alaska
Dole	Kirwan	Roberts, Tex.
Dorn	Knox	Robison
Downing	Lankford	Rogers, Colo.
Dulski	Latta	Rooney, N.Y.
Duncan	Long, Md.	Roosevelt

Rosenthal  
Roudebush  
Roush  
Ryan, N.Y.  
St. George  
St. Germain  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Schneebeli  
Schweiker  
Schwengel  
Secrest  
Senger  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sibal  
Sickles  
Siler  
Skubitz

Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Va.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Toll  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Tupper

Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vinson  
Waggonner  
Wallhauser  
Watts  
Weaver  
Wharton  
White  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wydler  
Wyman  
Young  
Zablocki

Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Harris with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Hoeven.  
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Kyl.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Rains with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Burton of Utah.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Quillen.  
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bromwell.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Lipscomb.  
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.  
Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Whalley.  
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Stinson.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Kunkel.  
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Halpern.  
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Gurney.  
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Staebler.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Flynt with Mrs. Kee.  
Mr. Holland with Mr. Gill.  
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Roybal.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. Baring.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Barry of New York.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Avery.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brock.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Alger.  
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.  
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Hoffman.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Smith of California.  
Mr. Garmatz with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Becker.  
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. McDade.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Betts.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Minish with Mr. Glenn.  
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Libonati with Mr. Short.  
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Minshall.  
Mr. Boggs with Mrs. May.  
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Curtis.  
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Quie.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Osmer.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lindsay.  
Mr. Kluczyński with Mr. Harrison.  
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. O'Konski.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. Bass.  
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Hawkins.  
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Tuten.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Casey.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Langford.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. THOMAS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

## A VICTORY FOR THE FORCES OF FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent overthrow of Joao Goulart and his pro-Communist government in Brazil is indeed a victory for the forces of freedom. It is also a disastrous defeat for Fidel Castro and his brand of Latin communism. Brazil's triumph over communism vindicates the belief of the majority of the American people that Latin Americans do not want communism nor will they stand by and watch its dark shadow envelope their country and continent.

The Brazilian anti-Communist revolution is a timely answer to those who, simply because communism may have gained a foothold, would give up and abandon the firm position of our Government for freedom and democracy and against communism. The greatest myth is the one that some are trying to generate that the Cuban people do not want to shed the yoke of oppression that grips their country. Those who try to build this myth had better take another look at the freedom forces in Brazil and all of this continent.

It should be the policy of this Government to continue to do everything in our power to isolate Castro from the rest of this hemisphere and have a "Freedom Curtain" surrounding Communist Cuba from which Castro cannot break through or penetrate.

It is for the Organization of American States with the strong support of our Government to act on the Venezuelan charges against Cuba. It is time to impose stricter sanctions on Castro and not to relax them.

In short, it is time for our country to step up its campaign against the menace which is Fidel Castro. It is a time for action rather than a time for debating invisible and manufactured myths. Let Brazil be a first example to those who feel we must compromise with communism in this hemisphere. Freedom has won a battle. Let us proceed to win the war.

## AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION ACT OF 1954

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

### NAYS—39

Abbutt  
Abernethy  
Andrews, Ala.  
Ashmore  
Beermann  
Bell  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Cleveland  
Colmer  
Cunningham  
Fountain  
Fuqua  
Grant

Gross  
Haley  
Hall  
Herlong  
Johansen  
Jonas  
Jones, Mo.  
Kornegay  
Langen  
Lennon  
McMillan  
Morris  
Poff

Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rumsfeld  
Schadeberg  
Scott  
Seiden  
Taylor  
Tuck  
Utt  
Watson  
Weltner  
Williams  
Younger

### NOT VOTING—161

Alger  
Ashbrook  
Ashley  
Avery  
Baring  
Barrett  
Barry  
Bass  
Becker  
Bennett, Mich.  
Betts  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Bolton,  
Frances P.  
Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonner  
Brademas  
Bray  
Brock  
Bromwell  
Broomfield  
Brown, Ohio  
Buckley  
Burleson  
Burton, Calif.  
Burton, Utah  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cahill  
Carey  
Casey  
Clawson, Del  
Collier  
Corbett  
Corman  
Curtis  
Daddario  
Davis, Tenn.  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Diggs  
Donohue  
Dowdy  
Dwyer  
Elliott  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Findley  
Finnegan  
Fino  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Frelinghuysen  
Fulton, Pa.

Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gilbert  
Gill  
Glenn  
Grabowski  
Gubser  
Gurney  
Halpern  
Hansen  
Harris  
Harrison  
Hawkins  
Healey  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Hoeven  
Hoffman  
Hollifield  
Holland  
Horton  
Huddleston  
Ichord  
Jennings  
Jones, Ala.  
Karth  
Kee  
Kilburn  
Kilgore  
Kluczyński  
Kunkel  
Kyl  
Laird  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Lesinski  
Libonati  
Lindsay  
Lipscomb  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
McDade  
Madden  
Martin, Calif.  
Martin, Nebr.  
May  
Meador  
Michel  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, N.Y.  
Minish  
Minshall  
Monagan  
Montoya

Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Multer  
Nix  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N.Y.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmer  
Pepper  
Philbin  
Pillion  
Powell  
Quie  
Quillen  
Rains  
Randall  
Reid, N.Y.  
Rivers, S.C.  
Roberts, Ala.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rostenkowski  
Roybal  
Ryan, Mich.  
St. Onge  
Sheppard  
Short  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Smith, Calif.  
Snyder  
Staebler  
Staggers  
Stinson  
Taft  
Talcott  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tuten  
Udall  
Vanik  
Van Pelt  
Westland  
Whalley  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Willis  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winstead  
Wright

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Talcott.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meador.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Van Pelt.



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

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues legislation which I introduced today to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Basically, this legislation would limit future Government expenditures in connection with the civilian nuclear power field to fast breeder reactors. There are urgent and compelling reasons why this should be done. I urge the Members of this House to study this legislation most carefully.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is not directed at hampering or hindering research and development work by the Atomic Energy Commission directed toward the realization of the full potential of civilian nuclear power. Rather, its primary objective is to bring about a new priority for the work to be undertaken which will be in the long-term national interests, but will not mitigate against the fossil fuels upon which the Nation now depends and must continue to depend for the next century or so for its primary source of electric power.

As far as thermal reactors are concerned, civilian nuclear power, supported by some hundreds of millions of dollars in Government subsidies, has achieved a relatively high degree of efficiency. The so-called light waterplants have been proven from the standpoint of reactor reliability and engineering feasibility. Both manufacturers and utility people insist that large plants of this type can produce commercial electricity at a cost which can compete with power from plants burning conventional fuels in some areas of the country.

The Jersey Central Power & Light Co., recently announced plans to build a plant of this type with a capacity in excess of 500,000 kilowatts to provide base load electricity for its system. The utility has made the unqualified statement that power from this nuclear plant fueled by a thermal reactor will produce power at less cost than electricity which could be produced in a conventional fossil fuel plant of comparable size at the same site. Jersey Central has staked \$68 million of its stockholders' money on its belief that thermal nuclear reactors are, as far as it is concerned, the cheapest and most efficient way to generate electricity.

Three other plants of comparable size are also in the advanced planning stages, all of which will be thermal reactors close to or almost identical in design to the Jersey Central plant. The Government is subsidizing these three plants to the tune of \$42 million for design assistance and free use for 5 years of Government-owned fuel.

In view of this advanced state of the technology of the thermal reactors, why should the Government continue to spend taxpayers money for their further improvement and refinement? Is not further improvement of this one reactor concept a job which should be left to the normal operation of our free enterprise

system? Should we continue to permit Government subsidy, for the construction and operation of such plants, to disrupt the normal forces of competition in the electric utility industry?

Let us not delude ourselves, Mr. Speaker. The present high state of technology of the thermal reactor concept has been achieved only through massive Government participation. The Government financed the basic research. It paid for almost all of the development work. Annual expenditures for all research and development work in civilian nuclear power are more than \$200 million and to date about \$1½ billion has been spent on the program.

It has been a long, expensive road between Shippingport and the Jersey Central plant and a substantial part of the bills has been paid by the Government.

There is no justification for further Government expenditures for research and development work on thermal reactors. If the economics of the electric utility industry demand that the thermal reactor concepts now in commercial use be further improved and refined, then I am sure that the electric utility companies or the manufacturers of the reactors will pay for this work. Why, then, should this House countenance continued spending of taxpayers' money to improve and refine an already successful reactor concept which has been brought to its present stage of efficiency only through massive Government expenditures?

I am not a physicist and I do not parade as an expert in this highly technical and complex field. But I am informed by men who are experts that there is yet another reason for withdrawal of further Government participation in research and development work on thermal reactors, aside from the questionable practice of Government intervention in an activity that should be left to private enterprise. And that is that by and large the thermal reactors are wasteful of the Nation's reserves of fissionable material. These thermal reactors, the type to be built by Jersey Central and the three huge plants to be built with the assistance of \$42 million in Government subsidy, consume more nuclear fuel than they create in the form of plutonium or uranium 233. In other words, nuclear fuel must continually be added. Our supply of fissionable material is not inexhaustible. Should this Nation build a large nuclear power industry, based solely on thermal reactors of the type we have heretofore concentrated on, there will come a day when nuclear fuel will be in critically short supply.

Dr. Frank Pittman, director of Division of Reactor Development of the Atomic Energy Commission, alluded to the danger of depleting our uranium supplies in an address before the Atomic Industrial Forum in November of 1962. Dr. Pittman declared then:

If a large fraction of the total uranium content of our uranium and thorium reserves can be utilized through breeder reactors, our nuclear reserves are enormous. If, on the other hand, only the energy of  $U^{235}$  can be utilized, the nuclear reserves of this country cannot have a significant impact upon the long-range energy picture.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the warning implicit in Dr. Pittman's statement is clear.

We must either develop the breeder reactor as a method for obtaining electricity from the atom or nuclear power will never be a significant factor in meeting the Nation's long-term energy needs.

The full potential of the atom will never be fully realized if we continue to concentrate upon the development of thermal reactors to the neglect of the fast breeders.

In the opinion of knowledgeable men with whom I have talked, our efforts must be concentrated in the field of the fast breeder. There is much work remaining to be done. It will take a long time. It will cost a lot of money and it will require the finest technical and scientific brains available to the Nation through the Atomic Energy Commission. Why dilute our efforts by continued attention to thermal reactors, which are already of an advanced technical stage and in commercial use?

I want to make it clear that in concentrating on fast breeder reactors, the development of which may be some years away, the Nation would not run any risk of encountering a shortage of electricity. Nor would a decision to put first things first by channeling research funds into development of breeder reactors penalize consumers by bringing about higher costs for electricity.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage of fossil fuels now or in the foreseeable future. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, United States reserves of coal are more than 800 billion tons, well over 200 billion tons of which are recoverable at present costs and with present mining methods.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage now or in the foreseeable future of low-cost electric power generated from coal and other fossil fuels. Electricity is one of the few items available today at less cost to the consumer than two decades ago. To a great extent that is due to the availability of ample fossil fuel supplies at steadily declining costs and to the steady improvement in the efficiency of equipment for burning coal and other fossil fuels to produce electricity.

These factors—ample supplies, lowered costs, and improved efficiency—have resulted in a reduction in the fuel cost per kilowatt-hour of electric energy of more than 25 percent in coal fired plants.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, while we plan for the wisest possible use of nuclear resources in the future, we can assure the Nation of ample supplies of low-cost electric power.

Let us in the Congress then see to it that our resources—of money and brainpower—are concentrated where the returns to the Nation and to mankind will be the greatest.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, would direct that the development of a fast high-yield breeder reactor become a matter of high priority concern for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It provides that no funds of the Commission shall be used for the development of any facility unless such a facility

ity is a fast breeder reactor or the AEC makes a written finding that such a reactor is an essential and direct step toward the development of a fast breeder reactor. This is a necessary saving clause, Mr. Speaker. I am informed that some of the more advanced types of thermal reactors may be essential and direct steps toward this end. The hands of the AEC must not be tied. They must be left free to exercise their best judgment on this matter.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that this legislation, by concentrating our efforts on the fast breeder reactor, will hasten the day when cheap, unlimited power, which most of us prematurely believed was near when the atom was first harnessed, becomes available. That hope has not been realized. It has taken 10 years and at least a billion and a half dollars to advance to the present stage, where nuclear power is competitive with power produced from conventional fuels in some areas of the Nation.

The first milestone has been reached. The time has arrived for us to enter a new and more meaningful era. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this can be accomplished by passing this legislation and requiring that attention be centered where it will achieve the best results—on the development of fast, high-yield reactors to conserve the Nation's reserves of fissionable materials and to provide cheap, abundant power.

#### ECONOMIC CONDITION OF OUR NATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate for the Congress, from time to time to take stock of the economic condition of our Nation so we might accurately judge the effectiveness of our national policies.

I am confident that every Member of the Congress can find justifiable optimism and confidence in the sound road of economic expansion we have been traveling under the Democratic administration of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

According to expert economic analyses, we are in the midst of one of the longest peacetime business expansion periods in our history; and the end is by no means in sight.

Through the continued vigilance of the Congress and the President, I believe the American people can expect the policies of our National Government to encourage even further the continuation of this significant upswing in business activity.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a brief article from the Associated Press pointing up in more detail the consensus of the business community confirming its confidence in the current long-term boom.

#### EXPERTS TEND TO CONFIDENCE IN LONG BOOM (By Jack Lefler)

NEW YORK.—The business upturn reached the ripe old age of 38 months last week.

That made it about the longest business expansion in peacetime.

Some economists felt it was getting decrepit.

Others contended it is still robust and has a considerably longer life ahead.

Majority opinion ended toward the belief that things look good for the months ahead.

M. R. Gainsburgh, chief economist of the National Industrial Conference Board, expressed this opinion:

"Because there are none of the familiar signs of economic strain, I would say the top of this expansion isn't even in sight yet, especially considering the stimulating effect of the recent tax reduction."

The Chase Manhattan Bank of New York said:

"The odds are high that the economy will be operating at, or quite close to practical capacity later this year. This is likely to be true even with moderation in consumer markets, capital expenditure, and inventories."

At present, the upswing isn't hampered by the usual signs of an expansion's demise. Inventories aren't excessive, loans aren't difficult to obtain, and prices are relatively stable.

It is being carried along by corporations' high sales and earnings, particularly in the automobile and steel industries, and heavy investment in new plant and equipment.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH BIPARTISAN NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to establish a bipartisan National Commission on Food Marketing. It is my understanding that a number of other Members have joined with me in introducing this measure. The resolution provides for a 2-year study of the various segments of the food industry, together with an appraisal and recommendations for legislative and other actions by the Federal Government, private industry, and individuals.

The resolution which I have introduced is in identical language to that introduced by Senator GALE MCGEE, in the other body, I understand, this is the draft received by him from the White House. The Commission which will be created by this resolution can perform a cardinal service to the consumer, the farmer, the food industry, and our economy in general. I have not changed the language of the resolution, feeling it better to leave this to the wisdom of the committee to which it is referred, after it has received and considered testimony on this subject.

There are, however, several points that I would like to briefly make at this time. First, there are problems today in the food industry, perhaps most

pressingly in the meat sector, that are of such intensity they cannot await a 2-year study for solution. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the passage of this resolution will not militate against the passage of needed legislation, such as H.R. 1706, which would prohibit large integrated firms from engaging in both the production and retail sale of meat and similar products.

While the word "antitrust" is not used in the body of the resolution, I am most hopeful that recognition will be given to the fact that there are serious antitrust problems arising from increasing concentration and integration within the food industry, and that both the committee considering the resolution and the Commission which will be ultimately created will attempt to devise solutions designed to foster and preserve the forces of competition in this vital area of our economy.

#### AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last December I spoke on the floor of the House about the Soviet campaign of discrimination against Russian citizens of the Jewish faith. At that time I detailed the various methods, including the prevention of publication of books, the closing of synagogues, the prohibition against the baking of matzo, and the eradication of Jewish religious and cultural life. I have also called upon President Johnson to use his good offices to appeal to Premier Khrushchev to lift these religious and cultural restrictions. Today and yesterday a conference on Soviet Jewry is being held in Washington, D.C., with over 500 persons in attendance. The conference is sponsored by the following 24 Jewish organizations:

American Israel Public Affairs Committee; chairman, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein.

American Jewish Committee; president, Morris B. Abram.

American Jewish Congress; president, Rabbi Joachim Prinz.

American Zionist Council; chairman, Dr. Max Nussbaum.

American Trade Union Council for Histadrut; chairman, Moe Falkman.

B'nai B'rith; president, Label A. Katz.

Central Conference of American Rabbis; president, Rabbi Leon I. Feuer.

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations; chairman, Lewis H. Weinstein.

Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America; president, Mrs. Siegfried Kramarsky.

Jewish Agency for Israel, American Section; chairman, Mrs. Rose L. Halprin.

Jewish Labor Committee; national chairman, Adolph Held.

Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; national commander, Daniel Neal Heller.



Labor Zionist Movement—Poale Zion, Farband, Pioneer Women; chairman, Mrs. Blanche Fine.

Religious Zionists of America—Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi; president, Rabbi Mordecai Kirshblum.

National Community Relations Advisory Council; chairman, Lewis H. Weinstein.

National Council of Jewish Women; president, Mrs. Joseph Willen.

National Council of Young Israel; president, Rabbi David Hill.

Rabbinical Assembly; president, Rabbi Theodore Friedman.

Rabbinical Council of America; president, Rabbi Abraham N. Avrutick.

Synagogue Council of America; president, Rabbi Uri Miller.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations; president, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisen-drath.

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; president, Moses I. Feinstein.

United Synagogue of America; president, George Maislen.

Zionist Organization of America; president, Dr. Max Nussbaum.

A fact sheet was prepared in preparation for the conference which I believe all Members of the House should read. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

[From American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., Apr. 5-6, 1964]

#### FACT SHEET: THE STATUS OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

##### BACKGROUND

1. The last Soviet census, in 1959, listed 2,268,000 Jews. Reliable reports indicate, however, that those census returns entirely omitted statistics on Jews in some areas and deflated the actual number in others. The correct figure is nearer to 3,000,000—perhaps more—making Soviet Jewry second only to the Jews of the United States in population.

2. Although Soviet Jews constitute but 1.09 percent of the population, they rank 11th numerically among the more than 100 Soviet nationalities. There is no republic of the U.S.S.R. where Jewish communities are not found. The great majority live in the three most populous republics: 38 percent in the Russian Republic, 37 percent in the Ukraine, 7 percent in Byelorussia.

3. Jews in the U.S.S.R. are officially recognized as a nationality group. In the personal identification papers which all Soviet citizens carry, Jews must list their nationality as Jewish (Yevrei) just as other nationalities—Russians, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, etc.—must list theirs.

4. The Jews are also regarded, secondarily, as a religious group, such as the Russian Orthodox, Baptists, Moslems, and others.

##### DEPRIVATION OF CULTURAL RIGHTS

1. In the 1959 census, 472,000 Soviet Jews listed Yiddish as their "mother tongue." This courageous demonstration of loyalty to Yiddish culture served notice on the Government that Soviet Jewry still hoped for a revival of Jewish cultural life.

2. Although Soviet practice recognizes the inherent right of every nationality to maintain and perpetuate its own cultural identity, the Jews are the only nationality who do not enjoy the basic cultural rights accorded to all other minorities.

3. Hebrew was forbidden soon after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 but Jews were permitted a flourishing cultural life in Yiddish until 1948: This included the publish-

ing of newspapers, books, and literary journals; professional repertory theaters and drama schools, literary and cultural research institutes, and a network of schools.

4. In 1948 this whole array of institutions was dismantled and hundreds of Jewish writers, artists, and intellectuals were imprisoned. Many perished in concentration camps; the 24 most distinguished and talented of them were executed in 1952.

5. A few positive steps toward easing the harsh suppression of Jewish cultural and religious life have been made since Stalin's death—whether as a result of the general easing of conditions under Khrushchev or strong criticism of the Soviet regime by Jewish and non-Jewish groups. In 1959 and 1961 a total of 6 Yiddish books were published, in editions of 30,000 each—albeit the writers were long since dead. None has been published since. In 1961, for the first time since 1948, a bimonthly Yiddish literary journal—Sovietish Heimland—began publication in an edition of 25,000. In 1963 a Hebrew-Russian dictionary was published and early in 1964 there appeared, in Russian, a book of poems by modern Hebrew poets.

6. This is all that remains of the rich Jewish cultural life that existed until 1948. Today Jews are forbidden schools of their own; forbidden classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in the general schools, and forbidden classes in the Russian language on Jewish history and culture. The result has been to deprive Soviet Jewry of all opportunity to perpetuate Jewish cultural values and Jewish identity.

##### DEPRIVATION OF RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

1. Judaism is subjected to special discrimination, and religious Jews are subjected to special disabilities which do not affect any other major religious denomination in the U.S.S.R.

2. Jewish congregations are not permitted to maintain national federations or other central organizations through which religious functions are governed, religious needs serviced, religious beliefs bolstered, and communication between congregations strengthened.

3. Judaism is permitted no publication facilities and no publications. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor has a Russian translation of the Hebrew Bible been allowed. In 1957, for the first time since the early 1920's, a Hebrew prayer book was photo offset in an edition of 5,000 copies. There is an extreme shortage of prayer books and religious calendars.

4. The decades-old ban on Hebrew prevents Jewish children from understanding or participating in the prayers of their religion.

5. The production of such indispensable religious objects as the tallis (prayer shawl) and tefillin (phylacteries) is prohibited.

6. Synagogues have been forcibly closed down in many areas, frequently to the accompaniment of virulent press campaigns against them. As a result, Jews have taken to gathering in each others' homes for prayers. Yet in many places such private prayer meetings (minyanim) have been banned, dispersed or otherwise harassed.

7. Circumcision is officially discouraged and mocked, even though there seems to be no law against it.

8. The yeshiva (rabbinical seminary) established in Moscow in 1957 has never been permitted to enroll more than 14 students. It has ordained only two rabbis, neither of whom has functioned as a synagogue leader. In April 1962, 9 of its 13 students were prohibited to reside in Moscow. Two years later there remain only four students, although applications for admission have been made by prospective students from all over the country.

9. In 1962, a total ban was imposed on the public baking of matzoth for Passover and renewed in 1963. This year, perhaps as a result of international protests against the

matzoth ban, a bakery was opened in Moscow to produce a limited quantity of matzoth for the Passover holiday. The bakery was closed a few days later. On March 19, the American Embassy in Moscow reported that no matzoth had been baked on the premises. In any event, the total output of the bakery was not expected to meet more than a tiny fraction of Moscow Jewry's matzoth requirements. Jews in the rest of the country remained without any local source of matzoth.

10. An atmosphere of intimidation and fear pervades the few remaining synagogues in the Soviet Union, the result of arrest and imprisonment on trumped-up charges of espionage leveled against synagogue officials in Moscow and Leningrad, and the infiltration of synagogues by police informers.

##### THE ANTI-JEWISH PRESS CAMPAIGN

1. The Government policy of cultural and religious repression of Soviet Jewry is conducted within the charged atmosphere of a virulent press campaign. In books, newspapers, and magazines, Jews are represented in traditional anti-Semitic stereotypes—as unscrupulous, cunning, malevolent, vicious, and conspiring. They are attacked, as Jews, for alleged economic offenses such as bribery, embezzlement, fraud, and currency speculation.

2. Judaism as a religion is vilified. Rabbis and synagogue officials are portrayed as swindlers, money grubbers, alcoholics, criminals. Jews are ridiculed for observing religious holidays.

3. The Soviet Union has a continuing campaign of antireligious propaganda. Yet only Judaism—of all the religions in the U.S.S.R.—has been singled out as a focus of disloyalty to the state.

##### OTHER FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION

1. Jews are subject to a subtle policy of discrimination in employment, education, and major sectors of public life.

2. A few especially brilliant Jews can still be found in high positions—and some in the middle rank—in professional, cultural, and economic life. But Jews have virtually disappeared from key "security sensitive" areas such as the armed forces, diplomatic corps, and membership in the Supreme Soviets (legislatures) of the 15 republics.

3. The proportion of Jews in higher education, science, and the professions has been declining for many years. In many universities and advanced institutes, a numerous *clausus* prevails. A generation ago (1935) Jews comprised 13.5 percent of all students in higher education. Today the figure is 3.1 percent.

##### THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST ECONOMIC CRIMES

1. Official hostility against Jews has been revealed in the massive campaign waged in the last few years against so-called "economic offenses" such as embezzlement of State property, currency speculation and bribery. Fifty to sixty percent of all those sentenced to death for such offenses have been Jews. In some areas (the Ukraine, for example) the figure is 80 to 90 percent.

2. In a number of cases, the Jewish religious affiliation of the culprits was explicitly pointed out. In Lvov, the city's last remaining synagogue was closed down on the ground that it served as a spawning ground for economic crimes against the state.

3. Jews are depicted as people "whose only God is gold," who are "slaves of gold" and who cunningly manipulate naive non-Jewish officials and workers for their own mercenary ends. They are portrayed as the initiators and masterminds of criminal plots.

4. The result of this campaign is both to exacerbate endemic anti-Semitism and to create an atmosphere of fright and intimidation among the Soviet Jewry.

##### REUNION OF FAMILIES

1. Tens of thousands of Soviet Jews wish to be reunited with their broken families

in Israel and elsewhere—families that were shattered by the Nazi holocaust.

2. The Soviet Government has refused, to all but a handful of Jews, the elementary human right to leave their country in order to be reunited with their families—even though the U.S.S.R. has in principle accepted the legitimacy of this right.

#### SUMMARY

The history of the past several years has shown that the rulers of the Soviet Union are not impervious to criticism of their treatment of Soviet Jewry. For this reason, world Jewry will not cease in the effort to end the government campaign to pulverize and ultimately to eliminate Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews and to keep them isolated from their fellow Jews in other parts of the world. Despite the hardships they face and the discrimination they suffer, the Jews of the U.S.S.R. profoundly desire to maintain their Jewish spirit and to perpetuate their Jewish identity.

Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg delivered a most thoughtful address to the conference in which he pointed out the reasons why all Americans must be concerned with Soviet anti-Semitism which constitutes a fundamental deprivation of basic human rights. I wish to bring to the attention of all my colleagues the address of Mr. Justice Goldberg:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO THE AMERICAN JEWS CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, APRIL 5, 1964

We are gathered in this important conference to consider the question of discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. The denial of human rights by the Soviet Union to Jews is properly a matter of deep concern to all Americans of every religious persuasion. It is similarly a proper matter of deep concern to all Americans of the Jewish faith that the Soviet Union while professing in theory to permit the free exercise of religion to all people and groups in fact and practice is hostile to all religious faiths. The Soviet Union is avowedly a materialistic nation. Its government is not neutral in religious matters. Its policies and influence are directed against religious beliefs and practices. Therefore, in a conference of this kind we are not and cannot be unmindful of the plight of the great body of people in the Soviet Union whose human right to freedom of religious exercise is substantially curtailed. The discrimination against Jews by the government of the Soviet Union is an aspect of overall discrimination against all religious groups. It is, however, something more than a manifestation of religious repression by an atheistic state. The evidence is overwhelming that the religious and cultural freedom of Soviet Jewry is more severely limited than any other religious group and that discrimination against Soviet Jews has reached alarming proportions. The tragic experience of mankind with the cancer of anti-Semitism so fresh in the minds of all makes it imperative that those who believe in the dignity of man and in human rights speak out in vigorous protest.

I want to commend the sponsors of this conference for convening it. The meeting itself is a virtually unprecedented testimonial to the unity of Jewish opinion on this vital and important subject. I hope and trust that you will continue to protest against the virus of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union until no vestige of it remains.

The 2½ to 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union, though classified by the Soviet Constitution and laws as a national group, are deprived of their national culture and the means of expressing it. Every other Soviet nationality is permitted the use of its na-

tional language and is granted support for its cultural institutions. But the teaching of Hebrew, the Biblical language, is banned in the Soviet Union; Yiddish, the tongue of 450,000 Soviet citizens, is discouraged; Jewish schools virtually prohibited and non-existent; the once flourishing Yiddish theater scarcely tolerated, and Jewish literature and publications sharply curtailed.

The religious freedom of Soviet Jews is severely limited—more so than any other religious group; increasingly synagogues are closed and private worship restricted; both Bible and prayerbooks are denied printing; other necessary religious articles made unavailable; the last kosher butchershop in Moscow closed down, the ancient Jewish cemetery in Kiev condemned; the state baking of matzoth discontinued; private baking discouraged by prosecutions; the training of seminarians hampered, and religious exchanges discouraged.

Jews are vilified in the Soviet press and other mass media which reflect hostility to the Jewish people as such. This has reached such proportions that Western Communist Parties which generally slavishly follow the Kremlin line have been moved to protest the publication of a blatantly anti-Semitic book published late last year in Kiev, copies of which have just come to light in this country and in the Western world. This book, "Judaism Without Embellishment," is not just a privately printed tract. It was officially issued by the Ukrainian Academy of Science and had a substantial press run in the Ukrainian language. I have seen this book and its cartoons are sharply reminiscent of Julius Streicher's "Der Stuermer," that notorious Nazi publication. I note in today's newspapers that the hierarchy of the ideological commission of the Soviet Communist Party has issued what appears to be a partial repudiation of this book. This is welcome, if somewhat belated, but in itself demonstrates the value of forthright worldwide protest against manifestations of anti-Semitism.

Jewish emigration even for the limited purpose of reuniting families torn asunder by war and Nazi persecution is permitted only on the most insignificant scale.

There is increasing evidence of discrimination against Jews in employment and areas of public life.

Finally, there is also evidence that an undue proportion of Jews is being prosecuted and executed for economic crimes.

No law-abiding citizen of any nation and particularly no judge can urge that any person or group is immune from the equal application of any nation's laws. But when 60 percent of those executed in the Soviet Union for economic crimes are Jews who comprise only a little more than 1 percent of its population then the belief naturally is fostered that Jews are receiving unequal treatment under Soviet law. Particularly is this so, in the setting of other discriminations against the Jews both historical and current in old Russia and in the Soviet Union.

Discrimination against Soviet Jews is not solely an internal matter for the Soviet Union. It is a proper concern for all in this country and elsewhere who believe in human values. Soviet mistreatment of the Jews violates worldwide concept of human rights and human dignity; transgresses the United Nations Charter to which the Soviet Union is a party and violates the universal declaration of human rights which is morally binding upon all member states of the United Nations.

It is not sufficient answer to reply, as Soviet officials are wont to do, that some of my best in-laws are Jewish. Nor is it an answer to assert that those charging discrimination are motivated by hostility to the Soviet people. The philosopher Bertrand Russell is a self-proclaimed friend of

the Soviet Union and even he has found it necessary to write profound and serious letters to Mr. Khrushchev expressing deep concern about Soviet treatment of its Jewish citizens in terms similar to those I have expressed this evening. In stating my views, I do so as an American citizen who supports the effort of our Government, with due regard for our own security as a nation, to seek ways for better understanding between our country and the Soviet Union; one who shares with the great majority of our people the desire for an end to the cold war and for a just and lasting peace.

In appealing for an end to governmental discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union, I am mindful that as a nation our record is not perfect—we all too often fall short of realizing the great ideals of human liberty and equality embodied in our great declaration of human rights. I am also mindful, however, that our Government policy is directed to ending rather than extending discrimination.

But one need never apologize for speaking out for human rights of all peoples everywhere. For as the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights asserts, "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world."

I am one who having read the full text of Rolf Hochhuth's controversial play "The Deputy" and who having lived through those terrible days, believes that the dramatist did not do justice to that great and good pontiff, Pope Pius the XIIth. Jews are and ever should be grateful for what the Pope and the Catholic Church did to rescue innocent Jewish victims of Nazi insanity and barbarism. But whatever one's views about the play's characterization of the Pope, all men of good will must agree with the ancient Biblical teaching echoed in the play, that we are indeed our brother's keeper and that it is the duty of all men at all times and under all circumstances to speak out against the denial of human rights whenever and wherever such denial occurs. In matters of conscience there can be no missing voices.

Mr. Speaker, anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union should be of vital concern to every American and to our Government. History has taught us that the rights of man are not divisible. As Justice Goldberg pointed out, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights asserts "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." I urge the State Department to lodge a vigorous protest with the Soviet Union and to press this issue in the United Nations where on March 12, 1964, Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, who is the U.S. representative in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, urged the Commission on Human Rights to include a new article condemning anti-Semitism in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

#### SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE REPORT ON FOREIGN TRADE

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

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

There was no objection.



Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I am today transmitting to the House a report of the Select Committee on Small Business entitled "Small Business in Foreign Trade." This report is the culmination of hearings and investigations of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress. It contains the findings of the committee concerning the various aspects of foreign trade as it relates to small business, along with recommendations thereon. This report is submitted with the unanimous approval of the full committee.

During the past year the full House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings on foreign trade, and more specifically the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as it pertains to small business. The Small Business Administration, Department of Commerce, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Export-Import Bank, and the U.S. Tariff Commission submitted testimony and reported to the committee on their areas of operation in this field. Small businessmen from all over the Nation testified before the committee.

Nearly 400 pages of testimony were received by the committee. One of the main findings of the committee was to the effect that there exists a place—an important role—for small business in foreign trade and that the opportunities in this regard for small business are practically unlimited. I quote from the introductory paragraph of this report:

The spirit of the Yankee traders of the 19th century is being revived—in fact, it has never died. Successful small businessmen from New York to California, from Minnesota to Florida, from New Hampshire to Georgia, with employees ranging from 10 to 300, in giving testimony before the House Small Business Committee, stated unequivocally that almost any business firm, regardless of size, can profitably break into and effectively engage in foreign trade. This is the basic finding of this committee—that vast export trade opportunities are available for small business and that there is nothing to prevent a small business firm from venturing into export trade—indeed, there are many advantages and incentives.

As has been stated by [former] President Kennedy, "for almost any American business, life can begin anew at the ocean's edge."

This report also discusses in detail the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as it affects small business. One of the critical findings of the committee in this regard was to the effect that the adjustment assistance provisions of this act, whereby firms or industries which are injured as a result of trade concessions to foreign countries are to receive assistance, do not appear to be filling the purpose for which enacted.

The U.S. Tariff Commission is showing a negative approach to these provisions of the act and has not yet made a positive finding in favor of any business or industry under the act whereby businesses could receive assistance as a result of injury from foreign competition. The report goes into detail in this regard and makes some positive recommendations in this connection.

In summary, the report contains some 16 recommendations to Government agencies and the Congress concerning

the operation of small business in foreign trade. This report and the recommendations are being forwarded to the agencies involved, and it is thought that it will be of special interest to the Members of Congress, not only in relation to the recommendations therein, but also because of the information it contains concerning this very important field.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I recommend this report to my colleagues of the Congress and others. Copies are available, upon request, through the House Small Business Committee.

#### THE NEW AGE OF DISCOVERY

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the sixth Air Force Academy Assembly on Outer Space which was held at the Academy in Colorado Springs last week. I wish to include in my remarks a splendid address delivered by James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, on our progress in outer space. This address received an enthusiastic reception from the delegates to the assembly and the Air Force Academy cadets. Mr. Webb was introduced by Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, Superintendent of the Air Force Academy.

The address by Mr. Webb follows:

#### THE NEW AGE OF DISCOVERY

(Address by James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, American Assembly Student Conference, Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., April 1, 1964)

Driving through this beautiful country, and coming upon this monument to the influence of science and technology on architectural progress, it is difficult to comprehend the difficulty with which Thomas Jefferson defended the wisdom of the Louisiana Purchase only 160 years ago. You may recall that in justifying the expenditure of \$15 million for the purchase of a vast area which included most of Colorado, Jefferson found many of his contemporaries skeptical of his bold prediction that this territory would be settled by A.D. 2600.

This should give you cadets, who have already settled here in 1964, and you students who have braved the hazards of a journey to this remote region, the feeling that Jefferson could see you only as hardy pioneers, despite these handsome surroundings.

Jefferson must be forgiven the limitations of his vision, however, for as late as 1844, before California became part of the Union, another illustrious American, Daniel Webster, rose on the Senate floor in opposition to an appropriation of \$50,000 to establish a mail service to the Pacific coast. In this place, in these times, it is of interest to recall his words.

"What do we want of the vast worthless area?" Webster asked. "This region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, cactus, and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these deserts or these endless

mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their bases with eternal snow?

"What use can we have for such a country?" Webster continued. "Mr. President, I will never vote one cent from the public treasury to place the Pacific coast one inch nearer Boston than it is today."

These incidents in our own relatively recent history may seem somewhat remote from the topic of this year's American Assembly Student Conference, which is "Outer Space." As remote, perhaps, as present day realities are from the past predictions I have cited.

But, in assessing the future one can always learn from the past, and if the thoughtful student of history learns anything from a review of the march of human progress, it is that the ultimate potential of contemporary undertakings is almost never perceived.

So, I believe, it is with research and exploration in space.

When I was asked what I would talk about tonight, I replied that I planned to discuss "The New Age of Discovery." I chose the title because it seemed appropriate, in speaking to a group of young people whose lives and opportunities are largely in the future, to relate man's newly found ability to explore in space to those which have opened to him before, and to consider the benefits which have accrued from the imaginative, venturesome, and thoughtfully undertaken explorations of the past.

I think, for example, of the Portuguese Prince and King, Henry the Navigator, who more than 500 years ago encouraged his bold and skillful mariners to penetrate the "Sea of Darkness," which lay beyond Cape Not. The result, which none in that time could foresee was unprecedented maritime progress in which "Portugal discovered the whole world; (and) shattered the medieval bonds that fettered the knowledge of mankind."

When Henry began his voyages, the outer limit of exploration on the African coast was Cape Not, which is opposite the Canary Islands at about 29° latitude. At the end of 40 years of exploration, he had pressed his seamen to explore and chart the coastline over 18° of latitude—a little more than 1,000 miles. And in the next 40 years after that, Africa was rounded by Bartholomew Dias and Vasco de Gama, and contact by sea was made with India, the Far East, and the American continents.

Henry, in his time, vastly extended man's concept of his habitable environment, but it was still limited to the land and sea areas of the earth. To achieve his hopes, he had to overcome centuries of superstition. It was necessary to evolve, by trial and error, the charts and instruments, and even a new kind of ship, the caravel, to beat back up the African coast against the prevailing north winds. One historian has written:

"His achievement was unique—something that can never be repeated. For tens of thousands of years, the races of mankind had been living in separate continents and islands. Vast and complex civilizations in Europe and in the East had risen and sunk in decay, without ever having communicated with each other. The wisdom, the technical knowledge, and the culture of one group of peoples were kept apart from those of others by the barriers of the ocean. Henry changed all that, and in doing so changed the course of world history."

"It was curiosity in the spirit of inquiry—voiced in that one word 'farther'—that drove the caravels into the Atlantic and down the coast of Africa. Henry set in motion not only the age of discovery but 400 years of European colonization—a process that has been decreed in our own time, but without which vast regions of the globe might still be in a state of barbarism."

While Henry's major objective was knowledge, and his instrument was a more efficient use of the energy of the wind provided by the caravel, there resulted quite practical and

tangible additional benefits which were not immediately apparent to the merchants of the time. In his contemporary chronicles of Henry's exploits, Azurara notes that Henry was motivated to embark on his career of discovery because "no sailor or merchant would undertake it, for it is very sure that such men do not dream of navigating other than to places where they already know they can make a profit."

Yet, though this was not the prime objective, Henry lived to see the day when he had difficulty in pressing his captains to further exploration because of the profits available in the new lands already discovered. And with the rounding of the Cape of Good Hope, Europe was freed from dependence on the caravan routes of the East, and enormous profits fell to those who supplied its needs for silk and spices by sea.

In the years that followed, other men of curiosity, vision, and imagination postulated laws of motion and energy which not only permitted man to further explore and utilize his environment on earth, but led to the new opportunities beyond the earth which lie before you today.

Some 100 years later, Copernicus was able to build on his inherent base of knowledge, and the concept that the earth was round, the geometric concepts which were to prove some of the most valuable tools of the human mind.

Between Copernicus and Galileo a hundred years elapsed, and another between Galileo and Newton. But the restless, insatiable search for new knowledge, and the increasingly ingenious utilization of energy, continued and absorbed the lives of many of the world's most talented men and women.

Galileo, extending Copernican postulations of circular and rectilinear motion, calculated the path of a cannon ball, and Isaac Newton later speculated on what would happen to a projectile fired with sufficient force to leave the earth. From this he worked out—nearly 300 years ago—the mathematical formula on which the launching of an artificial earth satellite is based.

But it was not until late in the last century that Konstantin Tsiolkovskii gave serious scientific consideration to the possibility of exploration beyond the earth, and it was not until 1926 that an imaginative and ingenious scientist, Dr. Robert Goddard, devised the liquid-fueled, multistage rocket, which would operate in the vacuum of space because it carried its own oxygen supply. This brought the far reaches of space within the grasp of the human race.

Today, 500 years after Prince Henry and his use of the caravel to initiate the oceanic age, 400 years after Copernicus presented his theories about the solar system, 300 years after Newton worked out the formula for space flight, but less than 40 years after Goddard devised the vehicle to make it possible, man has left the earth, and widened his horizons to include the entire solar system.

Science today has at its disposal a modern caravel, the chemical rocket, which has already traveled to the Moon and Venus. And, as with Henry and his explorations, we have improved navigation systems to guide them out and bring them back and to make steadily more accurate measurements of the environment of space—that environment through which Gagarin and Glenn and others traveled, and through which our own planet, Mother Earth, is also traveling around the sun at the relative speed of 67,000 miles per hour.

And to complete the parallel, just as Prince Henry inaugurated an age of discovery which led man to all the seas and continents of the earth, and into the atmosphere up to twice the height of his tallest mountains, so have we today embarked on a new age of discovery in which there is no foreseeable horizon.

It is worth noting that, as throughout the course of history, we were not quick to perceive nor grasp the opportunities opened to us by science and technology. The history of American aeronautics and astronautics, from the sands of Kitty Hawk in 1903 until the day an American grasps the first material from the surface of the moon reflects periods of rapid progress in times of crisis and disinterest during so-called periods of peace.

The United States became the first Nation in the world to possess an airplane when, in 1908, the Army Signal Corps contracted for a Wright biplane. Yet by 1914, the Nation possessed fewer military aircraft and of inferior types than the six leading aeronautical nations, one of which was Mexico. The United States in 1914 was the only major nation in the world not to possess an aeronautical laboratory with an up-to-date wind tunnel. By November 1918, not one aircraft of American design and manufacture had entered combat operations during World War I.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was created in 1915, but its research effort, which was to pay off in world aviation leadership in the late 1920's and early 1930's had barely begun.

Although Goddard devised the world's first liquid fuel rocket in this country in 1926, World War II found the United States with conventional air power which virtually ruled European skies in 1944, while 5½-ton German V-2 rockets rained destruction upon English and continental targets until their launching sites were overrun by Allied surface forces.

Meanwhile, German jet aircraft appeared in combat over Europe, a product of the successful Nazi effort to outdo our own NACA in fundamental aeronautical research. The Germans had set out to build a larger and better NACA in 1933, and to a great extent they did—at least in propulsion research.

With the appearance of the atomic bomb in 1945, the United States chose after World War II to mate it with the jet aircraft as its instrument for global influence in airspace, neglecting the other major technological innovation—the large rocket.

The demobilization of manpower and science after 1945 became only temporary; soon the cold war and Korea defined the political and ideological realities of world peace. In 1954, the United States awakened to the scientific and technological fact that intercontinental liquid-fuel missiles with nuclear warheads were not only feasible, but that their development was well underway in the Soviet Union.

A crash American program with the highest national priority and funding was devoted to the development of the Atlas ICBM and other military rockets with nuclear warheads. This urgent program became an outstanding achievement in itself, and one in which the military services can take great pride. But our preoccupation with it and lack of vision as to the effect on us of what might lie beyond it blocked any serious work on the projection of large rockets into space, other than the low priority and sparsely funded Vanguard project for the International Geophysical Year.

On October 4, 1957, the world's first man-made earth satellite, Sputnik I, began orbiting the earth. While the United States had successfully proceeded to develop an intercontinental missile capability which was vital in the balance of world military power, the U.S.S.R. had demonstrated with sputnik a broader application of rocket technology—one possessing dramatic psychological, scientific, and defense potentialities.

As a nation, we began the wholesale self-examination of what had happened at the dawn of the space age. An early result was the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct space exploration and peaceful exploitation of this

new arena of activity, and to provide the technological and scientific base for any application which the national interest might require—civil or military.

But enough of history. Let us turn to the present, and to the manner in which today's talented men and women of all ages are utilizing and projecting forward the new knowledge gained and the new concepts which are coming at such a fast pace from the modern tools of space exploration. Certainly, it is the younger generation, including some of our most talented men and women, who are moving with the greatest rapidity, personally and vicariously, to sail on this new ocean of space, and to invent new ways to apply what is learned to problems and uses here on earth.

What have we learned, and what is it that so excites the hopes and dreams of these young men and women and stimulates the application of their talent in this new space age era?

Let's look at the examples of what we already know.

More than two-thirds of the 200 satellites and interplanetary probes launched into space have been the product of U.S. scientists and engineers. These instrumented vehicles are exploring interplanetary space, a region rich in energy, radiation, and fast-moving particles of great variety. As you know, the scientists' desire to learn more about this interplanetary medium stems from the knowledge that almost all phenomena on earth, including life itself, are dependent upon energy from the sun which streams toward the earth through 93 million miles of space.

The scientific data collected by these space vehicles is greatly extending many of the natural sciences, bringing answers to questions which have perplexed mankind from the earliest days of human existence on earth. The first U.S. satellite confirmed the existence of the great radiation belt which surrounds the earth and the characteristics of this belt have been further defined by many subsequent vehicles.

Identified in 1958 by a brilliant young scientist at the State University of Iowa, Dr. James Van Allen, who is still youthful in years although a veteran of the space age, these belts have already been measured, mapped, and understood.

Another early satellite established that the Earth is slightly flattened at the poles. Subsequently, it was discovered that a slight bulge exists at the Equator giving the Earth a pear shape. Not only did these discoveries have great scientific significance, but they are of extreme importance in plotting military flights and targets, to the cartographers, and in space navigation.

The Pioneer V spacecraft, launched in March 1960, into an orbit between the Earth and Venus, transmitted data from a then record distance of 22.5 million miles from the Earth. It confirmed the existence of an interplanetary magnetic field and showed that the field varied with solar flare activity and the field's interaction with a stream of charged particles which is known as the solar wind.

Satellite observations of the ionosphere, not only by this country's scientists, but by those of Canada and Great Britain, have illuminated or explained many of the mysteries regarding this great band of thin ionized gases at the top of the atmosphere, which profoundly affects radio transmission. This knowledge has led to a project which involves the mapping of the ionosphere through at least one complete 11-year solar cycle to gain knowledge of value not only for civilian and scientific purposes, but to the military agencies, as well.

Satellites have also detected the presence of a layer of helium which surrounds the Earth in a band nearly 1,000 miles deep beginning at an altitude of about 600 miles



and the possibility of a huge ring of hydrogen extending out to some 6,000 miles. Within this area a concentration of cosmic dust has been discovered which scientists believe may be related to periods of heavy rainfall on Earth.

Other space phenomena detected by satellite observations include measurements of the solar wind, of solar flares, of micrometeorite and numerous other observations. Some of the information returned, particularly that gathered in intergalactic space, gives promise of answering fundamental questions about the origin and development of the universe, and providing a basis from which to predict the future.

Perhaps the most exciting and profitable scientific venture in space to date was the flight of Mariner II in late 1962. This remarkable spacecraft transmitted more than 65 million bits of information to Earth, operating at a record distance of nearly 54 million miles from the Earth. En route to Venus, it affirmed the concentration of cosmic dust near the Earth, and found that the amount of radiation encountered was significantly less than had been anticipated. It registered an 800° surface temperature on Venus—too high to sustain life as we know it—detected no water vapor and no cosmic dust. It also determined that the planet has no apparent rotation or magnetic field.

What do such things have to do with conditions here on the earth, and our mastery, control and use of the forces of nature? The answer is, a very great deal. New knowledge achieved through the use of satellites, sounding rockets, high altitude balloons, and other space-age tools is adding substantially and at a rapid rate to our knowledge of the interior of the earth, its electromagnetic and gravitational characteristics, and the energy systems which generate our weather. It is also contributing to the efficiency with which we can engage in the large-scale organized efforts covering many scientific disciplines and fields of engineering, which are essentially to utilize the very precisely constructed machines and systems, the new sophisticated understanding of the atomic processes, and to some extent the life processes, on which our future welfare is based. Within the past 3 years, the technology for an entirely new kind of worldwide communications system, based on repeater satellites, has been developed. Governmental actions have already been taken to create the Communications Satellite Corp. to exploit this technology.

The successful launching and experimental development of the first seven Tiros weather satellites has given us the basic technology for a worldwide weather system, and infra-red measurement system, and also added vastly to the research capability of meteorologists around the world. The eighth Tiros satellite, now in orbit, carries the unique feature of an automatic picture transmission system which permits any nation over which it passes to obtain directly from the satellite the pictures of its own cloud cover.

Perhaps more than any other satellite yet launched, this Tiros VIII demonstrates the fundamental nature of this new working tool of the space age—a machine that by its very nature must continue to circle the earth continuously and has the capability of providing useful work for any country over which it passes. No such machine has ever been available to the human race.

And what of manned space flight, which I am sure is of greatest interest to the cadets who are here tonight? With all the marvelous ingenuity built into modern instruments, the exploration of space still requires man's ability to observe and size up the unknown. The earliest aeronauts to develop the use of the air were balloonists who knew so little of the characteristics of the upper atmosphere that many died by the

trial and error method. Yet they learned things they could not have visualized nor prepared instruments to report.

This is true, as well, in space exploration. All space systems, of course, are manned. The difference between what NASA calls manned and what it calls unmanned is simply the location of the man—in the spacecraft or on the ground. To have the man in the spacecraft, however, gives us the potential for space exploration which all of our advances in unmanned technology have not yet given.

The astronaut provides a potential for instantaneous judgment and reaction at every moment during flight, made possible by direct human observation and reflection. Man himself, suitably trained, is still the most flexible, the most adaptable, the most intelligent data processing machine which we know. In new and relatively unknown environments, his on-the-spot flexibility exceeds the capability of any machine he has created. The man in space makes it possible for us to obtain direct observations of phenomena on earth, in space, and on the moon, and to look in another direction when the planned observation is impossible or unprofitable.

Man in space increases our ability to explore and to conduct scientific investigations in space by giving us a new dimension: he speeds and enlarges our potential for accepting, measuring, understanding and using the unforeseen. The results of the scientific experiments carried out in Project Mercury give us reason to believe that this will be increasingly true as man moves further into space.

Manned Gemini missions scheduled to be flown in this decade are expected to open new windows to the scientific investigation of the earth on which we live, its atmosphere, and its space environment. Although scientific observations were a small part of the Mercury flights, Gemini's much longer time in orbit and the presence of two scientifically trained astronauts will provide the United States its first significant opportunity to explore man's capability for conducting scientific investigations in space.

At the present time, NASA foresees Project Gemini as a means of extending knowledge in the disciplines of aeronomy, meteorology, the biosciences, and geosciences, physics, and astronomy. The science program of Project Gemini will be particularly noteworthy in that scientific knowledge acquired during flight will be used as a basis for modifying and extending the scientific capability of the same flight. Investigations using unmanned spacecraft have required the preprogramming of electronic equipment. On Gemini, man's judgment will be used directly. Undoubtedly, some of the observations will give us information on space which no one could possibly have predicted before the flight—and only a trained observer could respond intelligently to this unforeseen information.

Those of you with the interest and talent to become the astronauts of the future may one day find yourselves as independent satellites of the earth. The Gemini spacecraft will be constructed so that the astronauts may open the hatches and conduct extra-vehicular activities on several missions. This will make it possible for the astronauts themselves in orbit outside their spacecraft—to place experimental packages on the outside of the capsule while in flight, and retrieve them before reentry.

The aeronautics and space development activities of NASA are carried out in close coordination with the Department of Defense. Just as the predecessor agency, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, contributed technology to the development of military aircraft and missiles, so is NASA supplying scientific and technological knowledge for military developments in both

aeronautics and space. Meanwhile, NASA has relied heavily on launch vehicles adapted from missiles developed by the Department of Defense, and receives strong support in its manned launches from Armed Forces personnel, and in its construction efforts, from the Army Corps of Engineers and the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks. Nearly 300 military officers have been assigned to duty with NASA, many of them in vital line responsibilities. This has the effect of providing NASA with information about the requirements of the Department of Defense, which will help guide its research efforts, and, in addition, serves to keep the agencies of the Department of Defense informed regarding the results of NASA research and development efforts.

Recent years have seen a steady strengthening of understanding, coordination, and mutual support between the DOD and NASA. Mr. McNamara and I have worked closely together and the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board, as the principal medium of DOD-NASA interactions, has been revitalized. It has expanded its active monitoring to cover nearly every segment of the national space program. Through this Board, NASA and the DOD have jointly reviewed the requests for new facilities related to the aerospace research and development effort in the two agencies.

A comprehensive joint review recently completed had the objectives of delineating the minimum space program to meet the needs of the country and examining the programs of the two agencies for possible consolidations. The recommendations stemming from that review are now being acted upon.

NASA and the Air Force have cooperated fully in the development and flight program associated with the X-15 aircraft, and through a joint planning board, in the Gemini flight program.

Since the announcement by the Secretary of Defense of the decision to embark upon a manned orbital laboratory project, NASA has moved rapidly to gear its organization to assist the Air Force in every possible way in this undertaking. The Gemini-B/MOL program was needed by the DOD to make an early determination of the utility of man in space in connection with certain potential defensive systems. The DOD will be able to move ahead rapidly with plans to make this determination within the desired time frame by virtue of the fact that the necessary basic technology and capacity to provide the hardware and to conduct such an operation have been developed by NASA and are available, just as the availability of scientific knowledge and basic space technology enabled the administration in 1961 to establish the manned lunar landing as a national goal to be achieved by the end of the present decade.

The DOD MOL program will be accomplished using many component systems and operational techniques which have been developed and proven by NASA. Necessary supporting facilities established by NASA will be made available and fully utilized. In providing this assistance, NASA will be fulfilling its proper role under the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. At the same time, NASA will take full advantage of the opportunities presented by the MOL to further its research and development effort. Thus, the DOD and NASA will join forces to realize the maximum return from this expenditure of natural resources.

Beyond Gemini will come the Saturn V booster and the Apollo three-man spacecraft, which will permit men to travel, explore, and use the space not only around the earth, but outward to the moon.

What is this modern caravel, this Saturn V space booster? The first stage is a cluster of five engines, each of which consumes 3 tons of fuel and oxygen per second to lift 6 million pounds against the earth's grav-

ity, and to speed the Apollo spacecraft, together with the upper stages of the booster, up to 6,000 miles per hour. The five engines of the first stage then drop off, and fall into the ocean this side of Africa.

The second stage—five smaller, but very powerful engines which burn liquid hydrogen, will take over and speed the spacecraft up to 15,000 miles an hour, and drop off into the Pacific between Africa and Australia. The third stage is composed of one liquid hydrogen burning engine which will inject the remaining part of the Saturn rocket and Apollo into earth orbit, and after it has coasted around the earth once, fire up again to send off to the moon an expedition weighing about the same as Columbus' *Santa Maria*, a caravel, when he sailed to America.

The spacecraft will be made up of the Apollo, with three men in it, a landing module which will detach from the Apollo when in orbit around the moon, and then drop down to the moon so the astronauts can explore it, and with the power to blast off from the surface of the moon. This specialized lunar landing vehicle will then rejoin the Apollo spacecraft and return to the earth.

So it can get back home, an essential part of the Apollo spacecraft is a heat shield heavy enough to absorb and dissipate the very high temperatures which will be generated when this spacecraft with three men inside plunges back into the earth's atmosphere at 25,000 miles per hour. This kind of heavy heat shield, a necessary capability to return to the earth from a space age voyage is, in some ways, the kind of new technical advance which enabled the oceanic age caravel to sail around the Cape of Good Hope and return to home port.

Some would say that the Saturn-Apollo combination is a result of 500 years of evolution since the caravel of Henry the Navigator. It is the largest and most complex machine ever put under construction by the human race. It has the same potentiality for opening up vast vistas in man's understanding and utilization of the great oceans of space as did the caravel, with respect to the oceans of the earth—a potentiality that when realized so excited and expanded the mind of man 500 years ago.

In this new age, the space age, the world, and particularly the talented young people of the world, are fortunate that President Johnson believes in the Saturn and Apollo as Henry the Navigator believed in the caravel.

The late President Kennedy also believed in it. He had a great capacity to marry the present with the future and to see the opportunities which must be seized by this generation. Of space exploration he had this to say:

"Those who came before us made certain that this country rode the first waves of the industrial revolution, the first waves of modern invention, and the first wave of nuclear power, and this generation does not intend to founder in the backwash of the coming age of space.

"We mean to be a part of it. We mean to lead it, for the eyes of the world now look into space, to the moon and to the planets beyond, and we have vowed that we shall not see it governed by a hostile flag of conquest, but by a banner of freedom and peace."

Later, during the trip on which he met his death, President Kennedy told an audience at Brooks Air Force Base the story written by Frank O'Connor, an Irish writer, about his youth.

"As a boy," President Kennedy related, "O'Connor and his friends would make their way across the countryside, and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed too high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took

off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow.

"This Nation has tossed its cap over the wall of space, and we have no choice but to follow it \* \* \* with the help of all those who labor in the space endeavor, with the help and support of all Americans, we will climb this wall with safety and speed, and we shall then explore the wonders on the other side."

#### EDITORIALS SUPPORT SELDEN POSITION

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 26, 1964, I spoke on the floor of the House of Representatives in opposition to proposals that we should negotiate with communism in the hemisphere.

The following editorials which appeared in three of Alabama's leading newspapers indicate the reaction to my statement by the press of Alabama.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Apr. 1, 1964]

#### SELDEN AGAINST FULBRIGHT

The Old Myths and New Realities, speech of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, no matter how visionary it may seem, has to be taken seriously.

FULBRIGHT, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is one of the most potent figures in the U.S. Government. He might be a future Secretary of State. And finally, until there is a disavowal there will be a question whether FULBRIGHT's speech was a trial balloon for the Johnson administration.

It has been our durable impression that FULBRIGHT is more a scholar than a thinker. He nevertheless deserve to have his argument for a more amiable attitude toward Castro and some Communist countries dealt with. And this Congressman ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Greensboro, who is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, has done forcefully with particular respect to Cuba and the Panama Canal.

"Is the threat," asked Congressman SELDEN in a recent House speech, "of Castro Cuba to our national security and to the hemisphere indeed a myth? The missile crisis of October 1962 is history, not mythology—a mere distasteful nuisance."

If America had not been willing to march in and extract the missiles, they would be there today ready for a launch. The decision to retract the missiles were made, not by Castro, but the Russians. SELDEN hits it thus:

"What is meant when we are told to accept the 'reality' of the Castro regime? Shorn of its linguistic refinement, this means simply that we should begin negotiating with communism in this hemisphere. A tortured line of reasoning seems to hold that because we are a great nation we ought to be able to tolerate a small menace. But the menace is not Castro—it is Moscow."

"If we come to accept the 'reality' of Soviet influence in Cuba, we inevitably will end by accepting it throughout the Americas."

It seems to us that SELDEN is unassailable in this generality:

"I submit that a great nation committed to stand firm against communism in Berlin,

in Vietnam, and in other distant areas, should have a policy in its own hemisphere consistent with these worldwide goals.

"We have told the Communists that we intend to risk war if necessary in defense of free world interests at the Brandenburg Gate and in the Mekong Delta. Surely if we mean to hold a line against communism abroad, we must pursue a similar policy of firmness and action in our own neighborhood."

As for Panama, SELDEN asks what others have asked—why should a small nation not be expected to honor its commitments just as much as a large one? And finally SELDEN asked the House why, in Panama, America would allow a mob to do what it would not permit an army to do.

Castro is the reality of the moment, but that does not mean he must be accepted and thus upheld. If he is strong enough to endure as a reality, he must be accounted all the more a danger.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Press, Apr. 1, 1964]

#### SOME OTHERS NOW DISAGREEING WITH SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S SPEECH

Thank heavens some strong voices are being raised today against the formula for retreat presented recently by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Among these voices are the weekly news magazine, U.S. News & World Report, and Alabama's Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

As will be recalled, Senator FULBRIGHT clearly called upon the United States to change hemisphere policies toward Communist Cuba and Panama. It was a shocking speech, one that makes no sense whatever to loyal, patriotic Americans.

Said SELDEN in a speech in the House:

"A tortured line of reasoning seems to hold that because we are a great nation we ought to be able to tolerate a small menace, but the menace is not Castro—it is Moscow. If we come to accept 'the reality' of Soviet influence in Cuba, we inevitably will end by accepting it throughout the Americas."

"We cannot do business with Castro, and it is truly a myth to believe otherwise. We have told the Communists that we intend to risk war if necessary in defense of free world interests at Brandenburg Gate and in the Mekong Delta. Surely, if we mean to hold a line against communism abroad, we must pursue a similar policy of firmness and action in our own neighborhood."

On the Panamanian issue, Representative SELDEN told the House he disagreed again with the Fulbright suggestion to renegotiate the canal treaty.

"The record of the United States in Panama has been wrongly blackened by those who would sow the seeds of hatred and contempt for our country in Latin America. Yet, this historic record, rather than a stain, is in truth, a credit to our national history."

Mr. SELDEN made a highly important point, we think, when he said:

"The American people have been ahead of their leaders in correctly assessing the dangers of Castro communism to the hemisphere. As a matter of fact, it might be said, to paraphrase Clemenceau, that the security of our hemisphere might be too important a matter to be left in the hands of our foreign relations experts. A good case can be made for trusting the sound instincts of an American public that was right rather than the sonorous erudition of foreign relations authorities who have been so often wrong."

U.S. News & World Report strongly attacked the "peace at any price" philosophy expressed recently in speeches by President Johnson and Senator FULBRIGHT. Then it added: "Spokesmen of American policy must be careful of what they say lest potential adversaries misinterpret our eagerness



for peace and force the test which could bring on a war that nobody wants."

If the people are ahead of their leaders in their assessment of hemispheric dangers—and we believe they are—they can make their influence felt in the upcoming elections. This is their only chance to get national leaders back on the right track.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Apr. 2, 1964]

REPRESENTATIVE SELDEN ON SENATOR  
FULBRIGHT

Another Alabama voice has been heard in the developing foreign policy debate stimulated by the speech last week of Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, one of the most respected congressional authorities on Latin American affairs, took to the floor of the House to take vigorous issue with FULBRIGHT's views on Cuba and Panama.

He criticized dismissal of Castro as a nuisance, and advocated as firm a U.S. position in our own hemisphere as in Berlin or South Vietnam. He also hit critics of our position in Panama, repeating again the emphasis of an earlier widely noted speech dealing with that crisis—that we are in the Canal Zone by legal and moral right and that Panama has an obligation to respect international agreement. There can be no question but that an overwhelming majority of Americans stand solidly behind Representative SELDEN in both issues.

It is also a fact that the administration, which recognizes the realities of public opinion as well as of policy, itself took specific exception to the FULBRIGHT arguments on Cuba and Panama.

But the speech of Representative SELDEN is provocative beyond those two points. The Greensboro native, one of Congress' best examples of thoughtful conservatism, goes on to treat with the overall wisdom of the sort of public debate on foreign policy we currently find ourselves in the midst of.

SELDEN recognizes importance of debate. But he said that "responsible foreign policy spokesmen publicly identified with the administration have a special duty to consider the impact which both the content and the timing of their remarks might have on our foreign relations." He took a clear poke at FULBRIGHT when he added that "nebulous discourse about foreign policy myths and realities . . . offers no useful guideposts for this country's continuing search for answers to problems." Specifically in Latin America.

His point is sound when he speaks of an inherent obligation on the part of recognized spokesmen for an administration to weigh their remarks much more carefully than Joe Doaks need do. Despite FULBRIGHT's insistence that he was speaking only for himself, despite White House assurance that his speech was not a "trial balloon" for the administration, an impression was conveyed—and still lingers in many minds—that that is exactly what it was.

But however "nebulous" FULBRIGHT's comments on issues—and they were nebulous indeed in some instances—whether or not "useful guideposts" come from the speech itself, Representative SELDEN would probably agree that out of consequent debate some guideposts may emerge. If they do, we would not be surprised if Representative SELDEN and Senator FULBRIGHT, keenly intelligent men, both helped bring them into focus.

BILL TO BRING ALFRED I. DU PONT  
ESTATE UNDER BANK HOLDING  
COMPANY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentle-

man from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill—H.R. 10668—to amend the Bank Holding Company Act so as to bring the Alfred I. du Pont estate of Jacksonville, Fla., under that act and see that it stays there.

I consider this an important measure, Mr. Speaker. It deserves the support of the Congress. This Du Pont estate is one of the most extreme combinations of banking and nonbanking economic power that I have ever come upon.

For some time now, Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee, under my chairmanship, has been looking into the Du Pont estate and its affiliate, the Nemours Foundation, in connection with the subcommittee's study of over 500 tax exempt foundations and charitable trusts and their impact on our economy. The gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JOE EVANS, is chairman of the House Small Business Committee. An analysis of the Du Pont estate and the Nemours Foundation was submitted by me to the subcommittee on March 20, 1964.

My report to the House Small Business Subcommittee lays bare the anatomy of this self-perpetuating Alfred I. du Pont empire in more detail than ever before known. It is an extraordinary empire, Mr. Speaker, composed of banks, industries, railroads, land, and stockholdings.

I am concerned with the banking aspects of this Du Pont estate situation. We have here a combine that functions as a major banking holding company—yet it was not brought under the Bank Holding Company Act.

In the Bank Holding Company Act we told the other bank holding companies: You must choose; you cannot own both banks and nonbanking enterprises; we are afraid of abuses; you must divest yourselves of one or the other sources of power. But we exempted the Du Pont estate. We left them out of the act. We did not split up their great power, with its potentials for abuse.

My bill would put this Du Pont group under the Bank Holding Company Act. It would end their special treatment. We would treat them like the others. That is what my amendment aims to do.

Mr. Speaker, the banking holding company bill was brought to the floor in 1955 by our beloved colleague, Mr. Spence, then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. It was a fine bill. The law that resulted in 1956 is a fine and important law. I myself had the honor to urge its passage in the floor debate. The House approved the bill by 371 to 24.

This law aims to prevent abuses of power by bank holding companies. It provides, first, that bank holding companies must divest themselves of control over all nonbanking enterprises; second, that bank holding companies must register with the Federal Reserve Board; and third, that they may not acquire more banks without the Board's approval, based on certain standards set down in the act.

The reasons for making bank holding companies get out of nonbanking busi-

ness were well explained in our committee's report at the time, and by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Spence, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and others during the floor debate. As the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, said, out of his long practical experience:

I think it has been pretty generally recognized that there are potentials of evil in any situation that permits banks to engage in business other than banking business.

In fact, both National and State banks have long been prohibited from investing in the stock of any corporation, with some few exceptions.

Mr. Speaker, Congress wrote some exemptions into the Bank Holding Company Act. We exempted the Du Pont estate. Yet the very core of the power exerted by the Du Pont estate lies in the 31 banks it controls.

This is the Florida National group of banks, Mr. Speaker. It is a great combine of 31 banks, the biggest in Florida, with assets exceeding \$700 million. Some years ago, this group advertised itself as "the largest banking organization south of Philadelphia and east of the Mississippi."

There you have a very large bank holding company, Mr. Speaker, but we exempted them from the act. Unlike the other bank holding companies, we let these people keep all their outside enterprises. Let us take a look at those outside enterprises.

Apart from its banks, the Du Pont estate also owns 75 percent of the stock of St. Joe Paper Co., a major manufacturer of kraft pulp and paper. St. Joe Paper Co., in turn, owns a large paper mill in western Florida. It owns substantial box plants at Port St. Joe, Fla.; South Hackensack, N.J.; Houston, Tex.; Rochester, N.Y.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Hartford City, Ind.; Birmingham, Ala.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Baltimore, Md.; Memphis, Tenn.; Portsmouth, Va., and Chicago, Ill. It owns half interest in a factory at Chicopee, Mass., and operates a plant at Dallas, Tex., as a joint venture with Hunt Oil Co. It operates a paper mill and box plant in Ireland. There in itself you have a large industrial empire.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. St. Joe Paper Co. also owns over a million acres of land in northwest Florida and southwest Georgia. In distance, its Florida lands run 170 miles from east to west and 40 miles from north to south. Consider the power represented by that great empire of land alone.

But that is not yet all, Mr. Speaker. St. Joe Paper Co. also owns a small railroad, the Appalachian Northern. It owns a small telephone company, the St. Joseph Telephone & Telegraph Co. It owns a majority of the bonds and stock of a major railroad, the Florida East Coast.

But this is still not all, Mr. Speaker. The Du Pont estate also owned 764,280 shares of stock in the well-known Du Pont Co., of Delaware, worth over \$198 million on March 31, 1964. It owned 444,618 shares of stock in General Motors, worth over \$35 million on March 31, 1964.

An article by the business editor of the Miami Herald, Mr. James Russell, published on the front page of that paper on February 23, 1964, gives further information. It begins as follows:

You can hardly drive 50 miles in Florida—in any direction—without encountering some facet of the Du Pont estate.

The estate embraces a complex of banks, real estate, railroads, timber, and paper production facilities with a value of well over a billion dollars.

Over a billion dollars, Mr. Speaker.

The Miami Herald's article continues:

The Du Pont estate's significance in Florida cannot be accurately measured in dollars. As any State official can tell you, it is Florida's most powerful economic-political force influential enough to achieve or block all sorts of State public works projects.

I turn now to the policies followed by the Du Pont estate banking group, the 31-bank Florida National group. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic features of our American economic system has been the sturdy and helpful presence of thousands of homeowned independent banks. Such banks are vital to a competitive and progressive economy.

A major aim of the Bank Holding Company Act was to foster and protect this system of independent unit banks. I quote from the report of our committee on the bank holding company bill:

Bank holding companies [are] not as conducive to economic development as independent unit banks. Independent unit banks, by their willingness to bear substantial local risks, have accelerated the economic development of the United States. Most of our leading companies, it should be recalled, were once small, and got started because local banks had confidence in the ability of the founders. Ideas and ability are to be found everywhere. And who is so likely to recognize these as the local banker who has the power to act on his intimate knowledge, and who will benefit his bank and his community by developing a substantial customer and employer?

That is what our committee concluded, and I subscribe to it absolutely. How does this relate to the Du Pont banks? As of December 20, 1963, the Florida National group's combined statement showed loans and discounts outstanding equal to only 38 percent of deposits. In contrast, on approximately the same date, all commercial banks showed loans and discounts outstanding equal to 56 percent of deposits.

The effect of highly restrictive centralized control over these Du Pont banks seems clearly apparent here. Evidently, these 31 Du Pont banks would much rather say "No" than "Yes" to a borrower. And this is the largest banking system in the State of Florida.

Consider the position, Mr. Speaker, of a farmer who owns some woodlands and who has been selling standing timber to the Du Pont-controlled St. Joe Paper Co. He decides he will do better to hire a crew, cut his timber himself, and haul it to another papermill. Would a Du Pont bank lend him money to finance that operation?

Consider the position of a small trucker who wants to expand his fleet to

haul fruits or vegetables in competition with the Du Pont-controlled Florida East Coast Railway. Would a Du Pont bank lend him money to finance that?

Consider the position of a builder who wants to put up a new building in competition with some of the city property owned by the Du Pont empire. Would a Du Pont bank finance his payroll for that job?

These are some of the dangers, Mr. Speaker, of concentrated control over both banking and nonbanking enterprises. These clear dangers, as well as the other potentials for abuse of power, explain why I recommend bringing this Du Pont estate empire under the Bank Holding Company Act.

Why did we not bring this Du Pont group under the act to begin with? I have asked myself that question, Mr. Speaker. Looking back, I believe there was some little confusion at the time about the status of the Du Pont estate. I believe there was some feeling it was primarily a charitable organization.

My recent report to the House Small Business Subcommittee clears up that confusion. The Du Pont estate is a perpetual testamentary trust created under the will of the late Alfred I. du Pont. Most of the money from the Du Pont estate has gone each year to the late Mr. du Pont's widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont. During the 12 years 1951 through 1962, the estate paid to Mrs. du Pont income totaling \$58,870,947.84. In the year 1963, she received \$7,584,862.57.

These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. Only after the death of Mrs. du Pont and the death or settlement of other annuitants, will all of the Du Pont estate's earnings go to the Nemours Foundation, a tax exempt charitable foundation. The assets, however, will continue to remain in the Du Pont estate. The directors of the Nemours Foundation are also the trustees of the Du Pont estate.

From the standpoint of the Bank Holding Company Act, however, the important question is not who gets the money but who holds the power. The power here will remain in the same hands, Mr. Speaker. It will continue indefinitely in precisely the same hands.

There may have been another little confusion, back in 1955, as to whether the Du Pont group of banks is a chain banking setup. Our committee did not intend to cover chain banks under the Bank Holding Company Act.

Our committee report pointed out that chain banking exists where "one individual owns or controls a number of independent unit banks." In this kind of situation, the short span of one human life and the limitations of personal ownership tend to protect the public interest against any great abuses of power.

Instead, the Bank Holding Company Act was directed toward group banking. Group banking, as defined in our 1955 committee report, is "the ownership and control of a group of individual banks by a corporate holding company or control of bank shares by a trustee or a group of trustees or control through a

majority ownership of bank shares for investment purposes."

The Du Pont estate, with its 31 banks, engages in group banking, not chain banking. The Du Pont estate trust has perpetual life. Its trustees are self-renewing. When one dies or resigns, the others appoint a successor. It is not limited in any sense by the terms of one human life.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the reasons may have been, the Du Pont estate with its 31 banks was not brought under the Bank Holding Company Act. And since then, this matter has drawn very little attention. The full facts have been lacking. That points up a continuing problem for Members of the House. Members simply do not have adequate staffs to keep posted on all the issues that concern us. I shall not dwell on that subject now, but I repeat, it is an important and continuing problem.

Many of us are forced to rely on information from the various agencies and boards. In the present matter, involving the Du Pont estate, one would certainly expect the Federal Reserve Board to have taken note of the situation there during the past few years.

The Federal Reserve Board administers the Bank Holding Company Act. We specifically instructed the Board to report to us each year on how that act is working and on any desirable changes in it. The Board has sent us up a report each year, with recommendations. But not a word about this Du Pont estate and its possible abuses of power. Not a word, Mr. Speaker. Not a word, in any of the Federal Reserve Board's reports.

Mr. Speaker, my bill to bring and keep the Du Pont estate under the Bank Holding Company Act has three main provisions. The first would bring under the act any testamentary trust controlling bank assets of \$100 million or more. The second would bring under the act any organization controlling bank assets of \$100 million or more and whose money all goes for charitable or educational purposes. The third would instruct the Federal banking authorities, when deciding whether to approve other merger, to weigh, among other things, whether such merger might be inconsistent with the aims of the Bank Holding Company Act by removing any company from the purview of that act.

To the best of my present knowledge, this bill would not substantially change the status of any organization other than the Du Pont estate.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this an important bill. After hearing the facts I have now set before the House, I hope many other Members will agree. We are dealing here with an immense empire of finance, industry, real estate, railroads, and stockholdings—centered in Florida, but spreading out also into many other States.

The remedy I propose, Mr. Secretary, is the classic and obvious one for dealing with great concentrations of power that lend themselves to abuse. We should divide up the power. The answer is as simple as that. That is what our forefathers wrote into the Constitution of the



United States in providing us with the best government on earth. They divided up the political power.

That is what the Congress has done time after time since 1890 in dealing with great concentrations of economic power. We sought to split them up. That was the aim of the Bank Holding Company Act. Bank holding companies could no longer control outside industries. Their power must be divided. The interests of the owners were fully protected. The act very carefully protects the owners against any monetary loss. But the power must be split up.

By placing the Du Pont estate under the Bank Holding Company Act we shall simply divide up their vast concentration of power. The estate's beneficiaries need not suffer in the least. Funds now used to control various enterprises can simply be reinvested on a broad scale. The income need not be cut at all. Only the power will be cut.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the case is very strong for my bill. I hope our committee can hold early hearings on this bill. I hope we can hear the full views of the Du Pont estate people, and of any others who can make a contribution. We on the Banking and Currency Committee will, I am sure, give this matter the fairest kind of consideration.

I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act.

I am inserting herewith the text of my bill and a short analysis of its contents.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10668 is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 2(b) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) 'Company' means any corporation, business trust, testamentary trust which at the end of the most recent calendar year controls bank assets of \$100,000,000 or more, association, or similar organization, but shall not include (1) any corporation the majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or by any State, or (2) any corporation or community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, or (3) any corporation or community chest, fund, or foundation which at the end of the most recent calendar year does not control bank assets of \$100,000,000 or more and which is organized and operated exclusively for charitable or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, or (4) any partnership."

(b) The sixth sentence of section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1828(c)), is amended by inserting after "(including any tendency toward monopoly)" the following: "and its possible inconsistency with the purposes and objectives of the Bank Holding Company Act

of 1956 should the transaction result in the removal of any company from the purview of that Act."

#### ANALYSIS OF BILL TO AMEND BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT AND FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT

The Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841) is aimed at preventing abuses of economic power by financial-industrial combinations. It provides (1) That all bank holding companies must register with the Federal Reserve Board, (2) That bank holding companies must within two years divest themselves of control over nonbanking enterprises and (3) That a bank holding company may not acquire control over additional banks without the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, based on certain standards laid down in the Act.

Under "definitions," the act provides:

"Sec. 2. (a) 'Bank holding company' means any company (1) which directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, 25 per centum or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks. \* \* \*

"(b) 'Company' means any corporation, business trust, association, or similar organization, but shall not include (1) any corporation the majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or by any State, or (2) any corporation or community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, or (3) any partnership."

My amendment to the Bank Holding Company Act would, first, insert after the words "business trust" in the first line of section 2(b) the phrase "testamentary trust which at the end of the most recent calendar year controls banking assets of \$100 million or more"; and, second, delete the words "charitable, or educational" from subsection (2), delete the present subsection (3), and create new subsections (3) and (4) as follows: "or (3) any corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation which at the end of the most recent calendar year does not control banking assets of \$100 million or more and which is organized and operated exclusively for charitable or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, or (4) any partnership."

The first of these changes would bring the Alfred I. du Pont estate of Jacksonville, Fla., within the scope of the act, as the Du Pont estate is now organized. To the best of my present knowledge, no other testamentary trust currently controls banking assets of \$100 million or more and also controls two or more banks. On this point, in discussing the Du Pont estate's exemption during Senate hearings on the bank holding company bill (July 1955, pp. 72-74 of the printed hearings), Federal Reserve Board Governor J. L. Robertson said the Du Pont estate was the only such large situation of which he knew. He added that there are probably many smaller cases "where the father owns the bank and has other investments and he wants to preserve that for his family or his son and he puts that in an estate." My amendment would not affect situations of that type.

My amendment's second change in the "definitions" section of the act would keep

the Du Pont estate under the Bank Holding Company Act when, in the future, its income is devoted wholly to charitable purposes. At present the Du Pont estate's income goes chiefly to annuitants, especially to the late Mr. du Pont's 80-year-old widow, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont. After Mrs. du Pont's death, and on the death or settlement of the other annuitants, all the Du Pont estate's income will flow to the Nemours Foundation, a charitable foundation controlled by the Du Pont estate's trustees. However, control over the Du Pont estate's various important enterprises will remain in the hands of the estate's trustees. (See a report by me, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1, House Select Committee on Small Business, dated March 20, 1964.)

It is believed that at present few if any charitable or educational trusts or foundations control banking assets of \$100 million or more and also control two or more banks. My amendment would preserve unaltered the present complete exclusion of religious organizations from the Bank Holding Company Act.

Lastly, my bill would amend that part of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) which is usually referred to as the Bank Merger Act of 1960. This amendment is proposed for the following reason: Currently, where the banking laws permit, a bank holding company can combine all the separate banks in its system into one large bank, turning the previously separate banks into branches of the dominant bank. This would enable such a holding company to escape from the provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act, since that act covers only holding companies that control two or more banks.

My amendment to the Bank Merger Act would in no way affect the right of any State to decide whether to allow or prohibit branch banking. (The State of Florida at present prohibits branch banking, but recent news reports indicate this prohibition may be lifted in 1965.) My amendment would merely insure that the Federal banking authorities give due weight, among the factors to be considered in deciding on bank merger proposals, to whether such a merger might be inconsistent with the aims of the Bank Holding Company Act by removing a bank holding company from coverage under that act.

In the existing law, the fifth sentence of subsection (c) of section 2(18) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act sets forth a number of factors that the appropriate Federal banking agency shall consider in deciding whether to approve or disapprove a proposed bank merger. The sixth sentence of the same subsection reads as follows:

"In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly), and shall not approve the transaction unless, after considering all of such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest."

My amendment would insert in the above sentence, after "(including any tendency toward monopoly)" the following: "and its possible inconsistency with the purposes and objectives of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended, should the transaction result in removal of any company from the purview of that Act."

#### THE WHEAT BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKHALTER). Under previous order of

the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables and extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time because sometime this week we will be considering a wheat-cotton bill under a most unusual procedure. Four hundred and thirty-five Members of this body will have exactly 1 hour to discuss the so-called wheat-cotton legislation, and without an opportunity to offer amendments. We must accept or reject the bill as it comes to us from the other body, but to me it deserves considerable more discussion.

I might point out I have another hour tomorrow afternoon to discuss the bill in more detail. It became apparent after the referendum last May that the administration had very little interest in the wheat farmer of America. In fact, nothing was done for many, many weeks and many, many months. I would point out, too, that on May 23, 1963, 20 Members on the Republican side introduced wheat legislation; in fact, wheat and feed grain legislation, under a voluntary program combining both wheat and feed grains in an effort to help the farmers of America, and to permit a truly voluntary program. It had some very fine provisions, we felt, but I might point out that there was very little interest in this legislation as far as the administration is concerned.

Hearings were held on these and other bills in the month of July, but amounted to very little. We made statements but could not generate administration interest in our bills.

A summary of that legislation is as follows:

**SUMMARY OF QUOTE-SHORT-MAY-DOLE BILL, THE  
FEED GRAIN AND WHEAT ACT OF 1963**

**I**

The bill applies to wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, and at the discretion of the Secretary, oats and rye:

Its main features are:

If the Secretary should find that there will be a supply of these designated grains in excess of a "normal supply," he would put into effect a special agricultural conservation program based on these four principles:

First. It would be voluntary. Price support and diversion payments would be available only to participants in the program.

Second. It would require land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. A minimum 20 percent would be required with an optional, and additional 30-percent reduction allowed.

Third. It would use only payment in kind for making diversion payments. The Secretary could, however, advance the producer cash in anticipation of the sale of grain, but there would be no direct

payments as provided under the 1963 feed grain program.

Fourth. It would be based on a market economy. The CCC release price for surplus grain in inventory could not be less than 105 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. When the supply of grain is back to a "normal supply" this release price would be 115 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges and CCC would be required to make equivalent market purchases for grain which has been sold as being "out of condition." The release price for grain used to redeem payment-in-kind certificates would be at the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges. Other major provisions include:

First, time: Applicable to 1964 and subsequent crops.

Second, support price: 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Third, base period: 1959-60-61.

Fourth, diversion rates: Up to 50 percent of normal production times county support rate of first 20-percent reduction; also up to 50 percent on next 30-percent reduction.

Fifth, longer term retirement: Up to 50 percent diversion payment for acreage diverted for periods of from 3 to 5 years.

Sixth, advance payments: Up to 50 percent at signup time.

Seventh, diverted acres: Control weeds and pests. Allow oilseed crops at up to one-half regular diversion rates.

Eighth, small farms: Allow retirement of entire farm base if less than 40 acres.

*Example of bill on a wheat-milo farm*

Assume:

50 acres wheat,  
25 bushel yield,  
1 \$1.62 price support (per bushel),  
50 acres milo,  
40 bushel yield,  
\$1.10 price support (per bushel).

Total base:

100 acres total base  
20 percent diversion required

20 acres (acreage required to be diverted)

80 acres (can be devoted to either wheat or feed grains as farmer chooses—assume 40 acres of wheat and 40 acres of milo are produced)

Calculation:

40 acres wheat  
×25 bushel yield  
200  
80

1000  
×\$1.62

2000  
6000  
1000

\$1620.00

10 acres wheat  
×25 bushel yield

250 bushels  
×0.50 percent payment in kind rate  
125 bushels  
×\$1.62

250  
750  
125

\$202.50  
\$202.50 wheat  
220.00 milo

\$422.50 diversion payment

1 Minimum support price under the bill.

**II**

After the present surplus of wheat and feed grains had been reduced to a "normal supply," price supports on wheat and feed grains would be set on the designated grains at 90 percent of the previous 3-year market average. If another surplus should develop, the special agricultural conservation program would go back into effect until the surplus was again reduced. All acreage allotments and marketing quotas on the designated grains would be repealed. There would be no referendum since this would be a voluntary program.

**III**

The Secretary of Agriculture would be given the necessary authority for the next 5 years to extend expiring contracts on farms now included in the conservation reserve program. Under the bill, these contracts could be renewed on a bid basis for an additional 10 years. In 1964 some 7.4 million acres of conservation reserve land are scheduled to come back into production due to the expiration of contracts in 1963.

**IV**

The Secretary of Agriculture would be given specific authority to take action before the U.S. Tariff Commission for the relief of any surplus U.S. farm commodity suffering from excessive imports from foreign nations. Present law limits his authority to action on commodities under price support. This provision would give the Secretary a valuable legal tool to help U.S. livestock farmers.

40 acres milo  
×40 bushel yield

1600  
×\$1.10

1600  
1600

\$1760.00

\$1620 wheat

1760 milo

\$3380 gross

Diversion—20 acres

10 acres milo  
×40 bushel yield

400 bushels  
×0.50 percent payment in kind rate  
200 bushels  
×\$1.10

\$220.00

Totals: \$3380.00 gross  
422.50 diversion

\$3802.50 gross benefits



*Example of bill on a wheat farm—Gross benefits*

<b>Assume:</b>	
100 acres wheat,	
25 bushel yield,	
\$1.62 price support (per bushel),	
<b>Calculation:</b>	
100 acres total base	
×0.20 percent diversion required	
20 acres (acreage required to be diverted),	
80 acres	20 acres
×25 bushels per acre	×25 bushels per acre
400	100
160	40
2000 bushels	500 bushels
×\$1.62	×0.50 percent payment in kind rate
4000	250
12000	×\$1.62
2000	500
\$3240.00 gross	1500
405.00 payment in kind	250
\$3645.00 gross benefits	\$405.00 payment in kind

1 Minimum support price under the bill.

Last summer, however, administration leaders both in and out of Congress said there would be no new wheat legislation. The Democratic National Committee, in fact, expressed the "party line" in the following statement from the Washington World of June 24, 1963:

DEMOCRATS: "LET ALL THE PEOPLE PROSPER"

The farmers have made their choice on the wheat referendum, and we have no desire to resurrect that issue.

We will, like the democratic society we are, abide by the decision of the farmers. But another issue must be brought up: what kind of program will the farmers have now? (Written for the Washington World by the Democratic National Committee.)

In spite of this opposition we continued to work for sound and sensible new wheat legislation. We felt then, and we feel now, that the referendum choice given wheat farmers in last May's referendum was an impossible one.

All through last summer and fall the administration continued to oppose any new legislation whatsoever. Then early this year a renewed effort was made to reimpose upon wheat farmers what is essentially the program which they rejected in the referendum.

The administration and the advocates of the certificate approach refused to consider any other type of wheat legislation, including that which was similar to the feed grain program endorsed by the administration.

As hearings progressed, neither the committee nor the administration gave any serious consideration to a bipartisan effort to enact a new wheat bill. The issue came to a showdown in the Wheat Subcommittee where the majority members insisted on the certificate plan or nothing.

On January 27, 1964, the Wheat Subcommittee approved a wheat certificate plan by a party-line vote of 8 to 5.

A great deal of confusion existed following incomplete reports that the subcommittee approved a wheat certificate plan for 1964 and 1965. Reports were one thing and facts quite another. When the subcommittee acted there was not a bill, but only a mimeographed suggested bill available. The action in the subcommittee came on a motion that the Wheat Subcommittee chairman introduce a bill and after its introduction

report it to the full Committee on Agriculture "without recommendation," hardly a ringing endorsement. Following the subcommittee's informal and unusual action, a bill was introduced by the subcommittee chairman on January 28.

That bill, H.R. 9780, then languished in the full committee while the Senate was adding similar language to a House-passed cotton bill H.R. 6196.

Following that, in fact as late as last August 22, 1963, and perhaps later, our Secretary of Agriculture said that legislation was merely a matter of academic discussion, because no new legislation was being considered by the administration at that time. This has been the attitude of many administration leaders. Nonetheless we are faced this week with a very important determination as to whether or not we shall support the voluntary certificate plan as it relates to wheat.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is on the Wheat Subcommittee, of course. I am sure he is in agreement with me that there were over 400 pages of testimony in the hearings on the Wheat Subcommittee. We took time to go into the bill to which he has referred and others. I should just like to clear the record. I am sure the gentleman is not implying that there was not adequate time given for all hearings on this matter. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. DOLE. I think we had adequate time. If I may address myself to the subcommittee chairman, the point that while we were in fact reaching a fair agreement on many, many of the basic issues, we were finally advised the administration would accept nothing but a so-called voluntary certificate plan, and this is where we had a disagreement. Prior to that time, late January, we had had some very fine discussions in our subcommittee. I do not quarrel actually with that, however, the point I make is that we never had any administration support for anything except for the so-called voluntary certificate plan.

Mr. PURCELL. Will the gentleman yield further in order that I might seek agreement on one other point?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. In regard to the procedures about which this piece of legislation is being brought to the floor of the House, I would like to join with the gentleman in saying that for one I also regret the method by which we are called upon to approve or disapprove this particular piece of legislation. However, under the parliamentary rules and procedures of the House, I know of no other method by which this matter can be brought forth.

I certainly do not intend now or at any other time in the future to blame one party or one committee or any other group. But I would like to clear up the fact that it is not the fault of the gentleman from Kansas or the fault of the wheat subcommittee as far as I know. It is the fault of no one. However, it represents a set of circumstances which have developed under which we seem to be able to do nothing but either take this bill under these circumstances or have no opportunity to enact wheat legislation this year.

Is the gentleman from Kansas in agreement with that statement?

Mr. DOLE. I agree that unfortunately we do not have a chance to amend this bill, or even offer amendments. I am not stating my proposed amendments or amendments offered by anyone else would be adopted. But at least we should have that right as Members of the House of Representatives.

This is a point I have been making in many meetings during the Easter recess, and I think very properly so.

I am certain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] shares this view, that House Members should have the opportunity to offer amendments. The bill could be improved in a good many ways, but it seems we are asked to adopt or reject the version of the other body and rubberstamp their action. I do not feel this is the proper legislative procedure to follow. However, this is the way it is put up to us, and the choice has to be made.

Mr. PURCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman know of any other procedure that could be used at this point in the legislative history of this bill? Under some other circumstances would there be any way we could bring this bill to the floor of the House for action and have an opportunity to amend it?

Mr. DOLE. Well, of course, that would depend to a great extent upon what the Committee on Rules may have done. I think we were in agreement that perhaps a rule which would have permitted amendments would have been very acceptable from our standpoint. This was not granted, however, therefore we cannot do anything about it from the standpoint of offering amendments. We must take it or leave it. However, if it is rejected, something else might be done, but I am not guessing what the vote might be on the matter at this point or what the administration would suggest if it is rejected.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. Is not the parliamentary situation caused by the present action of the other body and not by any situation in which we find ourselves? Under normal circumstances we could go to conference on the disagreement between the House and the other body on the House bill. But if that were the situation, any amendments which were adopted would have to go to conference and it is possible that the other body would not yield to bringing the bill up while it is considering the civil rights bill.

Therefore, are we not being asked then basically to accept something that might not be in our best interest or at least it is the feeling of the Members of the House, and best interest of the farmers of the country, if we proceed without the right to offer amendments?

Is not that basically the situation in which we find ourselves, I will ask the gentleman in the well, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL].

Mr. DOLE. I might say to the gentleman from Montana first that I appreciate his entering into this discussion. This is an unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves. I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas shares this view or not. But he may care to comment on it.

Mr. PURCELL. Yes. I certainly wish very sincerely that there were a method by which the House could have brought forth wheat legislation to be considered on its own merits, for that matter, without any other type legislation being connected with it. But it does seem to me that the other body seems to be in the position of realizing that they would have no other opportunity to get wheat legislation passed at this session of Congress.

Under the circumstances I am sorry it is this way. But I know of no other method we could use. I think we should keep in perspective this problem under the existing circumstances. It is my opinion that the House has no one to blame over here with reference to the matter. We could argue about whether to blame someone in the other body, but under the circumstances this is the only method, as I understand the parliamentary procedures, that can be used in this matter.

Mr. BATTIN. If the gentleman from Kansas will yield further, the gentleman would agree would he not, that the usual procedure would be to go to conference?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, I agree with that.

Mr. DOLE. At any rate, as pointed out, we are in an unfortunate procedural position as far as the Members of the House are concerned. It is regrettable we must take it or leave it as it clearly does a disservice to the American wheat farmer.

There is a lot of confusion existing. There have been all sorts of reports as to how much the American wheat producers will lose if this bill is not enacted. This has been done by taking the highest possible price under the pending legislation that is the added value of cer-

tificates and diversion payment, and the lowest possible price to the farmer if additional legislation is not passed. If you do this you get a figure of about 50 cents a bushel, but the farmer should also be told just what would happen if this plan is rejected. The American wheat farmer does not appreciate threats or intimidation by anyone, and I trust it is not the intent of this administration to punish the wheat farmer if the bill fails. I am certain Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman could drive the price down to \$1.25 or less if he wanted but I trust this is not the intent of this administration, and I doubt it is, this being 1964. We have an obligation to be completely honest with the farmer as far as the facts are concerned. The cards should be laid on the table, and he should make the choice on this basis rather than if the bill is defeated. It is going to cost "X County" a certain amount of money, and if you want to take the lowest price and the highest price, if the bill does pass you can get to 50 cents a bushel. If this bill is rejected I do not know what the administration would do. Last year there was talk by leaders in the administration that the farmers had made their bed, and now should lie in it, but now the administration asks us to approve a wheat bill similar to the one farmers rejected on May 21, 1963.

Let me recall this to the Members: We passed a cotton bill in the House late last year. It went over to the other body and they tacked on the wheat bill. The wheat bill is before us now without the opportunity to amend, and without the opportunity to discuss the measure.

What does the bill actually do? I have had meetings in my district, as has the chairman of our subcommittee, as well as other Members, in an effort to determine whether or not the farmers completely understand the bill. Following our discussions many farmers expressed themselves for or against the bill.

First of all, it is called a voluntary program. If it is a voluntary program, and those opposed to the certificate plan have no right to protest, if it is a truly voluntary plan, participation is not required. Last year the bill had statutory compulsion. A farmer was required to participate. This year the bill has provisions which amount to economic compulsion. The farmer will only get feed price for his wheat if he is not participating. This statement was made by Secretary Orville Freeman before our committee, and has not been denied. I might point out there are those farmers, whether they belong to the Wheat Growers' Association, Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, or any other farm group, who do not want to participate in the program for many reasons. They do not feel they should be required to participate if they do not want to, and they should not be punished if they do not participate. The program should benefit compliers, but at the same time I see no reason to punish those who do not participate just because they do not.

The bill provides a 45-45-10 formula. In other words, it is not a \$2 wheat bill.

I have had many, many letters saying "Support the \$2 wheat bill." I do not find any \$2 wheat bill pending in the Congress. It provides \$2 on 45 percent of the farmers' production. You receive the price support of \$1.30 plus a certificate worth about 70 cents a bushel. This is for 45 percent of his production.

On another 45 percent of the normal production, the farmer receives an export certificate worth 25 cents a bushel plus \$1.30, or about \$1.55. On the balance of normal yield he receives \$1.30, which is the support price. This makes a blend price of \$1.73, or about 72 or 73 percent of parity, which I might add is the lowest in over a decade. These things should be explained to the farmer.

There is a diversion payment provision in this bill. It is 20 percent of the man's normal production at times the support price. So your diversion is between \$5 and \$8 per acre, which is not much for some of the very fine wheat land which must be retired from production. This has not been fully explained to the farmer.

He has been told this will mean a \$400 million loss if the bill is not passed. This is partially based on what the Secretary will do if the bill is rejected. I do not believe the present Secretary or any other Secretary would or should intentionally drive the market price down. If the free market were permitted to operate, I doubt that there would be much of a loss to the farmer.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me compliment the gentleman from Kansas for having taken this time, and also to compliment him for his continued effective and dedicated effort in behalf of the cause of American agriculture. Frankly, what a sad state of affairs we find ourselves in here today when it becomes necessary for the gentleman to take time in this manner in order that we might be able to talk about a bill that is not going to be considered for a couple of days, all because of the fact that there is not enough time allocated to it and we will have no opportunity to express ourselves at that time.

Let us go back to the history of farm legislation during the course of the past year and a half. We were here last year for 12 months. Many of us expressed concern at that time that something ought to be done, some consideration should be given to this problem at that time. But what happened? Absolutely nothing. The fact is that the emergency so far as time is concerned on this legislation was last year, not now. It ought to have been done before the winter wheat was seeded, not now, at the very last moment before the spring wheat is going to be seeded. Most of the wheat is in the ground actually on a national basis.

Let me get to the point the gentleman was just discussing, a matter that is so important to the wheat farmers of this country. I refer specifically to the value of the certificates that the gentleman



has outlined. I for one am not quite ready or prepared to ask the American farmer to raise wheat for foreign countries, Russia and its satellites included, at a price that is cheaper than we raise it for our own domestic use. This is exactly what the bill does. In addition, if the American wheat farmer makes any profit at all on the wheat that he raises for the American consumer he is going to have to share that profit with the foreign consumer.

In addition, up until this point we have had an export subsidy in order that we might be able to sell wheat to foreign countries. What are we doing now? We are shifting that subsidy right to the farmer himself, and we are going to make the American farmer carry the full burden of that subsidy, even though it may be of national concern that we do supply volumes of wheat to countries under certain circumstances.

Yes; it is the American farmer who will be taking a substantial step backwards economically. Now with items as important as that, it would seem to me, we at least ought to have time enough to talk about it. Thirty minutes on a side, if you will—what a pathetic situation. Remembering too, we have reached the point where the parity ratio right now is comparable to 1939. Last December, it was comparable to 1933. And we are about to enact a bill that is going to set it back even further than it is now. It is going to bring it back to 73 or 74 percent of parity. We will have not even have time to talk about this, or the many other items that are directly or indirectly related to this problem, which should be given some consideration by amendment.

I have just come back from my district. Oh, the concern there is amongst farm people about imports for instance. Is that going to be considered in connection with this? No—we do not have the time nor will we have the opportunity to offer an amendment. It is just a matter of saying yes or no to this proposition. It is kind of unique, you know, that this whole combination fits the pattern that we heard coming from the Secretary of Agriculture last summer when the farmers were told that you either vote for this or else. At that time he was directing the wheatgrowers in a referendum and telling them how to vote. Now we have the same thing before the Congress, and the fact is he is telling the Congress how we ought to vote.

I think the Congress ought to have a little better opportunity to direct its attention to the American farmer than this. So I repeat, it is a pretty sad parliamentary situation that we find ourselves in.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. I should like to ask the gentleman if he knows of any way—because I am not entirely without sympathy towards the gentleman's stand with regard to this method being used—but does the gentleman have any suggestion that could be followed under the

parliamentary rules of the House so that we can deal with this?

Mr. LANGEN. It is not the question of the method we might use. At this point the fact is that I and any number of Members of this House have suggested other methods long ago. We introduced legislation early last summer, and I recommended at that time, that prompt consideration be given and a determination made, and it could have been accomplished then. In addition to that, even within the last several weeks, recommendations have been made to the Committee on Rules. So that we would not have gotten into this kind of parliamentary situation, we, as Members of the Congress, and the majority here are going to have to accept that responsibility whether we like it or not.

To come along at this late stage and say, Oh, there is nothing else that we can do about it now—is no excuse. It is merely a matter of trying to find some easy way out of a predicament that we have created by not having recognized the problem earlier. I should like to call to your attention that there were plenty of us who pointed to the problems that would be coming along in wheat production after the referendum last year. But, you know, at that time, we heard nothing but, let them stew in their juice. Those are the words we were given then. Now all at once they begin to recognize what a need there is, and you better vote "yes" or dire things are going to happen. This idea must have all generated sometime between now and last summer after they saw the parliamentary situation in the making.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that as early as last July, the Wheat Subcommittee was in the process of having hearings, and if I understand the situation correctly, we here in the House as well as in the other body are those who really have the responsibility of providing the kind of legislation that our farmers will have to live with.

I wish to state to the gentleman that there have been hearings, periodically, from July on into the fall and winter, in December, and as late as January of this year. At those hearings anyone who wished had the opportunity to be heard. Every organization and every individual, so far as I know, who wished to be heard, was heard.

Interest was quite difficult to kindle or to create last summer on the part of all areas.

The situation which the gentleman related is quite true, but, so far as delaying it at the doorstep of some administratively appointed official, I point out that he and I should share as much as anyone else in the responsibility of not having been able to get legislation brought forward early enough so that a different kind of legislative procedure could be followed.

Mr. LANGEN. I agree with the gentleman that hearings were held. As a matter of fact, I appeared as a witness during the hearings. One surprising

thing about those hearings, which I remember quite well, since I was there, was that it was said there was no need for legislation. During the questioning, I was asked as to how many letters I had received and how much concern there was. I was told, when I appeared before the committee, by members of the committee, that there was no need for legislation, that the farmers were not interested, that there was no problem; so, actually, I was making a fuss just for the sake of making a fuss. That was the experience I had at that time.

There was not a word from the Secretary by way of recommendation, or big plea for wheat legislation by the Secretary then. If there was, I did not hear it.

Now we have moved along, and let us suppose that we were not able to arrive at some kind of agreement. The least we can do, at that point, is follow the normal legislative procedure of the House, by setting up a conference committee.

How often do we see a situation of this kind, when there is a difference between the House and the other body and there is no conference committee? We do not see this very often. But that is what we are to do now. Why? I wish somebody would answer that question for me.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I wish to point out two things to the gentleman. Does the gentleman recall those members of the Wheat Subcommittee who asked him questions in regard to how many letters he had received and the feeling of need? I do not mean to turn this into a partisan discussion, but does the gentleman recall that they were members of his own party who were asking him those questions?

Mr. LANGEN. I should have to disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. PURCELL. Of course, I attended those same meetings the gentleman attended. There is no point in disagreeing about them here, but as I remember it, that was the situation.

Mr. LANGEN. I do not wish to talk about a colleague who is not present at this time, but I suggest that the gentleman go back to look up the hearings and look at the record of what was said to see who asked me about the letters. The gentleman will find it was a member of the gentleman's party.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for taking this time to discuss the situation we shall not have the privilege of discussing when the bill comes before the House. It is a sad state of affairs when those of us who normally like to vote for a rule, so that we can have a discussion of a measure on the floor of the House, are being asked to vote for a rule to decide the question in toto as to what the law will become. I oppose this type of rule. I believe it is good for the United States and for

Members of the House, and perhaps for the other body, after they pass a bill, to hear some of these discussions prior to a vote on the rule. With the gentleman's permission, I should like to enumerate some seven points about the cotton-wheat bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a seven-point statement on the cotton-wheat bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, here are some features of the cotton-wheat bill which are important to Nebraska farmers:

First. The bill's income possibility may be 22 to 25 cents per bushel below that for 1963. The 1963 price support level was \$1.82 with a direct payment of 18 cents per bushel.

The program for 1964, under the bill before Congress, would provide price support at \$1.30 per bushel. Certificates worth 70 cents per bushel would be issued to cooperating farmers for 45 percent of normal production. Certificates worth 25 cents per bushel would be issued for 45 percent of normal production. The balance of wheat produced on the allotment would be eligible for price support loan at \$1.30 per bushel. This works out to a blend price of around \$1.72 per bushel, from 72 to 73 percent of parity.

Second. The bill will aggravate the problem of livestock producers because this bill would allow the Secretary to dump cheap wheat into competition with corn and feed grain in an effort to force "voluntary" compliance with the program. The history of the feed grain program in 1961-62 has taught us that the Secretary will use this dumping authority.

Third. The cotton section of the bill provides for an additional price of 4½ cents per pound for cotton farmers retiring one-third of their present allotment. There is no restriction that would keep this cotton farmer from planting this acreage to feed grains, soybeans, or wheat.

Fourth. For 1964, excess wheat could not be stored under bond and marketed in a future year of crop failure.

Fifth. The Commodity Credit Corporation resale price would be 105 percent of the effective price support—\$1.30 per bushel—plus carrying charges, which would have the effect of placing a ceiling of \$1.36 or \$1.37 per bushel on the market price. This feature tends to make participation in the program mandatory, rather than voluntary. The Secretary of Agriculture could raise the release price of CCC grain.

Sixth. Even though, under the bill, the farmers' income would go down, there is no question that the processor will pay more for wheat in 1964 and 1965 than in 1963. In 1963 the price support was \$1.82. The prices received by farmers averaged about \$1.87. The miller, therefore, paid \$1.82 to \$1.87 for wheat. The farmer got a direct payment of 18 cents per bushel.

During the next 2 years the miller will buy wheat for \$1.30 or thereabouts. He will also have to pay 70 cents per bushel for processing certificates. This brings the miller's cost to \$2 per bushel or more as compared to \$1.82 to \$1.87 in 1963.

Seventh. If the wheat legislation before Congress is not approved, it seems likely that the Secretary of Agriculture would proclaim the necessity for marketing quotas on the 1965 crop and call for a referendum. The present law requires that the quota must be proclaimed by April 15.

I should like to mention, for the purposes of this discussion, the second point.

The bill will aggravate the problem of livestock producers because this bill would allow the Secretary to dump cheap wheat into competition with corn and feed grain in an effort to force "voluntary" compliance with the program.

The history of the feed grain program in 1961-62 has taught us that the Secretary will use this dumping authority.

I would like also to quote this part in the RECORD, since it has not been brought up on the floor and few in the country know about it. I have not said anything about it before. Three years ago at this time we had an Easter recess. I went home to Nebraska during that week and visited with farmers and people who buy the grain and sell it to others. This is the extra grain that we do not use on the farm. We sell it between the middle of August and harvesttime after our crop is assured for the year. This grain is distributed around the country.

My discussion with the Secretary of Agriculture starts on page 144 of the hearings on H.R. 6400, April 24 and 25, 1961, serial E, part 1, and I shall put this in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. BEERMANN. You mentioned, Mr. Secretary, the price of corn 2 years ago. I wonder how much corn was released this year during the same period as compared to a year ago. My figures of a year ago and this year are different than your figures from a year ago to this year, and 2 years ago.

Secretary FREEMAN. You are correct. They are different.

Mr. BEERMANN. Would you furnish for the record the amount of corn released this year during this period of the last week of March and the first 2 weeks of April as compared with a year ago?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would appreciate that. (The information referred to follows:)

Commodity Credit Corporation domestic corn sale  
[Millions of bushels]

Period week ending—	Total sales
Mar. 25, 1960.....	2.6
Apr. 1, 1960.....	2.0
Apr. 8, 1960.....	1.9
Mar. 31, 1961.....	8.1
Apr. 7, 1961.....	9.4
Apr. 14, 1961.....	8.9

Secretary FREEMAN. If I may, I would like to add figures for the last couple of years, so that we can get the true picture.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to pursue this family-sized farm question a little bit. In your description of the family-sized farm, you say that the farmer has to operate the farm with one family.

Secretary FREEMAN. I amended that a little bit today with the addition of hired help. I think that is a more realistic definition.

Mr. BEERMANN. I was not going to ask this question, because it had been asked before, but when you come up with some information on compensatory payments then I must get into that.

It so happens that we farm, and before the six brothers bought them out there were three sisters in it and six brothers. It is a family operation. What size would that be?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that is a good sized family farm.

Mr. BEERMANN. It is a good-sized family, too. It is a good family. And you are welcome to visit us in Nebraska.

Secretary FREEMAN. Thank you.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to say that my share consists of 280 acres. It contains corn, alfalfa, a little small grain, and feeding cattle. Would you say that 280 acres times 6 is a family-sized farm?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, it is very difficult to be specific.

Mr. BEERMANN. I appreciate that. I want to hear you say it.

Secretary FREEMAN. Why? Because it is difficult?

Mr. BEERMANN. Yes. [Laughter.]

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think you have almost answered your own question in saying that you and your five brothers farm 280 acres times 6. And you do so efficiently and effectively and are willing to educate me in connection with it. I would assume that as a family farm it is a good one.

Mr. BEERMANN. I appreciate that. [Laughter.]

When you set up livestock committees, for calves, stockers and feeders, and helpers and steers and hogs and sheep around the country are you going to select these committees from the areas that have livestock development, or are you going to select them from all over the country?

Secretary FREEMAN. At the moment, as I think I said earlier, the likelihood of there being any committees for the items you have mentioned is very minimal. There has been expressed to me no desire for such in those areas. And as such there would be no committees.

Mr. BEERMANN. I like the way you answer questions for me. As to the release of feed grains and lowering prices, people who raise corn for sale harvested last year in October of 1960 and it ran until October of 1961, which would be a normal 12-month marketing year and they have felt somewhat, shall we say, apprehensive because in March Congress passed the feed grains bill and in April, when these people were normally marketing some of this corn, their prices in Nebraska are 12, 13, 14, or 15 cents lower in April than they were in March. This is Government intervention to the highest degree, even though you have to remove some corn, and I think that you could have sold No. 3 corn without this.

I do not think that there was any reason for passing the bill to do that. And when this corn is released we will have more corn on the market than can be properly used. What is the corn grower going to do in that condition?

In 2 or 3 months' time or 6 months, he can have a bred sow or several of them or he can buy some sows and a boar, and thereby he can prepare the way to feed up this corn. If there is too much free corn available he can do that. Next year we will have many people getting into the hog business and these people will say, "Mr. Secretary, we are in trouble. We want you to help us out in the hog business."

So here I forecast that as of this time the Secretary's action is going to force people to come to him next year for help in the hog situation, also, for calves and the like.



I do not like to see this and to pay \$2.30 for soybeans that you may have to buy next year. I see the thought behind it.

It was rather difficult for me to make up my mind to come here, but enough people voted for me to come here.

Secretary FREEMAN. I could not get enough to vote for me. You are more fortunate than I was.

Mr. BEERMANN. I never ran for an office before. I appreciate being elected the first time. The voters in the Third District, the farmers, the laborers, and the businessmen want to get the Government off their backs—that was their cry. Will this bill, H.R. 6400, help get the Government off of their backs?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. [Applause.]

Mr. BEERMANN. You do good—I hope that you come out some time. [Laughter.]

Many of the farmers in Nebraska who have never been in Government programs, and I understand that there are others like them—about 70 percent of the people who grow and feed the commodities on their own farms—so that, in effect, we are writing laws for 30 percent of the people, are we not? That is what it represents?

Secretary FREEMAN. No.

Mr. BEERMANN. Did you not hear about this one?

Secretary FREEMAN. I am not sure that I understand that.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggested in this discussion to the Secretary of Agriculture that if he did not quit dumping feed grains on the market, as he was doing at that time—he would cause problems in the livestock industry. Congress had passed the original feed grain bill of 1961 in March; the hearings on H.R. 6400 were for an extension of that program. Of course, most of us knew what the Secretary was doing. He was forcing a feed grain sign-up before the deadline. But he was not acquainted with the USDA dumping figures. So I requested the figures from March 25, 1960, through the week of April 8, 1960, and the corresponding weeks of 1961.

You will note from the preceding table that sales in the 3 weeks of 1961 were 8.1 million bushels up to 9.4 million, or 4 or 5 times more than sales in 1960.

From this background it is not logical to assume that the Secretary will dump wheat just like he did feed grains? Perhaps one of the reasons that the price of wheat is not lower is because the Secretary could not sell wheat for less than 105 percent of \$1.82, a figure much higher than 105 percent of \$1.30 in this bill. Our request for 115 percent release price of the loan rate was rejected. So I would almost feel that this bill is designed to lower farm income.

Mr. Speaker, when you read the CCC corn sales table which the Secretary furnished, there is ample proof that dumping contributed to lower feed grain prices and the livestock problem. In addition there is also ample justification for believing the USDA might dump wheat on the market to force a lower price, with this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] and would only hope that we had had an open rule and very thorough debate and the opportunity to offer amendments so that these things could have been properly explored for the benefit of all Members of the House who are not acquainted

with this sort of situation as to what has happened in the past prior to 1964.

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

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Kansas for asking for this time so that we might have an opportunity to discuss this very important bill that is soon to be brought to the floor of the House for consideration.

I would like to say that in listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] I want to point out that we did pass a cotton bill here and it went to the other body. It was amended in the other body. They could have taken this cotton bill and it could have been law now. But the matter in the other body did not receive the attention of cotton alone. We have now had the wheat bill tacked onto it. It has now come back over here. The Committee on Rules could have sent this matter to conference and we could have had an opportunity in conference to have done something about this wheat situation which is so much against the best interests of the farmers of Ohio and I think against the best interests of the farmers generally.

I would like to point out that the gentleman from Texas as the new chairman of our Wheat Subcommittee is highly respected by every member of the Wheat Subcommittee and by other Members of the House. Certainly, he has worked diligently on this problem.

However, I believe, in fairness to him and to the other members of the Wheat Subcommittee, I should point out that this very same bill was in our committee under discussion and came out without any recommendation for passage. This was unique in itself. It came before our full committee and rested there. We thought perhaps it would lie there for the rest of this session. But lo and behold when the other body tacked this bill that was resting very quietly in our committee onto the cotton bill and it came back and in one morning's discussion came out with the recommendation for passage, certainly here is a case wherein this liberalized Rules Committee could have permitted the House to work its will on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember the debate that was held at the time the packing of the Rules Committee was to take place.

The reason that was given for this action was to permit the Members of this House "to work its will," and I say this in quotes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this very same liberalized Rules Committee failed on this occasion to live up to its prediction and promise to permit the House to work its will.

If the Committee on Rules had permitted this bill to go to conference, perhaps this bill could have been worked on by Members who are interested in it, and we could have come forward with a pro-

gram that was in the best interests of the wheat farmers as well as in the best interests of the cotton farmers of this country.

I would also like to point out that we have heard a lot of talk about the voluntary features of this bill. Coming from Ohio and from a section where we have a lot of small farmers, I want to say that there is nothing voluntary about this program. If you call "voluntary", accepting \$1.30 for your wheat if you do not go into this program, it is voluntary. But I do not call that voluntary at all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to stress this point, because in Ohio and in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent we voted 9 to 1 against Federal-type programs last May. Only 22 percent of our farmers throughout Ohio voted for it. We cast more negative votes on this proposal than any other State in the Union. That action spoke very loud and clear at that time that they did not want any part of the certificate plan. Certainly, as a Member of Congress from Ohio I cannot support it, because the people have spoken out against it, and very decisively.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is improper for this administration to urge the passage of this type legislation after the farmers have turned it down, without giving this House an opportunity to work its will and to amend the wheat section of the bill in order that we may come forth with a proper plan for the wheat farmers who need some type legislation.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in extending thanks to the gentleman in the well for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I want, also, to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], that I certainly want to compliment him upon the work that he has done in conducting the hearings on wheat legislation. However, I would like to make reference to the feed grain bill and the application of some of the techniques of the administration which have been used in that case as they would apply in the wheat legislation which will presently be before us.

Many of us introduced feed grain bills away back in 1958, and we were pleased when the first feed grain bill came to the committee. But we were shocked when we saw in it provisions which permitted the Secretary to dump the surplus at below support prices. We were further shocked to see that parity was set not at 80, 90, or 100, but at 74 percent of parity which certainly is below a living wage. Further provisions of the bill permitted dumping of CCC stocks at below support price.

With that provision for dumping, you could not get much more than 74 cents unless the Secretary was more liberal in his administration of authority.

The circumstances that I cite were clearly set forth in the Farmer's Union

Herald publication, in a story titled "Chickens Come Home To Roost." We find that cheap feed has been a contributing factor to the livestock increase and the breaking of the livestock market, together with the imports.

Now, in this wheat bill you have exactly the same set of circumstances where the release price is 105 percent of the loan level of \$1.30. Please remember that I am not a member of the committee. I think that is right, and the gentleman may correct me. This means again if they sold at 105 percent of the loan level of \$1.30, the Secretary can hold down the wheat price if he wishes, and judging from past performance in the feed grain program, that is what he could be expected to do. The Secretary arbitrarily set a handling charge in the feed grain program of not 20 cents, where it normally should be, but at 9 cents a bushel, and whether it be a cooperative elevator, an independent elevator, or warehouseman, they cannot compete with the Commodity Credit Corporation under those terms. The result is that the Government controls the grain trade.

Again, as pointed out in the Farmer's Union Herald by Mr. Thatcher Factor, he says either the Government must get out of the business or the farmer must get out. I think the farmer should be permitted to have his own merchandising of his own property.

I would like to point out that we are in this very serious position here in the House. I operate a farm, and one of the things I regret is the fact those of us who are farmers seem to have no voice in the things we know best. I would like to point out that under the rules under which we are operating, in case we are the minority here in the House by a 3-to-2 ratio, and over in the Senate 2 to 1. Normally we would have a conference on a bill such as this one. Under the rule granted, there is not much of a chance that our conferees will change this bill. We will have to vote it up or down as it is and in effect we are now asked to repeat the mistake in the feed grain bill.

I would like further to say it is regrettable that we only have 30 minutes to talk about this particular measure and to emphasize and correct the things that are bad in it. We cannot even have time to talk about that. We cannot amend the bill for instance to provide for a release price of 115 percent of the loan support date as I have recommended. We have to take it or leave it.

This morning I had a delegation of farmers call on me and they said "We know this bill is not what it ought to be, but it is the best we can get." Is that not a regrettable situation when I represent farmers in a district and cannot represent the point of view of the people we represent?

I think it is regrettable we should have a situation like this crammed down our throats, not only ours, but the farmers we represent all over the country.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for taking the time today on this matter.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentlemen who have participated and would point out there are some marked differences between the bill we considered in the House subcommittee, the bill finally approved by the full House committee on March 11, and the bill passed by the Senate, and I refer only to the wheat portion of the wheat-cotton bill.

There are many things I have not been able to understand to my satisfaction: Under the Senate-passed bill, as one example, the Secretary is authorized to create a special acreage reserve of up to 1 million acres in 1965, and subsequent years. I do not yet know where these acres are coming from, or where they go, but before the Secretary can give acres to somebody he must take them from someone. In Kansas we like to feel we will keep the acres we now have. With about 20 percent of the allotted acres now in Kansas and the greatest producing State, we are not anxious to lose more of our allotted acres to any other area.

This is a very important provision of the bill. What happens to this million acres? I have never been told to my satisfaction. When this bill was before the committee on March 11 it was not even read. We voted on a mimeographed bill in the subcommittee on January 27 and on the Senate-passed bill, were not even permitted to have it read.

It is a sad day for the American farmer when he must come to the Halls of Congress and have only 60 minutes. It is a sad day when we must take time after the regular business to talk about a very important bill, or have no time at all. Not only the farmers are affected by this legislation but other millions of people who are affected directly or indirectly.

To avoid the stigma of the 70-cent and 25-cent certificates, the Senate bill says 65 to 90 percent of parity. Why have we not had testimony on these matters? Why have we not had answers from Secretary Freeman? We are asked to vote on essentially the same thing farmers voted on last May 21 and rejected. Either way the action by Congress could affect the economy of Kansas and every other wheat-producing State in America. Why? Because Secretary Freeman says if this bill is not passed wheat will be \$1.25. Last year he stated wheat would be \$1 a bushel and he could make it 80 or 90 cents if he wishes. Is this the kind of action we must expect from a Secretary of Agriculture, any Secretary of Agriculture? I do not think so. I think we should know now the Secretary is in sympathy with the farmer and what he is going to do about it. I read today where the press referred to this bill as a relief bill. I think it is a travesty.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend my colleague and congratulate him on his diligence in protecting the interest of the wheat farmers of this country. I represent the eastern part of Colorado, which has a large wheat-growing area and has conditions which

are similar to those in the gentleman's district of western Kansas.

I would like to ask the gentleman what he feels the general sentiment is among the wheatgrowers? I know he was home last week and was making every effort to find out what the situation is. Am I correct in saying there is a divided opinion among the wheatgrowers as to what the effect of this legislation would be?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, I think the gentleman from Colorado has it analyzed correctly. There seems to be a divided opinion. Many asked how I was going to vote, as there are still sharp differences of opinion. Farmers are asking questions such as, "Why vote for a wheat bill, Bob, we rejected last year?"

This bill merely suspends controls for the 1965 crop. In 1966 the farmer will have the same mandatory program the majority turned down last May. In fact, the farmers of Colorado, Kansas, and everywhere else are being given about what they turned down last year. So this is not a voluntary plan for this year and subsequent years. It is for 1 year—1965.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman referred to the probable price of wheat, the market price of wheat in the event that this legislation should fail. What is the gentleman's best judgment on that situation?

Mr. DOLE. I think the man who could answer that would be Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. If he wants to strengthen the market price of wheat, he could put a lid on commodity stocks and the price would go up, but if he wants to hang this over the farmer's head in order to get compliance, the price will go down. If I knew what the market price of wheat was going to be, if the bill was rejected, it certainly would make it easier to determine how to vote.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I talked with some wheat farmers in my district last week and I told them I did not think the Secretary of Agriculture was going to let wheat go to \$1.25, particularly in an election year.

Mr. DOLE. This is 1964 and there is an election later on this year. I am certain the Secretary is attuned to this kind of thing. He has been in politics a long time and he has a responsibility to the American farmer which transcends politics to see that the market does not drop. If we are going to tell the farmers of Kansas and Colorado—unless your Congressmen votes for this bill, the price of wheat will go down, then we are operating under a type of procedure I want no part of.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is it not true that this is a very complicated situation; that is, this matter of wheat legislation; and it is very intricate and very difficult for anyone to understand all of the ramifications?

Mr. DOLE. It is difficult for those who support this sincerely and there are people who sincerely support this concept. It is difficult for those who are opposed to it, and there are people who are sincerely opposed to this concept. So it is neither all one way or the other.



It is a very difficult problem that we must resolve on the basis of what is best now and in the future for American wheat producers.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Again I commend the gentleman for taking this special order today so that there could be this discussion of this very important and very intricate subject which is of such great importance to the people of our area.

Mr. DOLE. I might point out, the bill does have some features that are helpful to certain areas in Colorado and Kansas where they have had substandard moisture and where they made an effort to plant but will have no production. Under this bill they would benefit. We tried to point this out at our meetings, to be completely objective because this is our primary responsibility.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As I understand it, the 70-cent certificate price would prevail regardless of whether they actually produced wheat.

Mr. DOLE. That is right. It applies to the planted acres. If an effort was made to plant and, in fact, they were planted, the farmer would be paid and also receive the diversion payment. I am certain this is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate the opportunity we have had this afternoon to bring some of these facts to the floor of the House of Representatives. I think that as a farmer, perhaps, I resent more than as a Member of the Congress the highhanded manner in which this entire situation has been handled. Perhaps, there has been a lack of interest in the farmers' needs or a lack of compassion or a lack of willingness to allow Members an opportunity to work their will. This bill may well fail because of the way it has been handled. This is not exactly what I would like to see. However, I think that we, as Members of the Congress, have to realize we have a responsibility. I think part of that responsibility is laying out clearly to the farmers just exactly what this bill does entail. You have mentioned the fact that in 1966, this becomes a mandatory program. But as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, is it not true that this bill merely temporarily suspends the mandatory program that would be in effect if we did not have this 2-year suspension passed, and in 1966 the mandatory rule that goes into effect goes into effect because of a law that is already on the books? Is that not true?

Mr. DOLE. That is the effect of this bill, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. It is not the effect of the bill that it becomes mandatory in 1966. The bill suspends the mandatory provision for 1964-65 and it becomes mandatory in 1966 because of a law that already exists.

Mr. DOLE. That is correct. What we are doing is amending permanent law.

We are suspending its operation for a period of 2 years; however, don't forget the farmers rejected quotas on this year's crop.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. The point has been made that under this bill the Secretary has authority to enact a release price of 105 percent. Is it not true that the Secretary already has this authority to sell wheat on the open market at 105 percent of loan?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Actually, the loan price now is lower than the loan price in the bill.

Mr. DOLE. The point is that this is a minimum now, 105 percent. I feel that it should be higher, at least 115 percent, for many reasons. If it is a truly voluntary program, I believe the free market should have a chance to operate.

The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I certainly agree that I would like to see a 115- or 125-percent release price. However, the fact of the matter is that as of today under the law we have a 105-percent release price.

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. In view of the fact that we have a 1-year stock of wheat on hand, that we have a mandatory program already on the books, and that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who has not always shown the greatest compassion for the farmers of America—

Mr. DOLE. What was that last statement?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. In view of fact that we have a Secretary of Agriculture who has not always shown the greatest compassion for the farmers of America, what can we offer as an alternative if we turn down this program? Exactly what can we offer to the farmers in the way of a program?

Mr. DOLE. I would point out to the gentleman that he made a very good suggestion when he appeared before our subcommittee concerning his program. I do not agree completely with his program, but it is better than this one. Twenty of us had other programs, in fact there were over 50 bills pending before the subcommittee, but there were perfunctory hearings.

Apparently the administration and its supporters had the ground rules laid out before, so that at the proper time they would come forward with a bill that designated a voluntary plan, and we would have to take it or leave it.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate the good things the gentleman has had to say about the bill which I introduced, along with other Members of the House. However, the gentleman has been involved with this problem for a long time.

In your best judgment, would you say that we have a possibility of passing a better bill if we turn this bill down?

Looking the facts squarely in the eye, what can we do? The farmers are planting now. Time is running out. A filibuster is going on in the other body. Can we, who have a responsibility to the

farmers of our districts, say in honesty we believe we have a good chance to pass an alternate bill if we turn down this bill?

Mr. DOLE. Our combined experience would not be very much in the Congress—and I say this in all sincerity—so I do not know exactly what our chances might be. I know that last June, July, and August, when I was pleading about the need for legislation, I could not seem to stir up much enthusiasm in our committee.

I do not know what might happen. The chairman of the subcommittee is present. I believe he will agree that we dismissed some six or seven things on which there was almost complete agreement, such as raising the support price, raising the release price, and suspending the Anfuso amendment. These were some things, the chairman would agree, that we discussed in the subcommittee informally, but thoroughly, and found were areas of great agreement.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I wish to make one final point. In the conversations I have had with Members of the House who have much more seniority than the gentleman from Kansas, now in the well, or the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and certainly more than I have had, I have heard a unanimity of opinion expressed that if the wheat bill is turned down, there will be no wheat legislation this year.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOLE. That is a very good question. I do not know the answer.

I merely wish to make one other point. I hope the day has not come when, as a Member of Congress, I must tell the farmers in advance, "If you do not take this, you will be wiped out for the remainder of the year." If this is the attitude of the administration, the farmers should know it today.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think this is the attitude of the administration.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. I believe we ought to put the responsibility where it belongs now. If this type of legislation is turned down by the defeat of the rule, it will take very little time to iron out the differences. This can go to conference. It would take very little time to iron out the differences and to bring back a bill, in a week or the next week.

The idea of trying to vote out a rule with no opportunity for debate on either side and no amendments or anything else is fantastic in the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I appreciate that remark. The point I should like to bring out is the fact that in my conversations with Members on both sides of the aisle—those who, in effect, run this House; and particularly those in the majority party—the feeling apparently is distinct that the attitude of the administration is that if we do not pass this wheat bill, there will be no

wheat bill this year. If I am wrong in this, I would certainly like to be corrected before the time comes to cast a vote.

Mr. DOLE. I might say that this is what they told the farmers last May, but they are here now with a wheat bill. They might change their attitude.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. In response to the remark about the 105-percent release price referred to by my good friend, I point out that that is in the bill now. It always has been the accepted practice that the handling charge is so much per month, and it adds up to about 20 cents per bushel. By administrative decision that has been reduced to 9 cents. So in effect 105 percent is not being adhered to under the rules formerly in the ball game, as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned.

The gentleman in the well referred to what the Secretary said. I am reminded of the story of the New Hampshire immigrant who came into the State of New Hampshire and was there about 10 years. He said to one of his friends, "What do you have to do to be one of the fellows here? I have been here for 10 years and I am still not one of the boys." The other man said, "Just because a cat has kittens in the oven that don't make them biscuits."

The Secretary has told us repeatedly with reference to every bill that he has brought in that this is the answer. The truth of the matter is that the parity ratio of farm income is now 77 percent of parity which is the lowest it has been since 1939. So, obviously those biscuits did not turn out well.

Mr. PURCELL. To me, it is regrettable that we spend so much time in these discussions trying to place the blame for the good and bad points of legislation on one or more administrative officials. I feel that it is the responsibility of the Members of this body to accept the responsibility that is ours to study the situation and to develop the best possible legislation.

I, for one, am ready to accept this responsibility, to say that the legislation we vote up or down is the work of the House. I believe this is our responsibility to the country, and, in this instance, to the farmer. We could try to place blame all day. But, the fact is that the future of wheat legislation for this year is our responsibility. It is time for us to realize that this is the only opportunity we have to provide wheat legislation this year, to accept our responsibility for what it is, to vote on this legislation on its merits, and not on the demerits or merits of some individual.

Mr. DOLE. I agree in part, but also feel we have an even greater responsibility to act independently of the other body. Let us expose the bad points now and not wait until the farmer learns the hard way about its defects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] has expired.

## FACTS, FIGURES, AND LETTERS TO CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, 22 of my 50 years have been spent in Congress. During these 22 years I have tried to help all our veterans, their widows, and dependents, and all our service people and their dependents—I voted for the servicemen's pay raise on May 8, 1963—and I have tried to help our aged and others.

Within the last 3 years I have introduced two bills to enable more students and teachers to work in Washington in the summertime for the Government in order to learn more about our Government. These bills passed the House of Representatives by record votes of over 300 votes for, to less than 25 against.

My bill H.R. 10 passed the House December 2, 1963—301 for, 18 against.

I have mentioned I have tried to help our aged. I voted for the Kerr-Mills bill.

LONGVIEW, TEX.,  
August 6, 1963.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to my recent letter to you I've received phone calls from seven of my fellow constituents asking me what I had done to incur your wrath. I had been under the impression that you had voted for a King-Anderson-type bill. Therefore I wrote Mr. Williston for your voting record and enclose his reply. It seems you had not supported socialized medicine and that I owe you an apology.

I also urge you to continue your voting against any form of federalized or socialized medicine and I may bring my wife and two children to visit you, your wife and five children. Make it specific and we will be there.

A copy of this letter has been mailed to seven of the doctors here in Longview.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER CAVE, M.D.

I have tried to help our unemployed, including our older workers. Some evidence of my efforts is shown by my statements and the tabulations on pages 2857-2863 of the February 13, 1964, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I quote two paragraphs from a letter written me by Senator PAT McNAMARA, March 25, 1964. He is chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging:

Thank you for calling my attention to the material you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13 concerning Federal employment of older workers. The staff of the Senate Special Committee on Aging tell me that they noted the data when you inserted it in the RECORD and that it is one of the best discussions of the subject.

You are certainly to be commended for your zeal in combating age discrimination

in Federal employment, and I wish you well in your further activities along this line.

I quote the pertinent part of a letter I received from Hon. Stephen S. Jackson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, which was written me June 9, 1958:

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: At a recent hearing before the Davis subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, you questioned the late Assistant Secretary Francis regarding age limits for civil service employment in the Department of Defense.

The 46-year-old woman to whom you referred undoubtedly applied at Barksdale Air Force Base, which is one of the recruiting points for Air Force overseas positions, for a teaching position in the Air Forces overseas dependents schools.

The Air Force plans, therefore, in recruiting for the 1959-60 school year to increase the age limit for overseas schoolteachers to 60.

In the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7724, "a bill to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term 'change of program of education or training' as used in such section." A favorable report was given on my bill by the American Legion on July 15, 1959:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DORN: I understand that you will preside at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee scheduled to be held on July 21 in connection with H.R. 4306 and H.R. 7724.

The American Legion is not asking for the privilege of a personal appearance on either one of these bills.

We are not in a position to support H.R. 4306.

In connection with H.R. 7724, while we have no resolution on the subject matter, I would advise that the American Legion's rehabilitation representatives feel such an amendment to section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is desirable. We, therefore, trust the subcommittee will favorably consider H.R. 7724.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MILES D. KENNEDY,  
Director.

The Veterans' Administration gave a favorable report on my bill. The bill was reported favorably by the Dorn subcommittee on July 21, 1959, and its provisions have now become law.

I quote from the Washington Post of March 5, 1964, some words about a dinner given in Washington in March 1964, by the American Legion national commander, Hon. Daniel F. Foley:

There were no formal speeches, although in his brief remarks Commander Foley mentioned the GI bill of rights, which was passed 20 years ago:

"Many of you in this audience tonight played a part in the passage of that bill," Foley said, "both as Legionnaires and as Members of Congress, and to all of you, the veteran population of this Nation owes a vote of thanks that would be difficult, if not impossible, to repay."

I actively supported the so-called GI bill. At this point I wish to include in



the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the pertinent part of a letter written to me by Mr. Harry E. Rather:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS,  
Austin, Tex., April 26, 1944.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Thanks for your prompt reply in regard to the resolution passed by the department executive committee regarding the Legion's GI bill of rights for World War II veterans. We know that you are for this legislation. We have known it all along and we are very pleased to find that you were at least one of the Congressmen from Texas to sign discharge petition No. 8.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. RATHER,  
Department Adjutant.

I worked diligently to help pass the terminal leave legislation for enlisted men.

TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN AND LETTER  
ENDORSEING BECKWORTH'S BILL—H.R. 1160  
(June 7, 1946)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1943, I introduced a bill (H.R. 3875) to provide terminal leave for enlisted men. On January 8, 1945, I introduced H.R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill. The national legislative committee of the American Legion endorsed my bill H.R. 1160. Several Members of Congress and I appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee urging the passage of the terminal leave legislation. I include at this point the endorsement of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,  
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1945.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are, as you know, vitally interested in your bill, H.R.

1160, which provides terminal leave to enlisted men in the same manner as is now given to officers, except that it also provides that the compensation to which the soldier is entitled shall be paid in a lump sum, which, of course, is a very good idea.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,  
Director, National Legislative Committee.

I have undertaken at all times to cooperate with the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion.

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

I have the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line.

Also I quote a part of a letter which was written to me March 13, 1963, by one of the outstanding leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

You are known to have supported all veteran legislation.

I was chairman of the War Claims Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is the subcommittee under which prisoner of war legislation was considered. It helped prisoners of war.

I have been second ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—next to the chairman. This committee handles oil, gas transportation, and communications legislation. I

was chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee, the Airplane Accidents Investigating Subcommittee, and the Newsprint and Brands and Grade Labeling Subcommittees.

This subcommittee helped many newspapers and businesses including the Southland Paper Mill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1964.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am enclosing a copy of the meat import bill and a copy of a statement which has been prepared for me, telling just what the bill does, its background, etc. Your interest in and help with the bill is greatly appreciated.

Most sincerely,

A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr.

U.S. SENATE,  
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,  
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1964.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your penciled note which has just reached my desk.

I agree with Mr. Jack Price that there is too much beef coming into the country, and I have been assured by Senator HARRY BYRD that hearings will be held on my proposal, S. 2525, to reduce imports to an average over the past 5 years.

Must close now, but with best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, this table was sent to me by Harold M. Graning, M.D., of the U.S. Public Health Service, March 16 1964:

*Hospitals and medical facilities in 3d Congressional District, Texas, which have been approved for Hill-Burton funds*

Location	Name of facility	Type of construction	Initially approved	Total cost	Federal share
Kilgore.....	East Texas Treatment Center Rehabilitation Facility.	New rehabilitation facility.....	August 1961.....	\$329,953	\$163,946
Do.....	Kilgore Memorial Hospital.	75-bed new hospital.....	July 1948.....	1,450,605	459,421
Longview.....	Good Shepherd Hospital.	64-bed general hospital addition and remodeling.....	February 1957.....	1,181,518	531,500
Do.....	do.....	60-bed general hospital addition and remodeling.....	July 1948.....	891,777	283,435
Carthage.....	Panola County Hospital.	50-bed new general hospital.....	January 1948.....	558,618	182,668
Do.....	Sabine Area Nursing Home.	50-bed new nursing home.....	January 1964.....	450,000	225,000
Center.....	Shelby County Hospital.	23-bed new general hospital.....	August 1956.....	395,441	184,000
Tyler.....	Medical Center Hospital.	133-bed new general hospital.....	March 1948.....	1,685,457	558,776
Do.....	do.....	80-bed general hospital addition.....	December 1957.....	1,076,550	517,000
Do.....	Mother Frances Hospital.	128-bed general hospital addition and remodeling.....	August 1963.....	4,074,844	1,050,000

The Federal Government contributed \$48,489 to the building of the Rusk County Airport at Henderson.

This table was sent to me February 27, 1963:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,  
Dallas, Tex., February 27, 1964.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter under the date of February 29, 1964, inquiring as to the amount of Federal funds that have been disbursed in Rusk County, Tex., in the last 10 years. In connection with the Area Redevelopment Administration loan program, office records disclose the following:

*Name, date, and amount*

Henderson Industrial Trust, Henderson, Tex.:	
Approved, Oct. 25, 1963.....	\$149,500.00
Disbursed (fully), Feb. 18, 1964.....	149,500.00
Red Dot Plastics Industries, Inc., Henderson, Tex.:	
Approved, Feb. 6, 1963.....	228,540.00
Disbursed, May 13, 1963.....	176,187.80
Disbursed, May 23, 1963.....	50,421.24
Disbursed (fully), Oct. 25, 1963.....	1,930.96
Total.....	228,540.00

The SBA sent me this March 12, 1964:

*SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION*

A SECTION 502 DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LOAN  
(Small Business Investment Act of 1958,  
as amended)

Local development company: name, Kilgore Industrial Foundation, Inc.; address, Kilgore, Tex.; president, H. Donnell; term of loan, 20 years; amount, \$160,000.

Participating bank: name, Citizens State Bank and Trust Co.; address, Kilgore, Tex.; amount, \$16,000.

Small-business concern: name, Kilgore Manufacturing Co.; address, Kilgore, Tex.; president, W. R. Yazell; type of business, cutting and sewing women's apparel; new jobs created, 75.

Construction of an industrial building.

This table was sent to me by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, February 28, 1964:

Institution and location	Federal funds	Scope
Baylor University, Waco.....	\$1,250,000 669,000 320,000 1,805,000 1,711,000 1,716,000 1,024,000	Housing for 366 women. Completed. Loan approved Oct. 29, 1952. Housing for 340 men. Completed. Loan approved June 23, 1953. Housing for 48 student families. Completed. Loan approved Mar. 31, 1955. Housing and dining for 595 women. Completed. Loan approved Apr. 9, 1956. Housing for 558 men, dining (534 seats). Completed. Loan approved Feb. 11, 1959. Housing and dining for 312 men, 210 women. Completed. Loan approved Sept. 9, 1954. Housing for 352 women, 2 infirmary rooms. Completed. Loan approved Apr. 12, 1960.
Ablene Christian College, Abilene.....	1,800,000 1,790,000 1,900,000 2,825,000	Housing for 316 men, 302 women. Completed. Loan approved Sept. 10, 1956. Housing for 240 men, 250 women. Completed. Loan approved Mar. 18, 1955. Housing for 302 men, 245 women. Completed. Loan approved Oct. 10, 1955. Housing for 303 men, 155 women, 67 student families, dining (303 men). Completed. Loan approved July 30, 1958.
Texas-Christian University, Fort Worth.....	4,000,000	Housing for 348 men, 378 women, addition to college union-dining (550 seats). Under construction. Loan approved May 21, 1963.
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.....	200,000 90,000	Housing for 48 men, 48 women. Completed. Loan approved Aug. 30, 1957. Housing for 48 men, infirmary room. Completed. Loan approved Oct. 13, 1961.
Tyler Junior College, Tyler.....		

This table was sent to me by the U.S. Office of Education, March 9, 1964. I submit the pertinent part:

*Obligations to selected higher education institutions for student loans and national defense fellowships in Texas*

Institution	Fiscal year 1959	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964 estimate
Defense educational activities: Title II student loans:						
Ablene Christian College.....	\$85,925	\$55,397	\$112,014	\$182,700	\$189,350	\$240,660
Baylor University.....	78,315	172,152	250,000	250,000	250,000	390,600
Texas Christian University.....	144,027	84,078	85,500	72,900	157,379	153,000
Tyler Junior College.....		8,214				
Le Tourneau College.....					13,500	24,000
Southern Methodist University.....	92,612	63,734	86,796	124,020	150,397	181,493
Subtotal.....	400,779	383,575	534,310	629,620	760,626	989,753

I have diligently worked to help bring industry to east Texas. I have always cooperated with all of our officials in this connection. I worked with citizens of Longview to help bring the LeTourneau operations to east Texas.

During World War II, I worked to bring to the Third Congressional District, Camp Fannin in Tyler, Harmon General Hospital in Longview, and the radio training program in Tyler.

I quote from page 3 of the fall 1963 issue of *Chronicles of Smith County* published by the Smith County Historical Society and Historical Survey Committee, Tyler, Tex.:

Major Caldwell (today a retired full colonel living in Oklahoma City) provided the following report of the instructions given him at 8th Corps Headquarters:

"We are being pestered by Congressman Beckworth to establish some sort of military installation in his district and to try to quiet him down, we have decided to set up a radio training school at Tyler, Tex., and to operate it for only 3 months.

I continue to quote from the fall 1963 *Chronicles of Smith County*:

More than 2,000 soldiers from every State in the Union and representing virtually every branch of the Army took the 13-week radio operator training course at Tyler Commercial College. A total of 1,997 men successfully completed the course by attaining the required minimum code speed of 15 words per minute.

At Pounds Field in Tyler, Tex., during World War II—Pounds Field was then an Army installation—there was a program of advanced training carried on by the Air Force. About 1,700 men were trained there prior to January 1945.

I always have voted to strengthen and keep strong our country militarily and otherwise and I always have voted for the House Un-American Activities Com-

mittee and shall so vote in the future. I quote the pertinent part of a letter written to me by Vice Adm. Alfred G. Ward, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Plans and Policy, on February 14, 1964:

Secretary McNamara represents the Defense Department as a member of the National Security Council. In this capacity he is not only consulted by the President and Secretary of State but actively participates in the foreign policy decisionmaking process. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are Secretary McNamara's military advisers, as well as advisers to the President and to the National Security Council.

Early in 1963 under an exchange program between the State and Defense Departments 12 military officers were assigned to the State Department and an equal number of Foreign Service officers were assigned to the Defense Department. Of this exchange group, an Army and Navy officer were added to the State Department Policy Planning Council.

#### THE WHEAT-COTTON BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] and our other colleagues, on the important legislation which will be before us on Wednesday of this week, have been most interesting to all of us, I am sure. I, too, am interested in this legislation, primarily, I must admit, because of the cotton provisions of the bill. There is no greater economic problem in this country than that which confronts the textile industry due to the inequitable two-price cotton system now in being. I do not believe anyone would undertake to justify the proposition that the American textile industry should have to pay 8½ cents a pound more for

American-grown cotton than their foreign counterparts pay. So, I hope that the legislation will be approved by the House when it comes before us on Wednesday.

I hasten to point out that I do not consider this legislation to be ideal. I said before that I regret that the Congress must approach the problem in the way in which it is approached in the legislation. The Tariff Commission has had ample opportunity, under existing administrative procedures, to give to the American people relief when the section 22 application was before that Commission on the motion of the Secretary of Agriculture. That has not been done. Then, again, we had an application based upon the national security provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Again the American people lost the battle.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing left now is this legislation which will shortly be before us.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have mentioned that there are many who feel that this legislation constitutes some sort of bonus or subsidy to the domestic textile industry.

I have attempted to point out that while it will be of assistance to the domestic textile industry, the real beneficiaries of this legislation in the long pull will be those people who are involved in the cotton agricultural economy of the Nation.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the



remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and to agree with him that while some have said that this legislation will not produce any jobs, what this legislation will do is to preserve jobs that otherwise might not exist in the future. Does the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly do. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HEMPHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, I might further say that I have shared with the distinguished gentleman in his great endeavor to protect the textile people of his district and the industry itself the fear that we have had because of the decline in the number of people engaged in employment in the textile industry.

I share the belief of the gentleman from North Carolina also that this will help to stabilize that employment and probably increase that employment.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I certainly hope that the gentleman's prediction is correct.

I believe that this is our only possibility at the moment. Therefore I would hope that others would join with the gentleman and me in supporting the legislation.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I not only will support the legislation, but I am hoping to persuade others of the justice of our cause, because the gentleman from North Carolina and I so often have tried to be of help to others who had legislation of a peculiar interest to their particular economy. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina on the serious study which he has given this subject, one which is of vital interest to many of those who are directly or indirectly engaged in the cotton industry and the agricultural phase of that industry which affects cotton.

I know the gentleman from North Carolina has made a considerable study as to the impact of textiles which are made from synthetics.

Could the gentleman make a few additional comments as to what he feels may result of a detrimental nature to the cotton industry because of the continued use of more and more synthetics?

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I certainly appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has joined in this discussion.

I do not know whether the gentleman has some unusual extrasensory perception or talent in clairvoyance, but I was just before going into that subject when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] asked me to yield to him.

I think that in going into it, I go back to what I was saying when the gentleman

from South Carolina asked that I yield. I repeat that I believe the cotton farmers in the long run will be the chief beneficiaries of legislation which will eliminate the two-price cotton system. This is precisely because of the subject raised by the gentleman from Texas, and that is the invasion of manmade fibers in the textile production field in this country.

Mr. Speaker, just last week at the annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, held at West Palm Beach, Fla., Mr. R. G. Stoll, an official of the Celanese Corp. of America, one of the large synthetic fiber producing companies, made a speech which was reported very broadly in the newspapers.

I requested a copy of this speech as soon as I read about it in the press, and it was very generously furnished to me. At this time, to get to the question that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has just raised, I might read a few paragraphs from Mr. Stoll's speech to the ATMI at West Palm Beach. Among other things, he said:

Let us now look at a few areas which may offer special opportunities or threats to your industry and which may become important fields for the technological and fashion innovations. Cotton printcloth is one of the biggest commodity items for which highly efficient manufacturing methods have been developed, and extensive work is underway to improve the process by mechanization and automation. Although quite different in character and style, jersey tricot made from filament yarns has also found extensive use as printcloth. The price structure of these two commodity items puts them essentially into the same category, which could lead to the conclusions that the overall economies are very similar. However, considering the total capital investment and the manpower required to manufacture these goods, a totally different picture emerges.

For the spinning and weaving of 1 million yards of cotton printcloth per week, a modern printcloth mill requires a capital investment of \$14.7 million fixed capital and 390 people to operate the mill. For knitting the same yardage of fabric from acetate, nylon, or triacetate yarn, a capital investment of approximately \$2 million is required and approximately 64 operators. If we determine the total capital investment for the man-hours for these two processes and products, beginning with the growing of the cotton, and the manufacture of the raw materials for the continuous filament yarn production, the following data are obtained: For 1 million yards of cotton printcloth per week, \$19 to \$21 million of fixed capital investment and 40,000 to 45,000 man-hours is needed, as against \$18 to \$20 million of fixed capital investment and 14,000 to 15,000 man-hours for the continuous filament tricot printcloth. While the total capital investment of the two routes is of the same order of magnitude, the total man-hours required for the production of the knitted filament yarn fabric is only about one-third of that needed for growing, spinning, and weaving cotton printcloth. The automation of the cotton spinning mill will reduce the manpower requirements but add to the capital investment and will not significantly change the favorable economies of the jersey printcloth. It is recognized that the characteristics of a tricot fabric are so different from a cotton printcloth that it will not be possible to use one as a replacement of the other. However, when a production method offers such significant economical advantages, future technological developments may lead

to additional commercial innovations. The tailor-making of filament yarns together with the development of special knitting techniques may open up additional fields for tricot knit fabrics. This probably will not represent an immediate threat to woven fabrics but the low labor requirements of the knitting route using manmade yarns, and the possibilities of tailoring chemically produced yarns to meet functional and style requirements cannot but help this production method from gaining ground as labor gets scarcer and more expensive.

A similar comparison could be presented for circular knitting versus woven outerwear fabrics. Here again, the knitting would show considerably less capital and labor requirements than the automatic weaving of fabrics. In addition to the favorable economics, circular knitting offers a multitude of style variations which can be introduced in much shorter leadtimes than new styles in woven fabrics.

This is of particular importance to the fashion industry where the ability to change designs quickly is the key to better profits.

Circular as well as wrap knitting cannot be challenging with respect to the economics of converting yarn into fabrics. In addition, knitting offers a flexibility not inherent in the weaving process and thus permits rapid adjustments to the style demands of fashion. From a performance point of view, knitted fabrics have at the present time many limitations but they offer ease of care characteristics much more readily than woven structures. It is therefore no farfetched conclusion to anticipate that both wrap and circular knitting will continue to make inroads in the woven fabric market.

This change will be accompanied and accelerated by the increasing use of manmade filament yarns—particularly the textured type. The rate by which textured filament may replace spun yarns will be determined primarily by their comparative economics and the functional and style advantages or limitations. But here again, economic advantages will be a strong driving force.

It is not too presumptuous to predict that the knitting field and the tailormaking of filament yarn for warp and circular knitting will offer one of the most outstanding research fields to the fiber and textile industry. Innovations in this field may lead to a change in the industry comparable to the replacement of woven by tufted carpets made from textured filament yarn.

Mr. Stoll at that point pointed out something which is well known to all of us who are at all familiar with the carpet industry history. One of the great new phases of the textile industry has been the development of the tufted carpet made from synthetic fibers. As we go about Washington in these new modern buildings we see the use of these carpets in the hallways and in the offices and in the living quarters of apartment buildings, because these particular types of carpets have many advantages. But my point is that aside from the advantages which have been obtained, they have had a great impact upon the wool-producing sector of our economy. This is what Mr. Stoll, an official of one of the great synthetic fiber-producing companies in this country, is saying. This is an indirect answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Texas, that it is not too presumptuous to predict that the use of manmade fibers could well have as much impact on the cotton agricultural side of our economy as has the use of these manmade fibers in the production

of carpeting had upon the wool agricultural economy.

So this is the thought that I think might well be considered by many who sit here with us in the House. I refer to those who feel that they are representing the best interests of the cotton-producing areas of the country and I happen to represent one of those. When they come to vote on this proposition on Wednesday they should remember that our domestic producers of cotton have as their basic market the American textile industry. They will survive only so long as this basic market is preserved. Those of us who come from textile manufacturing areas have seen what has happened in the expansion and the use of manmade fibers. More can yet happen which will greatly affect the use of American-grown cotton.

We have seen the rather dramatic results of research and development programs by the producers of synthetics in this country. Having seen that, I believe we can be aware of the threat that is presented to the cotton farmers of our country. Until a few months ago, there were many who would tell you that we will never live to see the day when you can satisfactorily produce sheets and pillow cases and bedding out of synthetic fibers which would be acceptable to the people of America. Because, they said, cotton had some sort of special qualities that could not be obtained by the use of synthetic fibers. Yet, only a few months ago, in the district of my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], a new textile plant, a brand new one, costing some \$14 million, was put into operation by the Springs Mills of Lancaster, S.C. This mill will produce sheeting and pillow cases out of synthetic fibers. So, there is no point in our trying to delude ourselves that we can continue feeling secure that researchers will not find a synthetic substitute for cotton.

As one who is interested in the welfare of the cotton farmers of my State and of other States, I hope that we can all be farsighted when we come to vote on this important legislation and realize that not only will we take a cross from the shoulders of our domestic textile industry by the enactment of the legislation, but that we will in fact promote the interest of the cotton farmer in this country in the long run by trying to preserve his market—the domestic textile industry. But whatever the outcome might be, it is important that a decision be made here in the Congress as soon as possible. Even a defeat of the legislation is better for the economy of our country than a continual suspension of activity in this field.

Our domestic textile industry is operating on a week-to-week basis at this time. Many of the textile plants are running only 2 or 3 days a week because their buyers are only buying as they need the commodity to run for 1-week periods. I am hopeful that we will have no further delay in acting upon the legislation. Furthermore, I would express the hope that we might act favorably upon it because I believe it is to the best interest of the people of the country.

## DOUBLE PAY FOR OVERTIME—A DOUBTFUL SOLUTION TO A DIFFICULT PROBLEM

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, reduction of unemployment is an objective that all of us on both sides of the aisle can wholeheartedly endorse. Meaningful solutions to this problem, however, do not always meet with unanimity of opinion. It seems doubtful to me that more Government regulation and the further restricting of issues best left to free bargaining between labor and management, is the proper approach.

Great interest has been engendered in my district concerning proposals that the Government impose double pay for overtime as a device to cut down on the amount of overtime and thus spread employment. In my opinion, the proposals will be harmful not only to business but to the workingman and to the consumer. Based on the information that I have, the proposal is of doubtful merit and thus I shall oppose H.R. 9802.

STATEMENT OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. CLEVELAND BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 9802, DOUBLE PAY PENALTIES FOR OVERTIME, APRIL 6, 1964

Government imposition of double pay for overtime as proposed in H.R. 9802 could prove to be a penalty on industry, labor and consumers. It would grant further sweeping wage fixing authority to the Federal Government. Intended to stimulate the employment of more workers, the bill in reality would increase production costs without necessarily encouraging the employment of more workers. As a proposal to cut unemployment I consider it to be a fanciful and ill-conceived piece of legislation.

### CONSTITUENTS WRITE

From my home State of New Hampshire I have received much mail protesting the proposed double pay for overtime. When increased competitiveness and economic growth offer the best hope for increased employment, the double time penalty would adversely affect the competitiveness of U.S. industry, its ability to grow and employ more workers. While the tripartite committee established by the Secretary of Labor would make individual decisions on the particular industries to be affected by the double overtime rate, it is likely that all industries would be forced to pay either directly or indirectly the higher operating costs resulting from enactment of the bill. I am submitting here some of the typical comments I have received from my State of New Hampshire. A manufacturer from Keene, N.H., states: "We are a small manufacturer of elastic webbing with limited production facilities. In order to remain competitive in a very competitive industry, we use overtime extensively. This has enabled us to maintain a long record of stable uninterrupted employment at good wages for our people. We feel that the President's proposal will have serious adverse effects on our company and on many other small companies in similar situations so that instead of increasing employment as the President hopes, it will only lead to more unemployment."

### MORE MOONLIGHTING

An executive points out: "This proposed bill could also lead to more moonlighting. Workers deprived of their usual overtime, will seek other outside jobs. They will probably have to work longer on this moonlighting job to equal their previous pay received from overtime. This will injure the primary employer because the employee cannot do justice to both jobs." Another constituent writes: "Double overtime pay or more will increase manufacturing costs and corresponding selling prices, and in the writer's opinion decreases its purpose of creating employment."

A businessman says: "We feel that it would tend to increase costs and reduce employment opportunities instead of increase them. The textile industry, being somewhat seasonal in nature, would be particularly adversely affected." A steel products firm writes: "Regardless of whether the law requires us to pay time and a half, double time, or even triple time for over 40 hours, we would have no alternative but to work some of our experienced employees extra hours under the circumstances. The result would be that our costs would increase, and these added costs would have to be charged to our customers which would increase the cost to the consumer or these added costs would have to be absorbed by us, materially reducing our margin of profit." An official from a papermill in Monadnock writes: "We wish to be recorded as opposed to this bill because we feel most strongly that it will substantially increase costs of manufacturing without really serving to increase employment. Increased employment in this country, and under our system, can only result from the creation of more jobs which in turn depends upon a profitable and expanding industry."

### WON'T DO THE JOB

The double pay or more for overtime bill would be bad in theory because double pay for overtime will not create new jobs. While the Secretary of Labor says that the equivalent number of new jobs represented by workers now working overtime is over 900,000, he does not recognize that there are not available skilled men able to fill these positions full time. Limited in plant space and equipment, most industries would be required to work overtime regardless of the penalty. Such industries, while finding the double pay penalty costly, would still find it cheaper to pay the overtime penalty than to train new workers, pay more fringe benefits, and expand plant size. These industries would accordingly have to charge costs off to the consumer or have to absorb them themselves at a cost to profits and capital expansion. Some industries forced to pay penalty overtime rates may even have to reduce the scale of their business operations in order to remain competitive. The bill proposed here makes a false assumption because businessmen do not prefer to pay overtime if they can do without it, and if industries could eliminate overtime, they would do so now.

In most plants working more than regular hours, the overtime would generally not be enough to provide full-time jobs for new employees. The proposal will not result in the absorption of unemployed because the great mass of unemployed are mostly unskilled workers who would be unable to fit into skilled positions. As an answer to unemployment the bill provides scant hope, but its increased costs will be keenly felt by smaller businesses and all consumers.

### MAY SPEED UP AUTOMATION

The overtime penalty would hurt the competitive position of U.S. industry at a time when we are increasingly suffering from foreign competition and an unfavorable balance of payments. In the coming years the



penalty would further aggravate unemployment by increasing the pressures to seek labor savings methods in production. The pressures toward automation would thus be intensified. H.R. 9802 will cause employee dissatisfaction because workers like to receive overtime pay. If an industry did eliminate overtime, workers cut off from the extra income would demand wage hikes to compensate for lost income and this demand for higher wages would be felt by all industries. On the other hand, an industry offering double pay would lure skilled workers from other industries, and those industries faced with a loss of workers would be forced to increase their wage rates to retain their employees.

#### LANGUAGE TOO BROAD

H.R. 9802 would be bad in practice. The broad terminology of the language of the bill confers upon the Secretary of Labor vast discretionary authority which threatens business and is a further erosion of our private enterprise system. "Excessive overtime" is a vague term capable of no clear definition, but yet the Federal Government is given broad fishing expedition powers over any firm working overtime. Such interference by the Government will create further harmful harassment of industry, now in a position to grow, expand, and open new employment opportunities. Decisions on the overtime penalty will merely be made on the arbitrary findings of tripartite committees despite the disappointing performance in the past of so-called impartial tri-partite boards such as the War Labor Board and the Wage Stabilization Board. The bill as proposed does not even provide for judicial review and businesses will be at the mercy of administrative fiat.

The Government establishment of tripartite committees to select industries for the double overtime penalty falsely assumes that generalizations can be made on the character of industries and all the different plants and companies within an industry. Each firm and plant would be a separate case and it would be impossible for the tripartite committee to predict how a firm would react to double overtime.

In conclusion, it would appear that the proposals for double pay for overtime will not be successful in creating greater employment opportunities. In fact, there is reason to believe these proposals would lead to a reverse result. In my opinion, such matters should be left to the bargaining process, and it is interesting to find that double time for overtime, under certain conditions, is already the practice in some industries.

Increased Government regulation is not necessarily the answer to greater employment opportunities. A better way to increase employment is by a government fiscal policy conducive to business growth and investment. The Federal Government should encourage education and vocational training because the real need is for intelligent citizens and skilled workers and not for artificially created jobs which in the final analysis will strangle business and frustrate further investment and employment opportunities.

A far more productive area to study would be the impact of foreign imports from cheap labor areas on the U.S. employment picture. The entire question of moonlighting should be examined. The unemployment statistics themselves might well be further examined and reevaluated. Many workers in my district have come to count on their overtime pay, and this proposal that directly threatens to take it away, under the guise of a fanciful make-work, spread-work proposal, is just as disturbing to them as it is to their employers.

#### MULTIMILLION-DOLLAR WINDFALL TO TEXTILE MILLS

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, U.S. textile mills will pocket a multimillion-dollar windfall if the House approves the cotton-wheat bill next week.

Textile inventories are extremely low. Buyers have purchased only bare essentials in recent weeks, hopeful that mill subsidy payments provided in the bill will result in lower textile prices.

If the bill passes, a sudden surge of orders will result.

With orders piling up, mills will be in a strong position to increase profit margins. They could pocket a big chunk of the 6-cent-a-pound direct-subsidy payment authorized in the bill. Business may even be strong enough to enable textile firms to pocket most of the subsidy, which is estimated to reach a grand total of \$312 million during the first year.

A market-analyst firm, Commodity Research Bureau, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York City, made this statement in its March 27 customer newsletter, "Futures Market Service," volume 31, No. 13:

Mills and selling agents anticipate a sharp upsurge in cloth demand before long, since buyers have been restricting purchases for many weeks.

Mills will endeavor, it is reported, to retain as much of the subsidy as possible, if and when it becomes effective, in order to strengthen profit margins.

Due to these ideal market conditions, passage of the cotton-wheat bill will deliver a handsome windfall to textile mills.

To illustrate the windfall potential for individual firms, here are the annual subsidy payments the bill would authorize for the top five U.S. mills. Payments are computed on the basis of last year's use of raw cotton:

#### [Annual subsidy payment in millions]

Burlington mills.....	\$16.500
Stevens mills.....	13.500
Springs mills.....	11.250
Dan River mills.....	9.000
West Point mills.....	7.000

Secretary Freeman's prediction on March 26 of excessive profit-taking by wheat milling and baking industries if the bill is defeated is without foundation and misdirected. As we say back in Illinois, he was barking up the wrong tree.

The real danger of profit-taking will occur if the bill becomes law, and the profiteers will be the textile mills, not the wheat processors.

Illinois wheat farmers said very clearly in the referendum last May 21 they want no part of the certificate plan now in the wheat part of the bill. They are taxpayers as well as farmers. The windfall to textile mills makes the bill doubly offensive.

#### THE CASE FOR THE "NEW ECONOMICS" HAS NEVER BEEN PROVED

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a well-organized group of bookworm economists are constantly telling the American people that the Federal Government must continue to spend, spend, and then spend more and more of our taxpayers' dollars by the billions upon billions in order to insure by some magic means prosperity for every American and for all the people of the world. Now comes Mr. Walter E. Spahr, a recognized down-to-earth, distinguished monetary authority, with some salient facts which debunk the socialistic bookworm economists' bunk. Please listen, my colleagues, while I read:

#### MONETARY NOTES

(By Walter E. Spahr)

(Published by the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy<sup>1</sup>)

1. "The case for the 'new economics' has never been proved." From an address by Maurice H. Stans, onetime Director of the Bureau of the Budget, on "Are the Liberal Economists Overlooking Something?" as inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, pages A357-359, by Representative BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa:

"We all work 1 week a year on the average now just to pay interest on the national debt. The debt itself increases year by year.

"The total of all present debts, commitments, and accrued liabilities of the Federal Government—such as would appear on the financial statement of a business—is now in excess of \$1 trillion. This is about \$21,000 for every family of four in the country. Is it right to add to this each year for the sake of testing will-o'-the-wisp experiments that include semantic absurdities like calling a present deficit 'a down payment on future surpluses'?

"Even deeper than its impact on today's living costs or tomorrow's debts and taxes is the potential danger of weakening the national ability to fight communism. \* \* \*

"The new economic theories have the attractions of promising much, providing a pleasant euphoria of irresponsibility, and postponing of the reckoning to another generation. But the evidence of experience in our country and elsewhere shows they have little chance of success.

"The case for the 'new economics' has never been proved. It rests on a sandy foundation that has never, in history, supported a nation's long-term progress. It has failed under every test. \* \* \*

"The liberal economists are overlooking \* \* \* the likely risks of failure and its disastrous consequences. They are overlooking the \* \* \* danger that by pursuing their course they may build over us a dictatorship of economic planners and of central bureaucratic government, destroy our freedoms, and make us easy victims of communism.

"What's the alternative? It's \* \* \* a recognition that the privilege of being a free people involves assuming responsibilities. It

<sup>1</sup> The opinions expressed are those of the authors, not necessarily those of this committee.

is disciplined government which doesn't consider thrift a discredited word. It is government that can recognize danger signs and avoid financial brinkwalking.

"It is government that won't get in the way of sound economic growth, but will achieve it by encouraging the free market system. It is government that believes, like Lincoln, that it should do for the people only those things that they can't do as well for themselves, not in the centralization of all problems in Washington. It is government that believes in sound money, that debts must be paid, that the budget should be balanced, that the Public Treasury is a trust, that rate of material growth is less important than sustained strength and character."

S (for Spahr): Mr. Stans focuses attention on one of the most fundamental issues facing this country. When a nation is caught up in a tide which can, and may, lead to its destruction, there usually are some intelligent and responsible people who, seeing the dangers in correct perspective, do their best to rescue their country from the euphoria into which it has fallen. Mr. Stans' address is a solemn warning by a man of wisdom in respect to a serious state of affairs. As Representative JENSEN states (p. A357), the address "should be read by every American citizen."

It should be noticed that one of Mr. Stan's recommendations is that we have a government "that believes in sound money." We seem to have gone so far down the slide of government irresponsibility, manipulation, and dishonesty that few people now consider it important to recommend a sound currency for our people. Only an economic illiterate, or Socialist, or Communist, or a person who attaches no importance to truth could have the temerity to call our irredeemable currency a sound currency. Our use of irredeemable currency is a case of government injection of a poorly understood national poison into our social system; and this is a poison that can ruin us economically, socially, and politically. Like a cancer, it has already eaten deeply into the vital parts of our national organism.

2. Keynesianism: "A fashion of subtle equivocation"; "peaceful acceptance" of Marxian aims; the ideas of the monetary "cranks" are "at the root of Keynes' teachings." From W. H. Hutt, "Keynesianism—Retrospect and Prospect" (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1963, 447 pages, \$7.50):

Page 34: "Keynes established, I suggest, a fashion of subtle equivocation in monetary discussion, a fashion which, through habit and domination, has become almost a convention."

Page 48: "In what is probably the most effective recent defense of Keynesianism, Bronfenbrenner has argued that the great virtue of the doctrine has been that, through its influence upon policy—through the consequent secular inflation—the 'peaceful acceptance' of Marxian aims has been secured. Where the drastic measures which Marx himself contemplated would have failed, Keynesian methods have quietly succeeded."

Pages 89-90: "... Keynes' chief originality lay in his ironic attack on orthodox thinking about money and other things. His attack created, I believe, so much confusion in the minds of the young economists of the subsequent generation, that it has set back progress by at least a couple of decades."

Page 99: "The postwar inflations of Western Europe and the United States have been due to policy weaknesses, weaknesses which, in my judgment, have been dictated by treasuries actuated by political considerations—supposedly validated by Keynesian teachings—rather than by the technical requirements of a stable monetary system."

Pages 128-129: "The Keynesians like to praise the 'cranks' such as Hobson, Gesell,

Townsend, Douglas, Foster, and Catchings, on the grounds that they at least recognized the defects of the system which (it is alleged) orthodox theory had created. At the same time the Keynesians insist upon differentiating themselves from the naive reasoning and naive panaceas of the 'cranks.' They would be ashamed to hold, as the latter in effect did, that merely to dole out additional money is the cure for unemployment. And yet the Keynesian remedies amount to nothing more than this. The identical ideas in all their naivete are at the root of Keynes' teachings, but obscured in a mass of conceptually unsatisfactory theoretical paraphernalia."

Page 435: "In my judgment \* \* \* the enormous appeal of Keynes' thesis originated precisely in doctrines which were rendered plausible through the obscuring of unrealistic assumptions."

S: W. H. Hutt is professor of commerce and dean of the faculty of commerce, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

3. Clothing the perversion of commonsense in economics with academic dignity. From Dr. Melchior Palyi's review of Dean W. H. Hutt's, "Keynesianism," in the Palyi Bulletin No. 492, 211 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., January 18, pages 2-3:

"A true revolution, with or without blood and tears, means what Nietzsche has called the 'revaluation of values,' an outright break with basic standards and traditions. That is what has happened in economic thinking and economic policies of this generation. Keynesianism is the name of the revolutionary ideology that clothes with academic dignity the perversion of the commonsense embodied in classical economics—reverting to a crude sort of prescientific notions."

"Spending became the wealth creator, not saving. The more we spend, the more employment, and spending power, are being contrived. The trouble is, by Keynesian dialectics, that the saver obstinately 'withholds' his income. He must be discouraged by cheap money in perpetuity. It has the further 'advantage' of encouraging the producer—to replace genuine savings by (inflationary) bank credit."

"The 'General Theory' of Keynes appeared in 1936. It preached the 'euthanasia' of the wicked saver. It requested that the Government should step in as spender."

4. The ghost of our Government's lack of integrity in respect to our monetary standard. From Dr. Melchior Palyi's "Devaluation Damage of 1930's Still With United States," Chicago Tribune, January 27, 1964:

"The tremendous damage our devaluation did to the world is still with us. For one thing, it undermined the faith in the value of contracts we sign and in the promises we make. We have refrained from repeating the 1933-34 performance. Yet, the ghost of the devaluation haunts the foreign exchange markets."

"Whenever the dollar is under pressure, a panic gets underway—on the implicit assumption that what was done in the 1930's could and might be repeated in the 1960's, notwithstanding the most solemn Presidential assurances to the contrary."

"The wounds inflicted by the 1934 'reform' of our monetary system fester with the progress of time."

S: When a government departs from correct ethical standards, particularly in respect to its monetary standard, the harm which results is probably immeasurable. There was no valid excuse for the devaluation of 1934 in this country.

5. "The dollar is as good as gold." From "Martin (William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System) on Monetary Policy, Balance-of-Payments Woe," American Bank-

er, economic forecast section, January 31, page 46:

"No one could miss the firmness of that commitment [by the late President Kennedy in his special message to Congress on the international payments problem, 4 months and 4 days before his assassination] to 'maintain the dollar as good as gold.'"

S: If the nongold dollar is as good as gold, then why is it not made redeemable in gold, particularly since nongold dollars are much more convenient than gold money?

The statement attributed to the late President Kennedy, and offered by Mr. Martin with solemnity, is reasonably typical of those frequently made these days despite the fact that our dollars are irredeemable domestically, despite the fact that foreign central banks and governments have earmarked approximately \$13 billion of gold in this country for their account, despite the fact that our Treasury gold stock has fallen from \$22,787 million, as of February 19, 1958, to \$15,463 million as of February 12, 1964, and despite the fact the ratio of our Treasury gold stock to our nongold money and bank deposits has fallen from 24.6 percent in 1941 to 4.1 percent as of December 25, 1963.

6. An illustration of the misuse of the words "sound dollar." From an address by Dr. T. E. Donges, Minister of Finance of the Republic of South Africa, on "International Liquidity and Gold," at Salt Lake City, September 23, 1963 (issued by the Information Service of South Africa, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.), page 2:

"I am one of those who firmly believe, as you do, that a sound dollar is essential to the proper functioning of the international monetary system and the stability of the world economy. I believe that the dollar is strong, and I hope and believe that it will remain so. The measures which I shall put forward are \* \* \* designed to strengthen it."

His page 8: Here he recommends "that the par value of all currencies in terms of gold, as presently fixed with the International Monetary Fund, be changed by a large but uniform percentage, except possibly in a small number of cases where individual countries might wish to change their own par value by some other percentage."

His page 9: "What would happen \* \* \* is that the American official gold reserve (and the gold reserves of other countries) would increase very substantially—perhaps to double or treble their present values."

His page 14: "The right policy is to increase the gold component by means of a revaluation of gold in terms of all currencies."

"It is very desirable that the United States should take the lead in initiating this move."

S: Thus we see a devaluationist, of gold-mining South Africa, telling the Board of Governors Association of Stock Exchange Firms at Salt Lake City that our dollar is sound and then proceeding to recommend that it be devalued again.

Dr. Donges provides a revealing commentary on his speech in his last sentence (p. 14): "The free world would do well to take to heart the wise words in the Revelations of St. John; namely, 'I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich.'"

If Mr. Donges thinks it desirable to have another devaluation of our dollar, and other currencies, so that "the American gold reserve \* \* \* would increase substantially—perhaps to double or treble their present values" (p. 9), why would it not be even more desirable to write up the value of our gold stock to equal our national debt so that it could be paid off at once and in gold certificates?

7. "Authority over reserve requirements." From David P. Eastburn, "Where Is the Fed Heading?" Business Review (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, January 1964), page 7:



"It [the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System] has sole authority over reserve requirements."

S: Congress specifies in the Federal Reserve Act the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve banks and member banks of the Federal Reserve System. Reserve requirements of nonmember State banks fall under the jurisdiction of State governments.

8. Officers and directors of Federal Reserve banks as "public officials." From Eastburn, op. cit., page 7:

"But it is also true that officers and directors of the Reserve Banks are public officials. The fact that officers are chosen by the boards of directors, two-thirds of whom, in turn, are elected by the member banks, does not mean that either group serves private interests. In working toward the general objectives of the Federal Reserve System they serve as public officials in the public interest."

S: Mr. Eastburn does not present in a clear-cut or useful manner his concept or definition of a public official. As he points out, two-thirds of the boards of directors are elected by member banks. Moreover, their salaries are paid by the Federal Reserve banks. How, then, can these directors be regarded, correctly, as public officials? Even the Class C directors of the Reserve banks, who are appointed by the Board of Governors, are paid by their respective Federal Reserve banks which are owned by member banks. Is a person a government official if he is not paid by the Government?

The statement that the methods of selecting directors of Federal Reserve banks "does not mean that either group serves private interests" is unjustifiable for the reason that the directors would be violating the Federal Reserve Act if they failed to serve those interests. For example, paragraph 8 of section 4 of the Act states that the "board of directors shall administer the affairs of the said [Federal Reserve] bank with due regard for the claims and demands of other member banks, the maintenance of sound credit conditions, and the accommodation of commerce, industry, and agriculture." Paragraph (c) of section 12B of the act reads: "The time, character, and volume of all purchases and sales described in section 14 of this act as eligible for open-market operations shall be governed with a view to accommodating commerce and business and with regard to their bearing upon the general credit situation of the country."

There appears to be nothing in this bulletin from the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia which is a helpful contribution toward the maintenance of the proper independence of the Federal Reserve System from political control and manipulation.

9. On the money supply and the economy. From "Our Amazing Money Supply" (Lionel D. Edie & Co., Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., January 28, 1964):

"Today, the money supply is expanding—and expanding rapidly. What does this mean? It means that the economy has more expansion in it than most people realize. It means that we will continue to expand throughout 1964."

S: How does the author of that statement know what "most people realize"? And how can that author know that "we will continue to expand throughout 1964" since no one living today has seen tomorrow or can know what tomorrow may bring?

And as to an expanding money supply and an expanding economy: If an expansion of the currency brings an expanding economy, the answer is simple—expand the currency.

When Germany's currency was expanding into astronomical figures, 1920–23, her people were sinking to the level of "brown bread and paper clothes."

On June 30, 1939, the volume of all bank deposits and all money in circulation in the

United States of America was 7 percent greater than on June 30, 1937 (1926 equals 100); the index of industrial production was 16 percent lower (1935–39 equals 100). On December 31, 1929, the volume of money and deposits was 2.7 percent greater than in June 30, 1929; the index of industrial production was 12 percent lower. On June 30, 1929, the volume of money and deposits was 0.2 lower than in June 30, 1926; the index of industrial production was 20 percent higher.

Then the question of cause and effect is involved. An expansion of business commonly tends to draw more credit into use. A contraction of business commonly tends to contract the volume of credit in use.

10. On "The Federal Budget for 1965." From "Federal Spending Facts," Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Bulletin No. 208 (room 513, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., January 31):

Spending authority, fiscal 1955 equals \$57.1 billion; expenditures, \$64.4.

Spending authority, fiscal 1964 equals \$102.6 billion; expenditures, \$98.4.

S: These figures should reveal something of the degree of frenzy that marks the spending by our National Government.

And what lies at the bottom of this orgy of Government spending? It is the use of irredeemable currency which deprives the people of this country of power to control the public purse and, consequently, their Government. We have a runaway Central Government. That is a common consequence of injecting the poison of irredeemable currency into a nation.

11. On loss of control of public expenditures by Congress. From "Controlling Federal Expenditures" (Tax Foundation, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, December 1963), page 27.

"The extent to which the legislative branch does not at present have control over this spending was highlighted in an analysis of administrative budget proposals for 1964 in the Tax Foundation's Washington Report. This study showed that Congress, under present procedures, would be able to exercise effective control over only about 30 percent of the estimated \$98.8 billion to be spent."

S: Dr. Parker of the foundation raises the question of whether Congress can regain its traditional and desirable control over Federal expenditures under the existing system or whether there must be basic changes in procedures before this objective can be attained.

A fundamental consideration to bear in mind is that the U.S. Government's orgy of spending dates from the introduction of irredeemable currency in this country in 1933. That is the common consequence of the use of irredeemable currency which deprives the people of control of the public purse and of their Central Government.

12. "While the citizen is deprived of his natural right to protect himself by owning gold." From Dr. Melchior Palyi's "Our Gold Standard Is Without Discipline," Chicago Tribune, February 3, 1964:

"A sound currency to be preserved at all hazards," was the promise of the 1932 Democratic platform. Franklin D. Roosevelt's gold reserve act of 1934 scrapped it."

"Getting off gold may give us the kind of exhilaration an astronaut experiences when he leaves gravity behind. But he is not likely to fool himself as some people who believe in 'demonetizing' gold for good. In reality, it is with us always—the ultimate measure of every money's value—whether we like it or not."

"At the time [1933–34], the charlatans had a heyday."

"One [alternative] was to return to the gold coin standard and its 'discipline,' meaning the free convertibility in gold (to all comers) of the legal tender at a fixed gold price. That trims the spending propensity of the politicians. They disliked it accordingly."

"Our monetary setup is a gold standard in form—without the discipline, which is the substance. This is called an international gold-bullion standard. Its 30-year balance sheet is as was to be expected from a setup designed to establish and promote perpetual inflation."

"Indeed, the currency is wide open to tinkering by the Government while the citizen is deprived of his natural right to protect himself by owning gold either at home or abroad. He must not be so presumptuous as to frustrate the inflation-happy politicians whose last refuge is: Devaluation, open or concealed."

13. Correction of an error. The following statement appeared in item 5 of Monetary Notes for February 1, 1964: "Following this order [WPB Order L-208 of Oct. 8, 1942] there was a sharp drop, 1943–45, in the production of gold in this country—from 4,832,087 fine ounces in 1941 and 3,583,080 fine ounces in 1942 to 915,403 fine ounces in 1947." The year 1947 should have read 1945; and production figures refer to refinery production.

Ratio of gold to nongold money and deposits, January 29, 1964 equals 4.6 percent. Ratio for 1941 equals 24.6 percent. Average for 1915–32, pre-1934 data equals 8.6 percent; range of yearly averages, 1915–32 equals 6.7–10.9 percent. On February 19, 1958, before the persistent drain began, Treasury gold stock was \$22,878 million. On February 26, 1964, it was down to \$15,463 million. The peak was \$24,691 million for week ending September 21, 1949. Gold earmarked at Reserve banks for foreign and international accounts was \$12,899 million at end of January 1964. Earmarked gold is not included in monetary gold stock of the United States.

## "WHY I'M RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT"—BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the March issue of the New Guard, the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom, there is an article entitled "Why I'm Running for President," by BARRY M. GOLDWATER.

It is a clear and provocative statement of principle by the Nation's leading conservative and leading candidate for the GOP nomination for the Presidency.

As the organizing chairman of the official, pledged, and endorsed Goldwater-for-President slate of delegates entered in the Florida primary on May 26, I consider it a privilege to call this article to the attention of my colleagues in the House. In his usual forthright manner, Senator GOLDWATER states that he believes it to be his duty to provide a clear cut choice to the voters "of voting for or rejecting constitutional principles" for which he stands and that this is the reason for seeking the Presidency.

He considers his candidacy a call to duty to oppose "welfare statism and foreign policy weakness" offered by the Democratic Party in the past and at present.

I commend this article to the attention of all America:

**A CALL TO DUTY: WHY I'M RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT**

(By Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER)

One of the great phenomena of modern American politics is the manner in which some ostensibly self-effacing men become—in their own opinion, at least—indispensable candidates for elective office. But despite this syndrome, our history, from George Washington on down, has proved conclusively that the republican form of government has succeeded primarily because it rejects such dependency.

Understandably, there can be no greater personal achievement than election to the highest office the greatest Nation in the world can offer, but anyone who places personal ambition above the interests of his country should, per se, be considered unqualified for the post he seeks.

Ideally, candidates should spring from the people themselves or from the individual's belief that he can further a particular cause to which he is dedicated. Neither circumstance, however, leaves room for the candidate who seeks office solely because of his personal ambitions.

Although it is not unique, the ascension of individual politicians to power as the result of their personal determination is more common in the United States than elsewhere in the free world.

**PARTIES AND FACTIONS**

In England, for instance, the popular will historically has been expressed in support of the man whose leadership, political philosophies and experience best qualified him as representative of his own political faction. Thus, there is seldom more than one serious candidate for Prime Minister put forth by either the Labor or Conservative Party.

Even in France, so famous for her constant changes in administration, the head of state truly represents his particular political group. Charles de Gaulle's rise to power was solely a question of popular support springing from his leadership of the Free French forces in World War II. Although there can be little question but that he today exercises more power than most of his predecessors, he can be expected to hold office only so long as the Gaullists have popular support. There is little or no possibility that anyone else in his own political organization could unseat him. When and if De Gaulle is defeated, he will go down with his entire political faction, not alone to be succeeded by someone in that party who believes he is better qualified.

The two-party system, which theoretically should have obviated such personal ambitions, became an American institution soon after the birth of our Republic. Washington actually was the only man in our history to be elected unanimously, but unanimity ended there. His successor, John Adams, won the Presidency by a vote of 71 to 68 and throughout his term in office was known by his opponents as "President by three votes." Factionalism built up during Adams' administration and the power of party surpassed that of the individual image. Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received equal votes in the next Presidential election and it fell to the House of Representatives to decide the issue. Jefferson was elected, but party bitterness was such that Adams refused to ride with Jefferson to the latter's inauguration. Later, as we all know, the two patched up their differences and they died as friends on the same day—July 4, 1826.

Jefferson ran for the Presidency as a Republican, and the confusion that usually results from associating him with the GOP on the Democratic Party's annual Jefferson-Jackson Day observances is understandable.

Actually, the Republican Party to which Jefferson pledged allegiance later became the Democratic Party, but regardless of these changes in label, the two-party system was here to stay.

As changes occurred, the coexistence of old guard and avant-garde elements in each party made it impossible for the politically ambitious to jockey for support.

**POWER OR PRINCIPLE?**

Today, personal ambition, wealth, and bought power have become decisive factors in both nominating conventions and elections. Such old-line party workers and experienced legislators as Hubert Humphrey, Estes Kefauver, and Lyndon Johnson found this out, if they had not known it beforehand, in 1960, when all were defeated by a young and inexperienced candidate who had limitless wealth and posed as the champion of both extremes within his own party.

One reason that personal ambition, rather than party leadership and political philosophy succeeds, is a lack of any sharp delineation of party principles. Fortunately, this fuzziness of demarcation is not so pronounced in the GOP, as it is in the Democratic Party, where the old guard has been pushed aside by labor-boss-controlled liberals.

Thus, it is not surprising that despite the heavy national majority of Democratic registration, the ratio of Democratic and Republican ballots cast in our national elections is nearly equal. The reason, simply put, is cross-voting by lifelong Democrats who are disgusted with the welfare statism and foreign policy weakness their own party leadership offers.

Within the Republican Party, divergencies of opinions are comparatively minor in nature and only one set of principles is needed. Because these principles are conservative in nature, the Republican Party has become the representative of the conservative philosophy.

Unfortunately, some Republicans still feel that in order to overcome the numerical superiority of the Democratic Party at the polls, it is necessary to water down or "liberalize" GOP principles. The reasoning behind this theory is that the Republican Party thus may attract the liberal "independent" vote. This formula has a long history of failure simply because the "liberal" independent vote, like the liberal Democrat vote, always has been and will be cast for the most liberal candidate—a liberal Democrat.

**UNWAVERING CONSERVATISM**

In the past 3 years, there has been a growing awareness within the Republican Party that the best opportunity for election victory rests in unwavering adherence to conservatism. Although some in the party hierarchy perhaps have been slower than rank-and-file GOP members in understanding this, it, nevertheless, has become a pretty well-established fact of political life.

What makes sincere conservatism more attractive to the voters is as simple as the differentiation between good and bad. Every housewife and wage earner knows the disadvantages of overspending the household budget, and liberal-inspired and planned deficits on the governmental level are just as repulsive. In more than 30 years of catastrophic failure of welfare State programs and spineless foreign policy, the voter has developed ever-greater respect for the principles enunciated by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. This respect has not been acquired solely by members of our party, but by independents and a large percentage of Democrats.

Paradoxically, proof that conservatism is more attractive to the voters than is liberalism may be found in those same statewide election contests "moderate" Republicans

point to as support for the opposite view. In the large Eastern States, where "moderate" Republicans win by such overwhelming majorities, for instance, we find that the basic reasons for their victories rests in a public disavowal of the more liberal programs championed by their Democratic opponents. Although large blocs of conservative voters have remained at home on election day during such contests, the outpouring of independent and Democratic votes in opposition in the far-out liberalism of the Democratic candidate has been sufficient to give "moderate" Republican candidates victory.

Today, it should be obvious to all Republicans that the conservatism within the independent bloc and the Democratic Party itself can be further augmented by the strength of the conservative voters who have stayed home in protest against watered-down principles. The development of this understanding, of course, would minimize the possibility of party nomination on the basis of personality.

The emergence of the candidate who is inspired only because of personal ambition perhaps is traceable to this mistaken belief in the drawing power of liberalism. The personally ambitious, or opportunistic, suffers few pangs of conscience at the thought of tailoring his own political beliefs to suit the occasion, whereas the candidate who stands unshakably firm on principle, whether that principle be liberalism or conservatism, cannot conscientiously weaken or change for the purpose of winning votes.

**NO COMPROMISE**

This has been proved in both major political parties in recent years. We have witnessed supposedly conservative Republican candidates become moderates in the hope of picking up election strength only to find that the formula doesn't work at the polls.

Personally, I have never been able to alter my convictions for the sake of winning votes and I cannot conceive of the circumstance which could force me to do so. I first ran for office because a number of Arizonians felt I best represented their own political philosophy. Their insistence that I could strengthen the conservative cause by running for the Senate seat I now hold convinced me that I should run. My decision to seek the Republican presidential nomination was based upon these same factors.

I can say in all sincerity that I do not have and never have had any personal ambition to fill the highest office in the land. The prospects that I may win the election would be frightening except for the obligation I owe, as an American, to all those whose unwavering dedication to constitutional principles is the best hope of survival in freedom. I believe I can give them the choice of voting for or rejecting these principles as I understand them.

**A MASSIVE ATTACK ON READING**

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a comprehensive assault on reading is needed to develop the most valuable tool that education can offer—reading. It must not be a minor effort, handled by amateurs, if we are to have any hope of success. In the following



speech I have outlined a proposed approach which I believe is both practical and possible. I am sure that many of my colleagues will want to help in the job of developing literate human beings who can effectively participate in our society—to elevate literacy upon which our democracy depends.

Following is an address which I delivered before the Conference on Reading for Educators, at the University of Delaware, Newark, Del., March 7, 1964:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
OF RHODE ISLAND

I welcome this opportunity to meet with the men and women who are providing professional leadership for developing literate individuals in our society. You share with your colleagues throughout the Nation a heavy responsibility. In this era of great change, new demands of both quality and quantity are being placed upon American education. Today, as perhaps never before, there is no higher calling than that of the educator. It is to you and to our schools that the Nation looks for the structure and shape of our future.

As masters of reading skills you face a special challenge of inspiring and stimulating both teachers and students to the full attainment of their potentials. Those among you who are serving our elementary schools provide the foundations upon which the whole house of education rests.

I would like to talk with you today about a job begun—and a job yet to be done in American education. This job is to develop literate human beings who can effectively participate in our society—to elevate literacy upon which our democracy depends. You, as the experts, must provide the leadership for undertaking this task; I, as a Representative in Congress, wish to seek ways to help you.

My appearance before you today reminds me of a classroom tale which was recently related to me:

An extremely nearsighted schoolteacher was rapidly losing his temper, because many of his students apparently neglected their lesson. "You at the back of the class—what was the date of the signing of the Magna Carta?"

"I don't know."

"Well then, can you tell me what the Gordon Riots were?"

"I don't know."

"I assigned that yesterday. What were you doing last night?"

"I was out drinking beer with some friends."

The schoolteacher gasped, and his face went almost purple. "You have the audacity to stand there and tell me that. How do you expect to pass your examination?"

"Well, I don't. I'm an electrician, and I just came here to fix the lights."

Like the electrician, I may be ill prepared to answer specific inquiries. But perhaps, like him, I can help to repair the lights, to cast illumination on a subject that concerns us all. This is the role the Federal Government can play in helping to solve the problems related to reading and literacy.

Historically, the Federal Government has been an active participant in research and development activity in a variety of fields. Modern agriculture, of course, is deeply indebted to Government research aid for many of its present-day accomplishments. Governmental research and development was greatly accelerated during and after the second World War and with astounding success—especially in the medical, physical, and space sciences. Now, governmental leaders are beginning to look at the educational, sociological, and economic problems of our society in a similar way. People in Washington are asking what the Federal Govern-

ment can do to translate sensible ideas in these fields into sound and effective action.

Your vital and continuing interest in the development of literate individuals has bridged the progress accomplished since the days of the Hornbook and the McGuffey readers to the acute need for progress that lies ahead. Popular publications reflect the complexity of your task in the controversial aspects of reading.

Can Johnny read or can't he? we are asked. Is he a better or poorer reader than his forefathers? Should teachers use a "look-say" method, a phonics method, or some combination of both? I continually encounter words and phrases like "phonics," "phonetics," "phonemics," "the augmented Roman alphabet," "the Bloomfield-Barnhart approach," and so forth. If there is some confusion in the public mind, perhaps this is understandable. There is, I hear, some question among the specialists themselves over the best phonics approach—and how to use it and when to use it.

Now what can the Federal Government contribute toward solving this sort of problem? What is its proper and effective role? One example of a federally supported program which brought significant changes to our high schools was the physics program of the Physical Science Study Committee. For this program, the National Science Foundation provided funds which enabled an outstanding group of physicists and educators to focus their attention upon high school physics. After materials were developed by this group, teachers were trained to use them in workshops and institutes around the country. The total cost of this venture was approximately \$14 million. The net result—is that this program is currently being used by nearly 75 percent of all students receiving high school physics instruction in the United States. In a brief span of years, the teaching of physics was brought up to date, up to the potentials of modern knowledge and teaching skills and student capability.

Although there is at present no undertaking of this magnitude in reading, some notable accomplishments are underway. One of my congressional committee responsibilities brings me in close contact with the cooperative research program of the Office of Education. This program has provided funds for a number of basic and applied research undertakings pertaining to reading. For example:

One researcher is studying the effectiveness of beginning the formal teaching of reading in kindergarten. Although some educators have argued for years that many children can be taught to read at earlier ages than they are now taught, no research has been conducted either to prove or disprove it. The results of this study could be of great significance to reading instruction.

The structure of children's language was compared with the language used in textbooks in another study. The researcher found that the oral language children use is far more advanced than the language of the books in which they are taught to read.

In a third study the language growth of children is being studied over the span of the elementary school years and through junior and senior high school. A longitudinal study of language development such as this has never been conducted before and will give us for the first time a picture of how language and reading skills grow.

In a fourth study, the investigator is attempting to determine what communication barriers exist for the culturally deprived. He will then attempt to develop ways to evaluate these differences.

A fifth study has focused upon the problem of teaching illiterate adolescents how to read. If this researcher succeeds, he may contribute materially to reducing the num-

ber of students who drop out of school. And, he may well provide some vital clues to attacking the overarching problem of adult illiteracy.

A sixth group has undertaken an exploratory study of reading patterns among high school students. These researchers seek to determine whether specified training in reading will result in significantly better reading ability within various technical areas.

In addition to these six exploratory studies, the cooperative research program is also supporting 11 curriculum study centers within the framework of its Project English. Since the purpose of these centers is to develop curricular materials, the impact of reading upon each center's activity is of immediate concern. One of the centers, for example, is developing reading and language materials and teaching guides which will be used in junior high schools serving children from poor and culturally disadvantaged areas. Emphasis has been placed here because educators have found that available materials are usually unsuccessful with these children. Another center supported through Project English has as a major objective the development of a series of films on methods of teaching reading in the secondary schools. These films will be used in the training of teachers.

These studies, in which many of you are involved, form a firm basis for advancing our knowledge about reading. As many of us know, plans for further studies next year are also impressive. The Office of Education intends, first, to support a number of field tests of first-grade reading programs in various parts of the country; second, to establish a study group which will investigate needed basic research in reading; and, third, to relate activities in reading to current developments within the various behavioral and biological sciences. Each of these efforts is directed toward an evident problem in reading.

These are the types of studies in reading which are being or have been supported by Federal funds. They also typify the kinds of projects which receive support from private foundations or colleges and universities.

At this point, it would be well to evaluate the nature and extent of the research now underway in reading, to ask whether the present decentralized attack on reading problems is accomplishing enough, whether our current research ventures in reading are of sufficient magnitude to bring about desired and widespread improvement.

In weighing these questions, in finding a perspective on the magnitude of the task, we may recall that the National Science Foundation spent about \$14 million on a coordinated program to develop and strengthen the teaching of physics in high school. This effort was vastly successful. But we might also reflect that physics is often neither a required course nor even a course offered in many high schools, that many students have no contact with it whatever.

In teaching our children to read, however, we are speaking of a central enterprise of education, involving every child who attends our schools. We are speaking of the need to open doors to the written word, to develop what is surely the most valuable tool that education can offer.

The need to expand our reading skills, to elevate America's literacy is so comprehensive that I cannot imagine how the present research, worthwhile as it may be, can possibly be enough. As one who was involved in the development of our present high level of medical research, I am compelled to say that the educational community needs to initiate a comprehensive assault on reading, that such an effort abundantly calls for support and that the time for this effort and support is now.

It cannot and must not be a minor effort, handled by amateurs if we are to have any hope of success. The best minds in our Nation should be brought to bear upon it. It presents, in my judgment, a classic opportunity for schools, colleges, universities, publishers, and Federal agencies to join together in a project aimed at developing literacy as expeditiously and as effectively as our resources will permit.

Five or ten years ago, few people would have considered a Federal agency as a source of funds for such a project. Today, it would be eligible for funds from several Federal sources. The Cooperative Research Branch of the Office of Education, as one example, might well place its staff and resources behind a massive research approach to reading. But, however it is supported, research on reading cannot move ahead without expert leadership. You and your colleagues must provide that leadership.

Is our meeting today a proper place to set a project of this importance into motion? If it isn't, where shall we find a more likely place?

Now, what might result from the massive study which I have outlined? Generally, I would hope for a highly literate populace in the years ahead. Specifically, I would hope that as our young people become adults they will be equipped to share responsibility in the democratic process, trained to critically analyze issues in today's complex, fast-moving world, and prepared to take a proud part within the business and professional and cultural spheres of our society.

Are these goals beyond reach of our Nation, a nation which is about to put a man on the moon?

I think not. I think that our opportunity is now at hand to construct the sturdiest of foundations for American education, and that this is the time and the place to begin.

#### STANDARDS PROGRAM OPERATED BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SENNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, the standards program operated by the Department of Commerce is basically a sound program and fairly simple one. An industry which desires to develop a standard for its product develops a consensus which is then transmitted by the Department of Commerce to interested elements in that industry for comment. If the returns are substantially favorable, then the Department of Commerce promulgates the standard as a voluntary standard. When procedures are adhered to by the Department, Government-industry cooperation in this vital area serves the Nation well.

When the lumber industry developed the present American Lumber Standard in 1953 in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and Justice and with the specific approval of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the proposal was distributed for comment to approximately 3,000 individuals and companies within the lumber industry.

Comments on the then proposed American Lumber Standard were, I understand, received from fewer than 100 in-

dividuals and companies. On the basis of what the Department then considered an adequate sample, the present American Lumber Standard—R-16-53 was promulgated. Those concerned had expressed themselves and action resulted.

Ten years later, the same Department of Commerce has fostered development of an acceptor list of more than 20,000 names of individuals and companies within the lumber industry to which it proposes to submit revisions of the American Lumber Standard for comment. In addition to including such obvious groups as lumber producers, architects, engineers and home builders, the Department of Commerce has gratuitously added such groups as the Casket Manufacturers Association, the National Builders Hardware Association and the Heating, Piping & Air Conditioning Contractors Association. The Department of Commerce even went so far as to include the Cast Iron Soil Pipe Institute and the Plasterers Association. Since possible sources of comment had not even then been exhausted, the manufacturers of competitive products such as the Insulation Board Institute and the National Particle Board Association and the Plywood Research Foundation were also invited to give their opinions. The proposed revision in the standard, which applies only in the United States is also to be submitted to the Douglas Fir Export Co. for comment. It would scarcely do, the Department evidently judged, to limit comments on an American standard to Americans and their domestic markets.

The reason for my selecting the names of these organizations out of the list of more than 200 organizations who were asked to submit a cross section of their membership to the Department of Commerce for inclusion in the list of those to whom the revised standard would be sent, is to demonstrate that the Department of Commerce seems to be bending over backward to make certain that anyone and everyone who cares to comment on the proposed revision in the American lumber standard can do so. Although I might question the necessity for inclusion of certain of these groups, I know of no better method for the Department of Commerce to determine what the economic impact the proposed lumber standard will have on our economy than to query this broad representative group of American industry and commerce.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in spite of a conscious effort by the Department to establish a broadly representative group, there are those individuals and companies in our country who have sought by every means available to them to delay or deny the "vote" on this issue.

A program which involves reengineering of a product such as lumber can variously affect the vested interests of different groups in our country. The extent of the impact of such a change, however, can best be determined by an objective appraisal of the facts not by impassioned politically oriented charges or complaints.

I look at the program of the improvement in our lumber standards as a non-

partisan issue of considerable interest to all consumers of lumber and to all those who produce the product. However, I find it a little difficult to understand how common carriers or transporters of lumber whether by water, truck, or rail should be expected to render an informed opinion determining the extent to which an engineered size of lumber is better suited for construction. For example, I doubt seriously that, when milk cartons were introduced, the milkman who delivers the product to the American housewife was asked for his opinion as to whether glass containers or milk cartons should be approved as a standard method of packaging within the industry. Consequently, I find it a little surprising that a Distribution Subcommittee of the House of Representatives would enter the controversy in a manner which appears to be prejudging the action of the Department of Commerce.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Congress of the United States should be involved in a question of industry standards if the Department of Commerce renders a judgment that is clearly arbitrary and capricious. However, I do not presume that the man selected by my party to direct the activities of the Department of Commerce needs the advice of a distribution subcommittee of the House of Representatives in order to render a sound decision on the proposed revision of lumber standards.

For the benefit of those members who may not be informed on the issue raised by the change in the American lumber standard, a brief explanation may be helpful. Some lumber which is sold in the United States is seasoned or dried before it is sold. Other lumber is sawed and planed and sold in the green or unseasoned condition. Regardless of what the moisture condition of lumber is when it is sold by a lumber mill, all lumber dries to an average moisture content based upon the relative humidity in the area in which it is used. Lumber which is sold in the seasoned condition is already shrunk to about the size it will remain during its useful life. Lumber which is sold green or unseasoned shrinks as it dries out. Consequently, where lumber is in use today it is of two different sizes depending upon whether it was sold in the seasoned or unseasoned condition. For example, a 2 by 4 which is to be sold in the dry condition is dried before it is sent to the planer. It is surfaced today at 1½ by 3½ inches when it is still full of moisture. As the green 2 by 4 loses its moisture content through normal evaporation, it shrinks and becomes smaller than the dry 2 by 4. The impact of such variations upon the acceptance of all softwood lumber by consumers is readily apparent.

Given these simple facts, the American Lumber Standards Committee, a group of men selected by the Secretary of Commerce from among producers, architects, engineers, builders, and user groups, took the scientific findings of the Forests Products Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and designed a new 2 by 4 which would be identical in size whether it was sold in the green or the dried condition. In other words,



the new standard is based upon the consumer interest and equates the size of lumber in use rather than equating it in size at the mill. In the process of redesigning the size of lumber its strength was maintained and at the same time a raw materials saving was made possible. This will permit further conservation of our precious natural resource—the living tree.

There is not any question but that some competitive relationships within the industry are going to be affected—change and counterchange are, after all, the basis for competition in a free society. For example, for years manufacturers of lumber which is sold in the green condition have sold less wood to the American consumers than have lumber producers who have sold dry lumber. In other words, the man who intends to sell his product unseasoned cuts smaller pieces out of logs than the man who intends to sell it seasoned. This practice developed during World War II. Under the new standard, the same size piece of wood is cut out of the log whether the producer intends to sell it in a seasoned or unseasoned condition. The savings in raw material, however, will not mean that all lumber sold in the United States is going to be seasoned. The cost of drying lumber before it is sent to the planer whether dried through a kiln or stacked in a yard and air dried over a fairly long period of time, is such as to make the cost of manufacturing dry lumber considerably higher than manufacturing green lumber. In those markets where green lumber has traditionally been used I see no reason why it will not continue to be used. Cost of manufacturing green lumber will not rise one bit because of this new standard. As a matter of fact, there is a slight savings in raw material even for the green lumber manufacturer. Consequently, it seems to me there is nothing but benefit to the consumer of lumber in the United States that can come out of this new standard.

I have noted with interest the alarm raised by certain eastern wholesalers of green lumber who assert this new standard will tend to put all of the eastern seaports out of business because of the loss of the market for green lumber. Many of these same gentlemen who now lament the passing of lucrative business in cargo shipments of domestic lumber, testified against the U.S. lumber industry before the U.S. Tariff Commission and there stated that 80 percent of their waterborne shipments of green lumber came from Canada. They declared as well, since it then served their immediate purpose, that they bought Canadian lumber because there was no adequate source of lumber in the United States. Their sudden, vocal concern for the welfare of the U.S. lumber industry echoes hollowly against the mocking laughter of their earlier position.

There is no requirement in the new standard that lumber must be manufactured in the seasoned or unseasoned condition. The choice is up to the manufacturer and/or his customers.

The fact that more pieces of lumber may be cut out of a log, if the new standard is approved, has been used by some

who oppose the standard as a reason for disapproving the standard. They seem to argue on the one hand that those who own trees will be unduly benefited by the change in the standard and on the other hand that the change will cause an overproduction of lumber in the United States at a time when the U.S. lumber industry is already facing economic difficulties.

Let me make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that if this issue is to be decided on the question of conservation of our forests, then let the record clearly show that I stand on the side of the conservationist. Let it show as well that not only the private timber will appreciate in value but that the vast timber holdings of the Federal Government will become more valuable too. The return from timber sales in both private and public forests, influences the degree of forest management which can be undertaken and forest management holds the key to true conservation.

Since the U.S. Government is the largest single owner of commercial forests in the United States, and, incidentally, almost the only source of raw material for the lumber industry in my State where this standard is warmly endorsed, I would think that all American citizens would favor any change in a lumber standard which would tend to conserve the public-owned forests of this country. As a matter of fact, it has been my impression that some of the very companies who so vigorously oppose the standards in the States of Washington and Oregon have been in the forefront of a drive to get the U.S. Government to increase its sale of logs from the public lands in that area. If this standard will benefit the owner of commercial forest lands in the United States, I again say that is fine. There are 4½ million private forest land owners scattered throughout the 50 States. If they can benefit economically because of a change in the standard, I am all for it. Our natural history clearly demonstrates that the surest way to sponsor the husbanding of a resource is to increase its value.

The leaders in the homebuilding industry, one of the keystones of our economy, have estimated that an annual savings of \$100 million to home buyers would result from the adoption of the new lumber standard. This is easy to understand when it is realized that approximately 80 percent of the single-family houses built in the United States utilize lumber as a basic construction material whether the lumber which is to go into a house was sold at the mill in a seasoned or unseasoned condition.

The March 16, 1964, edition of *Railway Age* very succinctly summarizes the advantages that the proponents to the new lumber size attribute to the new standard:

#### SMALLER LUMBER SIZES SEEN AS HELP TO RAILS

Railroads, as well as lumber producers and consumers, could benefit from smaller size standards being advocated by some lumber manufacturers. J. G. Manning, traffic manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, figures it about like this: "Smaller sizes (e.g., 1½-inch thickness for lumber now finished at 1½ inches) will not affect per car revenues of railroads. A carload of lumber will

weigh about the same as it does now so freight charges will be the same. But a car will carry a few more board feet measure, so the buyer will save a small percentage of freight. Meantime, the smaller streamlined sizes will make lumber more competitive with other materials, which are often produced close to building sites and hauled by truck. As lumber thus strengthens its place in the construction field, it can be expected to move eastward, principally by rail, in greater total volume." The proposed new sizes, Mr. Manning explains, are an outgrowth of the feeling that more wood than necessary is being used in most building work. This, he says, "is a carryover from years ago when lumber prices reflected low log and labor costs. Now, laboratory testing, engineering data and experience have combined to prove that lumber will do the job in the smaller sizes." If approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the new standards are expected to save material, time, and money for users, because they will permit marketing throughout the country of uniform sizes of both dry and unseasoned lumber. Approval, however, seems likely to be strongly opposed by some port and shipping interests and some lumber dealers on both coasts, which now use intercoastal water transport for green timber. Lumber ranks high among all commodities shipped by rail; represents by far the largest single commodity moved west to east transcontinentally. The Douglas-fir region of western Oregon and Washington alone, according to Mr. Manning, sends about 250,000 carloads a year over virtually every railroad in the country. But inroads of competing materials have allegedly prevented the industry from increasing its shipments "to keep pace with the rising economy of the country."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, those who charge that the new lumber standard represents somehow a struggle between the "big" and "small" in the lumber industry would seem to me to be prejudging the case. For the information of my colleagues, the lumber industry includes more than 30,000 manufacturing units, according to the Census Bureau, with an average employment per mill of approximately 16 persons. This compares with an average of about 57 persons for all manufacturing industry in the United States. This means that the largest three or four companies account for about 7 percent of the production of lumber in the United States. Let the opponents of this new standard compare that figure with the concentration of production in the steel, aluminum, glass, and plastics industries which are highly competitive with lumber in the marketplace.

I make no effort to prejudge the decisions of the Department of Commerce in this matter. I am content to let the interested parties express their views through the acceptor questionnaire which they will be receiving within the next 2 or 3 weeks. I have little patience, however, for those in any industry who would hold back progress and improvement of a product that would benefit the American people for the sake of their own selfish interests. The arguments of some of the opponents who seek to protect the status quo and want no change remind me of those who argued against improving the efficiency of automobile engines because to do so would mean there would be less consumption of gasoline and the petroleum industry would therefore suffer damage.

In recent weeks, opponents of the new standard, desperate for ammunition and tactics, have dragged machine grading of lumber across the path. Since the studies on the findings of what machine grading of lumber will accomplish are not yet final, I am unable to inform my colleagues as to what the actual facts are. However, indications are that machine grading of lumber will disclose that lumber is much stronger than had been thought in the past. Such a finding would make it possible for a smaller piece of lumber to do the job than had been required in the past. This strikes me as being something to applaud rather than to condemn. If all species that are cut into lumber can be upgraded by use of a machine—and this appears to be the fact—then all lumber producers benefit. It strikes me that events such as these would indicate that the American lumber industry is awake to its responsibilities in meeting its competition in the marketplace and that the American lumber industry deserves every assistance that its Government can give to it instead of being subjected to actions that hobble its progress and competitiveness.

I hope that each and every one of the more than 20,000 individuals and companies that receive the questionnaire from the Department of Commerce will study the proposal carefully and give the Department of Commerce the benefit of his individual response to the proposal. And then I hope that the Department of Commerce will move quickly to make its final determination of this matter so that the lumber industry can be about its business and bring better products to the American people through wood.

#### PANAMA CRISIS: HEARINGS BY INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 23, 1964, I quoted a letter from the Department of State supplying information concerning a recent formal inquiry on the Isthmus of Panama by three observers of the International Commission of Jurists of Geneva, undertaken at the request of the National Bar Association of Panama.

The legal representative of the United States at these hearings was Joseph Califano, Jr., General Counsel of the Department of the Army. At a press conference held by him, after completion of 10 days of testimony on Friday, March 13, he described the nature of the hearings.

In presenting the case for the United States against Panamanian charges of violation of human rights, Counsel Cal-

fano emphasized the following three points:

First. That the Panamanian Government took no effective action to control or halt the violence for 3 days.

Second. That Panamanian radio and TV stations were used to incite rioters to bloody violence and to spread disorders.

Third. That extremist agitators, some of them Communists, encouraged the mobs.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be informed concerning the recent inquiry on the isthmus, I quote the account of Counsel Califano's press conference as published in the March 20, 1964, issue of *Spillway*, an official publication of the Panama Canal Company:

ICJ ENDS HEARINGS ON HUMAN RIGHTS; U.S. POINTS AILED AT PRESS CONFERENCE—U.S. COUNSEL STRESSES THREE MAJOR POINTS

The United States placed the blame for the January rioting in the Canal Zone primarily on lack of action by the Panamanian Government, as 10 days of testimony ended last Friday before a multinational committee of lawyers probing charges that human rights of Panamanian citizens were violated during the disturbances.

The American delegation to hearings in Panama City also alleged that extremist groups as well as irresponsible newspaper, radio, and TV reporting in Panama contributed to the violent incidents upon which the Panamanian Bar Association based its charges.

In a press conference, U.S. legal representative, Joseph Califano, Jr., General Counsel, Department of the Army, said a report from the three members of the International Commission of Jurists is expected within 2 months. Two of the ICJ members are returning to Geneva and the third will go there later after a vacation.

The testimony required about 100 hours, Califano said. It will fill more than 800 pages when transcribed from the 50 tapes on which it was recorded.

He said the United States is convinced that "criminal and extremist elements took control of the situation no later than 2 hours after the anti-U.S. rioting started the night of January 9."

The U.S. case stated that the Panamanian Government took no effective action to control or halt the rioting or looting for 3 days following the outbreak of the riots in the late afternoon of January 9. The jurists repeatedly asked Panamanian representatives for information on the arrest of looters and about the steps taken to halt the rioting.

The second point stressed by the United States in assessing blame was that inflammatory broadcasts by Panamanian radio and TV stations served to further incite the rioters and spread violence. "This continued even after the Panamanian Government officially took over the radio and TV stations," Califano said.

Extremists were the third element that acted as a goad to the mobs, he said. He pointed out that on January 11, Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance and U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann told Panama Foreign Minister Galileo Solis, that the United States would furnish a list of 10 known agitators, some of whom were Communists; and that control could be more readily established if these persons were taken into custody by the Panamanian authorities. "The Foreign Minister said these persons would be picked up if we gave them the list. We did," said Califano, "but the next day 6 of the 10 on that list were leading the funeral procession for Panamanians who died in the riots and some of them were holding flags in that march."

The jurists viewed three movie films on the march of the Panamanian students to Balboa High School and on the widespread violence that followed. About 150 photographs and dozens of documents were introduced by the U.S. representatives. The United States also played a tape recording in which a Panamanian radio station was heard passionately urging the people to continue the riots. The Panamanian representatives also submitted a large number of photographs, documents, and printed material. Twenty-five witnesses testified, 15 for Panama, and 10 for the United States. The proceedings were conducted along less formal lines than those generally observed in courts.

U.S. attorneys gathering evidence interviewed hundreds of military personnel involved and scores of Canal Zone police who were on duty during the riots.

On the ICJ panel were Dr. Navroz Vakil of India, a trial lawyer; Prof. Gustaf Petren, of Sweden, a judge; and Prof. A. N. Belinfante, of the Netherlands, a trial lawyer and professor at the University of Amsterdam.

The Commission has published nine major reports: Hungary (3), Tibet, South Africa, Liberia, Tunisia, the Berlin Wall, and Cuba. These have been described as models of thoroughness.

#### LET'S GET THE FACTS STRAIGHT ON THE WHEAT PROGRAM—PART 3

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, parts 1 and 2 of this series of statements on the wheat program contained in H.R. 6196 appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 25, page 6335, and March 26, page 6382, respectively.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will take time to study the facts outlined in these statements before we vote on H.R. 6196 later this week.

Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House have asked if the wheat program authorized in H.R. 6196 does not include an added tax on bread. The wheat millers apparently are confusing the issue for them.

"Let us get the facts straight."

H.R. 6196 will result in a reduction in wheat program costs as compared with recent wheat programs.

Wheat has been selling for about \$2 a bushel at the farm. It has been selling at that level because we have had a price support program for wheat.

Farmers have been able to deliver their wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation—a Government corporation—if they could not get a price equivalent to the support level in the marketplace.

Surplus stocks accumulated under this program.

The voluntary certificate plan authorized in H.R. 6196 permits the Secretary of Agriculture to drop price supports from the food grain price level of \$1.80 to \$2 a bushel to the feed grain level of about \$1.30 a bushel. It then distributes wheat certificates to those who voluntarily comply with the adjustment program. The value of these certificates is



fixed by the Secretary within the limits prescribed by the Congress. The Secretary has announced that the domestic marketing certificates this season will have a value of 70 cents a bushel if H.R. 6196 is approved.

Domestic wheat millers will be able to buy their wheat in the market about 70 cents a bushel cheaper than in former years. In addition, they will have to purchase domestic wheat marketing certificates at 70 cents a bushel, making the total cost of the wheat milled about the same as in former years.

The certificate plan authorized in H.R. 6196 actually recaptures for farmers a prospective windfall to the middlemen which would occur when price supports are dropped to \$1.30 a bushel.

It limits price support for food uses to domestic consumption and a percentage of total exports. Price supports at the food grain price level are no longer available on all that can be grown on the allotted acreage, with heavy applications of fertilizer. With price supports limited in this way program costs will be reduced.

I urge every Member of this body to consult the chart on retail bread prices and prices received by farmers for wheat, which appears on page 7 of House Report No. 1239—the report which accompanies H.R. 9780—"A Voluntary Marketing Certificate Program for Wheat."

This chart, prepared by the Legislative References Service, shows that wheat prices have fallen from an index of 110 in 1947 to 91 in 1963. And what happened to retail bread prices as wheat prices fell? Did they go down too? No, they went up.

Retail prices of bread, other bakery and cereal products went up steadily from 1947 to 1963 regardless of the decline in wheat prices. Retail prices went up a full 50 percent—from an index of 95 in 1947 to an index of 144 in 1963.

I should like to recall for the Members of this body the articles which appeared in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal immediately after the wheat marketing quota referendum was defeated last May.

At that time articles appeared in both papers stating there would be no reduction in the price of bread even though the price of wheat fell substantially.

These articles repeated what we all know—that the cost of the wheat in a 21-cent loaf of bread at the past wheat price support levels, was only 2.5 cents.

A decline of 70 cents a bushel in the price of wheat would be only a minor factor in the cost of producing bread.

Then why all this cry about a bread tax in H.R. 6196? Quite frankly, the middlemen want to pick up a windfall. And they will succeed if they confuse the issue sufficiently to secure the defeat of the bill.

The charge has been made that this is a revenue measure and should be considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Speaker, that issue has been settled by the courts. The Federal Government, under the Interstate Commerce clause has the authority to enact price support and adjustment programs and impose penalties for failure to comply with the regulations.

H.R. 6196 is a bill to provide price support and adjustment programs for both wheat and cotton. It is not different in its economic impact on domestic wheat processors than earlier wheat price support programs. It greatly eases the economic burden on textile mills. In both cases it is a fair bill.

I also would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about the 105 percent of the support price resale provisions included in the bill. A number of my good friends would like to have this provision changed to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from reselling any wheat it has in storage for less than 115 percent of the existing support price.

Mr. Speaker, the objectives of this bill are to maintain wheat producers' incomes without increasing consumers' costs, reduce Government costs and reduce wheat surpluses.

H.R. 6196 will accomplish these purposes.

If it were amended to restrict Commodity Credit Corporation sales to 115 percent of the price support level, the reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks would be restricted.

Or, the Secretary might find it necessary to lower the support on wheat to less than the feed grain price-support level to make sure that the Commodity Credit Corporation would be able to liquidate stocks as desired.

Restriction of Commodity Credit Corporation sales to 115 percent of the price support level or above would increase Government costs. In certain cases it probably would require the payment of export subsidies.

It would protect flour millers or consumers.

It would not increase producers' incomes.

It would increase Government costs.

#### DAG HAMMARSKJOLD MEMORIAL LECTURE BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Dag Hammarskjold was a devoted servant of the world, a pioneer dedicated to the mission of transforming the lofty ideals of the United Nations Charter into practical realities of international life. He assumed fearlessly the task of forging the United Nations into an effective international presence, and in the end he gave his life trying to resolve the bitter conflict in the Congo.

Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, follows in the tradition of Dag Hammarskjold. Like Mr. Hammarskjold he views the United Nations not as a static debating society but as a dynamic instrument of international cooperation for the resolution of conflict. His forceful presentation of the

U.S. position, his words of inspiration have earned him the respect of all the United Nations.

In the past the United States has been a strong supporter of the United Nations, of its peacekeeping operations in Korea, Suez, the Congo, and now Cyprus. We have supported these operations because we have viewed them as an alternative to local wars or possibly even East-West confrontation. The prestige of the world organization as an instrument of peaceful change has been steadily growing with each of its successes. The United Nations needs our continuing support; it is the best means so far discovered by man of solving international problems without resorting to national violence.

Ambassador Stevenson, in delivering the Dag Hammarskjold memorial lecture at Princeton University on March 23, 1964, rightly cautioned:

If we in the United States do not carry these burdens, no one else will. If we withdraw, retreat, hesitate, the hope of today, I believe without rhetoric or exaggeration, will be lost tomorrow.

I commend to my colleagues, the Ambassador's stirring and timely address:

#### FROM CONTAINMENT TO CEASE-FIRE AND PEACEFUL CHANGE

The United Nations and, therefore, the world has been fortunate to have three strong Secretaries General—Trygve Lie of Norway, Dag Hammarskjold of Sweden, and U Thant of Burma. While serving on the American delegation in London in the first days of the United Nations and latterly in New York, I had something to do with the selection of Trygve Lie and U Thant. And it was my good fortune to know Dag Hammarskjold well, and my sad lot to attend his funeral in the lovely old cathedral at Upsala. Like the others who came from all over the world, I walked behind him to the cemetery through the streets of the ancient town, lined with thousands of silent, reverent people. Upsala was the world that day when he was laid to rest in the northern autumn twilight, for he was a hero of the community of man.

Norman Cousins tells a story that says a lot about Dag Hammarskjold as a peace-maker.

He had scheduled an interview with a magazine writer one evening. The writer suggested that they have dinner at a restaurant, which the Secretary General accepted. He further suggested that they take his car, which the Secretary General also accepted.

Upon leaving the building, the writer recalled to his embarrassment that he had driven into town in a battered old jeep. The Secretary General was delighted. "Sometimes I think I was born in one," he said.

But the writer's embarrassment had only begun. Four blocks away, a taxicab darted in front of the jeep and there was a harmless collision.

I don't have to suggest the reaction of the cabdriver or the quality of his prose. But the writer was not without a temper himself, or the prose to match the cabdriver. It looked as though the disagreement was about to escalate into active hostilities. At this point, Hammarskjold climbed out of the jeep and stepped around to the cabdriver.

"You know," he said, "I don't think anyone quite realizes how tough it is to drive a cab in New York City. I don't know how you fellows do it—10, 12, 14 hours a day, day after day, with all the things you've got to contend with, people weaving in and out of traffic and that sort of thing. Believe me,

I really have to take my hat off to you fellows."

The cabdriver defused immediately. "Mister," he said, "you really said a mouthful." And that was the end of the incident.

But it wasn't the end of the story. A few blocks later the unfortunate writer ran out of gas. And who should drive by? The same cabdriver pulled up and said, "What's the matter chum, any trouble?"

"Out of gas," said the disgruntled writer. Well, you can guess the end of the story: The cabbie offered to get some gas, invited the driver's "nice friend" to come along with him, and drove off with the Secretary General of the United Nations in the front seat—leaving the writer to ponder the role of the peacemaker in today's tense society.

# I

No one ever doubted Dag Hammarskjöld's selfless dedication to peaceful settlement of any and all disputes among men and nations. None questioned his deep personal commitment to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, whose first business is the peaceful settlement of disputes.

But this can be said of other men: Hammarskjöld was unsurpassed, but he was not alone in his devotion to peace. What distinguished his service to the United Nations is that he came to see it for what it is: a specific piece of international machinery whose implicit capabilities can only be realized by the action of the members and the Secretariat working within its constitutional framework.

There was no doubt in Dag Hammarskjöld—nor is there in many others—that the United Nations is the most remarkable and significant international institution ever conceived. But Hammarskjöld also understood that the machinery not only needs lofty goals and high principles but it has to work in practice—that it has limited, not unlimited functions; that it has finite, not infinite capabilities under given circumstances at a given time.

He saw that the effectiveness of the organization is measured by the best consensus that can be reached by the relevant majority of the relevant organ—and that reaching that consensus is a highly pragmatic exercise.

Understanding all this, Dag Hammarskjöld—himself a key part of the machinery—helped make the machinery more workable, more adaptable, more relevant to the immediate political needs. By doing so, he helped expand the capacity of the machinery to act effectively. This, I think, was his greatest contribution to the United Nations, and thus to world peace.

His was dedicated service—backed by diplomatic skill, by administrative talent, and by a sharp sense of political reality.

The overwhelming political reality of Hammarskjöld's day was the division of the world into opposing and rigid military alliances, led by two incomparable centers of power and influence—with the two halves of this bipolar world engaged in a cold war paced by an uncontrolled and seemingly uncontrollable nuclear arms race—while everyone else held his breath lest the "balance of terror" get too far out of balance.

Many came to accept this as a continuing—almost natural—state of affairs which would continue until one side collapsed or the two sides collided in World War III. We now know that it was a transitory and unhealthy condition of the world body politic.

The cold war has not sunk out of sight, but the field of contest may be shifting radically—and for the better.

The nuclear arms race has not passed into history, but at least it has, for the first time, been brought within a first stage of control.

For these and a large variety of other reasons, the world is a very different world from that which existed when Dag Hammarskjöld went down to his death in that

cruel crash in Africa two and a half years ago. We therefore will be wise to tailor our thinking about the role of the United Nations he served so well not to his world of 1961 but to our world of 1964—which is to say:

A world which is no longer bipolar but in which multiple centers of power and influence have come into being.

A world which at long last is approaching the end of the historic struggle for military superiority—by acquiring absolute military power.

A world in which the myth of monolithic blocs is giving way to a bewildering diversity among nations.

A world in which realities are eroding the once rigid political dogmas.

A world in which not only imperialism but paternalism is dying.

A world in which old trading systems, monetary systems, market systems, and other elements of the conventional wisdom are being challenged and changed.

A world which at once makes breathtaking new discoveries and is crippled by ancient feuds—which is both fabulously rich and desperately poor—which is making more progress than ever before and seeing much of it wiped out by an explosive population growth.

And finally, a world in which fundamental issues of human rights—which have been hidden in closets down the long corridor of history—are out in the open and high on the agenda of human affairs.

For the first time in history the world is being changed radically within the span of an average lifetime: we enter one world and leave quite a different one. As E. B. White once said of New York, "the miracle is that it works at all."

Not even the sloganeers have caught the full essence of these times; we do not yet know what to call this particular passage of history. Since the end of the Second World War we have spoken of the "atomic age" and the "jet age"—of the era of "rising expectations" and the "epoch of the common man"—of the "first age of space" and the "first age of mass politics". Each of these labels identifies at least one of the swirling phenomena of our times, but none of them will do as an overall title.

# II

We should try to come to grips with the central theme of our times—with that aspect of current affairs which gives them their characteristic stamp and flavor—with that label which may not tell all but puts its finger on the most important thing that is going on.

You will recall that back in 1947 a certain Mr. X—who turned out to be my friend George Kennan—wrote an article for *Foreign Affairs* in which he introduced the famous label, the "Policy of Containment". He invented the phrase but he did not invent the doctrine; the United States already was busily, heavily, expensively, and dangerously involved in containing the ruthless, heavy-handed outer thrust of Stalin's Russia—wherever he might strike or lean.

This was the main pattern of world events for a number of years and "containment" was a meaningful description of the main purpose of U.S. policy. It was therefore a great public service, for in the free world effective foreign policy is difficult without the understanding and appreciation of the public. How can one rally support for a policy if one can't even describe it? In the absence of a suitable description, each individual action of government is dangerously exposed to attack and suspicion, but if it is known to be part of a larger and well-understood design, it becomes less difficult to act quickly and coherently. However, this is not a lecture on the glorious virtues and crippling vices of sovereign public opinion in a genuine democracy.

When we look back with pride on the great decisions that President Truman made, we see now that he had the inestimable advantage of public understanding. He could react to Korea quickly because he didn't have to stop to explain, to pull public opinion up alongside. It was quite clear to all that this was but another phase of containment, just like the Berlin airlift and the guerrilla war in Greece, and NATO.

Up until the postwar years, Americans had been brought up on the idea of fighting every conflict to a decisive finish—to total victory, to unconditional surrender. But when the nuclear age revealed the hazards of this course, it was neither easy nor popular to introduce the concept of limited action, primarily to preserve the status quo. This nuclear necessity went against the American grain, it was (and to some still is) both confusing and frustrating. It took patient explaining, and all of us can be grateful that Mr. X gave identification and illumination to a policy that was already being practiced. He showed us why the Greeks thought it so important to have "a word for it."

We can, as I say, be proud of our performance under the containment policy. Above all we can be proud that the tendency once noted by Lord Acton did not operate in our case: the possession of great power—unprecedented and overwhelming power—did not corrupt the American Government or the American people.

But as unquestioned leader of an alliance constantly threatened by external military pressure, we had to stand up and be counted for more; we had to stand firm; we had to confront force with force until the tanks faced each other gun barrel to gun barrel, along Friedrichstrasse in Berlin—until the Korean invaders had been thrown back across the 38th parallel—until the Navy drew an armored noose around Soviet missile sites in Cuba—and until, at long last, Soviet leaders became convinced that freemen will answer steel with steel.

During this whole period the positions and actions taken by the U.S. Government to contain aggression had broad public understanding and support. In a sense the policy of containment was too easy to understand. It tended to reinforce a simplistic view of a black-and-white world peopled by good guys and bad guys; it tended to induce a fixation on military borders to the exclusion of other things; and it tended to hide deep trends and radical changes which even then were restructuring the world.

And, of course, the policy of containment—being a reaction to Soviet Communist aggressiveness—necessarily had a negative and static ring to it. This had the unfortunate effect of partially obscuring the positive and progressive purposes of U.S. policies in support of the United Nations, in support of regional unity in Europe and elsewhere and in support of economic and social growth throughout most of the world where poverty was a centuries-old way of life.

Nevertheless, the doctrine of containment was relevant to the power realities of the times—to the struggle to protect the independent world from Stalinism—and to the defense of peace—which is quite a lot.

Indeed, the doctrine may not yet have outlived its usefulness. If the present Soviet leaders have come to see that expansion by armed force is an irrational policy, it is by no means clear that the Chinese Communists—pretending to read out of the same book—have yet come to the same conclusion.

No doubt we shall have to stand firm again—and face danger again—and run risks again in the defense of freedom.

We cannot and will not resign from whatever degree of leadership is forced upon us by the level of threat used against us, our allies, and our friends.

But as anyone willing to see clearly already knows, the current course of world



affairs calls for something more than a "policy of containment."

### III

What, then is the dominant theme that marks the character of contemporary world affairs?

I would suggest that we have begun to move beyond the policy of containment; that the central trend of our times is the emergence of what, for lack of a better label, might be called a policy of cease-fire, and peaceful change. I would suggest, further, that we may be approaching something close to a world consensus on such a policy.

No analogy is every perfect, but if the policy of containment stands for "limited war," then the policy of cease-fire perhaps stands for "limited peace." I believe this mutation is occurring simply because the H-bomb has made even "limited" war too dangerous.

Cease-fire and peaceful change may strike some as a curious way to describe a period so jammed by violence, by disorder, by quarrels among the nations—an era so lacking in law and order. But I do not speak wistfully; I speak from the record.

It is precisely the fact that so much violence and so many quarrels have not led to war that puts a special mark on our times.

Only a few decades ago, if a street mob organized by a government sacked and burned the embassy of another government—if rioters tore down another nation's flag and spit upon it—if hoodlums hanged or burned in effigy the head of another state—if ships or planes on lawful missions were attacked—you would expect a war to break out forthwith. Lesser excuses than these have started more than one war before.

And only a few decades ago, once hostilities broke out between the armed forces of two nations, it was assumed with good reason that since the war was started, the war would proceed until one nation or one side had "won" and the other had "lost"—however foolish or futile the whole thing might be.

It also was assumed that the only way fighting could be stopped was by surrender—unconditional or negotiated—confirmed by signatures on a document and ritualized by the presentation of swords by the vanquished to the victors. That was in the nature of the institution called war. This is how it was.

But this is not the way it has been for well over a decade now and I think we should begin to notice that fact. Scores and scores of what used to be called "incidents"—far too many of them—have occurred around the world without leading to hostilities or even ultimatums. The fact is that in the last decade, nearly every war, partial war, incipient war, and threat of war, has either been halted or averted by a cease-fire.

It is still a very foolish and dangerous thing to insult another nation or desecrate its property or take pot shots at its citizens or equipment. But there are other forms of penalty than mass slaughter and, happily, the world is beginning to avail itself of them. Firing has started and then stopped—organized hostilities have been turned on and then called off—without victory or defeat, without surrender or peace treaty, without signatures or swords.

This is what seems to be happening. If so, it is perhaps the most important and certainly the most hopeful news for many a moon. As Al Smith kept saying, let's look at the record.

Just after the last war, the Soviet Union sent two armored divisions though northern Iran toward the Turkish and Iraqi frontiers while Bulgaria massed troops on its southern frontier to form the other prong of a huge pincers movement against Turkey. Then the Security Council of the United Nations

met in London for the first time, and presently the Soviet troops went back into the Soviet Union. Not a shot had been fired.

Since that time there have been some 20 occasions on which the armed forces of two or more nations engaged in more or less organized, formal hostilities, which in another day would have been accompanied by declarations of war—wars to be fought until victory was attained by one side or the other. Eight of these could be classified as outright invasions, in which the armed forces of one nation marched or parachuted into the territory of another; only one of them—the mismatched affair between India and Goa—was settled in the traditional way in which wars have been settled in the past.

On at least another 20 occasions there has been minor fighting on disputed frontiers, or armed revolts which usually involved the national interests of an outside state. Any of them would have qualified as a *caus belli* in another day.

At this very moment the agenda of the Security Council of the United Nations lists 57 international disputes. Some of them have been settled, some are quiescent, and others could flare again at any moment. The point here is that more than half a hundred international quarrels have been considered by somebody to be enough of a threat to the peace to take the case to the court of last resort.

This is not exactly peace—at least not the kind of peace that people have dreamed and hoped and prayed for. But the record suggests that if fighting breaks out somewhere tomorrow, the chances are good that the next step will not be the sound of trumpets but the call to cease fire.

And the chances are good that the step after that will not be an exchange of swords but an exchange of words at a conference table. This is no guarantee that a way will be found to remove the root of the trouble: In the Middle East, southeast Asia, and the Far East there are temporary armistice lines that have been temporary now for more than a decade. But in these affairs there are no victors and no vanquished—and in this sense we are all winners.

This record of violence without war suggests, then, that we may have slipped almost imperceptibly into an era of peaceful settlement of disputes—or at least an era of cease fires while disputes are pursued by other than military means.

Without making light of life-and-death matters, one can conclude that it has become distinctly unfashionable to march armies into somebody else's territory. I can think of no better evidence than the fact that the Organization of African Unity—an institution hardly out of its swaddling clothes—quickly arranged cease fires when fighting broke out on the borders between Morocco and Algeria and again between Somalia and Ethiopia.

How has all this come about? I shall not attempt anything like a definite answer. I would only suggest in passing that perhaps Korea was the end of the road for classical armed aggression against one's next door neighbor; that perhaps Suez was the end of the road for colonial-type military solutions; and that perhaps Cuba was the end of the road for nuclear confrontation.

Perhaps man is adjusting once again to his environment—this time the atomic environment. Perhaps the leaders of nations around the world—small as well as large nations—have absorbed the notion that little wars will lead to big wars and big wars to annihilation. Perhaps we are edging toward a consensus on the proposition that nobody can afford an uncontrolled skirmish any more—that the only safe antidote to escalation is cease-fire.

I emphasize "perhaps"—for we must work and pray for that historical judgment on these times.

Yet skirmishes will occur—and will have to be controlled. Countless borders are still in dispute. Nationalism and rivalry are rampant. Ethnic and tribal and religious animosities abound. Passions and hatreds, ignorance and ambition, bigotry and discrimination, are all still with us.

The question is what can be done to make sure that this is in fact an era of peaceful settlement of disputes among nations.

For one thing, we can pursue this consensus on recourse to nonviolent solutions. Most of the world is in agreement right now—though there are a few who would make a small exception for his own dispute with his neighbor. Yet there is reason to hope that the aggressors are extending their doctrine of no nuclear war to a broader doctrine of no conventional war—on the grounds that you cannot be sure there will be no nuclear war unless you are sure there will be no conventional war either.

For another thing, we can get on with the urgent business of expanding and improving the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations. Most of the cease-fires I have been speaking about have been arranged by the United Nations and the regional organizations. Most of the truces and negotiations and solutions that have come about have come about with the help of the United Nations. Even if the will had existed, the way would not have been found without the machinery of the United Nations.

Violence—which there will be—without war—which there must not be—is unthinkable without an effective and reliable system of peacekeeping.

How should we and how can we improve the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations?

Cyprus has vividly exposed the frailties of the existing machinery: The Security Council, by an impressive unanimous vote, first saved the situation with a cease-fire resolution providing for a U.N. peacekeeping force, but shortly afterward war nearly broke out again before the U.N. could put the resolution into effect.

There were no troops immediately available, and the Security General could not marshal the U.N. force with the speed so urgently required. Then there was no assurance of adequate funds to pay for the operation. While these handicaps were overcome, the Secretary General has not yet found a mediator of the conflict. While I am confident that he will soon be designated, it took over 2 weeks (instead of 2 days or 2 hours) to get the peacekeeping operation going, and then only because armed intervention appeared imminent.

In short, when time is of the essence, there is a dangerous vacuum during the interval while military forces are being assembled on a hit-or-miss basis.

And we further risk an erosion in the political and moral authority of the U.N. if troops trained only for national forces are thrust without special training into situations unique to the purpose and methods of the United Nations. For a U.N. soldier in his blue beret is like no other soldier in the world—he has no mission but peace and no enemy but war.

Time and again, we of the United States have urged the creation of a United Nations International Police Force, trained specifically for the keeping of the peace.

Perhaps it is too early to contemplate a fixed U.N. international force which would be permanently maintained for use for any and all purposes—for the world's emergencies differ one from another, and there can hardly be one treatment for all of them. But surely it would make sense for member countries of the United Nations to indicate what forces, equipment, and logistic support they would be willing to train for peacekeeping service, and to supply on a moment's notice.

And surely it would make sense for the U.N. itself to add to its military and planning staff so that peacekeeping operations can be set in motion with the utmost speed and effectiveness.

There are some encouraging signs of progress. Recently it was announced that Scandinavia would create a permanent force for use on U.N. peacekeeping mission. This would include Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland, although it is not yet clear if Finland would join in an integrated command or form an independent unit. Other nations, such as Canada and the Netherlands, have also shown interest in creating a United Nations standby force. So things are moving.

## IV

There is also movement on the fiscal front. Last year it seemed hopeless that the United Nations General Assembly would be able to agree on a financing formula which would permit its vital Congo operations to continue. But it did, and in the process paved the way for further developments in this all-important area.

This next month a United Nations working group will be meeting in an endeavor to formulate agreed methods for financing future peacekeeping operations, so that there will be less need for controversy each time such an operation is to be financed.

It is true that every United Nations peacekeeping effort is and probably always will be different from any other, and that no simple financing formula can fit them all, but agreement on certain principles and improvements in mechanisms should be possible and useful for the future. The United States will join wholeheartedly in the search for such agreements.

There will, however, be a shadow over that working group—the shadow of unpaid assessments for past United Nations peacekeeping operations. No less than \$92 million of such arrears are owed by the Soviet bloc and a few other countries that have refused to pay their share of the cost of such operations—principally those in the Middle East and in the Congo.

But the Soviet claim that the assessments for these operations were not legally imposed and are not legally binding was rejected by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in 1962, and that opinion was accepted by a decisive vote of the General Assembly that fall. Yet the Soviets are still refusing to pay.

What can be done about it?

Article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that a member whose arrears amount to as much as its last 2 years' assessments "shall have no vote" in the General Assembly. This article has caught up with the Soviet Union and certain other countries, which means that if at the time the next General Assembly meets the Soviet Union has not paid at least some \$9 million of its arrears, it will have no vote in the Assembly.

The United States, and I believe all the members want to avoid such a situation—in the only way it can be avoided; namely, by a Soviet payment—in whatever form.

We think the best way to avoid the penalty and preserve the U.N.'s financial integrity is for the members to make it abundantly clear that they support peacekeeping operations, that they want all members to pay their fair share of the cost, and that the charter must be applied in accordance with its terms and without fear or favor.

It is our earnest hope that the overwhelming sentiment of the members will prevail, and that the Soviet Union and others will find the means, in one way or another, to provide funds that will make unnecessary any article 19 confrontation.

At the same time, the United States and others are exploring the possibility of adjustments to avoid the recurrence of this unhappy situation. Not many members

would agree with the Soviet Union's contention that the General Assembly has no right to recommend a peacekeeping operation and that the Security Council should have the exclusive right to initiate such operations. Nor would many agree to abolish the General Assembly's exclusive right, under the charter, to apportion and assess expenses.

But it should be possible to give new emphasis to the position of the Security Council by providing that all proposals for initiating a peacekeeping operation should first be presented to the Council, and that the General Assembly should not have the right to initiate such an operation unless the Council had shown that it was unable to act.

Also when it comes to the apportionment of the costs among the members by the General Assembly, we are exploring possible arrangements whereby the viewpoints of the major powers and contributors to the cost could be assured of more adequate consideration, and also the possibility of more flexible methods of distributing the cost.

I mention the fact that these possibilities are being discussed to make clear that the United States is using every effort to reach agreement as to future peacekeeping arrangements, in the hope that agreement as to the future will facilitate solution as to the past and provide a more firm foundation for a peacekeeping structure that has already proved itself so valuable.

Let me make it quite clear that it is the charter that imposes the penalty of loss of voting privileges for nonpayment of assessments. The United States has never presumed to think it could negotiate this requirement of the charter with the Soviet Union and it has not entered into these exploratory talks for this purpose. But we are eager to discuss a sound system for financing future peacekeeping operations, a system which involves no change in the terms of article 19 of the charter and, indeed, presupposes settlement of the arrears problem.

We hope and believe that these efforts to preserve the peacekeeping function will have the support of all members, and certainly of all members who believe in the efficacy, indeed the indispensability, of the United Nations as a force for peace in the world.

## V

Finally, if we are going to get the nuclear genie back in the bottle and keep it there, we shall have to improve our techniques for arriving at basic solutions to problems which remain even when a cease fire has gone into effect.

I referred earlier to the point that the doctrine of containment was essentially a negative and static concept—as it had to be for its purpose. But a simple cease fire is static, too; it is a return to the status quo ante. And that is not good enough for a world in which the only question is whether change will be violent or peaceful.

The world has known periods of relative peace and order before. Always the order was assured by a system designed to preserve the status quo. And this is precisely why the system of order broke down—because the status quo is indefensible in the long run.

What the world needs is a dynamic system of order—a system capable of bringing about not just a precarious halt to hostilities, but a curative resolution of the roots of hostility. This is to say that a dynamic system of order must be one which helps parties to a dispute to break out of rigid stalemates—to adapt to new times—to manage and absorb needed change.

It is easier to write this prescription than to fill it. But if conflicts are to be resolved and not just frozen, it is manifest that only through the United Nations, the community of nations, can the workable system of peace-

ful change evolve. The United Nations is a shared enterprise; it speaks for no nation, but for the common interest of the world community. And most important, the United Nations has no interest in the status quo.

## VI

To conclude: I believe there is evidence of new beginnings, of evolution from containment to cease fire, and from cease fire to peaceful change. We have witnessed the first concerted and successful effort to avoid the confrontation of naked force. The Cuban crisis has been followed by the nuclear test ban treaty and a pause in the arms race. We see growing up in the interstices of the old power systems a new readiness to replace national violence with international peacekeeping. The sheer arbitrariness of force is no longer possible and less lethal methods of policing, controlling, and resolving disputes are emerging. Do we perceive, perhaps dimly, the world groping for, reaching out to the fuller vision of a society based upon human brotherhood, to an order in which men's burdens are lifted, to a peace which is secure in justice and ruled by law?

As I have said, I believe that now, as in the days of the Founding Fathers, even the faintest possibility of achieving such an order depends upon our steadfast faith. In their day, too, democracy in an age of monarchs and freedom in an age of empire seemed the most remote of pipe dreams. Today, too, the dream of a world which repeats at the international level the solid achievements of law and welfare—of our domestic society must seem audacious to the point of insanity, save for the grim fact that survival itself is inconceivable on any other terms.

And once again we in America are challenged to hold fast to our audacious dream. If we revert to crude nationalism and separatism, every present organ of international collaboration will collapse. If we turn in upon ourselves, allow our self-styled patriots to entice us into the supposed security of an impossible isolation, we shall be back in the jungle of rampant nationalisms and baleful ambitions and irreconcilable conflicts which—one cannot repeat it too often—have already twice in this century sent millions to their death, and next time would send everybody.

I believe, therefore, that at this time the only sane policy for America—in its own interests and in the wider interests of humanity—lies in the patient, unspectacular, and if need be, lonely search for the interests which unite the nations, for the policies which draw them together, for institutions which transcend rival national interests, for the international instruments of law and security, for the strengthening of what we have already built inside and outside the United Nations, for the elaboration of the further needs and institutions of a changing world for a stable, working society.

If we in the United States do not carry these burdens, no one else will. If we withdraw, retreat, hesitate, the hope of today, I believe without rhetoric or exaggeration, will be lost tomorrow.

We have called this land the "last best hope" of man—but "last" now has overtones of disaster which we would do well to heed. With Churchill, I can say that "I do not believe that God has despaired of His children." But I would say also, in the words of the Scriptures: "Let us work while it is yet day."

## SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.



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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to speak in support of the soil and water conservation and development activities of the Soil Conservation Service.

In Montana are the headwaters of two of the Nation's great rivers—the Columbia and the Missouri. This means we have a great responsibility not only to Montana, but to our sister States through which these rivers flow. What landowners and operators in Montana do may affect the people of many States. In our State—where agriculture is dependent on irrigation—we consider water a very precious asset. We cannot afford to waste it through inefficient or inadequate agricultural systems and practices. I am disturbed that this might happen if we do not provide more—not less—help to soil and water conservation districts through the Soil Conservation Service.

The number of landowners and operators receiving assistance from local Soil Conservation Service technicians increased about 60 percent nationally between 1952 and 1962. Yet the number of technicians available has decreased by about 1 man-year for each district since 1954. I think this speaks well for the increased efficiency of the Soil Conservation Service, but I think we have reached the point where help is spread too thin. With the new responsibilities assigned to the Soil Conservation Service because of broadened soil and water conservation programs, I believe we cannot afford to expect the job to get done unless we provide the trained personnel to do it.

The work being done through districts is necessary and urgent. It is basic. If we do not do it today, we will be merely postponing it to the future when it may be more costly. And postponing it is costly to our present economy.

Montana's 63 soil and water conservation districts need a minimum of 30 additional men to handle the backlog of requests for assistance. This need is for technicians who work directly with farmers and ranchers and rural groups to establish soil and water conservation systems.

Frank Thompson, president of the Montana Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, has told me he is greatly concerned about the proposed reduction of Soil Conservation Service assistance to districts. In a letter he said:

Through our district programs we are striving to improve the overall economy by getting resource development up to a satisfactory level. Our farmers and ranchers have made more than 40 cost-return studies on conservation practices. From these studies, it is estimated that the overall economy in the State has been increased by at least \$26 million annually in soil and water conservation districts.

I think this affirms the value of the program and the need to give districts the assistance they need.

According to the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts,

the need for technical assistance has increased in all States. They indicate that nationally a total of 1,500 additional man-years is needed to handle the backlog of soil conservation district requests. To meet this need, the conservation operations item in the budget needs to be increased by at least \$10 million, and the personnel ceiling raised accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to voice my support of the small watershed program. Montana is seeing the benefits of this program in the two projects having been completed.

Besides the completed projects, Mr. Thompson tells me that we have 20 currently active applications for projects, 13 of which have received no technical planning assistance from the Soil Conservation Service.

He says that at present we have one small planning party in the State which needs the addition of two people to make it a full planning party.

I have inquired of Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, what the proposed decrease of planning funds would mean in my State. I find that under the present budget estimates it will be necessary to reduce the watershed planning activity in the State by about one-fifth.

Our present small planning party can plan about three watersheds a year. At this rate, it will take between 4 and 5 years to plan just the projects for which there are presently active applications. This is not a very pleasant outlook for them or for the 245 small watersheds in the State that the recent USDA conservation needs inventory indicated need project-type action.

Small watershed projects have proved to be successful shots-in-the-arm to the rural communities in the Nation where they have been developed. The projects bring an immediate upswing in the economy as soon as they go into operation. Their construction gives work to local people. They require services from the local community. And they have been the catalyst that starts the economic wheels in motion. They are in the public interest. Local people are ready and anxious to do their part.

Congress has given local people hope through the broadening of the Small Watershed Act. I do not like to see this get bogged down because Federal assistance is not available.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should increase the watershed protection item by \$7 million and earmark \$1½ million of this for planning. Also, personnel ceilings need to be increased to permit adequate planning parties to carry out the work.

The Great Plains conservation program is being well used in my State. It is an excellent way to get the conservation job done on a planned long-range basis. I am in favor of the increase proposed for 1965.

I believe that each of these programs has a place in our national efforts to combat poverty and to give a lift to rural economy.

I know that your task is not an easy one, but I hope you will consider each of

these activities favorable. I appreciate very much your giving me this opportunity to speak in support of them.

#### COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Today I have joined in sponsoring a resolution to establish a 15-member National Commission on Food Marketing, as proposed by the President. Although I introduced a somewhat similar resolution on March 26, the President's new proposal has distinct advantages over my earlier House Joint Resolution 974 which leads me to support it.

First, the President's recommendation authorizes a sweeping study of all aspects of the food industry, while House Joint Resolution 974 would concentrate the Commission's attention on the more specific but highly controversial practices of supermarkets and food chain-stores. These practices are perhaps the most significant forces at work in the food industry today, but there is little doubt that trends in other phases of the industry bear on them critically, and would constitute an important subject for the Commission's inquiry.

Second, House Joint Resolution 974 was referred to the Judiciary Committee due to its emphasis on the antitrust implications of developments in the food industry. Although this was certainly an appropriate reference, it is now clear that the Judiciary Committee would not have an opportunity to give House Joint Resolution 974 adequate attention in the near future. The broader resolution introduced today should receive more timely consideration by the Agriculture Committee.

Another feature of today's resolution which warrants comment at this time is its provision for five members of the Commission to be appointed from outside Government. In earlier discussions within the administration, it was suggested that these five be representatives of the affected industries and the farm organizations. However, I understand that the farm organizations themselves favor a Commission without farm, wholesale, or retail representation. Certainly, inclusion of industry and farm representation would raise conflict-of-interest problems owing to the confidential nature of the corporate records which the Commission would have to secure to do its job. For this reason alone, I earnestly hope the President and the committee will specify that these appointees shall be nonindustry if they are also to be nongovernmental.

Today's resolution proposes an extremely broad inquiry and authorizes a commensurately wide range of recommendations by the Commission. While this breadth of scope is admirable and

important, it will certainly take every bit of the 2 years allowed for the study. In the meantime, there are immediate and pressing problems in the food industry which require early solution. Accordingly, I hope that the proposal and establishment of the Commission will not be construed as a moratorium on vigorous action by the Justice Department, the FTC, and the Department of Agriculture to correct existing abuses of market power.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution responds most directly to the acute problem of prices received by red meat producers. Yet, in slightly less dramatic form, disparity in market power plagues all phases of agriculture. Producers, wholesalers, independent retailers, and the consuming public would all have a stake in the Commission's work. I strongly commend the resolution to all Members and solicit their support for the study it proposes.

### SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, observance of the 25th anniversary of Slovak independence was held on Sunday, March 15, at the SS. Cyril and Methodius Auditorium in Greater Cleveland, at which I was privileged to address an overflow assembly of interested citizens. I addressed them as follows:

It is most fitting that the observance of this 25th anniversary of Slovak national independence should be held in this auditorium dedicated to the brother saints, Cyril and Methodius.

For the brother SS. Cyril and Methodius are indelibly linked with 11 centuries of Slovak culture and history.

They were invited by Rastislav, who then ruled Slovakia, to bring the civilizing message of Christianity to the Slovak people.

That was in the year 863 and so effective was their work that history records them as the apostles of the Slavs.

Slovakia has stood fast by her Christian faith from the days of Cyril and Methodius to the present.

That faith has carried her over epics of great suffering and has preserved the culture of her people in the face of foreign occupation and rule. The strength of that faith is matched only by the sturdiness and resolve of her people.

No nation in history has fought harder or longer for freedom and national independence than Slovakia.

No people have paid a greater price for their allegiance to liberty and human dignity than that paid by the Slovak people. And no nation or people are more firmly committed to the principles of freedom today.

To understand the aspirations of the Slovak people and their plight as a nation today we need but look back upon events of the century in which we live.

When this century opened, Slovakia was a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—but a very restive part.

Their struggle for autonomy and selfrule over the previous century prepared them well for the political struggle during and following World War I.

It was no accident of history that the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, German, and Ottoman Empires fell in the wake of that war.

For it was the yearnings and struggles for national independence by nations long subjugated which toppled those empires.

In preparing the people of Slovakia for their political independence the name of Msgr. Andrew Klínka looms large.

A great patriotic leader, he took the initiative to form the Slovak Peoples Party as a united and democratic voice of his people.

That party adopted the guiding principles of the great encyclicals on the social order as their guideposts for the formation of a new social order in Central Europe.

Meanwhile, there were discussions among Czechs and Slovaks in the United States concerning the formation of a common federation following the war. One historic meeting took place in Cleveland in 1915.

At that meeting the Slovak League of America made clear its intention to support a Czechoslovak federal state, providing Slovakia would be an equal member with Czechia and would retain complete autonomy in all legislative, executive, judiciary, cultural, and national matters.

Matters of common concern, such as defense and foreign affairs, were to be handled by a common parliament.

That agreement, together with the Pittsburgh Pact, led to the establishment of a provisional government at Paris with Thomas Masaryk as President.

That provisional government was ratified by a Czechoslovak National Assembly on November 14, 1918, and elected Thomas Masaryk as President of the Republic.

It was not long before serious disagreements between the Czechs and Slovaks developed over the issue of a strongly centralist state and the concept of a federation of coequal states.

In the opinion of the Slovak leaders the Czechoslovak Republic was rapidly becoming a Czech state and the identity as well as the independence of Slovakia was thereby threatened.

This trend was contrary to all agreements entered into before the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Under these circumstances Monsignor Hlinka went to Paris in September of 1919 to plead the cause of Slovak independence before the peace conference of the victorious Western Powers.

There he was falsely denounced to the French authorities by the Czechoslovak delegation as a Hapsburg spy and was forced to depart the country.

Returning to his homeland he was immediately imprisoned by order of the Prague Central Government and his release was won by the Slovak people who elected him a deputy.

In the years between the wars the Slovak people fared poorly under the centralized regime in Prague.

Their hopes for self-government were denied by a system they had opposed and rejected and which laid upon them laws and demands to which they had not given their free consent.

Slovaks were the victims of harsh discriminations in all phases of government, education and public life.

Their ancient culture was put under a barrage of controls and regulations which had no other purpose but to suffocate their national heritage and yearnings.

Practically all the district and county public offices in Slovakia were directed and run by Czechs assigned by Prague. They, along with the police establishment, were directly responsible to Prague and none of these arms of a central government were responsive to the will of the Slovak people.

For example, in 1938, there were 120,926 Czech public officials quartered in Slovakia.

The Slovak people made numerous attempts to win their just national rights from the centralist government in Prague.

But these attempts were rebuffed and rejected by a series of delaying tactics, unfulfilled promises and outright deceit.

Since an alleged parliamentary form of government was established in Prague, the Slovak leaders took their series of complaints to that central body for redress.

But there they were faced with impossible odds for the parliament was loaded with 233 Czech deputies against 58 deputies from Slovakia and 9 deputies from Ruthenia.

Hence, the Slovak grievances fell upon unresponsive and unyielding ears.

Then the Slovak leaders took their grievances to President Edward Benes, who had succeeded to that post after the death of Thomas Masaryk.

There they met the same treatment of delay, rejection and rebuff.

When Hitler came to power in Germany and began to manipulate the smaller and weaker nations of Europe the Slovak people did not seize upon this situation to attain their long neglected grievances against the Government of Prague.

Contrarywise, all the legitimate political parties of Slovakia moved into a state of cohesive unity.

Moreover, they eased their complaints against Prague, conscious of the coming storm over all of Europe.

The Munich Conference of September 22, 1938, which was alleged to be a peace conference, unleashed new forces of division and discord throughout all of Central Europe.

When the Sudetenland was ceded to Germany as the price of peace, the centralist government of Prague was doomed.

Czechoslovakia was forced by the circumstances of political reality to become a federation of Bohemia-Moravia, Slovakia, and Ruthenia.

Slovakia, at long last, was to become master of its destiny as well as self-governing.

But the removal of 9,000 Czech officials in Slovakia to make room for officials chosen by the Slovak people caused additional strains on relations with Prague, although Edward Benes had fled into exile, the 1938 centralist vent of Prague remained, and this despite the lesson of Munich.

On March 10, 1939, the Prague government, annoyed at the serious manner in which the Slovaks were taking their responsibilities for self-government, dismissed the autonomous Slovak government headed by Dr. Joseph Tiso and declared martial law over all of Slovakia.

Public demonstrations against the Prague government spread throughout Slovakia and threatened a blood bath revolution.

Under these circumstances, Hitler invited Dr. Tiso to a conference in Berlin where he showed him a telegram from von Ribbentrop, then foreign minister of the Reich, in which the threat of foreign occupation of Slovakia was made.

Hitler then suggested this threat might be avoided if Slovakia declared its national independence.

While Hitler was a mad fool, he was by no means ignorant about the aspirations of the Slovak people for national independence.

Dr. Tiso returned to Bratislava where he reported fully to the Slovak diet on his conference with Hitler in Berlin.

The Slovak diet then proclaimed the national independence of Slovakia on March 14, 1939.

That, in quick summary, is the history of the 25th anniversary of Slovak national independence we observe here today.

All that I have said, and more, can be found in an official report of the U.S. Congress, rendered by the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress.

I was a member of that committee and I can tell you its members had no fear of the truth as we sought the facts on this vital issue.



That report also tells the story of Slovakia's loss of national independence following World War II and the manner in which the unprincipled political rogues who made up the centralist government of Prague sold out their own people as well as the Slovak nation to imperial Russia.

It is fitting at this moment that we offer up a prayer for the soul of Dr. Jozef Tiso, who made the supreme sacrifice for the political ideals of a free and independent Slovakia.

Dr. Tiso was tried in a mock trial, sentenced and hanged by the Communist quislings who eventually sold out their own country to the Russian Communists.

But history will treat Dr. Tiso kindly because the passage of time has brought forth and will continue to bring forth the truth about his desperate efforts to save his native land.

Slovakia today suffers under the harsh heel of Russian Communist occupation. That occupation has sought to rob the Slovak people of their ancient traditions, their religion, and their heritage as well as their political liberties. But the Slovak people are steely in the tactics which must be employed against a foreign occupier.

Time and the experience of centuries has prepared them well for the tests they now endure. It is little wonder that the spirit of resistance to tyranny runs so strong in Slovakia today. The Russians as well as their Czech quislings in Prague, know the power of Slovak national aspirations.

History is repeating itself today as the people of Slovakia are bringing pressures upon the diehard Russian Stalinist regime entrenched at Prague.

Those pressures are against the twin chauvinisms which seek to erase the distinct national character of the Slovak people.

Genuine dissent against the Prague regime comes only from Slovakia while Bohemia and Moravia remain strangely silent, even on the old hat Russian trick of de-Stalinization.

All of us remember that on the occasion of the Hungarian freedom revolution in 1956 the people of Slovakia alone among all the peoples of a Russian-restored centralist Czechoslovakia demonstrated sympathy for the aims of that freedom revolution.

The danger of that demonstrated sympathy was quickly recognized by Moscow. As a result three Czech divisions were moved to the common border between Slovakia and Hungary, to seal off any prospect of assistance and collaboration with the Hungarian freedom fighters.

That is a lesson of history which must never be forgotten by those who love freedom and fight against tyranny in any form.

There is another lesson to be gained from the era of the Hungarian freedom revolution which needs telling, but which up to this moment has remained buried in the archives of truth. That lesson occurred several weeks before the outbreak of the Hungarian revolution.

The scene was Poland, long under occupation by the oppressive Russian Communists. The Poznan revolt in the spring of 1956 was an important event in history, but it failed to expose to the free world the full story of the human pressures which had built up among the people of Poland.

That revolt served as a short-fused safety valve for the pent-up feelings of the Polish people. But by September and early October of 1956 the oppressed people of Poland had reached a breaking point. They were willing to risk all in a heroic effort to break the chains of Russian slavery which had been fixed to their national life and ancient heritage.

The Russian quislings in control of Poland became alarmed by these developments and sent urgent warnings to Moscow. Khrushchev knew the full meaning of these warnings and flew to Warsaw to avert disaster for the Russian empire. But the Poles were ready for him. They had managed to gain anti-Communist discipline and control over 40 divisions of Poles and East Germans.

When Khrushchev's plane arrived over Warsaw airport it was not allowed to land. The Russians then surrounded Warsaw airport with a Russian armored division. But the Poles countered this move by surrounding the Russian division with several loyal divisions of their own.

The Polish leaders of revolt sought time to negotiate with the American Ambassador in Warsaw. What they sought in these negotiations was assurance of United States moral support if they attacked the Russians and drove them from Polish soil.

In these negotiations the Poles were discouraged in their efforts and reminded that their ambitions would likely unleash a nuclear war. The Polish negotiators left the U.S. embassy discouraged and disillusioned and returned to the Warsaw airport. There they agreed upon a plan to force as many concessions out of Khrushchev as they could.

They agreed to demand the release of Cardinal Wyszynski from house arrest, the release of Gomulka from prison, and a general relaxation of oppression which had been laid upon the Polish people.

This brave action on the part of the enslaved Polish people held Khrushchev in the air over Warsaw for 4 to 5 hours.

When his plane was allowed to land, there was no pounding of a Russian shoe on a desk and there were no insults poured upon the negotiators because the Poles stood firm in their promise of unrestricted bloodshed unless their demands were met. Khrushchev understands that kind of negotiation. He met the demands of the Polish negotiators who negotiated upon nothing more than their confidence in the Polish people to stand up in support of their ideals and aspirations.

These facts were not known to the people of Hungary. All they knew was that the people of Poland were standing up to the Russians. In support of that stand they began peaceful demonstrations in Budapest.

It was no accident that these peaceful demonstrations moved toward the historic statue of General Bem, a Polish hero who went to the rescue of Hungary a century before when the people of Hungary fought for their national independence.

Nor was it an accident when the Russian secret police machinegunned the peaceful Hungarian demonstrators.

Moscow remembered the events in Warsaw a few weeks prior and knew only too well their meaning.

A show of brute strength, the traditional source of Russian power, was ordered. That brutal action triggered off the Hungarian freedom revolution which could have brought the Russian empire down in shambles if the United States had demonstrated the moral and political courage which has brought us to a position of leadership in the free world.

Looking back on that heroic chapter in history, in light of these facts which I have exposed, I must conclude that one of the greatest opportunities in history was bungled in Warsaw in the early days of October 1956.

The Poles and East Germans would have been joined by Slovakia, Hungary, Ukraine, Lithuania, Rumania, Byelorussia and all the rest of the peoples in the captive nations.

A popular revolution of that dimension, reaching from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea, would have brought about the total disintegration of the Russian empire.

The Russians would have been powerless in the face of such a popular movement for freedom.

The Red Army would have fallen into total collapse, as its occupation elements did during the Hungarian revolution, and Moscow would have been rendered powerless.

These conclusions are inescapable and they will become more apparent with the passage of time.

Truth will not be buried because truth endures time, mortal men, and the imperial Russians.

For these reasons I am honored by the opportunity which you have given me to participate with you in this observance of the 25th anniversary of Slovak national independence. This is the silver anniversary of an important event in the annals of freedom's cause. It serves well to provide a bright lining, a silver lining, to the dark clouds of war which stretch over much of the civilized world.

That silver lining raises our hopes for peace with justice and freedom. It reminds us that the power of human aspirations dwarfs the power and threat of all the nuclear weapons stockpiled throughout the world.

God bless the Slovak people and hasten the day when their hard journey toward freedom and national independence shall end in a glorious triumph.

On this occasion a group of leading citizens in Cleveland made a declaration based upon a former declaration of Slovak-American leaders made in Cleveland during the course of World War I. The present declaration reaffirms the hopes and the aspirations of the people of Slovakia for a return of freedom and self-government to their homeland. I include the declaration and the signatures thereto:

#### CLEVELAND CHARTER OF SLOVAK FREEDOM: 1915-65

The following declaration of the Slovak nation's natural right to freedom and self-government was enunciated on the eve of the golden jubilee of the Cleveland charter of the Slovak Nation's Freedom that was adopted by the city's American Slovaks during the second year of World War I:

We, the representatives of Cleveland's Slovak civic, fraternal, religious, and patriotic organizations do hereby solemnly declare these truths to be self-evident, namely,

1. The Slovak nation has an inalienable, God-given right to its free and self-governing state in the family of nations in central Europe.

2. The Slovaks who have inhabited their present historic homeland uninterruptedly for 1,500 years have a right to determine their own political destiny.

3. The Slovak nation cannot exercise its full right to self-government if another nation is allowed to impose its will upon Slovakia by colonial rule.

Therefore, we demand:

1. That the United Nations insist upon the cessation of Czechoslovak Communist rule over Slovakia.

2. That the Slovak nation be granted its natural right of setting up home rule with a democratic administration and native Slovak officials.

3. That the postwar religious persecution and political tyranny of the so-called liberators cease throughout the land.

4. That the Slovaks be freed from economic exploitation and political subjugation.

5. That Bratislava be made the national headquarters of the country's government.

6. That Slovakia be accepted as a sovereign, free state according to the spirit and principles of democracy as expressed by the

Atlantic Charter and contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

Signed and subscribed by:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Dubosh, P.A., Honorary President, Slovak League of America, Rt. Rev. Abbot Theodore G. Kojls, O.S.B., Spiritual Protector, First Catholic Slovak Union, John Zachar, Cleveland President of Slovak League Assemblies, Stephen Hudac, Cleveland District President of Slovak Catholic Federation of America, Joseph Kirschbaum, Ph. D., LL.D., President, Slovak Liberation Council Assembly, Toronto, Canada, Rev. Mikulas Sprinc, Secretary, Slovak Writers and Artists' Association, Rev. Andrew Pier, O.S.B., Director, Slovak Institute, Cleveland, Ohio, Stephen Krajcik, President, Cleveland Slovak Radio Club, John J. Biro, Secretary, Cleveland Slovak Radio Club.

Andrew Roman, Chairman, United Slovak Clubs of Cleveland, Joseph Klucar, Cleveland District President of Okres Furdek Jednota, Paul Drotar, Secretary, Supreme Court of the First Catholic Slovak Union, Stephen Suhajcik, Former President of Slovak News Association, Inc., Attorney George E. Fedor, President, Home Federal Savings & Loan Association, Andrew Pavelcak, Chairman, Slovak Independence Day Program Committee, Michael Kendra, Chairman, Publicity Committee, Slovak Republic 25th Anniversary Program, James J. Koscak, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Parma, Ohio, John Kompan, National Slovak Society, Lakewood, Ohio.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS), for April 6 and 7, on account of illness.

#### 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. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 15.

Mr. BECKWORTH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, Monday, April 13, 1964; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, Tuesday, April 14, 1964; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. WHITENER, for 30 minutes today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. GILBERT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELL.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. DOWDY.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

Mr. HEALEY.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2701. An act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 7, 1964, 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:

1882. A communication from the President of the United States, recommending the enactment of legislation establishing the bipartisan commission to study and appraise the changes taking place in the American food industry and submitting a draft of a bill to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1883. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for fiscal year 1965 in the amount of \$501,595 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 290); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1884. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of \$50 million for disaster relief (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1885. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service," for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1886. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.," to the Committee on Armed Services.

1887. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 408 of title 37, United States Code, to provide for reimbursement for the expenses of parking fees incurred by a member of a uniformed

service in connection with transportation necessary for conducting official business of the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1888. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority for flight instruction for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1889. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), relative to additional projects for the Air Force Reserve under Public Law 87-554, relating to a letter dated October 4, 1963, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a (1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1890. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 50th Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of operations for the year 1963, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1891. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a report covering its activities and accomplishments during the calendar year 1963, pursuant to the provisions of the statute creating the voluntary home mortgage credit program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1892. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the second report to Congress relating to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), as amended by Public Law 88-214, pertaining to the progress made during the calendar year 1963—the first full calendar year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1893. A letter from the assistant secretary-treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1963, pursuant to section 4 of the charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

1894. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the fiscal year 1963 (H. Doc. No. 291); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1895. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the military assistance program in advanced Western European countries, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1896. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a supplementary report on inefficient utilization of personnel to administer the military assistance program in advanced Western European countries, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1897. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on use of unsuitable materials to construct airfield pavements at Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1898. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs resulting from weaknesses in admission and billing practices relating to hospitals under contracts with Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1899. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audits of Government Services,



Inc., and of Government Services, Inc.'s, employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, year ended December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1900. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs resulting from the operation of separate departmental public information offices, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1901. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred in transporting Saturn launch vehicles by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1902. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overpricing of B-58 electrical power systems purchased from Westinghouse Electric Corp. by General Dynamics Corp. under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee prime contract; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1903. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on need to consider realignment of organizational and management structure for health and medical activities in the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1904. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary planned procurement of major assemblies for the M-151 utility truck, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1905. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate administration of automatic data-processing operations air route traffic control centers, Boston, Mass., and Washington, D.C., by the Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1906. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of the M-405 rocket-handling unit, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1907. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary per diem payments to military personnel during construction of nuclear-powered submarines, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1908. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to excessive costs of duplicate automatic teletype switching centers in the military services, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1909. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in aircraft procurements, utilization, maintenance, and accounting, Federal Aviation Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1910. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone-President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report on the disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1963, pursuant to (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1911. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacturer on furnishing of property for this purpose during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1963, pursuant to 63 Stat. 377, as amended (5 U.S.C. 630); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1912. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conveyance of 10 acres of federally owned land on the White Earth Reservation to the Minnesota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1913. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the Attorney General on the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1914. A letter from the American Symphony Orchestra League, transmitting a copy of the audit report filed by George H. Jones, Jr., certified public accountant, for the American Symphony Orchestra League for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 87-817; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. 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, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1916. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1917. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(d) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 141, 142); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1918. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, and incorporate therein specific statutory authority for the Presidential memorial certificate program"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1919. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age survivors, and disability insurance system of the Social Security Act to temporary and intermittent service performed in the employ of the District of Columbia if such service is not covered by a retirement system established by a law of the United States"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1920. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 29, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of Stratford, Conn., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 292); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

## 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. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on Small Business and Foreign Trade (Rept. No. 1303). 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. PATMAN:

H.R. 10668. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10669. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 10670. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 10671. A bill to impose import limitations on certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 10672. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10673. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the treatment of certain real property acquired by foreclosure and subdivided for sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 10674. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 10675. A bill to provide for the development of the Berlin National Fish Hatchery, Berlin, N.H.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 10676. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 10677. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription and the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10678. A bill to extend the third-class bulk mail rates and charges to nonprofit cemetery organizations and associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10679. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain Spanish-American War veterans eligible for pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10680. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1948, to authorize the construction of an additional bridge across the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10681. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 10682. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequalities in the construction of fishing vessels,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10683. A bill to permit officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia to reside anywhere within 25 miles of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10684. A bill to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10685. A bill to increase the amount of domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar which may be marketed during 1964, 1965, and 1966; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10686. A bill to provide financial assistance to Alaskan fishermen adversely affected by the earthquake of March 27, 1964, and the resulting tidal waves; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10687. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to limit future subsidies to certain types of reactors; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10688. A bill to designate the tomb in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., of the three unknown servicemen of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict as the "Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10689. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 976. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 977. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 978. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 979. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 980. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 981. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to residence requirements for voting in the case of presidential and congressional elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 982. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 983. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to

the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the 6-day period beginning May 18, 1964, and ending May 23, 1964, as National Hallbut Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in favor of immediate action on the part of each of the several States with respect to obsolete residency requirements for voters; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

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

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Memorial of the State of New York Assembly, to the Congress of the United States to incorporate or charter the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending section 7701(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to the inclusion of the Anchorage-Fairbanks Highway and a portion of the Alaska Highway in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to appropriate Federal action to protect the interests and rights of persons and villages affected by the Rampart Dam hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a veterans' hospital in Alaska; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take final action on the major civil rights legislation now pending before it at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of the surplus lands within Fort Baker, Fort Barry, and Fort Cronkhite for use for park and recreation purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to do all things necessary and pertinent toward keeping control within the States in the licensing and supervision of contract matters as defined under section 1(e) of the Walsh-Healy Public Contracts Act; to take immediate action to defer enforcement of the U.S. Labor Department assumption of control by amendment to part 50-204 of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to incor-

porate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending section 7701(A) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to afford nondiscriminatory tax treatment as between corporation employees and self-employed professionals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 10690. A bill for the relief of Saadet Erolgac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10691. A bill for the relief of William J. P. O'Brien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 10692. A bill for the relief of Park, Kyung Ok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10693. A bill for the relief of Aydogan Gargin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 10694. A bill for the relief of Rose Minutillio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Efronia Tossounian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 10696. A bill for the relief of Pauline Africa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 10697. A bill for the relief of Marija Pust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 10698. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 984. Joint resolution authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.J. Res. 985. Joint resolution authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

830. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Memphis Association of Student Councils, Memphis, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to consideration and passage of S. 1321 (National Service Corps); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

831. Also, petition of William P. Walsh, commander, and others, Rockville Centre Post No. 303, American Legion, Rockville Centre, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a rally supporting the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the voluntary recitation of nonsectarian prayer in the public schools of our great country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

832. Also, petition of Mrs. F. Bottieri, Mayaguez, Philippine Islands, requesting an investigation of the Communist infiltration in Puerto Rico, and citing anti-American activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.



833. Also, petition of Erwin Gozdek, Sopot, Poland, requesting passage of H.R. 7234, a bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

834. Also, petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, County of Essex, Newark, N.J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to pass the resolution amending the Constitution to permit recitation or enunciation of a prayer daily in those schools where pupils wish to participate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

835. Also, petition of Turgut Menemen-cioğlu, Ambassador, Turkish Embassy, Washington, D.C., with reference to a message from the Honorable Fuat Sirmen, President of the National Assembly of the Turkish Republic, expressing the shock felt by that legislative body on the occasion of the recent earthquake disaster that devastated the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

836. Also, petition of Chung Yul Kim, Ambassador, Korean Embassy, Washington, D.C., with reference to expressing deepest sympathy to the American people upon learning of the tragic disaster caused by the recent earthquake in the State of Alaska, particularly in the city of Anchorage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

837. Also, petition of the president, United Okinawan Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to settle Ryukyu Islands war claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

838. Also, petition of the mayor, Yonagusu-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

839. Also, petition of the mayor, Kuni-gami-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

840. Also, petition of the mayor, Ie-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

841. Also, petition of the mayor, Mago-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

842. Also, petition of the chairman, Municipal Assembly, Onna-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

843. Also, petition of the chairman, Municipal Assembly, Kunigami-son, Okinawa, with reference to early solution of compensation for damages sustained prior to peace treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

called some for the awesome responsibility of leadership, imbue them with all the qualities needed to make this land what You would have it be.

In this hour of dire need for deep, genuine brotherhood and sound legislation, grant especially to the U.S. Senate and each of its Members the grace of wisdom in full measure. To proponents and opponents alike, grant compassionate understanding of the other. Give courage for right action, even in the face of personal loss. Enrich words with genuine concern for the welfare and dignity of every American, of whatever race or culture. Cut through the maze of problems, to the core issues, with Your guiding grace. Illumine all the blind spots which might hinder sound action for the well-being of all. Expedite the urgent.

O Father, who alone can insure to this land and this people real peace, unity of spirit, solutions to sore problems, and healing for deep wounds, brood over us with Your spirit, through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

#### [No. 113 Leg.]

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Allott	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Morton
Bayh	Holland	Mundt
Beall	Hruska	Muskie
Bible	Humphrey	Neuberger
Boggs	Inouye	Pastore
Brewster	Johnston	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Cannon	Keating	Proxmire
Carlson	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Case	Kuchel	Russell
Church	Lausche	Saitonstall
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cotton	Magnuson	Simpson
Curtis	Mansfield	Smith
Dodd	McClellan	Sparkman
Dominick	McGovern	Walters
Douglas	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Miller	Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is necessarily absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). A quorum is present.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 4, 1964, was dispensed with.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I shall submit certain resolutions. It is the intention of the leadership to ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, for the purpose of allowing Senators to express their feelings about the passing of one of the great men of this country and this century, the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall join the majority leader in asking that there be a morning hour for that purpose. It is particularly fitting that at this sad hour there be a morning hour, to enable Senators to speak on the passing of General MacArthur.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I join the majority leader and the Senator from Oregon in the request for a morning hour, to enable Senators to speak in regard to the late General MacArthur.

General MacArthur was my general during the First World War; he was the head of what was known as the 42d—Rainbow—Division. I thought a great deal of him, and I regard him as one of the most outstanding generals our country had in the two World Wars.

#### ILLNESS OF SENATOR RANDOLPH— POSITION ON ROLL CALL VOTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday, on the roll call vote to recess, the RECORD does not show how Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, who was absent on account of illness, would have voted. Had he been present, Senator RANDOLPH would have voted with the leadership to recess.

## SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1964)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. Obed Lundeen, pastor, Augustana Lutheran Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has created all men in Your own image, and has given to us this great land through the blood, sweat, tears, and devotion of our fathers, we give you thanks. O Lord, who has