cooperative effort be accompanied by the presence of Federal ownership and operation of the line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam. Such a line would insure the prevention of monopolistic practices by the private electric utilities.

Prevention of private power monopoly activities necessitates simultaneous construction by the Federal Government of the line to Hoover Dam. According to the plans of the Secretary of the Interior, this particular line would be scheduled for completion in 1971—long after completion of the other three proposed lines into California. Being a realist, I fear that this line, if constructed after the private utility lines and after the completion of the city of Los Angeles line, would never be constructed by the Federal Government. This fear is based upon years of experience in dealing with the activities of private utilities. They have long sought to control, for profit, the transmission of public power generated at multipurpose dams built with the taxpayers' money.

My apprehension concerning the Columbia River-Hoover Dam line is heightened by this statement appearing in the fact sheet issued by the Secretary of the Interior:

> If the Congress desires that the Department of the Interior call for non-Federal proposals to build this line, as it did in the case of the lines to California, we can see no objection to such a procedure.

The same assertion was repeated in the question-and-answer sheet attached to the Secretary's press release accompanying the transmittal of his June 24 report. I note also that on page 25 of the report there appears a similar statement. These sentences can be construed as an escape hatch which could vitiate the merits of the proposed package.

The Senate Appropriations Committee can provide the safeguard I have just suggested if it will recommend that Congress appropriate and direct the expenditure of funds for the fiscal year 1965, to start Federal construction on the 750,000 volt direct-current line from the Columbia River to Hoover Dam.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of having proper electric power yardstick protection in connection with the intertie. In this respect, I am reminded that recently a top private power company executive of the Pacific Northwest was quoted quite candidly in the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Who controls transmission, controls the works." If we give the private utilities either direct or indirect control of the transmission of power under the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie, we might just as well turn over to them at the bus bar the power generated at our great multipurpose dam.

One additional safeguard is needed in this instance: I allude to the importance of a giving to congressional committee an opportunity to examine in minute detail the contracts eventually worked out between the private electric utilities and the Government, relating to power generated over the proposed alternating current lines into California. Also, the committees should have an opportunity to give searching examination to the contract the Government eventually works out with the city of Los Angeles, for the direct-current transmission of power on the third intertie line. I suggest that these contracts be transmitted to the appropriate committees, and that a period of at least 60 days be given the committees to examine the contracts, to assure that proper safeguards for the taxpayers and electric power ratepayers are inherent in them.

In closing, I repeat what I said in the Senate on June 29—namely, that we should scrutinize any intertie proposal from this standpoint. What assurance do we have that the private utilities will give us fair agreements for the wheeling, over their transmission lines, of the power that is generated at dams owned by the American people? We are confronted with a legislative problem when we sanction an intertie arrangement, and leave for future negotiation with the private utilities the working out of the agreements in regard to the wheeling of the power and the protection of public-preference customers. We should carry out our full legislative responsibility in this respect.

TWO PART RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR NEVADA UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1023, H.R. 287; and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business. There will be no action taken on it. It is merely for the purpose of having some business pending on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—H.R. 287—to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 6, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1964:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Abraham L. Freedman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Herbert F. Goodrich, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 142.

U.S. ARMY

Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962.

Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The words of Scripture inscribed on our Liberty Bell—Leviticus 25: 10: *Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.*

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers and their succeeding generations, may our beloved Nation, conceived in sacrifice and dedicated to liberty, inspire and sustain us in our glorious mission of helping to release the hidden splendor of humanity and in leading all mankind into the radiant light of a brighter and better day.

Grant that our American democracy, with its patriotism and love of freedom, may continually bear testimony to that moral and spiritual truth that we must have the greatest respect for the dignity of man, whom Thou hast created in Thine own image and hast endowed with certain inalienable rights which we will safeguard.

On the coming day, may we remember with our tribute of gratitude and praise those great patriots who stated in verbal form their indomitable faith and deepest convictions by signing the Declaration of Independence, and by dedicating to the cause of freedom their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace and may the legislation which we enact here today be in accord with Thy divine will for our beloved country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4364) entitled

"An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WORK PLANS APPROVED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions 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; and committee approval:

Georgia, Hiawassee River, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Kansas, Muddy Creek, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Maine, Presque Isle Stream, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Ohio, West Fork Duck Creek, No. 2228, July 1, 1964.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 789 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 178]

Avery	Hébert	Nedzi
Barry	Jarman	Norblad
Bennett, Mich.	Karth	Pilcher
Broyhill, N.C.	Kilburn	Powell
Burton, Utah	King, Calif.	Purcell
Clark	Lankford	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Lesinski	St Germain
Derwinski	Lloyd	Staggers
Healey	Miller, N.Y.	Utt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD after the debate on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, today the House is about to vote on the first comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation in the history of our Government. House Resolution 789, reported Tuesday by the Rules Committee, presents in general the civil rights bill passed by the House several months ago. The other body made a few necessary major changes in the voting rights, public accommodations, educational, and employment sections of the House bill. These few important changes have been constructive and will greatly aid toward the practical success and enforcement of this legislation. Chairman CELLER, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MCCULLOCH, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, will present to the Members a concise and factual explanation of the Senate changes from the bill passed by the House in February.

Civil rights has been debated in the Congress, pro and con, for weeks, months and for years. Had the "skim milk" civil rights bill enacted in 1957 dealt with this problem as comprehensively, factually and completely as the bill now under consideration, we would have been saved from a lot of embarrassing situations like Little Rock, Birmingham, Jacksonville, and so forth. This bill will be effective and amply provides to make all sections of our Constitution a reality to all American citizens.

Presidents and American statesmen for generations knew in their own minds that civil rights legislation for all citizens had to be enacted some day. When this bill is signed into law it will be our first official start to aid in extending voting equality, educational equality, public facilities equality and citizenship equality to all American citizens. The issue we vote upon today has been neglected and postponed by lack of courage on the part of generations of American statesmen and leaders. Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and now President Johnson have pressed the Congress for action on effective civil rights legislation for a period covering almost 30 years.

Educational advancement of our people with the help of universities, newspapers, radio and television have aroused millions of our citizens to the fact that large sections of our population can no longer be denied all the citizenship privileges which our Constitution has promised for almost two centuries.

Enactment of this legislation will not bring on an immediate civic utopia for everyone tomorrow, next month or next year. It will give our Nation a start with the necessary laws to eventually eliminate second-class citizens in our Nation. Several months ago this legislative body voted 290 to 130 on practically the identical legislation that we are considering this afternoon. Possibly some criticism will be expressed here today concerning the action of the Rules Committee in so diligently and without unnecessary delay in reporting out the resolution last Tuesday. Our only task on Tuesday was to hear the testimony of Chairman CELLER, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], and other members of the Judiciary Committee explain the changes made by the other body to our House bill. All the necessary testimony was taken from when we convened at 10:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. when the committee by a majority vote agreed to go into executive session and vote on the resolution. Our hearings lasted, with the exception of a couple of interruptions by two quorum calls, 6½ hours.

The records show that this legislation was considered and debated by the House Judiciary Committee, 22 days; by the Rules Committee, 7 days; on the floor of the House several months ago, 6 days, and by the Senate or other body, 83 days.

This bill has been considered by both bodies a total of approximately 114 days. If unnecessary delays, stalling tactics and filibusters were eliminated, this bill could have been disposed of in one-tenth of the time and also have given every Member of both bodies ample opportunity to be heard.

The comment has been made that a precedent was broken when the Rules Committee voted that a committee member in favor of Resolution 789 file the report and present the resolution to the House.

I want it to be understood that the members of the Rules Committee in my judgment were displaying no disregard or lack of confidence in the integrity of our chairman. The majority of our members decided that it was time to call a termination to some of the shenanigans and delays to which the progress of this legislation has been a victim.

I personally felt that our good chairman, by reason of his known and admitted intense opposition to this legislation, could not enthusiastically file the report that this resolution be considered and also bring it up on the floor of the House for debate. Possibly he could have accomplished this task, but not with jubilation or enthusiasm and with any hop-skip-and-jump hilarity. I firmly believe that down in his heart, our good chairman was very happy to let the committee confer this task upon somebody who was enthusiastic and in support of this legislation.

The time limit for debate on this resolution is 1 hour. I have extended 30 minutes to the minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, and 30 minutes at my disposal. I am extending one-half or 15 minutes of my time to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and he can advise me as to how he wishes it allotted.

It is my opinion that the passage of this bill does not terminate the responsibility of the Congress from contributing some time, experience, and advice in the successful administering of this complex problem. Members of both bodies, experienced over the years in legislation, can well advise leaders of organizations and groups who have been active in the civil rights movement on practical methods to be followed in insuring the success of this legislation.

The support of the American public opinion is necessary for the success of civil rights legislation. Progress in the first months and possibly first few years of this legislation will determine its effectiveness. It is my earnest hope that some Members long experienced in legislative processes over the years will devote their time to meeting with and extending advice and counsel to the leaders of well-meaning civil rights organizations and groups on how to best secure and maintain public opinion and support on this important task to secure civil rights equality for all citizens.

It is my thought that the leaders of the Congress, primarily responsible for the passage of this legislation, to wit: Speaker MCCORMACK, Congressmen HALLECK, ALBERT, CELLER, MCCULLOCH; Senators DIRKSEN, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, and KUCHEL would be glad to sit and confer with leaders of any civil rights organizations and groups who have been active in bringing about this legislation and in civil rights activities. The exchange of thoughts and recommendations at a meeting or meetings with these legislative leaders might be the determining factor on the immediate success or failure of this great legislative adventure which is admittedly difficult and all advice and suggestions possible are needed for its success.

In conclusion, let me say that President Johnson last week gave this important message on civil rights:

> We are going on from this civil rights bill to give every American citizen, of every race and color, the equal rights which the Constitution commands and justice directs. This will not be a simple task. No law can instantly destroy the differences shaped over centuries. And there is a law more hallowed than the civil rights bill, or even the Constitution of the United States. That law commands every man to respect the life and dignity of his neighbor—to treat others as he would be treated. That law asks not only obedience in our action, but understanding in our heart. May God grant us that understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who is in charge of this rule, has explained that this rule or resolution which gives only 1 hour of general debate on the resolution—30 minutes to the side—and if approved will automatically take from the Speaker's table the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and agree to the Senate amendments. There will be no other vote, on any other resolution. Frankly, I do not like this method of legislating, but it has been used before. A precedent was established here early in the year, when we did the same thing on a very important piece of legislation. At that time the 435 Members of the House were not permitted to consider or debate in any way farm and wheat legislation, but forced to adopt a Senate amendment after only 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great demand, in view of the fact this legislation has been before the Congress for more than a year, and because there is a desire to conclude consideration of this measure quickly for other important reasons, that this perhaps is the only method which could be followed at this time, and still not greatly inconvenience most of the Members of the House. Voting on the issue today, instead of a few days from now, can in no way change the final result.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, rather reluctantly perhaps, I am supporting this method of bringing this matter before the House today. I shall, of course, support the resolution so the Senate amendments may be adopted and this matter may be promptly disposed of.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under the exercise of raw, brutal power of the majority of both the Democrats and Republicans, the opponents of the civil rights bill on this side are given only 15 minutes to debate a bill that has never been before the Judiciary Committee of the House or before the House itself before today. This is not the bill that the House passed. It is the substitute bill of the Senate with some 80-odd new and different provisions. Under the rule, there is no opportunity for the House to consider or amend the Senate bill. When the roll is called, you will vote this monstrous invasion of the civil and constitutional rights of all the 180 million people of this country into the law of the land. It will contain implements of oppression upon the people of this country unmatched in harshness and brutality and raw dictatorship never before witnessed since the tragic days of reconstruction following the War Between the States.

I deeply regret that out of the 15 minutes allotted to me I cannot assign time for protests to the many patriotic Members of this House who would like to express their distaste, dismay, and disgust at this invasion of the rights of American citizens.

The history of this legislation is one of heedless trampling upon the rights of American citizens from the time the first bill was introduced, marching ruthlessly through the Judiciary Committee with every opportunity denied to Members to either discuss the measure or offer amendments. You will recall that the only committee hearings held upon the bill upon which the House voted were those which I insisted upon, in the Rules Committee over strenuous opposition, at which hearing only Members of the Congress were permitted to be heard.

In the other body, the U.S. Senate, after months of what should have been illuminating debate, a handful of Members in that body devised a new bill differing in 80-odd particulars from the House bill, and under a cloture rule each Member was given less than 1 minute to debate each of the many and far-reaching changes in the House legislation.

It comes to the House under a rule forced through by the leadership that gives the House no opportunity to discuss the glaring inequities, the discrimination against millions of American citizens, the destruction of rights that have been a part of our system of Government since the formation of this Union. But the bell has tolled. In a few minutes you will vote this monstrous instrument of oppression upon all of the American people.

You have sowed the wind. Now an oppressed people are to reap the whirlwind. King, Martin Luther, not satisfied with what will then be the law of the land, has announced his purpose, with the backing of the executive department, to begin a series of demonstrations inevitably to be accompanied by mob violence, strife, bitterness, and bloodshed. Already the second invasion of carpetbaggers of the Southland has begun. Hordes of beatniks, misfits, and agitators from the North, with the admitted aid of the Communists, are streaming into the Southland on mischief bent, backed and defended by other hordes of Federal marshals, Federal agents, and Federal power.

Be forewarned that the paid agents and leaders of the NAACP can never permit this law to be gradually and peacefully accepted because that means an end to their well-paid activities. Let us still hope for a peaceful and gradual solution of this problem that has brought this country, north, east, west, and south, closer to disaster than anything that has confronted us in the past 100 years. With all allowable disrespect to the Supreme Court of the United States, may I still be permitted in this hall to utter the pious and prayerful words, "God save the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following newspaper articles:

KING PLANS ACTS TO TEST RIGHTS LAW COMPLIANCE

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA., July 1.—The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., spelled out his summertime program today for bringing the civil rights bill home to the South.

The head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference said SCLC affiliates throughout the South will be asked to negotiate with leaders in their communities to secure compliance with the bill's provisions against discrimination in public accommodations.

Tests will follow. Businessmen will be notified in advance of plans by small groups to drop in to eat or to request a room, Dr. King explained. "Court suits will be filed against those who refuse to comply," he said.

For communities that resist the law with a united front, he predicted "massive direct action."

Dr. King singled out six southern cities already scheduled for direct action—Birmingham, Montgomery, Selma, Tuscaloosa, and Gadsden, all in Alabama, and Albany, Ga. "These are communities which have already said they won't comply," he said.

Attempts will also be made to turn Savannah, Ga., into a "model community."

He labeled the two phases of the program "Operation Dialog" and "Operation Implementation."

In St. Augustine, he said, the "dialog" has already begun. He said he was encouraged by appointment of a secret, four-member biracial committee to reduce racial tensions.

Civil rights demonstrations have been temporarily called off here to give the committee a chance to function.

The Negro civil rights leader said he understood President Johnson had "personally intervened" with Gov. Farris Bryant in the St. Augustine crisis.

Meanwhile, members of St. Augustine's Motor Court & Restaurant Association met jointly to pledge to obey the civil rights bill once it becomes law, "regardless of our personal feelings."

About 50 businessmen and women took part in the vote. Five opposed the pledge of obedience.

"We want all Americans to know we are unanimously opposed to the bill," said motel owner James Brock, spokesman for the group. "But the only thing we can do in public accommodation is obey the law."

POINT OF VIEW: CIVIL RIGHTS IN HISTORY

President Johnson vetoed the civil rights bill. In his veto message to Congress, he spoke his mind:

"In all our history no such system as that contemplated by the details of this bill has ever before been proposed or adopted. They establish for the security of the colored race safeguards which go infinitely beyond any that the General Government has ever provided for the white race. In fact, the distinction of race and color is, by the bill, made to operate in favor of the colored and against the white race. They interfere with the municipal regulations of the States, with the relations existing exclusively between a State and its citizens, or between inhabitants of the same State—an absorption and assumption of power by the General Government which, if acquiesced in, must sap and destroy our federative system of limited powers, and break down the barriers which preserve the rights of the States. It is another step, or rather stride, to centralization and the concentration of all legislative power in the National Government."

Does this sound like Lyndon Johnson? Well, no. This commentator is quoting, of course, the words of President Andrew Johnson, with reference to the civil rights bill of 1866. But they seem apropos.

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, this day will long be remembered by the American people. Their memory of it will not be pleasant. Forever and a day July 2, 1964, will be marked as the day on which greater violence was done to the U.S. Constitution than had ever been witnessed by Americans.

We can strip this so-called Civil Rights Act of the race issue and get down to the heart of it. When that heart is reached we find that it is about 10 percent civil rights legislation and 90 percent extension of the concept of further centralization of Government. This extended Central Government will, after the enactment of the bill, prove to be a curse to our people and a destructive assault upon the basic tenets which have made our system of government great.

Nothing in the legislation commends itself to me. The tactics employed in the House of Representatives and in the House Judiciary Committee in pressing this bad legislation upon the people are equally abhorrent to me. The hysteria of proponents of the legislation has been equaled only by their unwillingness to heed meritorious contentions made by thoughtful citizens on both sides of the civil rights issue. These misadventures in legislative procedures will rise to haunt some of those who have so happily employed them to accomplish what they consider to be a great legislative victory.

The American people are entitled to a better deal than they are getting today. We should give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I close these brief remarks by invoking the sage counsel given to the Nation by President Woodrow Wilson, when he said:

Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up.

Paternal morality enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience—unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control.

You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. * * * It is the alchemy of decay.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, events in Mississippi necessitated my inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on yesterday an indictment of the past and present official leadership in the State of Mississippi. In that statement, I categorically accused the entire corps of public officials of that State of being responsible for the violent oppression of the masses of Mississippians, both white and Negro. That oppression, as I stated, has been and still is complete in regard to economic, political, and social conditions of the vast majority of the people of the State.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to document further those charges and to insist again that Federal protection is a minimal necessity if the reign of terror is to be brought to a halt. On April 4, 1963, I called upon all of my colleagues in the Congress "to join me in protesting and denouncing the illegal activities on the part of the authorities of Mississippi" and I stated then that "these crimes cry out for positive and courageous action, not tomorrow, but now."

Mr. Speaker, what I said then is even more current now. And, to remind all the Members of Congress of the gravity of the situation—of the inhumanity of man to man in Mississippi—of the gross and brutal injustices being visited upon Americans there—of the complete breakdown of law and order within official ranks among the State's public officials—I ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article from the Philadelphia Inquirer, the issue for June 30, 1964, by M. W. Newman, which underlines my remarks of over a year ago and further documents my indictment of yesterday.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 30, 1964]

MISSISSIPPI: LAND OF VIOLENCE—BLOODY PAGE IN SOUTH'S HISTORY

(By M. W. Newman)

On September 25, 1961, a Negro named Herbert Lee was shot to death in downtown Liberty, a sweaty Mississippi town. He had been active in trying to register Negro voters in the South's bastion State of white supremacy.

His slayer was State Representative E. H. Hurst. The authorities held that Hurst had shot in justifiable self-defense. A Negro logger, Louis Allen, was one of the alibi witnesses for Hurst at the inquest.

On January 31 of this year, Allen was killed by shotgun blasts in that same town.

Student civil rights workers say he admitted before his death that he lied to protect Hurst at the coroner's inquest under threat of death.

Murder—unsolved murder—has run like chain lightning around Mississippi as the voter-registration drive has threatened the centuries-old rule of Jim Crow.

Acts of terrorism against Negroes and their young white allies are everyday occurrences.

U.S. Justice Department investigators believe that five Negroes have been killed by racist terrorists in southern Mississippi in the last 6 months. Negroes say the figure may be far higher.

The record of shootings, beatings, jailings, bombings, cross burning, threats and terrorism is appalling. Federal officials believe there may be 60,000 armed white men in southern Mississippi, organized in virtual guerrilla units and primed for terror.

The Ku Klux Klan is on the prowl.

So are the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race, a "fight-now" hate group. And, apparently, so are policemen, often accused of beating, threatening, and shooting.

Some Negroes have been flogged. Some have been driven out of jobs and homes. Tossing of Molotov cocktails is a standard procedure. On the night of April 24, crosses were burned in 64 of the State's 82 counties.

The reign of violence was touched off by persistent campaigns to register the Negro and give him his simple rights as a citizen. These campaigns have not made great headway—no surprise in view of the bloody resistance—but have frightened many whites beyond reason.

Said the Greenwood, Miss., Delta Democrat-Times, one of the State's few moderate voices:

"Countless crimes, ranging from the burning of business establishments * * * and the bombing of a Negro barbershop * * * and motel, have been accomplished with frightening immunity.

"No one sees anything, says anything, or does anything."

Most of this violence passes almost unnoticed by the world at large. Only a few cases ever have made big headlines—the butchery of teen-aged Emmett Till, of Chicago, in 1956, the University of Mississippi mob riots of 1962, the murder of NAACP leader Medgar Evers in 1963.

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, consisting of young crusaders for civil rights, has kept book on scores of other incidents.

There have been dozens in just one Mississippi city—Greenwood—since the SNCC began a voter registration drive there in August 1962.

Two months later, the Leflore County Board voted to drop a surplus food program that had helped sustain 22,000 poor Negro farmers.

By 1963, arrests, arson, beatings, and shotgun blasts were the order of the day. SNCC worker James Travis was machinegunned by two white men. Eight SNCC workers were arrested for inciting to riot. Their crime consisted of marching 100 Negroes to the courthouse to register.

Registration workers were harried with traffic tickets and fines, tear gas, smoke bombs, cross burning, threatening phone calls, arrests and jailings. That they managed to get anyone registered is a tribute to their bravery and persistence—and to the determination of many Negroes to at last assert their rights.

The Greenwood Delta-Democrat Times of May 11 tells how the Americans for the Preservation of the White Race boycotts white businessmen who won't fire Negroes.

The publisher of this maverick Mississippi newspaper is Hodding Carter. The night after the recent death of his youngest son, a load of garbage was dumped on his lawn.

Here is just a sampling of some of the handiwork of the brothers in hate over the last 5 years as compiled by SNCC.

McComb, Pike County—Two white youths, Paul Potter and Tom Hayden, were dragged from their cars and beaten while accompanying Negro antisegregation marchers.

Jackson, Hinds County—Dion Diamond, a SNCC worker, was arrested for "running a stop sign." The arresting officer told the judge: "He is a freedom rider. Throw the book at him."

Diamond was refused legal counsel and fined $168, SNCC reported.

McComb—A mob of 30 to 40 whites attacked 5 Negroes seeking service at a bus terminal lunch counter. The mob kicked and beat and used brass knuckles. Other Negroes finally rescued the victims.

Tylertown, Walthall County—John Hardy, SNCC registration worker, took two Negroes to the courthouse to register. The registrar told them he wasn't registering voters that day. When they turned to go, Hardy was gun slugged on the head from behind, arrested and charged with disturbing the peace.

Shelby, Bolivar County—Aaron Henry, State NAACP president, was convicted of making advances to a white hitchhiker. He charged that he was framed and was sued for defamation by the prosecutor and police chief. A Mississippi white jury awarded $40,000 damages.

Henry's home also has been bombed and his drugstore shattered.

Columbus, Lowndes County—A Molotov cocktail was tossed from a speeding car into the home of Dr. James L. Allen. He is vice chairman of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Canton, Madison County—Sylvester Maxwell, 24-year-old Negro, was found slain, his body mutilated.

Canton—A shotgun blast wounded five Negroes as they walked home from a voter registration meeting.

Clarksdale—A coroner's jury ruled the shooting of 21-year-old Ernest Jells, a Negro, was justifiable homicide. He had been shot by police, who said he pointed a rifle at them.

Jackson, Hinds County—Two SNCC workers, Jesse Morris and George Green, were shot by police during a demonstration February 3.

Meanwhile, Mississippi has beefed up both its State highway patrol and police forces in individual towns. New laws permit crackdowns on picketing, mass demonstrations, and "disturbances of the peace."

Jackson, the State capital, has a riot-trained force of 435 policemen, armored vehicles, and special equipment.

Mississippi is an armed State, waging violence against the nonviolent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for all the troubles we are having throughout America with civil rights. Negroes and whites can get along together in this Nation. They want to. The vast majority of our citizens of whatever color feel this way. They resent the violence, the bloodshed, the hatreds and the distortions that are the trademark of extremist groups of both races. What then is the difficulty?

It is that the present administration and its immediate predecessor have deliberately injected race relations into the political arena. The President of the United States seeks political gain by supporting this unsound and unconstitutional legislation. The civil rights bill now before us gives to the Federal Government the power to deny important civil rights of all Americans.

This civil rights bill is sloppy legislation. Its draftsmanship is poor, its meanings doubtful and its unconstitutionality obvious in at least two titles.

A vote for this bill, now 20 pages longer than the monstrosity that passed a submissive House on February 10, is not evidence of greatness of leadership. It is evidence of a demoralized Congress. Voting for this bill and thus creating a Federal police state is an outright surrender of the constitutional rights of all Americans to freedom in their private lives. It is abject abdication of congressional responsibility to preserve and protect the constitutionally required Federal-State balance in the face of political pressures such as Congress has never faced before; and knowing that the U.S. Supreme Court has, by its decisions, tortured the Constitution out of all rational historical proportion in disregard of the will of Congress and the intent of the Founding Fathers in the fields of law enforcement, sedition, religion, apportionment, civil rights, and what have you. Only Congress remains to protect the constitutional rights of our people.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the American people realize the surrender of their private rights to a Federal "big brother" established by this bill, they will be dismayed to learn of their betrayal. They hear from the press, the commentators, and the columnists the misrepresentation that this is greatness of leadship—true statesmanship at its best. It is nothing of the sort. This legislation is capitulation to ultimatums from a militant minority that threatens violence. It is outright surrender of our cherished rights as free American citizens. It is a perversion of the Constitution.

A vote for this legislation is not a vote to be proud of, for it is a vote to undermine the Constitution of the United States. Perhaps in November the voters will elect a Congress with a majority that will stand firmly for upholding the clearly written mandates of the Constitution of the United States, even if the Supreme Court of the United States does not do so. Then perhaps at long last we can start this Nation on the governmental road upward from the depths of the near anarchy that judicial license and congressional indifference have led us into at this hour, toward a stable constitutional government once again. Perhaps all this is too much to hope for, but it is certainly something worth fighting for.

One hundred ninety million Americans, in living their private lives, have certain inalienable private rights under our Constitution. These include the right of free association and free disassociation, the right of free use of property both personal and real, the right to select customers in private business, the right to choose whom to patronize in private business and whom not to patronize, the right to hire and fire, the right of personal choice in respect to whom to wine with, whom to dine with and whom to work or be with in private affairs.

This bill, with its self-serving title of "civil rights," is nothing less than an act to establish a Federal license to deny private freedoms everywhere in our land by giving shotgun powers to a Washing-

ton Attorney General who, on his record and for political advantage, has shown again and again that he just cannot wait to help destroy these rights.

Stripped of its political hyprocrisy, this bill is a naked grasp for extreme Federal power over private business and private lives in the several States. In respect to public accommodations and equal employment opportunity, there is not a single word in the Constitution to support such Federal control. This legislation, in the name of civil rights, takes more civil rights away from all Americans than it confers on any minority group.

When the States wrote the Constitution, they were very careful to create a Federal Government of limited powers. The infringement of this bill on the police powers of the States is exactly what the 10th amendment to the Constitution was designed to prevent.

If we had a Supreme Court worthy of the name, there would be little to fear from this bill because its unconstitutional aspects would soon be struck down by the Court. Of this we could be confident. Unfortunately, it is otherwise, and has been virtually ever since the incumbency of the present Chief Justice.

It is truly a tragedy that so many of our people have lost faith in the U.S. Supreme Court. This loss of public respect is infecting our entire judicial structure. Decision after decision of the High Court has been on the basis of personal predilection and social attitude of a plurality of members instead of on a basis of law and precedent. Confusion has reached a point where even the most learned members of the bar in America are unable to advise their clients the course of the law or the prospect of decisions on issues affecting individual rights or Federal-State relations.

A majority of the U.S. Supreme Court as presently constituted will hold that digging a worm in your own backyard is interstate commerce should it be necessary to do so to uphold this bill. In this knowledge, the people's confidence in our system oozes away even further. Can it be that there are those in high places who want this to happen? That many Americans are beginning to ask this question contributes further to our uneasiness in the realization that there is no appeal from the U.S. Supreme Court.

By voting for legislation so loose, so reckless, and so unlawful as this so-called civil rights bill, Congress itself is compounding the difficulty. We in the Congress are not without our critics and deservedly so. Are we to be stampeded into voting for anything called "civil rights," good or bad, just because a majority of this body deems it politically inexpedient to vote against any package with such a label? It is not leadership but weakness when Members of Congress bow because of patronage commitments to an administration that demands that Congress should, by this law, "damn the Constitution, full speed ahead."

Mr. Speaker, what is the principal civil right sought to be protected here? It is the right to be free from discrimination in American living. In essence, it is the right to be treated equally regardless of race, color, or religion. There are limits in such assurance beyond which no Federal legislation can or should attempt to reach. Equal rights are not a guarantee of equality. There can be no such guarantee by act of Congress. Nowhere in this entire 75-page "new" bill is the word "discrimination" defined. It is used, again and again, but it is not defined. What it is to mean is left to the Attorney General and the courts.

Let me be specific. Let us talk of bread, butter, and jobs.

Do the workers of this country realize, for example, that if this bill becomes law and a white man applies for a job in competition with an equally qualified colored man, the prospect is that under this administration the policy will be to give preference to the colored man until certain quotas are met, even though quotas are not themselves included in this bill? Is this equal rights? It is not.

Or consider public accommodations: suppose you have a rooming house covered by the bill. A white couple with children comes to apply for rooms and you say, "I'm sorry. I don't rent to couples with children." This is your private right. Under this bill that is the end of it. The white couple must find another place. But, suppose it is a colored couple and you say the same thing, "No, I'm sorry. I don't rent to couples with children." What will happen? You will face a complaint that you discriminated. You'll have to pay for your own lawyers in any event and the complainant's lawyers if he prevails. You'll have to prove your claim of innocence with records. You'll be subject to one nuisance and harassment after another.

Is this equal rights? It is not.

Or suppose at a motel on a highway a white couple seeks lodging at 11 o'clock at night, only to be told truthfully that the lodging is not available, the place is full. That's the end of it for that white couple. They must find another place. A law suit? Of course not. But, suppose that couple is colored and the same truthful answer is given. If this bill becomes law that motel will face a complaint, a suit, unwarranted costs, harassment and all the rest.

The same type of illustrations of the practical effect of this bill can be carried right down the line into hiring and firing policies, seniority lists in unions, eligibility lists in employment agencies, and a thousand and one nooks and crannies of our private lives that this bill would control, without a single provision of our Constitution giving the Federal Government the power to so regulate.

The Federal Government, even in the cause of civil rights, has no authority to interfere in the private business affairs of persons or companies not aided by Federal funds and not engaged in interstate commerce. It was agreed as to child labor legislation that a constitutional amendment was required to enable the Federal Government to act in intrastate matters.

This legislation goes much further than merely making it unlawful to hire anyone under 16 years of age. Obviously, it requires a constitutional amendment to regulate private business in the manner that this bill provides. As purported to be established in this bill's titles II and VII, the provisions of this bill are sheer Federal decree without constitutional foundation.

If a businessman in Arkansas or in any other State does not want to hire, in his private business, a member of a particular race or religion, this is his undeniable constitutional right as a free American. It is his business, not the Federal Government's. Those who would legislate otherwise here today would literally surrender the constitutionally protected rights most cherished by all Americans to a Federal Caesar who plays the Pied Piper to the Congress of the United States from Maine to California. I want no part of a surrender of our rights to such political pressure.

What should be done with this legislation? The most offensive Titles are II and VII, Public Accommodations and Equal Employment Opportunity. How can they be amended to assure a reasonable amount of protection to all Americans in their proper civil rights without disregarding the plain language of the 10th amendment which provides that the powers not granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution are reserved to the States and to the people?

The Public Accommodations Title (title II) should be stricken from this legislation in its entirety and a simple provision substituted requiring that the sale of food, shelter, drugs, medicines, or other necessities of life by the Federal Government, or by persons or corporations engaged in interstate commerce, shall be without discrimination for reason of race, color, or religion. Title II of the present bill, seeking to define inns, hotels, motels, soda fountains, theaters, and the like as subject to Federal regulation because their operations "affect commerce," is a palpable deception, for on no rational basis can it be said that the mere serving of customers from other States is interstate commerce. The fact that the customers of a business move from State to State cannot constitute the business engaged in interstate commerce. Undeniably, such business in an oblique fashion "affects commerce." But if the phrase "affecting commerce" is to be a legal basis for the establishment of complete Federal police power over such activities, we shall indeed have established a Federal police state, for virtually everything any citizen does in his daily living "affects commerce," one way or another. "Affecting commerce" is not interstate commerce.

A simple amendment such as I have indicated above would prohibit discrimination in interstate commerce at restaurants located in transportation terminals, on railroad trains, on airlines and at airports, and in the myriad of other locations that are honest-to-goodness interstate commerce. This is as far as we may constitutionally legislate at the Federal level in the application of Federal police power to activities within the States.

The regulation of hotels, motels, and the like within the several States is for the States, not for the Federal Government under the Constitution. Let us face this fact squarely and honestly. Let us uphold the Constitution in this Congress despite the U.S. Supreme Court. It is inconceivable at this stage of debate, after the fullest and most complete exchange of views and information concerning this bill, that any Member is not aware of the patent unconstitutionality of the offensive titles. No matter the extent and depth of our respective sympathies toward any minority group, it is a violation of our oath of office and a perversion of the legislative function to steamroller an unconstitutional law onto the books at the expense of the reserved constitutional rights of all Americans.

Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunity, should be amended to apply only to the operations of the Federal Government and to persons or companies doing business for or with the Federal Government. To undertake by Federal law to police private business and private labor unions in the manner proposed by this bill unconstitutionally invades the private property rights of all free Americans, whatever their race or color. A business is not considered to be engaged in interstate commerce merely because its activities "affect commerce." But, even if it were, the only proper reach of this legislation should be to cover activities of the Federal Government, those contracting with it, and those engaged in interstate commerce. This would be a simple amendment and one that all people could understand. It would help make good legislation out of bad, for under the Constitution there just is no power in the Federal Government to police private business not engaged in interstate commerce nor doing business with or subsidized by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there is in this country at this moment in history a shameful need for good civil rights legislation. It is shameful because civil rights should come from the hearts of men and not from the printed page, the billystick, or the Marines. Yet this legislation, in the form in which it is presented to us today, is a serious mistake. If enacted into law and undertaken to be enforced throughout the land, this bill will set brother against brother and business and States against the Federal Government.

This is precisely what those seeking to further aggravate our domestic troubles wish to accomplish in America. It is exactly what the rabblerousers, the leftwingers, the fellow travelers and the Communists want us to do. It is the sort of legislation which will do more harm to our country if enacted than were there to be no legislation whatsoever.

Leaders in the Negro movement have made it clear that whether this bill passes or not their demonstrations will continue. In the light of such statements, one can only speculate as to what may lie ahead for our Nation.

One thing, however, is beyond dispute. The present administration has deliberately chosen to make this serious domestic problem a political issue. It encourages the setting of the national stage for violence while seeking to convey the false impression to colored people that it alone is their champion and those who oppose this particular unconstitutional bill would deny the proper rights of Negroes everywhere. If proof be needed of the truth of this, it is readily found in the actions of no less than a member of the President's Cabinet. The Attorney General of the United States, while seeking from Congress extraordinary and plenary powers, caused to be set up in his office, before dealing with the University of Alabama crisis, a complete television installation so that throughout the clash between Federal and State authorities in that unhappy affair, he and his deputy were "on camera." This was a deliberately staged performance for use as political propaganda without regard for the strength of the Union.

This Nation of 190 million people has approximately 170 million white and 20 million colored citizens. This civil rights bill steals private rights away from all 190 million Americans—rights of the most serious, the most fundamental, the most valuable type. These are the rights of association, of property, of privacy—even the right of personal choice—all to be prohibited by politically motivated, power hungry bureaucrats from faraway Washington.

When the full impact of this grievously unconstitutional and unwarranted invasion of all Americans' private rights is upon our people, I believe their support of those who stand firm and vote against this legislation will be in percentages even greater than 10 to 1.

I am proud that I am recorded, by my vote against this unconstitutional law, as working to protect the people of this country against a law that would create a Federal Frankenstein masquerading as civil rights.

I believe that the American people will remember who stood fast for their rights when the going was tough. One thing is certain—it will not be those who vote for this unconstitutional surrender to a Federal police state.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, two facts need to be understood.

First, the House has no parliamentary opportunity to amend the Senate bill. Neither can the amendments adopted by the Senate be acted upon individually. Under the rule, all of the Senate amendments must be voted up or down as a package, and if they are voted up, the bill as passed by the Senate goes straight to the President for his signature. This bill should have gone to conference.

Second, in the time allotted by the rule for House deliberation, there is less than 9 seconds for each of the 435 Members. It is difficult to find, count and read the 87 changes made by the Senate and almost impossible to evaluate their individual and collective effect in context with the countless statutes and court decisions involved. Parenthetically, it should be remembered that these 87 changes were made in a House bill which House civil rights leaders said could not and should not be amended at all, and none of these amendments have ever been afforded a committee hearing by either body of Congress.

Some of these 87 amendments may be good, some may be bad. Whether the net effect is good or bad, no two people can agree. Without attempting to make a complete inventory, here are some of the changes made by the Senate which I regard as bad:

First. In the House bill, the Attorney General was given no specific right to intervene in lawsuits brought by individuals under title II—public accommodations—and title VII—FEPC. Under the Senate amendment he is empowered to do so.

Second. In the House bill, the Attorney General was not specifically authorized to institute suit in the name of the United States on behalf of an individual under the FEPC title, but he is granted that authority under the Senate amendment.

Third. In the public accommodations title of the House bill, the Attorney General was expected to attempt conciliation through local agencies before bringing a suit against the businessman; and under the FEPC title, the Commission was required to do the same. Under the Senate amendments, the Attorney General can bring suit under both titles immediately. All he has to do is to allege that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists and the court will grant a temporary injunction which may later be made permanent if the Attorney General later produces evidence of a pattern or practice.

Fourth. In addition to originating suit or intervening in an individual's suit under the public accommodations and FEPC titles, the Attorney General may, under the Senate bill, ask the court to appoint private counsel for the complainant and waive any costs assessable against a complainant.

Fifth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, all covered employers were required to keep records concerning job applications, hiring, firing, promotions, working conditions, pay policies, and so forth, and to make periodic reports to the Commission. Under the Senate amendment, employers in States which have State FEPC laws are to all intents and purposes exempt from Federal recordkeeping.

Sixth. Under the FEPC title of the House bill, an employer was permitted to refuse to hire an atheist. The Senate deleted this clause.

Seventh. The House bill placed a limitation of $2.5 million the first year and $10 million the second year on appropriations for the FEPC title. The Senate struck out the limitation and left an open end authorization.

Eighth. Under title X, the House bill limited the number of regular employees for the new Community Relations Service to six. The Senate deleted the limitation.

Ninth. Title X of the House bill permitted the new agency to utilize the services of public agencies at State and local levels. The Senate bill extends this permission to private organizations as well.

Tenth. The three-judge court provision was confined to title I—voting—in the House bill, and the option was granted to the defendant as well as the Attorney General. The Senate bill writes this concept into title II—public accommodations—and title VII—FEPC—for the first time. However, in these two titles, only the Attorney General has the option to demand a three-judge court. The businessman charged with discrimination has no equivalent option.

This recitation is not intended to convey the impression that all of the changes made by the Senate are objectionable. Some, like the double jeopardy amendment and the jury trial amendment—so bitterly condemned during House debate—are salutary. However, welcome as it is, the jury trial amendment itself is defective in part. It applies only to titles II through VII.

In section 302 of title III of the House bill, the Attorney General was empowered in the name of the United States to intervene in all suits brought by individuals "seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race," et cetera. For some obscure reason, the Senate bill lifts this section from title III and places it in title IX. This places it outside the boundary of the jury trial amendment's application. The list of suits based on the equal protection clause is too long to itemize, but according to the Attorney General himself, it might include such subjects as legislative apportionment, commitments to mental institutions, State criminal proceedings and censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that nothing said in this brief interval by proponents or opponents will change a single vote. The roll could with the same result have been called as well before the debate as after. It is regrettable that this is so, because the issue here involved is not so simple as some have pretended. It involves more than a question of justice or injustice, and votes on the rollcall cannot and by fairminded men will not be called moral or immoral. Many who acknowledge equality under law as the soul of morality will with perfect consistency reject as immorality statutory infidelity to the supreme law of the land. And this bill, in several parts, is clearly unfaithful to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to spend this time discussing the principal subject matter before us, and that is should this rule accepting the Senate amendments and adopting the bill be passed or should this bill go to conference. That is the issue before the House now. There were some 90 changes made in the other body, many of which were very substantial in nature. Certainly there has been no bill before this House since I have been here, for 10 years, coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary, that has more effect on the basic constitutional property, business and personal rights of the individual in America than this one before us here today, which delegates to the Federal Government to a broader or greater extent new powers. Certainly a bill of this nature and magnitude and having this effect on the life of each and every one of us should properly go to conference rather than be considered for only one hour, under a gag rule, with no right to make changes in a situation where there are some 90 amendments to the bill.

If each Member of this body, with the time limit of 1 hour on this resolution, were given an equal opportunity to discuss the matter, each would have 9 seconds on it. If each Member were given an equal opportunity to discuss each of the amendments, he would have nine-tenths of a second to discuss each amendment. I say that this is a farce upon the proper and orderly legislative process particularly in consideration of a bill of this significance.

Why do I say that as it relates to what the other body did? I say that this bill is stronger than the bill that passed the House. I say that is true in many respects and in the very two areas where it was expected there would be some compromises made between this body and the other body, in the areas of accommodations and the FEPC. In fact, in many instances, in those two titles, this bill is stronger than the bill that left the House. It is my belief that the majority of the Members of this House felt that the bill that left the House was too strong, to say nothing of the bill that comes back from the other body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what am I talking about? Let us look at the FEPC provisions. The appropirations were limited in the first year to $2½ million and to $10 million in the second year. That has been deleted. There is unlimited authorization for expenditures in the Senate version of the bill.

In the Community Relations Services section, I introduced an amendment in the committee that limited the personnel of the Community Relations Service to six people. The House approved it. What was the reason for that? Because they did not want the Community Relations Services on a Federal level to take over the proper functions of the community relations services which are now acting, I hope, effectively, for instance, in the city of St. Augustine. But instead now, when this bill becomes law, the Federal Community Relations Service is going to have unlimited personnel and it is going to take over the proper function of the local community relations services. And yet, as to the essential function, if this bill is going to be effective, if community relations are going to be favorable at all, it will be because the State and local communities are willing to accept this bill and to enter into agreements and to try to reach a better understanding with the Negro communities through local community relations services.

Mr. Speaker, what else am I talking about? This bill, as it comes from the other body, gives legislative sanctions—the House refused to give legislative sanction—to the President's regulations with regard to all Federal employees. Now, I am going to repeat that. They wrote into the bill these legislative sanctions as they affect all Federal employees. The bill as it left the House excluded Federal employees. That is a very significant change.

Returning to title VII dealing with FEPC, the House did not give the Attorney General the right to bring an action, but the Senate amendments provide for such action, and without the censent of the aggrieved parties or party, without first referring the matter to the State or local authorities where State or local FEPC laws exist, and without a finding by the Commission that discrimination in fact exists.

Thus, the Attorney General is not subject to the heralded Senate amendments in the FEPC section, in that he does not have to acknowledge State and local FEPC laws as does the Commission. Likewise the Attorney General can, on his own, determine that discrimination exists in labor practices on the part of the employer or the labor union.

Thus, the Senate claimed to take cognizance of State and local laws on one hand but wrote this concept right out of the bill again by permitting the Attorney General to ignore such laws.

The Attorney General, thus can also bring the action without consultation with or a finding by the FEPC beforehand.

The Attorney General can request a three-judge court be empaneled to process the case, thus permitting him to forum and judgeship, under the amended FEPC.

The Attorney General can bring an action and so can an individual without consultation with the FEPC. The House bill gave the Attorney General no right to bring such an action, and gave the individual such an action only if at least one of the Commissioners authorized it.

Under the amended FEPC provision, the court can provide attorneys fees, can provide an attorney, and can waive even filing fees and ordinary court costs required to be paid in every other type of litigation.

The Senate failed to rectify the crucial weakness in the FEPC of not requiring any type of a hearing before the Commission makes its findings of discrimination, affording the party complained against no opportunity to be heard on the matter.

Returning to title II, accommodations, the Senate provided that the court can make available counsel but only to the aggrieved person, and can waive initial court costs, provisions not in the House bill.

The Attorney General can ask for a three-judge court under title II as amended by the Senate.

The Attorney General can again waive the heralded amendment in the Senate on this title, recognition of local and State laws, by simply certifying that it is in the interest of the United States to do so or that to do so would be ineffective.

The Attorney General is not limited by the provision applicable to individual complainants under the accommodations section that the case may be referred to the Community Relations Service where such exists.

These examples I believe amply demonstrate, first, that this amended bill is stronger in many instances than the House bill and second, that the broad effect of many of them necessitates adequate consideration which can only be accomplished in this instance by voting down the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments that were attached to the House bill that was passed in February of this year are clearly acceptable by the majority of the House and the Judiciary Committee. No one will agree with all of them. I have some disagreements with some of them, but those are not overriding disagreements.

In title VII, for example, "Job Opportunities": My own opinion is that too much has been loaded onto the courts and yet at the same time the jury amendment diminishes the traditional equity powers of the Federal courts to safeguard the dignity of their own decrees.

In titles II and VII, "Public Accommodations and Job Opportunities," the device we used in the Civil Rights Act of 1960 of the finding of a pattern or practice has been incorporated. I should think those who are in opposition to this legislation and who were in opposition originally would find that this is a helpful amendment. This places to even a greater extent the cushion of the courts in between the Department of Justice and outside institutions. It requires that there be a finding of a general pattern or practice in any case involving an alleged discrimination in the area of public accommodation or job opportunities.

There is a greater emphasis in the Senate amendments on arbitration and voluntary compliance than there was in the House bill. In short, I would think in general, the Senate amendments would be more acceptable to those in opposition to the original House bill. The amendments do not do violence to that extraordinary bill that this House of Representatives wrote in February and sent over to the other body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we as lawyers who serve on the House Judiciary Committee wish to reaffirm as strongly as we can that in our opinion this bill is constitutional in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to restate our conviction as lawyers and as Members of this great body and as members of the House Judiciary Committee charged with the problem of dealing with the Constitution and wishing constitutional legislation that this specific bill is constitutional in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to emphasize also that this bill does not require quotas, racial balance, or any of the other things that the opponents have been saying about it. The bill simply places a negative restraint on those in the public arena who would discriminate against people because of their color or their religion.

We emphasize further that the purpose of this bill is to safeguard individuals against denials of their constitutionally guaranteed rights. It insures that persons will be free of racial and religious discrimination in their relations with public institutions or private institutions which operate in the public arena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does at this historic time and moment is to deliver on the promise that was made by the Constitution, and most especially those mighty amendments to the Constitution that were passed after the War Between the States.

The bill provides the framework under which grievances can be aired at the conference table and in the courts rather than in the streets.

The bill will lessen tensions, not increase tensions.

We ask that the bill be given a chance to work. We ask that all persons who have the most at stake exercise restraint and wisdom in the weeks and months to come in order to give the legislation a chance to work in the manner in which it should. And we ask that in this House of Representatives today, by our vote for this civil rights bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that we do our job as we must and that we deliver on that promise which our forefathers made 100 years ago to the citizens of this great country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, at this historic moment, and in order that the record may not be forgotten, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that title VII of this memorable legislation would not be in the bill except for the foresight, the persistence, and the courage, in the face of much pressure, of a few individuals.

Equal opportunity in employment has long been discussed, but to the members of the general Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, fully supported by the chairman and other members of the full committee, goes the credit for having passed in a spirit of bipartisanship cooperation a practical and workable measure.

At the time it became obvious that only one civil rights bill was a feasible legislative objective, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor gave his approval to my proposal to present the equal employment opportunity measure, approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, to the Judiciary Committee, and to ask for its inclusion in the package civil rights bill. There was much hesitance in many quarters because of the controversial character of the proposal. Thanks to strong leadership within the Judiciary Committee, particularly by Chairman CELLER and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], Mr. RODINO, Democrat, New Jersey, and Mr. LINDSAY, Republican, New York, title VII was accepted by the Judiciary Committee and we were allowed to cooperate fully in securing and maintaining its acceptance on the floor of the House.

When the bill reached the Senate, there were again loud cries that the title would have to be eliminated if the bill were to be accepted. Again, it was only through the courage and insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and others that the title, even though slightly modified, was retained as an integral part of this final bill which we are shortly to vote upon.

I want to pay my tribute to Judge MCCULLOCH for his integrity and to all of my colleagues on the subcommittee, Messrs. DENT, PUCINSKI, DANIELS, HAWKINS, GILL, AYERS, GOODELL, MARTIN, and BELL, and to the membership of this House for what I think, in the long run of history, will turn out to be the section which does more to eventually win the hearts and minds of all Americans for the broad principle of equality of citizenship that is inherent in this civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation can accomplish miracles, but we have set a standard and we have opened a door through which the people of America may march forward to a better day for all of its citizens, and into a bright light where they may face their fellow men and women throughout the world with a clear conscience that we recognize at last that in all aspects of life, every human being is an equal creature of his God.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York on his remarks and join with him in strong support of the resolution and the civil rights bill wherein the Congress will be keeping covenant with the American dream; making possible a new birth of freedom and guaranteeing that rights inherent to all are a reality for all.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my friend, the gentleman from New York on his excellent remarks. I point out to the Members of the House that this civil rights bill is a bipartisan bill, and I support this civil rights legislation wholeheartedly.

There are excellent basic provisions in this civil rights bill which will give the basis for real progress in equal rights and equal opportunity for all of our people, without discrimination or segregation because of race, color, or religion. Success of this civil rights legislation must depend on people of good

will and moderation to make the Civil Rights Act effective.

We who vote for this bill must emphasize the absolute need of good and fair administration of the Civil Rights Act in order to respect human rights of all of our people. Good administration of the Civil Rights Act will reduce extremist actions, and will insure fair and peaceable administration by the Government and acceptance by our people.

A test of proper administration of the Civil Rights Act will be the incidents, both as to severity and number, which occur after the passage of the civil rights bill.

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on his superb statement. He has distilled the issues in a remarkably short period of time. We are indebted to the gentleman from New York and all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle for all the dedicated work they did in making civil rights for all Americans a reality instead of a mere dream. In this historic hour, I would humbly ask to associate myself with the remarks just made by the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, today we have taken a long-awaited step toward fulfilling our obligations to our heritage and to our fellow Americans. A fundamental pledge of the Declaration of Independence is that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is a pledge guaranteed by our Constitution; it is a pledge which Americans have fought and died to defend; and it is a pledge which, until today, has been unkept.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that all individuals are not equal in ability, in motivation, or in talent. Unfortunately, it is also true that all individuals have not been recognized as equal before the law. And we as Americans can hardly deny that it ought to be possible in this great land of ours, where liberty, freedom, and justice are cherished rights, for all Americans to have equal opportunities to develop their resources and talents to the fullest degree, free from restraint because of the color of their skin.

The great significance of the passage of this legislation today is that it provides a strong legal foundation for the protection of these rights. While such legal protection in no way removes from each individual in this Nation the obligation to insure equal rights and opportunities to all, it is a step toward closing the gap which continues to exist between our hopes and reality. We, the Representatives of this Nation, elected to represent the people, and supported by the executive and judicial branches of the Government, have provided in this Civil Rights Act, a foundation upon which this Nation may build constructively and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly a great and historic day. But it represents a mere beginning of the struggle ahead of us. As God-fearing citizens, as Americans who believe deeply in the idea of human dignity, we must strive unceasingly to make this law meaningful and to bring to it the spirit of tolerance and understanding so necessary if it is to be the pillar of the great society and the model for democratic societies everywhere that it is intended to be. Let us in the spirit of the Great Emancipator go forth "with malice toward none—to bind up the Nation's wounds," to continue our Nation's march toward the noble goals and ideals of true freedom.

To the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and members of the distinguished Judiciary Committee who make this great piece of legislation possible, I wish to express my deep appreciation and thanks for this outstanding achievement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that all Members have at least 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this particular measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a great day in the history of our Nation and in the history of the Congress of the United States. I am gratified to be a Member of this legislative body and to have the opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever passed by the Congress. To take part in this momentous occasion, when final action is taken on this long-awaited and vitally necessary legislation, is an experience I shall never forget.

My colleagues and I who have worked long and arduously for this bill greet this moment with much happiness and satisfaction. I wish to take this opportunity to commend my dear friend, our courageous and knowledgable chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], whose splendid leadership and unremitting efforts made this event possible. I also wish to thank and commend all those of my colleagues who worked for and supported the bill.

It is most fitting that this bill become a law at this time when we look forward to celebrating our Nation's Independence Day—the Fourth of July. True independence and equality for all our citizens are assured by this measure. Those denied their rights under our Constitution for more than a hundred years can now look forward to a new life, new hope, and we rejoice with them because the evils of discrimination based on color, race, or national origin, are now being ended.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the history of this country. H.R. 7152, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1963, has passed both the House and the Senate. We are being called upon today to accept or reject the Senate-passed bill. From the history of this legislation, today's action by this body can be safely predicted.

In a lengthy House speech during the debate on this iniquitous bill, I emphasized, among other things, that this proposed legislation is unconstitutional, undesirable, unnecessary, and would invade States rights. Other Members of the House joined me in urging its defeat because of its evil and insidious nature. Despite our vigorous and determined efforts, we were unsuccessful in preventing its passage. Our best arguments fell on deaf ears.

The House-passed bill was then sent to the other body. It was debated there for nearly 3 months. The Senate supporters of States rights and constitutional government laid bare to the public the many bad features of this bill and its far-reaching effects. Likewise, their best efforts were in vain for it passed the Senate by a large majority.

I would like to take this opportunity to make some observations about the motives behind and the pressures used to secure the passage of this proposed legislation. The chief motive behind this legislation is obvious—political expediency. In this connection, I say that this country has reached a bad state when the leadership of both of its main political parties can be induced to give their unqualified support to such patently unconstitutional legislation as is this bill. Whatever their motive may be, there can be no justification for anyone taking constitutional rights away from all the citizens of this Nation so that rights may be given to a minority group.

Someone made the observation that had this evil legislation been voted on in secret, and its Members been free from possible political repercussions, it would not have passed the House. I concur with this observation.

The pressure exerted on Members of the House to support this legislation was the greatest I have seen during my long service in the Congress. It came from all directions and in varied degrees, but dubious credit must be given the National Council of Churches and to certain elements of the clergy for being the chief generators. They successfully gave the Congress, the public and much of the news media a "snow" job on this bad legislation.

When this legislation was first introduced, I believe that a majority of the House membership intended to consider it on its merits or demerits. About that time, certain elements of the clergy entered the picture. They began to raise the hue and cry that the Congress was "morally" obligated to pass this legislation. They offered no comments on the legality of this bill. They offered no opinions on the effect its passage would have on the constitutional rights of all of our citizens. They obviously did not know or did not care about this. Left-wing groups, much of the press and parts of other news media joined in the chorus. Pressure had been built up on House Members to such an extent, it was obvious when the bill came up for debate that a majority had been reached by this "snow" job. The pressure had reached its zenith. The steamroller began to

move. Any provision was acceptable so long as was done in the name of civil rights. Any bill could be passed so long as it possessed the right label—civil rights. H.R. 7152 had this label so it passed the House.

I say this country has come to a bad state when the constitutional rights of all its citizens can be taken away from them by such legislation as H.R. 7152 just because some people believe it is "morally" right to do so.

I have some predictions to make on some of the end results of this so-called civil rights legislation. I foresee that some Members of this body who have been victimized by this "snow" job will involuntarily depart this scene when their constituents come to realize that their constitutional rights have been given away to placate certain minority groups. I predict that when the citizens of this country, in the North, South, East, and West, are awakened to the far-reaching effects of this vile legislation, they will rise up in righteous indignation against all those who had a hand in its passage.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, with the signing of this bill our country has come full cycle from the dream of independence, initiative, and individual freedom envisioned by those who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Pleas of those who seek to maintain reason and balance in government; of those who seek to respect the rights of the majority as well as of the minority, have been ignored and trampled underfoot. With the signing of this bill it can be said that the Constitution has been set aside. With the signing of this bill the foundations have been laid for the creation of a police state at any time those in power so desire.

The most far reaching civil rights bill in history is being passed by Congress. With its passage, the historic concept of democratic rule by the majority passes into oblivion. Henceforth, the Nation may be governed and run for the benefit of minority groups. If you are a businessman, you can no longer hire or promote on merit without the risk of being hauled into court. Your business establishment will no longer be yours to operate as you believe proper. An army of snoopers paid for by the Federal Government will be checking to see that you run your business in a way that appeases and satisfies anyone who demands service. The Federal Government will now be free to move into the operation of schools, welfare, and all other programs in which the Federal Government participates. This is what the new law provides. How far the administration is prepared to go toward bringing about this police state existence for America remains to be seen. That power will now be in the hands of the Attorney General, and any President who wishes to do so may put this fearsome monstrosity into effect.

When this bill was before the House I offered many amendments. So did other Members. All of them with one or two minor exceptions were defeated. They fared no better than the great majority of the amendments offered in the Senate. After the bill reached the Senate, I urged my friends there to seek among others the adoption of amendments making the Federal Government financially responsible for damages caused to American business firms and individuals by the application of the terms of the civil rights bill. If a man is put out of business because of this bill, he should be recompensed. Of course, the amendment was ignored along with nearly all others.

The civil rights bill offers the coercive approach, the compulsory approach, the police state approach, to the problems of integration. The passage of laws will settle no racial problems. The hired agitators and the imported demonstrators who have sought to panic this country will never work cooperatively for the solution of racial problems. They cannot afford to. Their stock in trade would be lost, their income cut off if racial problems were solved.

No, these matters will not be settled by passing laws. There is a way to deal with racial problems effectively and successfully. An example is to be found in my own State. There Gov. Farris Bryant is to be commended in highest terms for the calm and capable manner in which he has handled the problems arising from the racial conflict in St. Augustine. An extremely dangerous situation existed between hired agitators and imported demonstrators seeking to inflame Negro residents in St. Augustine and strong segregationists who flocked to St. Augustine from other Southern States. By refusing to yield to pressure from either side and insisting that law enforcement be retained in State and local hands, the Governor set an example which could well be noted in Washington. Even when confronted with unusual Federal judicial proceedings which sought to hold him in contempt, Governor Bryant preserved a rational demeanor and continued to work for a reasonable settlement of the problem. Now the demonstrations have ceased at least temporarily and local groups are seeking through a cooperative and understanding approach to solve the problems which have arisen.

No, the hired agitators and the impatient ones in Government are not interested in rational approaches. They demand extremism. This bill is the result. Those of us who have fought it have warned of the consequences. There will most certainly be a surge of bitter reaction if the civil rights bill is enforced. It will be nationwide. The people still have the last word. They can vote out those who placed such an unconstitutional act on the statute books, and they can vote in men who will have the courage to reestablish a democratic America. In the meantime, the Constitution is being set aside.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we shall lift onto the penultimate step a bill that will be respected and cherished by this and future generations as the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Emancipation Proclamation are now respected and cherished.

No longer will any of our citizens have to wonder if they are second-class citizens. No longer will they have to bear the responsibilities of citizenship without also enjoying the privileges.

We recognize that passage of this civil rights bill is not going to automatically solve all the many problems that have beset our Nation. But it establishes the framework for solution. Now it devolves upon every one of us to see that the spirit, as well as the letter, of this bill which will soon become law, extends to all our citizens throughout the Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support this civil rights measure because to me it violates the oath that I took to uphold the U.S. Constitution when I became a Member of Congress. I can see no constitutional grounds for taking property away from people who have built up their businesses and not recompensing them for it. I can see no justification of the Federal Government violating the explicit language of the Constitution which leaves the voting qualifications up to the individual States. It may be that some of these things require attention by our Government, but the attention should be given in the constitutional manner of amendments to the Constitution rather than by usurping the powers that were allowed to remain in the hands of the people. Nevertheless, I am conscious that the Supreme Court of the United States as now constituted is very likely to uphold almost any and all measures, if not all measures, which have the philosophical approach for the legislation before us. Under these circumstances, those who feel that this legislation is improper have only one practical way left to them to have their voices heard, and this is by amendments to the Constitution which would make it crystal clear that the will of the people of the United States will be obeyed because of newly enacted constitutional provisions stated precisely and clearly.

There has been much talk about the possibility of a referendum on the civil rights bill. I would favor a referendum on the civil rights bill. However, I would like to point out that even if such a referendum were possible and successful for the conservative point of view, the Supreme Court could still find some excuse for nullifying the desires of the people of the United States, or at least they would have a better chance of doing so than they would if the matter were handled by an amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge the defeat of the bill before us and urge instead that support be given to the constitutional amendment which I have suggested. In the event that the House and Senate enact the current legislation called the civil rights bill, I would still hope that by some procedure the constitutional amendment which I have proposed could be brought before the American people in a way in which we could all legally express our opinion in this field so that the Supreme Court would not be in a position to overturn the will of the majority of Americans under the democratic processes as set out in the Consti-

tution. The constitutional amendment which I have suggested reads as follows:

Freedom of association shall be preserved. The Federal Government shall not compel association of persons in private businesses or in housing or in educational institutions; but may assist in programs to provide equal accommodations and facilities for all, including withdrawal of such Federal assistance when equal facilities are not in fact provided. Each State shall have exclusive jurisdiction over its public educational institutions and may separate students therein on the basis of sex or race when this is decided by it to be in the best public interest or to assist in preserving freedom of choice in individual associations, provided that equal facilities shall be maintained at all times.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this resolution—House Joint Resolution 789—I do so in the firm belief that the civil rights bill (H.R. 7152) is consistent with our Federal Constitution.

It is my fervent hope that the effect of this legislation may be to promote harmonious relations among Americans, regardless of race or color.

The legal machinery provided in this legislation should be sufficient to put an end to mass demonstrations and racial conflict. Of course, laws alone will never end discrimination. Furthermore, if the principal benefit of this law is limited to those cases which are enforced by the courts, those who have supported it are destined to disappointment.

As in the case of all other laws, substantial voluntary compliance is necessary in order for such laws to be truly effective. This is doubly true in the case of the civil rights bill. Citizens of our Nation should recognize the scope, as well as the limitations, of this legislation. They should resolve within the provisions of this bill to make it work.

The civil rights bill of 1964 is and should be a most articulate expression of the Congress—and of the citizens of the United States in behalf of fairness and respect for all Americans, regardless of race or color.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of a few minutes this House will give its final majority approval to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

As long ago as last October 23 I said in a House speech:

If any provision which I regard as unconstitutional is incorporated in the civil rights bill, I will have no choice but to vote against the entire bill—and I will so vote.

For better or worse, so far as the future verdict of the voters of Michigan's Third District is concerned, I am living up to that commitment.

These are the grounds on which I voted against the original House bill on February 10. Although improved in some particulars, I believe the Senate version, now before the House, still contains clearly and grievously unconstitutional provisions.

Accordingly, I shall vote "No" again today.

And now, for better or worse, so far as the future general welfare of the Nation and the American people is concerned, this sweeping measure becomes law. What of the days—and the problems—ahead?

First. It is the clear and inescapable duty of the President and the executive branch to implement and enforce the law—and of all citizens to obey it. I continue to reject the concept of civil disobedience.

Second. It is the function of the judicial branch to interpret the law, to adjudicate cases arising thereunder, and to pass on constitutional issues raised incident thereto. It is a corollary right of citizens to raise and press such issues.

Third. As experience or public sentiment may hereafter warrant, it is right and proper to seek future changes in the law in this area by legislative enactment, always subject to the Constitution. Congress has not closed up shop.

I do not expect either instant utopia or inevitable disaster in consequence of passage of this law. While stating certain clear responsibilities and obvious prerogatives of government and citizens, I venture also some hopes.

So far as the laudable objectives of the new law are concerned—and they are many—I hope they will receive maximum public acceptance and support, through voluntary compliance.

I hope our citizens will recognize and demonstrate that freemen can do what is right, what is just, what is decent and helpful, without waiting for the compulsion of law.

I hope that in large measure a good will "consent of the governed" will work to the constructive end that the harsh letter of the law will become a practical nullity and that the vast police powers created in this law will be little used, because little needed.

I hope that a maximum voluntary compliance will frustrate the big-government-social-planners' dream of new and mushrooming bureaucracies and powers.

I hope that use of the new law, and of the newly created governmental powers, will be for the good faith purpose of righting genuine wrongs and not for the purpose of creating more tension and turmoil.

I hope there will be an early and expanding moratorium on mass demonstrations and incitements to passion and violence.

I hope there will be a rediscovery of constitutional limitations and judicial self-restraint on the part of the courts—even as those courts gain unprecedented new powers.

I hope the "victors" in this long legislative controversy will be neither arrogant nor intolerant and that the "losers" will be neither defiant nor despairing in adherence to the constitutional principles in which they still believe.

And, above all, I hope the plea of President Lincoln will again be heard, and this time better heeded:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the first time as a Member of this House. I do so on an occasion of great historical significance. The thread of history which runs through Runnymede and Magna Carta in 1215, through Independence Hall and the Declaration of Independence in 1776, through Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of July 4, 1863, through every act of this great deliberative body which advances the cause of human dignity and freedom, binds our act today to all of these great events.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 will take its place in history—not as an attempt to solve a regional issue but as a means of answering a national problem. This Congress has worked its will. Bipartisan efforts have produced this piece of legislation which proclaims to the world that a free society can adjust—can make amends for the wrongs of the past century—can and does reaffirm the ringing declaration of our national greatness which proudly proclaims that "all men are created equal." The passage of this civil rights bill is no panacea—nor is it a Pandora's box. It gives us a constructive framework within which to work. Only experience will indicate where we must strengthen or modify. It will call for adjustments in ways of life—but adjustment and change, to achieve harmony, are the blood and sinew of a democracy.

We have this day advanced the cause of freedom and equality.

We have moved to give those who hunger and thirst after justice, their fill.

We have given the rule of law an effective tool with which to cope with the problems facing our society.

We have demonstrated to the world that freedom, justice, equality, and the dignity of man are not concepts of our past—but goals of our future which we will secure for all of our people—goals which this Congress has achieved in part today in passing this Civil Rights Act.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today will, in my opinion, put a blot of shame on the record of the U.S. Congress as an institution.

I say this not because I am opposed to this bill—not because we are passing legislation which is, I sincerely believe, unconstitutional on its face. We have in the past passed many bills which were unconstitutional and certainly many bills have been passed by this body to which I was opposed.

But these things are not shameful. The shameful thing about our action today is that we are passing this legislation—more drastic, perhaps, and more authoritarian than any measure to come out of this Congress in a century—under the pressure of the threats of a militant minority. In other words, we are acting with a political shotgun pointed at our heads in an election year.

I do not doubt the sincerity of many of the proponents of this legislation. Nor am I opposed to the protection of the civil and human rights of all individual Americans. But I cannot believe that it is less than shameful for this House—with its great heritage as an independent, courageous legislative body—to pass any legislation whatsoever, no matter how meritorious, no matter how necessary—simply because we do not have the courage to stand up before the threats of anyone. And that, to our shame, is what we are doing here this day.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today in the closing hours of the 188th year of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we are witnessing the civil rights bill of 1964 becoming law. You and my other colleagues know my position well on this matter, for during the last year while this bill has been before the Congress, I have risen here on the floor many times to express my opposition.

I have tried in every way I could to convince my colleagues of the apparent and hidden dangers of the civil rights bill, but I and others who opposed and still refute it, are much like Tantalus the Greek hero who could almost, but not quite, reach the fruit or the water outside his prison cell. We have almost been in reach of your understanding, but the tides of opinion have swept away the fruits of our labor.

The only recourse open for my dissent in this situation is by legislation to revoke the wrong that has been done. I have taken the first step in that direction today by introducing a bill that would require the civil rights issue to be submitted to the people of this land for advisory referendum.

Action to this end seems only right to me, for it is a grave issue and the people are the ones whose lives will be changed by it. And many, many people have written me urging opposition, while only a token few are for the bill. Below I am inserting a recent letter which expresses such opposition; a letter expressing how millions feel, yet who have not been able to express it nearly so well.

ATMORE, ALA., *June 20, 1964.*

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: With the passage of the civil rights bill by the Senate, our Nation has witnessed in a little more than two decades a second day of infamy. The fight on behalf of constitutional government waged by the small group in our Nation's Congress will be remembered and appreciated for many years by the people of your State and the Nation. It would be well for the chortling victors in this effront to constitutional government to pause in their revolting display of jubilation to ponder the sober words of John Locke in his "The Origin, Extent, and End of Civil Government," to the effect that a people owe no obligation to a government if force, not choice, compels them to submission.

In the long uphill fight waged by the small band in the Congress against the rape of the rights of all citizens of our Nation as blueprinted in this vicious legislation, the people of America have been reminded again and again of the words of our forefathers admonishing us not to sacrifice freedom and liberty on the altar of monetary passion or political expediency. However it has now been demonstrated again that none are so blind as those who refuse to see.

As we now abandon a government of laws to become a government of raw power, coercion and intimidation, it would be well for our people to be reminded of the words of a great American spoken in 1735. In that year Andrew Hamilton, a lawyer then 80 years of age, in defending Peter Zenger against false and malicious charges brought against this humble printer by a corrupt Governor of the State of New York and the Jerseys, said:

"The loss of liberty, to a generous mind, is worse than death. And yet we know that there have been those in all ages who, for the sake of preferment, or some imaginary honor, have freely lent a helping hand to oppress, nay, to destroy, their country. This brings to my mind that saying of the immortal Brutus when he looked upon the creatures of Caesar, who were very great men but by no means good men. 'You Romans,' said Brutus, 'if yet I may call you so, consider what you are doing. Remember that you are assisting Caesar to forge those very chains that one day he will make you yourselves wear.'

"Power may justly be compared to a great river. While kept within its due bounds it is both beautiful and useful. But when it overflows its banks, it is then too impetuous to be stemmed; it bears down all before it, and brings destruction and desolation wherever it comes.

"If, then, this is the nature of power, let us at least do our duty, and like wise men (who value freedom) use our utmost care to support liberty, the only bulwark against lawless power, which in all ages has sacrificed to its wild lust and boundless ambition the blood of the best men that ever lived.

"It is an old and wise caution that when our neighbor's house is on fire we ought to take care of our own. For though (blessed be God) I live in a Government where liberty is well understood and freely enjoyed, yet experience has shown us all (I am sure it has to me) that a bad precedent in one government is soon set up for an authority in another. And therefore I cannot but think it my, and every honest man's duty that (while we pay all due obedience to men in authority) we ought at the same time to be upon our guard against power wherever we apprehend that it may affect ourselves or our fellow subjects. Men who injure and oppress the people under their administration provoke them to cry out and complain, and then make that very complaint the foundation for new oppressions and prosecutions."

The smirking individuals presently representing the leadership of the majority, standing with jowls adrip with the life blood of wounded freedom, may well find themselves soon in the position of being hoisted with their own petard. The appalling thing to many thoughtful citizens in this land is that none of these people seem to realize that they have made a mockery and held for naught the constitution they swore to uphold when elected to high office. To add insult to grievous injury it is now being suggested that this involuntary servitude act of 1964 is to be signed by the President on Independence Day. What a hideous travesty.

With kindest personal regards I remain,

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS S. WEBB.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today will go down in history but I am afraid that historically it will be a day of gloom for the American people. The passage of this legislation, alleged to give impetus to the Constitution, in effect destroys the freedom of all men and the rights of the individuals.

The legislation has been debated both on the floor of this House and in the other body for a considerable length of time, and of course, if I had my way we would continue to debate it into eternity for certainly the passage of the bill today will destroy our heritage and the unalienable rights—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

To pass this unwarranted and unnecessary legislation, which I am sure, if properly considered will be found unconstitutional, particularly on the eve of the day we celebrate the Declaration of Independence is unquestionably the greatest single mistake the Congress has ever made. It is the most far-reaching action that I can remember and will usher the people of the United States into a most dangerous and unpredictable era which can be compared only with the dark days of Reconstruction. The bill, to my mind, can never be enforced without turning our Nation into a police state and without cost of bloodshed and violence.

While the news media points up the various situations in the South giving the impression that our problems are in only a few of the States I can say to you that the problems we of the South have in this area are minor in comparison to those that now exist and will become manifold in the other States of the Union, particularly in New York.

Already, Mr. Speaker, persons are on the move for the sole purpose of inciting trouble. I believe it would be well for these persons to remain in their own back yard and clean up their problems at home before they attempt to assist others.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly opposed to this legislation. It is unpalatable to me and to all of the good citizens that I have the honor to represent. I will, so long as I am able, strive to have this legislation stricken from the books for as I have previously stated I believe the major sections of the bill are unconstitutional and the implementation of the bill can do nothing but create strife and bloodshed and strip our people of their inherent rights.

Mr. Speaker I strenuously object to passage of this bill.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, once again this House is faced with a decision of tremendous magnitude—a decision which may well mean another step toward the destruction of constitutional Government in the United States.

We are under the gun, as it were, and this is scheduled to be the next-to-the-last act in the "farce" which we have experienced in the past months, during which the so-called civil rights bill has been rammed through Congress in utter disregard of all proper legislative procedure.

Judging by the "schedule" outlined in this morning's Washington papers, the way is now greased for full implementation of the law, once it is signed and the proponents can now take their bows and enjoy the sunshine of victory, if that is their choice. However, I feel it is well for the American people to consider this legislation for what it is—not for what the propagandists call it.

This is a bad bill. Make no mistake about it. Much of it is of questionable constitutionality, to say the least. It is a political document—designed to garner the support of certain minority groups. Make no mistake about that. And, finally, make no mistake about the fact that this bill gives to the Attorney General of the United States more power over the lives of Americans than anyone in this Nation has ever had.

Under the bill, a man's business is no longer his own. He no longer will have the right to hire and fire employees without fear of reprisals from the Federal Government. He cannot operate his

hotel, restaurant, theater, or amusement place according to the dictates of his own conscience. In short, he is no longer a free agent—in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

This bill attacks the foundations of our Constitution; it destroys the concept of private enterprise; it hands to minority groups a "blank check" to demonstrate, harass and agitate, and guarantees that the Federal Government will stand behind them in doing it. It gives to the Justice Department and the Attorney General powers which stagger the imagination. I fear what some occupant of that office might do with these powers at a time and under circumstances which we might now be unable to visualize.

However, I also mourn the passing of the democratic process in the enactment of this bill. The damage is now done but let the record show that it was done in the face of determined opposition by those who wanted to see proper legislative processes followed. This bill has been passed because a determined minority pressure group has forced a majority of this Congress to disregard the normal procedures in unprecedented manner. Never in the history of this Congress has a bill been railroaded as this one has.

The original administration bill came to the House Judiciary Committee and hearings were held. Then, because of pressures and political expediency, certain people conceived a substitute which was falsely labeled by the press as a "softer" bill and this was brought back to the committee and rammed through—without hearings and with opponents given no time to consider it.

When this "substitute" was sent to the Rules Committee, those who opposed the bill tried to discuss the bill on its merits and again on the House floor extensive debate showed conclusively that this bill will open a Pandora's box of problems which may well cause much more difficulty than the so-called ills which the legislation is designed to correct.

After House passage, the bill was sent to the Senate where it did not go to the Judiciary Committee for hearings, as is the usual procedure. It was brought to the floor direct, cloture was imposed and amendments were voted down in dictatorial fashion. However, I remind you that the bill which we are asked to approve today is not the bill which left the House. It is an entirely new bill. Hearings have never been held on this bill—nor on the bill which it replaced. We have come a long way from the original bill. Yet no conference committee has ever considered the differences in the bill which the House passed on February 10. The Rules Committee which considered the bill on Tuesday did not have time to adequately weigh the differences. Just as the majority of the Judiciary Committee overrode the minority last November, the majority on the Rules Committee railroaded this bill for consideration today.

This is more than an insistence on proper procedure—we are talking about an entirely different bill.

This is the most liberty-destroying bill that has ever come out of this Congress. It takes away more rights than it gives. It is labeled a "civil rights bill" but in fact it is a "civil wrongs bill" because it will foist upon the American people more wrongs than it will cure. It will create a power hungry army of Federal agents who will roam the countryside in search of litigation. It will establish a bureaucracy whose object will be to work against the majority of the people of this country at the behest of minority pressure groups. These groups will call the shots; they will choose the places where the bill is to be brought into use—but the American people will have to pay the price.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in all the years during which I have been a Member of this distinguished legislative body, I have had occasion to support and oppose many thousands of items of proposed legislation. In common with the rest of you, my colleagues, I have repeatedly taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I have attempted through these years to apply myself as conscientiously and painstakingly as my powers and my strength have permitted to the execution of my duties as a Member of this House.

Never in my years of service with this body, however, have I encountered a legislative proposal that calls out so compellingly for protest as the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964. In my opinion, there is nothing either genuine or honest underlying this vicious proposal. It is a grotesque hoax upon all the people, particularly minority groups. This bill is a phony attempt to have the Federal Government twist arms, if need be to break arms, in order to attain undesirable and dangerous results. This so-called civil rights bill is the most vicious, ill-conceived, drastic, power-grabbing legislative travesty I have borne witness to in 24 years of service.

It embodies a cold, ruthless stab in the back at all the freedoms and liberties which we Americans have cherished throughout the ages. This bill foists upon the American people the overpowering burden of a powerful, undemocratic bureaucracy which is responsible to no one, least of all to the people whom we in this House represent.

If we allow this bill to pass we will have opened Pandora's box to an entire philosophy previously alien and foreign to our shores—a philosophy of the "Big Brother State": the obnoxious philosophy that it is better that a people be governed, than that they govern themselves.

This bill will place the Congress of the United States in the position of endorsing basic changes in American social relationships, the unjust and disruptive consequences of which we can only dimly foresee. I do not question the good intentions of the proponents of these changes; but I object vehemently to the methods that have been used to ram the bill through this House and the other body.

If I am to continue to call my conscience my own, I must rise in protest against this bill. We, as Members of Congress, no less than the President and the members of the Supreme Court, have a duty to act responsibly and within the confines of the Constitution of the United States. Reasonable men may differ on their interpretation of that great instrument. But those of us who oppose this bill take our position in the light of sound and long-settled interpretations of certain key provisions of the Constitution.

Few people object to the goal that all Americans should enjoy the fruits of constitutional liberty. But it is a major paradox of our time that the bill before us today, although ostensibly aimed at that noble goal, will have the effect of narrowing liberties that all Americans had heretofore taken for granted. In the name of expanded freedom for a comparative few, we are urged by the proponents of this ill-conceived legislation to shrink the freedoms of the many.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the impact on our fellow citizens of the choice confronting us. I plead with my colleagues, from North and South alike, to examine their consciences and to ponder gravely the decision they are called upon to make today.

The proponents of this measure have used every weapon in their power, both public and private, to insure passage of this legislation. Evils, many real and many imagined, have given inspiration to the proponents of this bill. It is true that in practice, we and our fellow citizens have not always measured up to the high ideals set forth in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. While I cannot and do not boast of our failure, I can plead only that it springs from the human condition which makes us limited and fallible. While we must be guided by our highest ideals, we must, as a practical matter, learn to live with our limitation and fallibilities. We must have the wisdom to know that the economic, political, and social ills that beset us cannot necessarily be righted by acts of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before this House this afternoon is fraught with danger. Its provisions, to the extent that their vague language can be understood and put into practice, will work incalculable hardships on the vast majority of our citizens. Because of the vagueness of much of the language of the bill, its practical application will flood the Federal judiciary with test cases for generations to come. Within the lifetime of those of us sitting here today, I predict that the proponents of this misconceived legislation will come to regret it as much as those of us who oppose it do today.

Our Constitution, as Americans of widely differing pursuasions agree, has been and is the foundation stone of our American way of life. Yet today, we are asked to pass judgment on a measure that would radically alter that constitutional foundation, with far-reaching consequences for all of our citizens for no one knows how long.

Time does not permit an extended analysis of the provisions of this bill, nor does it permit any exhaustive examination of its implications for our future. I would, however, like to focus your attention on two titles of the bill which most conspicuously ignore free

constitutional government as we have known it.

The first is title II, the so-called public accommodations title. This is based on the constitutional power granted Congress to regulate commerce among the several States. As chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I can say that for many years it has been my responsibility to understand the scope of Congress' power under that clause of the Constitution. Over the years, my duties have brought me into confrontation with the application of the congressional commerce power to hundreds of practical problems. Yet never in my experience have I encountered a legislative proposal which goes as far beyond the granted power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce as is contained in title II of the bill before us today. Never before has Congress undertaken to trample so heavily on the rights of private property owners. Never before has it seemed necessary to expose the vast majority of our population to injunctive and criminal contempt assaults in order to appease a minority of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal attempts by legislative fiat what can only be accomplished by education, patience, and understanding.

We hear increasingly of a supposed distinction between "human rights" and "property rights." It has always been my feeling that property rights are human rights. The public accommodations provisions of this proposed legislation would profoundly alter our well understood laws and customs governing the ownership of private property. That a decision of such profound impact might be made with no more deliberation than has been given this bill is unthinkable.

I want to comment on another part of this bill that would have most drastic effect on the lives of our citizens.

Title VII, the so-called equal employment opportunity provision of the act, constitutes one of the most brutal, naked power grabs ever attempted on behalf of the Federal Government.

It provides that the long, clumsy arm of the Federal bureaucracy be extended into the minute-by-minute operations of the private businesses of our great country. In complete disregard of the precious constitutional rights previously guaranteed to businessmen, managers and workers, this bill gives "superbureaucrats" in the Capital the pernicious power to ordain who shall be associated with and who shall be employed by a private business enterprise which exists thousands of miles from the Capital.

I submit that these provisions correct no evils—they create them; they rectify no wrongs—they perpetrate wrongs; they create no freedoms—they deprive the hard toiling business community of its previously existing freedoms. These provisions take away the necessary authority and freedom of management and subject individual businesses to the beck, call, and command of the Federal bureaucracy.

I am constrained to ask, what is the real difference between the pernicious system created in these provisions and the police states that we have denounced and gone to war against throughout our history?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker:

> The tumult and the shouting dies,
> The captains and the kings depart,
> Still stands the ancient sacrifice—

Not with a contrite heart, but with the full and certain knowledge that a vital part of America has been thrown to the political wolves who stand lean and hungry, ready to demand their reward for participating in the destruction of a way of life.

An organized minority has once again proved that it is stronger than a confused, naive majority.

And if an organized minority can achieve what is about to be accomplished in this Nation, then those who love the America of their fathers and their forefathers had better heed the warnings of those of us who know what is contained in this so-called civil rights bill.

On the 4th day of July, we are told that the President may sign this bill into law. If so, what a travesty on the history of our independence.

On the same day when our Nation celebrates the declaration of our independence in a union of 13 sovereign States, we are told the President may sign into a law a bill that will destroy almost the last semblance of State sovereignty.

Do you recall the words of Richard Henry Lee who moved, in 1776, in the Continental Congress "that these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States"? This was the resolution that was adopted; this is what we celebrate on the Fourth of July; and this is what may be destroyed on the Fourth of July 1964.

I can only express the fervent prayer that those charged with the responsibility for administering this law-to-be will recognize and respect the power that is vested in them. Every segment of American commerce, American industry, American agriculture, and even the customs and mores of the people are subject to the broad reaches of this bill that is about to become law.

Sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men may keep this law from becoming the poison of our own destruction—but sensible, intelligent, patient, and understanding men who are forced to submit to the tirades of success-drunken minorities, or to the plaintive pleas of propagandists, or pusillanimous politicians will destroy this Nation as surely as there will be a sunrise tomorrow.

Heed my words well—this is the most dangerous legislation ever enacted into law.

The South has once again been bludgeoned into submission—but this time the army of occupation will not confine its police activities to the South. Every State—or perhaps now our States should be called political subdivisions—will feel the weight and might of Federal power. The reaction from Wisconsin, Maryland, Indiana, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Maine may eventually lead to a new chapter of reconstruction.

Perhaps in the destruction of our way of life, perhaps in the sacrifice of the South, the American majority may awaken to the danger.

If this or any other administration does not take steps to keep agitators from the South; if the carpetbaggers who have invaded Florida and Mississippi and Alabama are allowed to continue their activities, they will extend their operations to every State in the Union.

Those who administer this law have a grave responsibility, but their responsibility is to all Americans and if they are carried away by their own power, Americans—the Americans of the majority—may react in a manner that may surprise some of the most outspoken advocates of civil rights.

To those who are about to assume the awesome responsibility of dictating the destinies of all Americans, I say—proceed with caution—call back your agitators—be humble in your victory—be modest in your exploitation—or the monster you have created may turn upon you.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, 100 percent when he tells the American people that this civil rights bill is unconstitutional. I agree with him when he tells the people of these 50 States that this bill is a product of organized groups who are well paid for their activities and who will not permit the law to function successfully because they want to continue the strife and discord to maintain their jobs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, extremists of the so-called civil rights movement already have threatened that, upon passage of this unnecessary, far-reaching, and dangerous legislation, they will begin massive agitation in cities of the South. It is clear that by so doing these race extremists seek to divert attention away from the festering lawlessness which increasingly plagues northern and eastern communities.

Never has the hypocrisy of the northern and eastern press in its coverage of racial incidents been so transparent as in its current handling of racial and crime news. For while reporters and commentators from New York City have descended by the planeload upon the State of Mississippi, the real violence of this long, hot summer is taking place right in their own Manhattan backyard.

As a prime example of this journalistic sham, I have here a copy of the June 24, 1964, edition of the ultraliberal New York Post. The front page and lead editorial of this edition of the Post are devoted to the current situation in Mississippi. Writes the Post, I quote: "There is neither law nor order in Mississippi." And on page 8 of the same edition appears a story headlined—I quote: "Philadelphia, Miss.—Violence is the Rule."

But while the Post's editors are self-righteously concerned about the state of law and order in Mississippi, well might they begin reading and comprehending their own local news coverage. For here, in this same June 24, 1964, edition of the

Post that rails about the intolerable legal and moral climate of Mississippi, we can read about the state of the most fundamental of human and civil rights—that is, protection of life and limb—in that purported paradise of law and order, New York City.

Let us open the June 24, 1964, edition of the New York Post—the same edition that says that there is no law and order and violence is the rule in Mississippi—to page 2. Here we have a story headlined: "DA Grilling Mitchell on Story of Beating." The story concerns the trial of a man accused of stabbing a 15-year-old girl half-a-dozen times while the girl slept in her own bedroom nearby her parents. According to the Post story, a defense witness called in this case was the Negro accused of having viciously killed a woman in full view of an entire neighborhood of onlookers. This latter case has been given national and even international attention, although the Post and similar journals have yet to be heard to complain about this aspect of New York City life damaging our Nation's prestige overseas, a frequent charge they direct at Southern States and communities.

Opposite page 2, on page 3 of this same edition of the New York Post, we have two headlines pertinent to the question of the state of law and order in New York City. Headline No. 1, and I quote: "Cops Ask Public's Aid in Hunt for the Sniper." This story concerns the sniper-killing of an 18-year-old girl in the parking lot near Times Square. An insert urges anyone who has information about the sniper-slaying to call a special police telephone number to relay it. Says the story: "The special phone will be manned 24 hours a day and all information will be kept confidential."

I do not have to detail what the New York Post would be saying if the same tragic incident had occurred in any southern community and the same plea for assistance to police had to be run in local southern newspapers. We would, no doubt, be reading in this ultraliberal journal about the reign of terror existing in the South, where citizens allegedly in fear of their lives had to be urged to call a special police number if they had information that might aid in the track-down of the guilty party or parties. But the Post is not heard to comment about the growing reign of terror in its own community. Instead, it hypocritically and self-righteously denounces alleged violence and lack of law and order in distant Mississippi.

Yet, that is not all the news concerning New York's reign of terror appearing in this edition of the Post. Beneath this story of the sniper-killing, on page 3, the Post headlines: "Arraign Suspect in Park Slaying." This story concerns the fatal stabbing of a man, unidentified, in Central Park, and the arrest of a suspect.

And, on page 4 of the same edition of the Post, there is a story headlined: "Woman's Body in Burning Auto." This story concerns the discovery of the scorched body of an unidentified woman in a Canarsie auto junkyard. The automobile was burned. Let me quote from the story:

"Asked if the fire was started by a burning cigarette, Captain Casill said: 'It looks much more suspicious than that'."

Thus, in four pages of the New York Post, June 24, 1964, edition, we read about no less than five violent deaths of a criminal nature. Yet, on this same page four, there is a two column headline, and I quote: "NAACP March in Capital Will Demand Mississippi Action."

That is the final ironic note appearing in this single edition of the New York Post. Were the situation not so tragic, we might comment of the absurdity of the civil rights extremists in their zeal to focus attention on other parts of the country and away from their own backyards.

I have read from a single edition of a single New York newspaper some of the news concerning violence and the breakdown of law and order in New York City. My purpose here has not been to gloat over the serious problems besetting the people of New York City, but rather to point out that those northerners and easterners who would reflect upon the efforts of Southern States and communities to solve our racial problems had best take a good look in the mirror at their own community problems. The insincere, the self-righteous, and the professional agitator will not do this, of course, for there are always those in our society more interested in exploiting problems for their own selfish ends than in solving them for the public good. Thus, the NAACP will march to demand Federal action in Mississippi—but there are no marchers to protest the senseless killings and muggings and acts of violence that every day transpire in New York City and infringe on the fundamental rights of decent citizens there.

The legislation being considered by the House today is the end product of this irresponsible philosophy. Its passage will create rather than solve problems, for it is one more effort—the greatest effort to date—to serve the selfish ends of professional agitators at the expense of the fundamental freedom and rights of the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of words, some eloquent, some irrelevant, have been said about the civil rights bill. As this misnamed and misunderstood legislation starts its final journey through the legislative process there appears to be nothing else bad or good that can be said which has not been said before.

Yet, at this time I feel that someone must voice the feeling of many Members of this body that this act will create an alien force in the lives of communities all across our land.

That force is no longer alien to the South: Racial tension and civil strife, born of dissatisfaction and nursed by professional agitators, have scarred towns and cities all over the southern part of our country. But, like any act of arson, these fires have now spread from the area of their original intent; they have spread to communities in parts of our Nation which never before knew racial discord. And, with the passage of this bill the problems will have just begun.

It appeared for a while that some sanity which did not react to the slogans of the race agitators might help remove the more harmful provisions from this bill on the floor of the Senate.

The presidential primary showings of Alabama Gov. George Wallace proved that there was a great feeling against this measure, because he made it clear that a vote for him was a vote against the bill.

Many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, who voted for the bill in the belief that it would never pass the Senate without major changes, began to heave sighs of relief when it appeared public sentiment was going against the bill. There were signs that a great uprising of resentment among people who were just learning the true meaning of this bill would allow some Senators to vote for weakening amendments without fear of the vocal minority leaders who threatened them with political reprisals.

But those hopes died, and the thing that many men in this Chamber said would not happen has happened. We have before us a bill that is stronger and more repulsive than the measure President Kennedy asked for something over a year ago; stronger than the administration's bill which was sent to the House; certainly stronger than any of us sitting here today imagined could be passed.

What strange set of circumstances brought this about? Certainly there has been no great increase in the pressure by civil rights demonstrators; there has been no great outpouring of public sympathy on behalf of the bill. If anything, this bill has been on the defensive for some time. But this is a political year, gentlemen; and, at a time when the national elections could easily be decided on the issue of civil rights, this bill has become a tool for building the political fortunes of both parties. Thus was born the unfortunate alliance which resulted in the infamous piece of legislation we are now being asked to pass.

Looking back over the volumes of debate which have centered around this bill I find one voice curiously missing. As a matter of fact, in the whole area of racial problems, and certainly in the bill on which we are preparing to pass judgment, there is a missing element—and its loss may well be the most serious wrong yet inflicted upon our deliberative process and our society in general. I am speaking of the voice of reason; the voice which says, "Let us reason together, thoughtfully and intelligently to find the real answer to our problems;" the voice which believes that change does not require revolution; the reasonable voice which is interested in solving the questions which can be solved instead of fabricating easy answers which can only sow more seeds of strife and hate.

Last year I appeared before the House Committee on the Judiciary and made an appeal for considering what I considered the real problems, instead of the intangible and deeply embedded problems of man's attitude toward his fellow

man. I would like to repeat that testimony, because I feel it even more keenly today as this bill comes close to being the law of the land:

This is what I think Congress should be considering, if we really are going to help our people—white and Negro—to meet the challenges and problems that lie ahead of us:

1. In the field of education, we need to improve the opportunity for all to get the quality education that is so badly needed if this country is to continue to prosper and grow and meet the needs of this fast-moving space age. I feel strongly that our whole educational system needs upgrading—elementary, secondary, college, technical, and vocational training. I believe that this can best be done by the States and communities themselves because it is the local areas that know best what the educational needs and problems are and can best solve these at the local level. However, the States are seriously handicapped in their efforts for lack of enough funds. Most taxes collected now go to the Federal Government. It appears to me that there is no logical reason why the States cannot have the benefit of some of this great source of tax money within its own borders to handle its educational problems. It would eliminate the serious entanglement of Federal aid to education and it would remove education from the issue of race. Louisiana has made great strides in this whole area of providing equal educational opportunity for all citizens. There is still much to be done in my State—and I would suggest in your States as well. We have far to go, and we had best be getting on with the job.

2. There is a great need for advanced technical training for the unemployed—so that they can develop new skills for new jobs. There are millions of unemployed Americans who cannot find jobs because they are not equipped to take on jobs that are available. We know that there are twice as many Negroes unemployed as there are whites in this country—but passage of this legislation will not get them jobs.

Only adequate training and personal initiative will do that. There is a growing demand for skilled workers in this country, and you cannot tell me that a businessman will not hire the skills that he needs for his business.

3. Millions of Americans still cannot read and write. We should be seeking new ways to help the States to meet this pressing problem.

4. Many Americans do not have their own homes in which to raise their children in decent, peaceful residential neighborhoods. They cannot afford to purchase a home. Is it not possible for Congress to help the States in setting up private housing programs that would provide for quality, low-cost housing with 40-year low-interest terms? At least every man who hopes for a home of his own will have a chance to fulfill those hopes. I stress a private housing program—not public housing. Such a program would allow a man to own his home and to develop pride in his private property. No reasonable man wants to be a ward of the community—he seeks help when he needs it—not charity.

I stress these four areas, because it is these areas that I feel demand the greatest attention. I also stress the action of Congress, because the States have arrived at a position where they are financially unable to meet the burden of these pressing needs. Congress must redress the balance. The money is at the Federal level. But it is money that comes from the citizens of my State—and your States. If the States, through action of Congress, could regain financial ability, they could do the necessary job. Why should the movement only be to Washington to do these tasks? The States have the talents and abilities to do this work just as well—if they had the resources. We consider Federal aid to the States as if Congress were aiding foreign countries—only there are ties on aid to the States. Why should the States be forced into either having to come to Washington—hat in hand—or having to fight the enactment of many programs because the Federal involvement that such programs would cause in its own affairs represents too great a danger? It is a frustrating affair—because the States want badly to provide for the needs of their people—but not at the expense of becoming no longer master of their own house.

The programs that I mentioned would benefit all Americans—but the immediate impact would be greatest in the Negro community because the need is greatest there at the moment. But I emphasize again the benefit would be for all.

Where is that spirit of amity and partnership—that atmosphere of mutual respect and friendship that characterizes a progressive, open society—that provides the fertile ground in which the seeds of progress grow? We do not find it today in this Congress. We do not find it in this summer of demonstrations, violence, threats and recriminations.

Social movements based on mob action, fear and distrust carry the seeds of their own destruction. The lessons of history are plain—we can read it in the French Revolution of 1789—and we know what happened to the people of Cuba. I do not suggest that this is our lot. I do suggest that the freedom of one man can become the chains of another. We can insure that this does not occur by abiding by our constitutional principles—by protecting both property and human rights, because one is not the contradiction of the other—and by providing the States with the opportunity to care for the needs of all their people.

Despite the claims of its defenders, this bill will not solve those needs. Instead it will create a climate of distrust and enmity which will stifle the voices of those good people of all races who believe in fair play and independence of thought and action. I fear it may stifle those voices forever.

The leaders of the major civil rights groups have already declared war on reason and order. They have promised to spend this summer "testing" the willingness of communities across the land to obey this law. If any person needs proof that what they are interested in is riots, not rights, the statements of these self-appointed leaders should be ample evidence.

We will have reached a point of no return with the passage of this bill, a point beyond which our Constitution, our Congress, our very form of Western civilization will be forever changed. The Negro, who came from slavery a hundred years ago, can show himself a responsible citizen, take the gains which he has captured during these long, bitter months and become a better, more productive member of society. Or, joined by intellectual vagabonds and privateers, and protected by the might of the Federal Government, he can mount a 20th-century crusade against the "infidels" of the South and elsewhere, drawing tight the lines of bitterness and distrust.

If they choose to follow the urging of the fanatics in their ranks, the Negro citizens will find nothing but disillusionment as the fruit of their labors.

I, like most of my fellow Louisianians, do not justify injustice, under whatever banner it is committed. In my eyes the greatest injustice is the act that pits one man against the other. And, underneath the high-sounding words and phrases of this bill there is that terrible danger.

Gentlemen, no single piece of legislation in the past 100 years has been as crucial as the civil rights bill which is now before the Congress. For that reason, if for no other, the people should have a voice in whether it becomes law.

I am today appealing to the sense of fair play of this great deliberative body to submit this far-reaching legislation to a referendum in which all American citizens are entitled to participate.

This bill which I am introducing today provides that the great changes in our system of government and in the way of life of one-fourth of the people of this Nation shall be submitted to the electorate during the next national election.

The legislation which is about to pass will have as great an effect as any constitutional amendment which was ever put to a vote of the people. Therefore, the people have a right to express their opinion.

I am well aware of the fact that there is no clause in the Constitution of the United States for a referendum on a subject of this nature. However, there is certainly no prohibition against such a referendum. And, in the light of recent interpretations by the Supreme Court, and the action of the Congress on this bill, there is plenty of justification for taking this fair and necessary action.

Certainly there can be no doubt that there is a great variation of opinion on this bill; and any fairminded person should have no fear of such a referendum. Certainly if the Members of this body felt that the majority of their constitutents opposed the civil rights bill they would have been bound by conscience and their oath of office to oppose it.

This is not a delaying device. The Members of this body will still have an opportunity to vote on the civil rights bill and send it to the White House for the signature of the President. But this referendum of the people would be the final judge, the final deciding factor in the long history of this legislation.

If the referendum revealed that a majority of the people opposed the bill it would be a mandate to the House of Representatives and the Senate to repeal its provisions or soften them in the ensuing Congress.

I, for one, believe that the public debate on this measure would be a healthy thing for the Nation. If, as its backers claim, the people of the United States of America are ready and willing to submit themselves to the excesses of this monstrous bill, let us give them an opportunity to say so.

If I am willing to place my faith in the good judgment of the American people, why should those who claim to represent a majority opinion of the people be afraid to do the same?

I believe, also, that the prospect of a referendum would be a warning to the civil rights groups to conduct themselves in an orderly, lawful fashion or face a possible public rejection of their cause.

The request I am making is fair to everyone involved; and it is particularly needed in view of the important changes that the civil rights legislation will bring to our country. I hope my colleagues will see the justice of this plea and join me in allowing the people to exercise their right to cast a vote in a momentous national issue.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which I am confident will pass today.

Final passage of the civil rights bill today is only the beginning, not the end. Enactment will increase, not abate, the demand for equal rights now.

Many citizens in this country believe that much of the lack of understanding, racial tension, and violence that have plagued this country in the past 10 years in the civil rights field stems from the fact that following the historic desegregation decision in 1954 no attempt was made to create a consensus of support. Had such an attempt been made, many tragic events might have been prevented.

The 1954 decision taught us that the mere judicial pronouncement of a rule of law is not enough. In 1964 mere passage of a bill, important though that may be, is not enough. As President Johnson said recently: "Laws do not create moral convictions."

But the enactment of the civil rights law will provide a historic opportunity to muster public opinion, awaken the conscience of America and create moral conviction in the hearts of the people of America.

It seems to me that the most effective way this great effort could be launched would be the calling by President Johnson of a White House Conference on Human Rights with representatives from each of the 50 States. Following this there should be conferences in the States and finally in the cities, towns, and villages across the Nation. It would be a vast national town meeting.

What would be the purposes of the conferences? I think they would be threefold:

First. To inform the people of what the bill does and, almost equally important, what it does not do.

Second. To give civil rights leaders across the Nation the opportunity to impress upon their followers the idea that, under the new law, the courts instead of the streets may be the best places for the redress of grievances.

Third. But to give to minority groups a forum in which to air grievances and to explain to majority groups the depth and intensity of their feelings and to permit members of majority groups to understand and fully accept the meaning of equality for, as President Kennedy said a little over a year ago, the problem "must be solved in the homes of every American in every community across our country."

In the great educational campaign now needed, different groups will have differing roles to play.

The universities and the foundations have a significant role to play. The universities can offer their facilities for the holding of civil rights conferences. The foundations can provide much of the needed financing.

Already the U.S. Conference of Mayors has given us a good example of a pattern for many civic associations to follow. In May of this year, the mayors' conference held workshop meetings on civil rights and what must be done after the law goes into effect. The mayors' conference and the American Municipal Association are considering including topics dealing with civil rights at the various State conferences held regularly by the State leagues of municipalities.

The efforts of the conference of mayors are consistent with President Johnson's statement that:

> This bill is intended to help our communities find peaceful solutions to problems of human relations. Many of these communities have asked for the provisions in this bill so that the same standards can be applied to all businesses serving the public, and so the taxpayers can be given assurance that public funds will be administered equitably. None of these provisions in this bill would create preferential treatment for one race or another. This would be a direct violation of the bill itself.
>
> All that this bill will do is to see to it that service and employment will not be refused to individuals because of their race or their religion or where their ancestors were born.

Other groups will have different roles in this great effort. For example, there will be specific things that labor and management can do jointly. As a Representative from a great steel center, I was pleased when 11 major steel companies and the United Steelworkers recently signed an agreement pledging continuing action to advance nondiscrimination in employment in the steel industry.

For some time, the steel industry and the United Steelworkers have been working on the problem of discrimination. This agreement was the work of a joint human relations committee cochaired by Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, executive vice president, personnel services, of the United States Steel Corp. and Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers.

Educators and education have a vital role if we are to have a nationwide understanding of our responsibilities under the new civil rights law. The professional and academic organizations ranging from the Phi Beta Kappa Society to the county teacher organizations should aid in bringing us the intellectual comprehension that must permeate the country. It must be borne in mind that laws and government are at best inadequate instruments for remaking social institutions. Education must illuminate the dark places of the human heart. The law can guard against segregation in schools but it cannot prevent the thousands of incidents of discrimination and hatred which give lie to what is learned in the schoolroom.

Finally, we all recognize the great role that American churchmen of all faiths have played in the contemporary battle for civil rights. Perhaps more than any other single group in America, they will now have a continuing role to play. I think they should be represented in every conference. President Johnson recently spoke to a group of churchmen. He said:

> It is your job as prophets in our time to direct the immense power of religion in shaping the conduct and thoughts of men toward their brothers in a manner consistent with compassion and love. So help us in this hour. Help us to see and do what must be done. Strengthen our will. Inspire and challenge us to put our principles into action.

I think the task ahead is clear. Our historic experience teaches us that when the American people know and understand they will rise to the occasion of history.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, though the hour is late and the issue hardly in doubt, I cannot pass up this final opportunity to speak out against the misnamed "Civil Rights Act of 1964."

This bill grants dictatorial, gestapo-like authority to officials and agents of the Federal Government. They will be able to go out among the people, openly or incognito, there to select victims to be the objects of their police power. Having thus picked out a fit subject for chastisement, the Federal agent may then define the charges and proceed against him. Even Adolph Hitler had less legal sanction than the Attorney General will have under this bill.

In every respect, the bill is a drastic encroachment by the Federal bureaucracy upon fundamental rights of private citizens of every race and creed to hold and control private property and to choose his own associates in business as well as social institutions.

But there is an undercurrent, a backlash of fear and opposition in every State of the United States, particularly where there are large, concentrated Negro populations. Where there are no such Negro populations, there is less concern, but there is still some everywhere.

Several forces or factors have combined to generate this fear and concern. During the long debates in Congress the lawless demonstrations have continued, spread and intensified, making it increasingly apparent that legislation is not the answer and, indeed, will not be accepted as the answer by the very people who are agitating loudest for it. The people in every section of the country have had opportunity to learn and study the proposed legislation. They have come to realize that the Federal Government is about to poke its nose into every phase of their private lives, their businesses, their labor unions, their social institutions and their very homes.

Many of these citizens of the North and West have made known their concern by such means as was available to them. They have counterdemonstrated against the lawless, community-paralyzing, racial demonstrations. They have raised their voices and their votes against efforts of local authorities to tear down customary neighborhood patterns and school districts to accommodate local agitators. They have opposed block-busting housing ordinances which threatened or actually destroyed property values. They have written to their Congressmen. And many of them have voted for Alabama's courageous Governor, George Wallace.

I am aware that under the bill de facto segregation in the North will remain while Federal agents swarm over the South to force and enforce actual integration. This is because the bill permits Northern States to use as a defense against Federal invasion their so-called equal accommodations, fair employment laws, and open-school regulations, which in most cases merely serve to exempt the Northern States from the harsh effects of the Federal law.

I am also aware that many northern Representatives and Senators have assured their constituents by correspondence and newsletters that their fears are ungrounded because the bill will apply to the South only.

Thus it is an open secret, halfheartedly denied if at all, that this bill is directed at the South. Thus that greatest of all minority groups—the southern white—becomes the official scapegoat of the minority voting blocs in the big cities of the North, Midwest, and West.

There are some who feel that the element of hypocrisy has played an important role in the development and passage of this legislation. That may be true. But there is also a strong element of that strange human behavior which I call, for want of a better term, the psychology of distant misery. This unfathomable trait in human beings blinds them to problems at close range while magnifying those at a distance.

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

This eye for distant misery could be amusing if it were not so often tragic. Nevertheless, it permits many of our meddling friends to overlook the jungles of the North, where savages run loose in the streets, parks, and subways, mauling and murdering innocent citizens, while making pious speeches about racial matters in the South.

Regardless of the intentions of those who wrote it, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a punitive, oppressive measure aimed at the South. We have an opportunity to kill it now. It will be more difficult to repeal later.

There is hatred in this bill. All the bitterness and animosity of a 100 years is wrapped up in this package. The hatred of Thad Stevens, Ben Wade, and Charles Sumner that went into the civil rights bills of the 1860's is handed to the South in the civil rights bill of the 1960's. It is a new Reconstruction.

The South faced the old Reconstruction, persevered, survived, and prospered. Of all the qualities possessed by the southern people, perseverance is the deepest, strongest, and most enduring. The South will persevere.

According to reports President Johnson has considered the recordation of his approval and official signing of this force bill to take place on Independence Day, the 4th day of July. If this is an effort to make of our President a second Abraham Lincoln, let it be said that Lincoln not only would have refused to sign such a bill, but he would never have espoused it. In the light of this forthcoming ceremony, someone most appropriately said it is ironical that the people of the United States gained their independence on the Fourth of July and then had it taken away from them on an identical day in an identical month—I fully agree with the statement.

I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that under this bill we are taking a long stride toward a police state and a Federal dictatorship. Our Government is being surrendered to political expediency.

May God have mercy upon and save this Republic.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is especially fitting that we should act on the civil rights bill of 1964 in this House and at this time. It was here in the House of Representatives that this historic legislation originated. It was here in this House, whose Members are so close to the people they represent, where the bill received its first resounding vote of approval—a vote which reflected the deepest convictions of our people. So it is right that it should be here in this House that the civil rights bill will receive the final expression of the people's sanction on its way to becoming the law of the land.

It seems appropriate, too, Mr. Speaker, that we should take this action virtually on the eve of Independence Day, the 188th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. What our forefathers began in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776—in the prelude to representative government on this continent—we are perpetuating today. It belongs to every generation to keep alive the fires of freedom, to extend the benefits of the liberty we inherited to all our people and thus to protect it for each.

As we all know in our hearts, Mr. Speaker, what we do today will not be the end of the struggle for human and civil rights in America. Just as with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, enactment of the civil rights bill marks the beginning of a new era in our life as a free people—an era which will test the adequacy of our resources of tolerance and good will and understanding and require from all of us the deepest commitment to the principles of freedom and justice.

This bill is a good and a just bill. I trust we can make it work.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1964, I stated in the House of Representatives that the civil rights bill will not provide instant brotherhood, a room at every inn for every weary traveler, or a job for each according to his skill or strength, but it will multiply the chance. Our work is neither totally done or perfectly done, but it is well begun. In the passing of recent events and the adoption of this law, the country will not violently change. It is just getting better for more people.

Mr. WHITTEN. Truly, Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day. As a student of law, and a practicing lawyer, I never dreamed that the day would ever come when more than two-thirds of the Congress—Senate and House—would virtually destroy the Constitution, violating every intent of the founders of our Republic.

For 10 years the executive and judiciary departments have had a virtual partnership to set up a dictatorship. Here, today, the Congress gets in on the act, says, "Me, too," and ratifies the unconstitutional acts which have gone before.

Present conditions are so similar to the days just preceding the Civil War, we should pause to remember that heartbreaking conflict, which pitted brother against brother, and father against son—today, it is section against section, and those who need to straighten out their own sections, cover up by going to mine.

As we look back upon those troubled times we can see that sound leaders of both sides deplored any effort to settle the issue by armed conflict. Unfortunately, the radicals of that day prevented a peaceful solution. Then, as now, they were not satisfied to run their own local affairs, but insisted that all other sections conform to their pattern. A terrible war resulted.

The terrible days of Reconstruction were very similar to those we see in the Congo now, where all experienced leadership has been forced out, just as happened in the South.

Instead of forcing integration upon the Southern States, truly it would be well for the rest of the country to learn from the States of the South that the way for peace and harmony is to provide for separate but equal facilities and protect each race in the enjoyment of its own way of life.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS

You may well ask why the Supreme Court rendered the unanimous decision in the Brown integration case. It was probably argued that if we do not bring about integration in the United States, we will lose the contest with Russia throughout the world; and if we do not do this, Russia will eventually conquer the world. It was said by the press, "If Russia takes over here, the first thing they will do is set up a dictatorship. If Russia takes over," they charged, "they will do away with the right to trial by jury." "Yes," they said, "if we do not integrate, Russia will force on us a system similar to Hitler's in Germany or Stalin's in Russia."

What did they do in Germany and Russia? What was the source of their absolute control of those nations? Why, they had the courts issue decrees, then they used troops and government officers to enforce the decrees.

Have we not done that here? We have seen the Supreme Court, unwilling to wait for constitutional amendment in the regular process, change the Constitution. We have seen the President send troops and Federal officials to enforce such decrees. Our Government does itself what we feared Russia might do.

We were told we have to integrate all the races of the United States or we cannot hold the friendship of the people of India, China, Japan, Africa, and all the rest. If that be true, why have China and Japan been at dagger's point throughout history? Talk about India—in spite of what you read, we know in many areas people of the same color cannot even touch each other.

The agitation is right here at home. People are using the threat of Russia

here in the United States to accomplish their personal desires and actually to impose the Russian system of required conformity upon us.

My friends, history clearly shows an individual must have pride or he makes no real progress. A family must have pride or it goes down the scale. So it is with countries. So it is with race. Any race, whatever it may be, which feels it must be intermixed with another acknowledges its own lack. Such a race will not serve itself well, nor that with which it wishes to intermix.

Integration, where it has taken place, has only led to great turmoil. We all know that if you go into some sections of New York City at night you take your life in your hands; and you may be in danger there in the daytime. You can not go to certain areas of Chicago without danger to life and limb. The same is true of most of our major cities. Rape, murder, and robbery are commonplace in some areas of Washington.

THE FREEDOM BUSTERS

In recent weeks we have seen agitators deliberately go into areas of the South for the admitted purpose of violating laws of the States which have never been held to be beyond the power of such States, but rather have been held to be within the power; and then we have seen the Federal Government move its force in to protect such individuals in their avowed purpose of testing existing laws.

What if it were the law against murder they wished to test, or rape, or treason? Is there one rule in the Federal Government for laws the executive or the judiciary likes and another for the laws they do not like?

My friends, power breeds desire for power. No dictator ever stopped short of taking it all. This concentration of supreme power in our Supreme Court, backed by the Executive, will not stop with school and public facility integration, nor with race. Once seized, this power will be used to control industry, to control agriculture; yes, and eventually even labor.

In Russia everyone is supposed to own everything. However, for all practical purposes everything may as well belong to the Communist leaders, who control according to their own desires. In our country, if the present trend continues, it will not simply be the Chief Justice, the President, or even the Attorney General who issues orders, it will be everyone who speaks in the big chief's name. So it has been in history and so it will continue to be, for the basic traits of human nature do not change.

WEAKNESS

Several years ago I was at the opening session of the United Nations. I saw Khrushchev as he virtually ran the length of the floor to embrace Castro, though they had been together all morning. Yes, and I saw the representatives of Africa, the African Congo, each with a vote, though many of them represented virtually only a small tribe, recognized and seated there at our instance, another group for whose vote we must bid, not once and for all but on every issue as it arises.

Today the United States has moved into almost every country which would let us in. We have granted funds and goods to foreign governments, which in turn sold such goods to their own people for what the traffic would bear. We extended this foreign aid primarily on the promise, but many times merely in the hope, that incumbent governments would support our wishes. Through this means we have made a few persons rich here and abroad. In many of these nations we have forced them to take on our ways, to the point many countries are virtually defenseless, both from revolution within or from enemy attack from without.

Not since the Civil War have our people faced a more trying time. Our problems today call for the best within us. The attack on the Constitution and on our way of life is insidious.

It comes under the guise of government. It is offered with an appeal to the natural tendency of Americans to be law abiding. It appeals to religion, is presented in the name of world peace, but creates strife, dissension, and disturbance. It is said to be necessary to protect the rights of individuals, but is itself based on usurpation of power. We are told it is necessary in order to maintain our form of government; yet its starting point is the destruction by judicial decree of the rights of the States, of the Congress, and of the people. Yes, it begins with destruction of the Constitution iself. It can only lead to complete ruin.

Mr. Speaker, in the long run we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a foreign policy which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we do not approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign countries are going to do it anyway, and we will continue to be the loser. If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we hold dear will be gone, for no dictator can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an all-powerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, to those here who believe that passage of this act will satisfy present agitators, I say it will only begin agitation. To those who believe it will affect my section only, they need only to look to the dynamite and lighted fuse in practically every northern city.

I am proud that the people of my section are showing real self-restraint under trying circumstances. I hope time will show you who support this bill, that you are wrong; that those on the Supreme Court who have led this Nation down the road to state socialism are wrong; and that the present judicial dictatorship of the Supreme Sourt, supported by the executive branch, and here affirmed by this Congress, is all wrong and that this act will be repealed; that the rights of individuals to accumulate and control one's own property, the right to choose one's own customers, one's own companions and one's friends, regardless of color will be reestablished. Only then, Mr. Speaker, will our Nation endure.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of supreme legislative conscience and duty I most earnestly urge and hope this Senate-amended version of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which we passed here last February 10, will be unanimously accepted and approved.

The work the Senate performed on this measure follows the general lines of the House bill we acted upon here and there is no substantial alteration of the principles of equality embodied in the original measure. An overwhelming majority of both Chambers, as representatives of the American people, have already, in substance, approved this measure. In patriotic unity let us all close ranks and approve this bill.

For our inspiration toward this action we may timely remind ourselves of the immortal words of our late President John F. Kennedy when he urged us, just about a year ago, on June 19, 1963, to pass a comprehensive civil rights law. On that occasion President Kennedy appealed to the Congress with these words:

> Justice requires us to insure the pleas of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy, and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right.

This measure will not, nor was it ever pretended that it could, resolve all of our racial problems. Such will not occur until each of us applies the lesson taught centuries ago, to do unto others as we would have others do unto us; only when we have universally adopted the practice of that divine law will discrimination, attitude, and oppression cease in this troubled world. History shows us the best intended legislation does not, overnight, change personal attitudes nor dissolve all animosities. Only human charity, love, respect, and consideration that come from the moral culture and religious heritage of a people can do that. On this score we, the American people, will certainly be on trial for a long time to come but at least we have begun this glorious journey with the proper legislative first step.

We have upon us now the promise of a new birth of freedom throughout every neighborhood in this Nation. To nourish this birth to maturity will require from all Americans everywhere great forbearance, great kindness, great understanding, great love for one another, and great patriotic dedication to America. This is the challenge of our time, this is the call of our destiny.

For God, for country, for our fellow Americans and for men everywhere, let us meet the challenge, let us heed the call, let us fulfill our destiny.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic hour for the House. The enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 marks the culmination of a prolonged legislative journey through procedural obstacles and roadblocks in both bodies. The journey has highlighted the

need for congressional reform. When it takes over 1 year to enact urgent legislation, the need for change is obvious. I hope the public has been sufficiently aroused to demand it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will begin to redeem the pledge of our heritage—a pledge which guarantees equality and justice to all of our citizens. It is before us today because of the civil rights revolution which is sweeping America, a revolution which in the long run will make all men free regardless of race, creed, or color. The dedicated and courageous activities of thousands upon thousands of Americans, many of whom are young, have brought Congress to the point of enacting the most comprehensive civil rights bill in our history. The path to this point in our history is covered with the courage of those who were at Albany, Ga.; Oxford, Miss.; Cambridge, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; and now Philadelphia, Miss., to mention only a few battlegrounds of the second American Revolution which will be recorded in history along with Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. And let us not forget the countless citizens who have participated in the sit-ins, freedom rides, boycotts, rent strikes, picketing, and other civil rights demonstrations all over this land. Those who have put their liberties and lives on the line for freedom deserve special credit.

While it is a comprehensive bill, it is, in fact, a moderate measure which falls short of meeting the challenge of racial equality. As amended by the Senate, H.R. 7152 is both weaker in some instances and stronger in other instances than the House bill. I would like to mention briefly some of the major differences.

In title I, the House bill permitted the States to give oral literacy tests upon request of an applicant. The Senate bill requires that literacy tests be written unless the Attorney General enters into an agreement with a State permitting oral tests. Another Senate change permits a request for a three-judge court to be made only in suits in which the Attorney General has requested the court to find a pattern or practice of voting discrimination.

The House bill would have permitted such requests in any voting rights suit brought by the Attorney General. The first change probably strengthens the bill. The second weakens it to some extent.

In title II, the Senate left the coverage of the House bill unchanged reaching the same public accommodations. The same acts of discrimination are made unlawful.

The Senate bill still permits an aggrieved individual to sue but adds a provision authorizing the court to appoint an attorney for him, and to waive fees, costs and security. But it also requires an individual to wait 30 days after notifying the appropriate local agency before bringing suit if the offense occurred in a State with a law prohibiting the act of discrimination. Even after the 30 days, the court may stay Federal proceedings pending determination of local proceedings. The individual need not wait before suing in a State with no law prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations. However, the court may refer the matter to the Community Relations Service, if there is a reasonable possibility of obtaining voluntary compliance, for a maximum period of 120 days.

The House bill permitted the Attorney General to bring an action whenever a violation occurred. Instead, under the Senate bill, the Attorney General may initiate an action only if he has reasonable cause to believe, and pleads, that a person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination intended to deny the full exercise of title II rights. It is regrettable that this important title has been weakened, and I hope that it will be amended in the near future.

The section in title III permitting the Attorney General to intervene in equal rights suits was transferred to title IX.

The most significant change made in title IV was to eliminate a provision authorizing allowances for dependents of teachers attending desegregation training institutes.

There were many Senate amendments to title V, most of them technical, some of them imposing additional requirements on the Commission to publish details about their rules and operations in the Federal Register but none of them decreasing the powers of the Commission to carry out its important function.

Title VI, dealing with nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs was strengthened in the Senate. When the House approved an amendment which removed programs involving contracts of insurance or guaranty from the title, many commentators suggested that the President's order on nondiscrimination in federally assisted housing has been gutted. Although I did not agree, the Senate made it clear in section 605 that:

> Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

It would take a long time to describe all of the changes the Senate made in title VII, the equal employment opportunity title. The net effect of them is much like the changes made in title II. On charges filed with the Commission, States with fair employment laws are given up to 60 days to resolve them—or 120 days during the first year after a State enacts such a law. If the problem is not resolved during this period, an aggrieved individual may sue, and the court may permit the Attorney General to intervene upon timely application. Although the Commission is no longer authorized to bring a court action, the Attorney General is, whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that an individual or group is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance intended to deny the full exercise of equal employment opportunities.

An amendment of major significance is the provision in title XI which allows the accused in any proceeding for criminal contempt, arising under any of the titles except the one on voting rights, to demand a jury trial. This will undermine the bill and the traditional powers of the Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a meaningful measure, but it should go further.

The voting rights title should extend to State elections and eliminate literacy tests, as I have advocated on previous occasions.

Title II should have a salutary effect on those establishments it reaches. But Congress, through the commerce power, can reach much farther than it has in title II. There is no reason to permit racial discrimination in any kind of establishment which has an effect on commerce.

It is shocking that, at this late date, so much of our racial strife is attributable to failure of communities to permit equal use of their public facilities, including parks, golf courses, public pools. St. Augustine and other communities should have realized before now that public facilities must be open to all the public regardless of race, creed, or color. Under title III the Attorney General must use his authority to sue to desegregate such facilities and use it freely, just as he must use freely his authority to intervene in or initiate actions under the education and employment titles of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some of the differences between the bill before us today and the bill which passed the House. Neither version fully faces up to the enormous challenge of establishing racial equality in this Nation. We have a long way to go before the problems which the civil rights bill attempts to ameliorate are in fact solved. In fact, it may very well take further legislation to insure fully the right to vote, the right to enter all public accommodations, and the right to a job regardless of color.

This bill does not deal with the problems caused by the fact that the Negro has been disadvantaged for over 100 years—the problems of education, employment, and housing. These will be solved only by a massive commitment by our society to the elimination of poverty. The administration's antipoverty bill is a small and tentative beginning. But we must move our society much further toward the realization of our ideals. The day must come when all Americans share in the American dream. By voting for the civil rights bill today, we hasten that day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this bill will bring only grief to Negro Americans.

The die is cast and I realize the futility of my remarks at this late hour; but I cannot let the occasion pass without appealing once again to your judgment. If the veil of demagoguery were torn from the environment of this bill, there would stand revealed the stark fact that lust for power persuades the Congress of the United States.

Those who support this bill will carry the shame of the ages with them on the irreversible course charted by political

exploiters of human freedom. The price for this collapse of reason will be paid in the streets, parks, and arenas in northern cities as well as in the South. The mobs, whipped to fanatical fervor by Negro racists, will extract their toll of life, liberty, and happiness among the white population.

With the passage of this misnamed civil rights bill, we are embarking on an era of mob rule—of mass emotion. Leaders of the mob will not be pacified. They will be back for more punitive legislation because their appetite is insatiable.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the Rules Committee, and in the House, we have seen how a ruthless majority can crush a minority. When the full impact of this bill hits the American people, those advocating this desperate grab for power will be in the minority.

I think the House should reflect on the indisputable fact that the most ardent support of this legislation has come from the Communist Party. That, alone, bodes ill for our Nation. I suppose I am cynical enough, however, to doubt that constitutional arguments, logic, and reason will overcome the political appeal of this legislation.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I must protest this outrageous proposal which would hamstring local law enforcement officials, strip States of their sovereignty and make a civil rights czar of the Attorney General. Chaos will be the aftermath and racial strife will dominate the American scene for years to come.

This bill and the evils it incubates should be defeated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, our freedom as a nation was won in 1776, on the Fourth of July.

The battle to achieve this great victory was not an easy one, and since freedom is something which has to be continually sought after, the battle goes on.

Freedom requires vigilance, and eternal courage.

When men fail, laws are necessary.

And we continue to be a nation of laws; not one established on the whims of individuals.

The passage by the U.S. Congress of this historic civil rights bill in 1964, approximately 188 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, is another example of how the United States must continue to put into effect its belief in the dignity and freedom of all men.

The civil rights issue is basic to everything that is American.

In the same manner that we fought our way West, we now reaffirm our strength in our great heritage, our freedom and faith in the inherent right of all men to secure life and liberty together with the pursuit of happiness.

I am pleased to once again offer my full support to this civil rights legislation, and to follow its course as law of the United States.

The battle—which is never ending—will continue to rage on. Let us hope that, as Abraham Lincoln once said, we can bind up the Nation's wounds and that, "whenever there is a conflict between human rights and property rights, human rights must prevail."

With millions of other Americans, I dedicate myself to this great and noble cause.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that in the name of civil rights, this travesty is about to be inflicted upon the American people. The manner in which it is coming before the House today can only forcibly remind us of the manner in which the bill, as passed by the House in February, was railroaded through the Judiciary Committee without discussion, debate, or possibility of amendment.

This so-called debate today, is a farce, and nothing else. One hour is allotted, and it is controlled by the proponents of the bill, who are here asking the House to vote for a new bill, without knowing what is in it—and obviously, the majority of the Members of the House are going to do so, in response to the jerk of a string, without consideration of the results following this action.

We have here an entirely new bill, which has not been considered by the House, or any committee thereof; it contains some 70 pages, and some 89 differences between it and the bill as passed the House in February. This new bill came to us from the Senate only last week, and now, its proponents callously limit the debate to 1 hour; this is less than 1 minute for each page of the bill, and, of course, a page cannot even be read in 1 minute, leaving aside the lack of discussion and explanation.

It is apparent that the majority of the House is willing to take this bill, sight unseen, and impose its totalitarian provisions upon the people of this country. Therefore, I want to use this time to register my objection to this highhanded dictatorial method of procedure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 last, indeed a black Monday, this House approved H.R. 7152, the misnamed Civil Rights Act of 1964. Today, we have before us a slightly modified version of H.R. 7152 approved by the other body after 83 days of debate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7152, as modified, remains the same sinister and evil bill which cannot but bring chaos and disaster to this Nation, both North and South.

It offers nothing but discord and strife to the American people no matter who they are, no matter what the color of their skin, no matter what their religious beliefs. Further, this measure will strip from all Americans basic constitutional rights and protections so carefully and laboriously spelled out by the illustrious framers of our Constitution.

Certainly this legislation places unlimited power in the hands of the executive branch of our Government and makes a mockery of the historic division of power between State and Federal Government. It undermines, perhaps critically, the time-honored and accepted concept of our Constitution which sets up the vital system of checks and balances among the three branches of the Federal Government.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does nothing but tear down and uproot. It is destructive, not constructive. It negates the great values which have been the nervous system of our American way of life.

It creates artificial solutions which will not solve the basic problems facing the Negro today.

In the name of what is alleged to be freedom for a minority, this legislation would destroy fundamental liberties of both minority and majority.

One section of this bill deals with "public accommodations." Under this section, the proprietor of a business will no longer have any choice to make with respect to whom he serves. The Federal Government will make this decision for him whether he operates a business in Washington, D.C., Lincoln, Nebr., or San Diego, Calif. Like an octopus, long Federal arms will reach out from Washington to each unit of the great American service industry and stifle what always have been sacred and inalienable property rights and individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, this section of the bill may well inflict chaos on this Nation. The control of business will be switched to Washington and the local customs and social traditions will be ignored by the bureaucrats in control in our Capital.

This section of the bill may indeed breed violence and bloodshed, Mr. Speaker, and I shudder to think of the possible consequences as it is enforced.

I see no alternative to this grim threat because each man or woman who operates a service business in this Nation is different one from the other. Now, each of them must suddenly discard his or her particular sensibilities, personal predilections and beliefs, personal ideas and emotions, and personal standards of human relationships. Yes, these freedom loving Americans will be ordered to conform to the ukase from Washington. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this situation may well bring about chaos.

Another section of this measure which I find particularly obnoxious and which I believe to be particularly dangerous concerns so-called fair employment practices. This is title VII.

Here again is involved an outrageous delegation of power to the executive branch by the legislative branch, a revolutionary abdication of responsibility by both legislative bodies of the National Government.

In simple terms, title VII of this act would permit the Government to establish the employment policies of private business concerns. A Federal agent would, in effect, tell each employer who he could hire, who he could fire, and who would get this or that job, or receive a raise or a salary cut.

Mr. Speaker, millions and millions of words have been written proclaiming the virtues of the free enterprise system and the importance of this system to the survival of our democracy. But with title VII in effect, it is certain that millions and millions of words will be written describing the death throes of this same system.

To implement title VII would require an army of Federal police officers to pry

into the affairs of millions of businessmen and workers. Snoopers and informers would flourish in every community of our land. The conduct of businesses and labor unions would come under Federal dictation.

Mr. Speaker, the destiny of America, past and present, has been shaped by a working, healthy, free enterprise system. In some instances, there has been helpful governmental regulation but never, never such a gross invasion by Federal authority as is contemplated under title VII.

I should like to make direct reference, Mr. Speaker, to one more section of this act, title VI, although I should point out that I stand firmly opposed to each and every title of the proposed measure. Each is repugnant to me.

Title VI could properly be renamed the "blackmail title." In effect, this title says to each community and State of this Nation: You do as you are told by Washington or we will shut you off from all Federal funds. If you practice "discrimination"—and this broad term is not defined in the title—no more money.

Here, indeed, is a most vicious piece of legislation. It does not call for action against those local officials responsible for "discrimination" but would turn the Federal wrath against each man, woman, and child in the area concerned. The sick, the aged, and the infirm would be among the first to suffer. And the schoolchildren and the destitute.

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful legislation, totally un-American, totally ruthless, totally heartless.

Taking the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1964 as a whole, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this final and vital point.

This act strikes at the heart of another minority—the white people of the South. Where is their protection? This act runs roughshod over the social customs and traditions of a great and loyal section of this Nation. It undercuts the sincere attempts by conscientious people of the South to find permanent solutions to the serious social and economic problems facing the Negro today.

The South seeks racial peace just as much as does the rest of the Nation. Unhappily, I do not believe that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will achieve racial peace. And I believe this is the sad and bitter fact that all Americans must now face.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. It is, without question, the most important piece of legislation considered during the 88th Congress. President Johnson's signing of this measure will culminate many years of struggle and disappointment. It will forge the last link in a chain of events which has brought torment, despair, and now success.

The insults and indignities suffered by those who have attempted to call attention to discriminatory practices were an exorbitant price to pay. For the opportunities being sought were of the kind our democratic theory demands as the simple rights of citizenship. This is a second Emancipation Proclamation in all but name.

And yet, just as it signifies the end of an era, it places a new perspective upon human relationships. Equal opportunity and equal protection of the law will henceforth be extended to all people regardless of race—as a matter of public policy. Recourse to the courts is provided in virtually every instance of systematic discrimination. We must make certain that these gains are not now dissipated by unreasoning emotion.

Doubtless some members of all races will ignore or seek to abuse the rights granted. I am confident that they will be insignificant in number; that those who have opposed the bill's adoption will now obey its moral and legal strictures; that those who have done so much to bring it about will rely upon the safeguards it provides.

Defiant protest is no longer in order. The time for street demonstrations has passed. The time has come for reliance upon, and orderly enforcement of, a measure which has been 100 years in the making.

I ask that all men make the most of it.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of House Resolution 789. I oppose H.R. 7152 for a multitude of reasons.

There is no need for legislation of this kind at this time. In my opinion, it will increase rather than diminish the discord, strife and turmoil which is taking place in every section of the United States.

In my opinion, at least two titles of the civil rights bill are unconstitutional. It clearly strikes down or violates existing provisions of the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution as it was written and under which our country has achieved greatness, very carefully placed a limitation on the powers of the Federal Government. I believe that the 10th amendment to the Constitution still means what it says, although recent decisions of the Supreme Court have effectively rewritten the scope and the intent of the 10th amendment.

The bill taken in its entirety or section by section is an unwarranted grasp for power. It places powers in the executive branch of Government and specifically in the Attorney General that no good man would want and no bad man should have. In a different time and under changed or changing conditions, the powers granted to the office of the Attorney General could be used to destroy the rights and privileges and even the existence of the very same minority groups in whose name this legislation is being enacted into law.

This bill creates jurisdiction of subject matter which under our constitutional form of government could not be appropriately classified as properly within the scope of Federal jurisdiction. The Federal Government has enough major problems which are properly Federal in their character without undertaking to assume jurisdiction over matters which are clearly within the exclusive jurisdiction of State law or personal determination.

Experience should have taught us that any problems and issues which can be determined and handled at the local level can be best handled at the local level. When the Federal Government undertakes to involve itself in matters which are not properly Federal in nature, then it necessarily weakens the administration and the proper handling of many matters which are properly and exclusively Federal.

The powers contained in this bill are so broad and sweeping and unrestricted that if a would-be dictator should seek my advice on how to achieve totalitarian and dictatorial power in this country in all candor I would have to tell him to begin with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the language in this bill is such that a willful and arbitrary enforcement of its provisions would undermine and destroy the structure of our Government as a government under law. It could be used as a weapon to destroy the rights, liberties, freedoms, and privileges of all Americans without regard to their race, creed, color or national origin. It could amount to a surrender of individual rights—personal and property rights—to an all powerful police state.

The bill with the language of the Senate amendments is just as bad, perhaps even worse, than the language of the bill which passed the House of Representatives in February of this year.

I opposed it then. I oppose it now, and by my vote I have done that which I could to prevent its enactment into law. Accordingly, I shall vote "No" on the pending resolution.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, 20 or 30 years from now I know, and I think you do, too, that we will be able to say pridefully to our grandchildren that we were part of these historic times when America moved forward in the direction of guaranteeing constitutional rights and equality of opportunity to all of her citizens.

Americans then will remember the civil rights law of 1964 with the same historic importance we now give to the Emancipation Proclamation of 1864. Because our daily lives are deeply immersed in these times of change, tension, and turmoil, it is difficult for us to see the significance of the progress we are making.

In the long run, our children's children will probably look back on these times and wonder what all the fuss was about. They will wonder why some of their grandparents found it odd that every citizen should have the same rights and opportunities, and we will, too.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, our Union of States survived 188 years.

With hands bloody with the doing, we wrested freedom from a tyrannical motherland.

We survived the anguish of a fratricidal war.

We fought at Lexington and Concord, at Chickamauga Creek and the Bloody Angle, at Verdun and Ypres, at Guadalcanal and Bastogne to preserve for ourselves and all men the sacred freedom to choose.

This golden thread, this freedom of choice, was woven in the tapestry of our country in so tight a skein that it could not be unraveled without rending the whole cloth.

But it has now been unraveled with the passage of this bill and the cloth is rent.

On the eve of the 188th anniversary of our blessed, fruitful Union, it is being torn asunder by the choice, not of the people, but by a handful of men whose appetite for political power and for self-preservation in office drove them to the madness of bartering this freedom to choose for the bloc vote of the Negro.

How shoddy, cheap, and shameful an end for something that was so glorious.

They have not given "rights" to the Negro; they have sold him "special privilege" in return for his vote. Caveat emptor; let the buyer beware.

The tiger will not be satisfied with steak. His gluttony will not be sated until he has killed and gorged himself on the whole animal.

There are those who think they are done with this subject now that this infamous bill is made into law.

Not so; the curtain has only begun to rise.

The indignation of the people is yet to be heard. Slowly at first and then in an avalanche, they will learn what has been taken from them with this legislation. Their protest will roll over this Congress like a tidal wave.

I am glad I stand on the high ground; on the side of the people.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this bill now assured, we can only hope for the best but be prepared for the worst. Its enactment may very well trigger a wave of riots, bombings, racial clashes, and other outbursts inspired by the racial agitators who support this legislation. Threats have already been made by some of the leaders in the movement. Triggerhappy recipients of this new and preferred treatment may feel that the Government is on their side, no matter what they do.

There are many lawabiding Negroes who practice restraint and moderation. But unfortunately many members of that race are criminally inclined and prone to make trouble. Since the big sendoff for the drive that resulted in this bill's enactment, there has been a noticeable increase in crime committed by Negroes in many areas. Right here in Washington it has jumped up by more than 25 percent during the past year. Many other cities are having a similar experience.

We know that many of the agitators who arouse the passions of the Negro populace have openly encouraged disobedience to local laws. We know that these agitators, including such leaders as Martin Luther King, have gone into many communities and inspired criminal actions by members of their race. Many others have done the same thing. J. Edgar Hoover has said the Communists have had a hand in this.

But they have a good thing going. They are well paid. And now, with the passage of this bill they can be expected to intensify their actions, and inspire more and more disobedience and disrespect for law and order.

Mr. Speaker, let us not deceive ourselves. In a manner of speaking, everyone who has had a hand in the passage of this legislation must share some of the responsibility for the consequences of what they have wrought.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill will not create new jobs for Negroes, except for Federal enforcement jobs. The average Negro will still be dependent for employment on the good will and solicitude of white employers in his neighborhood. Will the enactment of this bill, with all the force and compulsion given to enforcement agents, encourage that good will? Or is it more likely to have the opposite effect? After all, jobs, better jobs, food for the family, and a decent house to live in, are the chief interests of the average American Negro. They already have good schools in practically every community in the country. The passage of this bill will naturally reduce rather than enhance good will and job opportunities in the average community, and make no mistake about it.

Aside from the unfortunate effects on job opportunities and the encouragement of lawlessness, the bill strikes a heavy blow at constitutional government. It will destroy a hundred times more rights and freedoms than it will protect. With this law on the books, America will never be quite the same again.

We have heard a lot about Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse. Let us consider her problem for a moment. If she rents as many as five rooms, for any purpose, she is covered. Suppose Mrs. Murphy, who comes under the law, has a vacant room. The doorbell rings at 2 o'clock in the morning. She answers and is faced by a Negro man whose appearance raises doubts in her mind as to his intentions. If she denies him a room, what can happen under the terms of this law that is being enacted here today?

She may end up in jail. At least she will be subject to harassment if the Negro reports her and claims he was denied the room because of his race. She can be hailed into court, and if she persists in using her own judgment about the desirability of patrons, may end up in jail. The rejected room seeker is furnished a Government lawyer, at no cost, to prepare and prosecute his case against Mrs. Murphy. This bill so provides.

This is but one of the scores of booby-traps that are built into this legislation. Its enactment will open a Pandora box of court actions, court orders, injunctions, and prosecutions. This all smacks of the police state, certainly more so than we have ever experienced in free America before.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not belabor the issue. This bill has been thoroughly debated, at least in the Senate, although it has been steamrollered through the House, encumbered with scores of Senate amendments, under a gag rule that has allowed only 1 hour of debate.

As I said at the beginning, we can hope for the best but must be prepared for the worst. Let us hope that the Negro agitators, encouraged by Communist and radical forces, will be silenced by members of their own race. But that has not been the case in the past and we can hardly hope for it in the future.

It is my firm belief that the enactment of this bill will cause a serious setback of progress in racial relations in this country. And this is being done because of what appears to be an insatiable desire to corral Negro bloc votes. What a price to pay for political advantages. And both major parties share in this scramble for Negro votes.

VIOLATES FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is being called upon to pass a bill which violates my fundamental concepts of American constitutional government.

I have asked before, and ask again, for the Members of this body to study this proposal and its provisions. While it is glossed over in flowery tones by its proponents, this bill strikes at the very heart of our system of free enterprise.

When we tell a man how he must operate his private business, when we tell him how he will hire and fire his employees, then we are violating his fundamental rights under the Constitution. I have always felt that this was a government which recognized free enterprise. It has been accepted that a man had the right to operate his place of business, his private property, with a minimum of control.

The basic difference between our system of government and that of the Communist nations is that here we recognize the right to own and operate private property. Under communism, the government tells the individual how that private property must be handled and claims ownership.

We may not always agree with how a man operates or controls that private property, but we recognized up until this point that he had that right. On the highly dubious commerce clause of the Constitution, we have based a law which is absurd when reasonable legal standards are considered.

There may be imperfections in our system, but it has proven to be the soundest ever devised by man.

I predict that this bill will take away basic freedoms from men of all races, creeds, and colors. It is a bill which has been designed to make the South a whippingboy when the whole Nation has problems in race relations.

Passage of this bill will not solve those problems. They are deep rooted. Their solution will come with time and with emphasis on two areas—education and a healthy economy.

Education is needed to train and make useful citizens out of our deprived citizens, who for generation after generation, follow a pattern of ignorance and poverty. And after we have provided them with educations, we must have a healthy economy which can absorb them into productive and financially rewarding lives.

I believe that when we address ourselves to these two areas, then we will be making progress. And I do not believe that we will make any real progress until we meet these challenges.

I cannot with a clear conscience vote nor support this bill. The few changes that the Senate has made does not make it more palatable, it just makes it more pointed against the South. It, in my opinion, solves nothing.

Today we see mob rule substituted for the rule of law. We see outsiders pouring into a city like St. Augustine, Fla., to incite the people. Outsiders from both sides pour into a beseiged community and the local people are bewildered, incensed, maddened, and disgusted. But no voice is raised to help them—any charge made is accepted by the people in other areas.

As Senator RUSSELL said in a Senate speech last year, it has become a national disease for the people of the States outside our area to dispise the South. They know not what they are talking about, they never listen to the great areas of progress. The news media continually picture the South as an area of bumpkins, pointing out only the worst, and generally isolating very selected instances, and even inciting the incident themselves to get a picture of twisted story.

We have our problems to be sure. But other States have also. Race relations are a problem. This bill solves none of them. This bill in my opinion should be ruled unconstitutional, but I doubt if the Supreme Court as it is now constituted will do so. They interpret the Constitution just as they please, without regard to precedent, written law, the intent of the founders, or the will of the Congress.

My vote is only one. But it will be cast with a clear conscience for what I believe to be our constitutional way of life. I predict that the passage of this bill will be a serious mistake for this Nation and set us off on a dangerous path of government control and dictation. I urge that it not be passed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is substantially "Will the House recede and concur with the Senate bill on civil rights?" If a bill identical to the Senate bill were before the House for initial passage, I would vote against it. In my opinion, it contains provisions of very dubious constitutionality, and in many instances will probably create more problems than it will solve.

However, the choice we make today is whether to have a civil rights bill or not to have one. Since this body and the other body have both adopted civil rights bills, there will be a law passed on this subject at this session of Congress. To me, it would be the most naive type of wishful thinking to believe that defeating this resolution and subsequently sending the bill to conference would keep it from becoming law. It has been well demonstrated that Congress will be kept in session until it passes a civil rights law.

A conference committee could only resolve the differences between the two bills. In my opinion, on balance, the Senate amendments make the bill more palatable than the House bill because they provide for trial by jury and the application of local laws where they are in existence.

I voted against the civil rights bill when it was before the House. As I have stated, I would vote against the Senate bill if it were here as an original bill. However, the choice I must make is between these two bills. Since I find the Senate bill to be more palatable than the House bill, or to put it another way—the lesser of two evils, I shall vote "aye" on the resolution.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic moment in the House of Representatives. Today we are enacting legislation which goes to the very core and character of this Nation. By passing this bill we affirm ideals which were written into the Declaration of Independence, and we make it clear to ourselves and to the world that we mean to close the gap between promise and fulfillment.

This bill represents a very real victory not only because it assures a better America for more Americans but because the forces of a dynamic, forward-looking nation have defeated forces which in the past have been a blot on our national conscience. There are those who will continue to insist that this measure violates the traditional concept of property rights and represents an unlawful intrusion of the Federal Government into matters which are the concern of the several States. But the plain fact, Mr. Speaker, is that most Americans not only accept but insist that human rights are preeminent in our free society and are the proper concern and responsibility of the Federal Government.

The Congress can be proud of the action it takes today, but the special gratitude of Americans for generations to come must be reserved for our late President whose inspiration and dedication has stamped itself upon this work. In truth, this is his hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for the opponents of the civil rights bill, we who favor its passage know that it is a foregone conclusion that the measure will pass today and will be signed into the law of the land shortly thereafter. It is now too late to debate the issue. All that need to be said, pro or con, have been fully stated. The die is cast and no wiles or forecasts of doom is going to change one vote.

We should, therefore, give some thought to what follows after the bill is enacted into law. While this day will go down in history as eventful as the day Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation over a hundred years ago, the days which immediately follow the signing of the bill by President Johnson will largely determine the success or failure of the law to serve its intended purpose.

The new law should not be used as an excuse for provoking civil disorders. If it is, we can expect violence and bloodshed through racial clashes in the years ahead. The new law should rather serve as a guide of conduct for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or religion. The white American must realize that the Negro American is going to fight for his rights, frequently in blind anger and bitterness, and must be treated with greater understanding. The Negro American, on the other hand, must exercise the patience of Job, and seek to remedy wrongs only through the peaceful means provided by the new law.

Through respect for the law, we who are fortunate to be able to call ourselves Americans must seek to avoid the ugly incidents of civil disorders. Unless we do this we shall have labored in vain to bring about justice and equality through the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, with regret, I must cast my vote against the resolution to accept the Senate amendments and enact the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Senate amendments, in some respects, did improve the bill passed by the House on February 10, 1964, which I opposed. Those amendments, however, do not go far enough and do not cure the excessive power or the oppressive sanctions the House wrote into the bill. I voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first major legislation in this field in nearly 100 years, and favored the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, except the voting referee provision, a device for the assumption of State power through the appointment of referees by a Federal court.

My regret stems from my belief that the Congress can and should take action within its constitutional powers to carry out our longstanding national policy that all citizens be treated alike. Congress should pass a fair, workable, effective civil rights law; but not one which extends the long arm of the Federal Government into every nook and cranny of our country; nor one which strips 190 million Americans of their sacred rights and protections written into our Constitution.

The Senate version of the bill did provide that the vast power vested in Federal officials with respect to public accommodations and equal employment should not be employed until remedies under State law were exhausted. The Senate version also provided for a jury trial of criminal contempt proceedings in Federal injunction suits except those relating to voting.

The Senate version, however, did not limit the authority of the Federal Government to what I regard as its proper sphere of activity, actually increasing the power of the Attorney General and did not remove the objectionable, oppressive sanctions of the injunction process for enforcement of the act.

It should be emphasized that the jury trial provided by the Morton amendment relates only to criminal contempt after a judgment has been entered by the Federal judge, and does not provide a civil rights defendant with a jury trial on the merits of the case.

A thug, a narcotics peddler, an assassin, is entitled to, first, presumption of innocence; second, proof of guilt by admissible evidence beyond reasonable doubt; third, freedom to refuse to testify against himself; fourth, jury trial; fifth, judgment expires when penalty has been paid.

Not so the defendant in a civil rights case if H.R. 7152 becomes law.

Worse yet, his offense—discrimination—is not defined in H.R. 7152, nor is it a term of art in legal terminology defined by court decisions.

A civil rights defendant, first, enjoys no presumption of innocence; second, proof, according to much less stringent rules of evidence, need be only by a preponderance of the evidence; third, he can be compelled to testify against himself under pain of being jailed for contempt of court; fourth, he is not entitled to a jury trial; fifth, the injunction against him hangs over his head for the rest of his life.

It was to protect individual citizens from abusive tyranny by its government and to avoid the evils and oppression practiced by the British monarchy, that our constitutional founders insisted upon the first 10 amendments as protections to all citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee which held hearings on this measure, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has absorbed the greatest part of my time and my efforts in this Congress. I sought in the subcommittee, and in the full Judiciary Committee, and on the floor of the House, to write a fair, workable bill. Some of the suggestions I made and amendments I offered were adopted, notably the nonpreemption provision which preserves the validity of present and future State laws and municipal ordinances in the field of civil rights. Other amendments I offered were rejected, notably one to strengthen the voting provisions of the bill by reducing representation in the House of Representatives for those States denying or abridging the right to vote on grounds of race or color as required by section 2 of the XIV amendment.

At the end of the legislative process, however, this bill contains such excessive Federal power and such harsh sanctions for enforcement that I could not in good conscience return to my constituents and say I helped fasten a yoke of tyranny on the American people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 7152 passed the House of Representatives, I voted for it but with great reluctance. On my way to the floor of the House that day and immediately before casting my vote, I remarked to my colleague, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, BILL MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, that this would be the worst vote I had ever cast. On the following day I remarked that I felt very bad about my vote in favor of that bill, and I threatened to go before the House to apologize for so doing and to suggest that perhaps I had outlived my usefulness as a Member of Congress.

At this stage of the game, I am sure my vote was wrong, and I am going to oppose the Senate version of the bill this afternoon. The bill is not a civil rights nor an equal rights bill, and it is going to encourage violence, incite mob rule, and bring about suffering to no end.

I have always been for equal rights—or civil rights if you care to call them that—and my record speaks for itself. As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations and as ranking minority member, I have initiated and supported an orderly integration program within the District of Columbia and without the aid of this legislation. All of our schools, theaters, hotels, and so forth were integrated without violence. That is the way it should be, and the way we went about it is the proper way.

The bill on which we are voting this afternoon is being used not to give equal rights to everyone, but to usurp the rights of one group in favor of another. The most flagrant example of such abuse exists right here in Washington today. Here people who have obtained rank in important positions and on employment rosters are being pushed aside and downgraded in order to favor people of other races.

I apologize for having voted for the bill in the first place. But long debate and much publicity, the results of which are already beginning to show, have caused me to see this picture in a different light. Yes, I have changed my mind, but only fools refuse to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Virginia, who did not complain about his time allotment of 3 minutes, I shall not complain about my 2 minutes. I shall also not apologize for the vote I cast on February 10, 1964. I said "yea" then, and I am pleased to say "yea" today.

Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do is to guarantee to all Americans an equal chance to vote, to get an education and a job, and to be served in historically public places of accommodation. Important as the scope and extent of this bill is, it is also vitally important that all Americans understand what this bill does not cover.

Your mail and mine, your contacts and mine with our constituents, indicates a great degree of misunderstanding about this bill. People complain about racial "balancing" in the public schools, about open occupancy in housing, about preferential treatment or quotas in employment. There is a mistaken belief that Congress is legislating in these areas in this bill. When we drafted this bill we excluded these issues largely because the problems raised by these controversial questions are more properly handled at a governmental level closer to the American people and by communities and individuals themselves. The Senate has spelled out our intentions more specifically.

Title IV, as amended by the Senate, provides:

> Nothing in this title shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of students from one school to another, or from one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance—

The Senate laid to rest the fear that the Federal Government would begin to use GI and FHA mortgages to control home sales or rentals with the following amendment:

> Nothing in this title shall add to or detract from any existing authority with respect to any program or activity under which Federal financial assistance is extended by way of a contract of insurance or guaranty.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the difficult area of equal employment opportunities, the Senate has added this language to title VII:

> This title shall not be interpreted to require any employer, employment agency, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee to grant preferential treatment to any individual or to any group because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of any race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has improved this bill in clarifying its scope and coverage. I urge each Member to search his own heart and conscience when he casts his vote today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to again vote our conscience in the cause of civil rights.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee will explain the major amendments adopted by the Senate. I approve them.

Five months ago, the House debated the civil rights bill for 10 days, and passed the bill by a vote of 290 to 130. The bill was then comprehensive in scope yet moderate in application, subject to effective judicial and administrative safeguards. The bill returns to the House, from whence it came, comprehensive in scope, with the individual States clothed with more authority and responsibility in the enforcement of the legislation, than when it left the House. In short, the bill comes back to the House tempered to and softened by the sober judgment of the Members of the other body, yes, even by the wishes of the people.

Much inaccurate information has been circulated about the legislation both as it left the House and as it is now before the House. In view thereof, I wish to negate only a few of the most glaring inaccuracies that have had such wide dissemination.

First. The bill now before the House does not permit the Federal Government to tell a bank, savings and loan company, or other such financial institution to whom it may or may not make a loan.

Second. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell any home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell, rent, lease, or otherwise use his real estate.

Third. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with the day-to-day operations of a business or labor organization.

Fourth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to require an employer or union to hire or accept for membership a quota of persons from any particular minority group.

Fifth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to destroy the job seniority rights of either union or nonunion employees.

Sixth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with a farmer's operation of his farm.

Seventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to impose minority quotas upon farmhands or tenants.

Eighth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with membership in farm organizations.

Ninth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to deny or interfere with an individual's rights to receive social security or veteran's benefits.

Tenth. The bill neither authorizes nor permits the Federal Government to interfere in a State's right to fix voter qualifications.

Eleventh. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to interfere with or destroy the private property rights of individual businessmen.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Ohio who is now addressing us is one of the most able Members of the House of Representatives. He is one of the most dedicated, one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House in this particular field. There has been tremendous misrepresentation as to what is contained in this bill and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could have order so that the gentleman's remarks may be heard.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. The House will be in order.

The gentleman from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, twelfth, the bill does not permit the Federal Government to tell a lawyer, doctor, banker, or other professional man whom he must serve.

Thirteenth. The bill does not permit the Federal Government in any way to interfere with freedom of the press or freedom of speech.

Fourteenth. The bill contains no primary criminal penalties.

The bill does, however, seek to prohibit discrimination by every proper means, in accordance with the Constitution.

No statutory law will or can completely end the discrimination under attack by this legislation. Such discrimination will finally end only when the mind and heart and conscience of everyone of good will decrees it.

To create hope of immediate and complete success can only promote conflict, and result in brooding despair.

In the meantime I call upon—yes, I implore—leaders everywhere to shun violence of every kind, use our constitutional rights of freedom of speech and press, to peaceably assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, in the same fine spirit by which they became a part of our great Constitution.

In the same vein, I suggest that those charged with the enforcement of the law proceed with all deliberate speed and consideration during the time of adjustment to the new duties imposed thereby.

In the meantime 20 million Americans can, for the first time, dream some dreams and in due course see nearly all of them come true.

To my colleagues in the Congress as well as to people everywhere who believe in equality under the law, who support the Constitution, and who love liberty not only for themselves but for others as well, the civil rights bill now before us for final consideration is in accordance with the best traditions of America.

I call upon every one of you to vote for the resolution.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for rendering statesmanlike service over the years and for doing a job with dignity, with courage, with energy, and with great skill in a very difficult time on a very difficult subject. The country and the Congress owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to paraphrase a sentence of that great Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill.

I say to my colleagues in the House and in the other body and to people all over the country: Never have so many of such ability worked so hard, and so effectively, for which so few received the credit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will close the debate, but before that I wish to grant the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] 1 minute.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, over 4 months ago, the civil rights bill came to this floor. Its stated purpose, equality of opportunity for all Americans, is a proper goal. But I questioned its means, and voted against passage. Now, after the most thorough and sifting examination in legislative history, this measure returns for final consideration. It returns with the overwhelming approval of both Houses of Congress.

Manifestly, the issue is already decided, and approval is assured. By the time my name is called, votes sufficient for passage will have been recorded.

What, then, is the proper course? Is it to vote "no," with tradition, safety—and futility?

I believe a greater cause can be served. Change, swift and certain, is upon us, and we in the South face some difficult decisions.

We can offer resistance and defiance, with their harvest of strife and tumult. We can suffer continued demonstrations, with their wake of violence and disorder.

Or, we can acknowledge this measure as the law of the land. We can accept the verdict of the Nation.

Already, the responsible elements of my community are counseling this latter course. And, most assuredly, moderation, tranquillity, and orderly processes combine as a cause greater than conformity.

Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my lot with the leadership of my community. I shall cast my vote with that greater cause they serve. I will add my voice to those who seek reasoned and conciliatory adjustment to a new reality.

And finally, I would urge that we at home now move on to the unfinished task of building a new South. We must not remain forever bound to another lost cause.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to close debate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my fervent hope that all of the United States shall unite and work with patience and with harmony to achieve the objectives of this legislation. Let all of us of all regions, of all faiths, of all races move forward together to redeem the American pledge of equality of opportunity for all. No exhortation of mine should be necessary to bring this performance to a close. Further delay, I will say, would be fatal.

Cervantes once said, "By the street of by and by you reach the house of never."

No phase of the bill has been left unexplored, undefined, unexplained. The amendments offered by the Senate are not lethal. None of them do serious violence to the purpose of the bill. The country can live with them. Acceptance of the amendments is a reasonable price to pay to avoid a conference that might renew lengthy debate, open up old sores, encourage more bitter controversy. The country desires no more argument, no more speeches; the country demands action now. Action is eloquence.

As to the Senate amendments, first, conviction of criminal contempt under all titles of the bill, except title I, with respect to voting rights, will require a jury trial. Jury trial is provided irrespective of the severity of the penalty imposed, but in no event may it exceed $1,000 fine or 6 months' imprisonment. No person can be convicted of criminal contempt unless the contempt is intentional. No person shall be placed in double jeopardy. The Senate amendment requires increased resort to State and local law for the settlement of complaints involving racial discrimination in public accommodations or employment. Before the Attorney General may initiate an action under titles II or VII, he must have reasonable cause to believe that a pattern or practice of resistance to law exists. The Senate amendment to title IV, desegregation in public education, also provides for an increased resort to State and local machinery in the settlement of complaints respecting school desegregation.

The amendment further defines the intent of Congress with respect to the issue of racially balanced schools. Nothing in the bill empowers Federal courts to issue any order which seeks to achieve, by busing or other means, racial balance in the public schools.

The Senate amendment would assure that termination or refusal of Federal financial assistance under title VI is limited to the particular program or particular political entity in which discrimination is found after a hearing.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to ask my chairman, what is the meaning of "pattern or practice" as it is used to limit the Attorney General's power to initiate suit under titles II and VII?

Mr. CELLER. A pattern or practice of resistance would exist, for example, where there is discrimination by several concerns in the same industry or line of business, where a chain of motels or restaurants discriminated in all or part of its branches, or where a single company regularly refused to treat Negroes without discrimination. There would be no authority for the Attorney General to sue a single firm for an isolated or sporadic act of discrimination. The words "resistance to enjoyment of the rights" under the act means no more than refusal to comply with titles II or VII of the act; that is, engaging in any prohibited discrimination. There is no requirement that the pattern or practice be pursuant to a conspiracy or a concert of action, and the Attorney General is authorized under titles II and VII to join in a single lawsuit all or some of the persons or companies whose conduct amounts to a pattern or practice, whether or not joinder would otherwise be appropriate.

Finally, the statute contains the usual directive to the Attorney General that he should have a reasonable case before he sues, but of course, he—not the court—decides whether reasonable cause exists, and the issue of reasonable cause does not present a separate litigable issue.

Mr. Speaker, I shall outline the substance of changes made by the Senate to the House version of H.R. 7152.

TITLE I (VOTING RIGHTS)

HOUSE

Title I of the House bill requires registration officials to apply uniform standards in registering voters and prohibits denial of registration because of immaterial errors or omissions on voting applications in Federal elections. It creates a rebuttable presumption that a citizen who has completed a sixth-grade education is literate for voting purposes. It further provides that where literacy tests are employed as a qualification for voting the tests must be conducted wholly in writing and certified copies maintained.

It also authorizes the Attorney General or a defendant to request a three-judge court to hear and dispose of voting cases. It is particularly important to settle voting cases promptly because the right to vote is of little value after the election has been held.

SENATE

The Senate added a provision which would permit the Attorney General to exempt from the literacy tests provisions those States which he determines are not discriminating in voting registration and procedure.

TITLE II (PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS)

HOUSE

Title II of the House bill provides that no citizen shall be subject to discrimination because of his race, color, religion, or national origin in certain places of public accommodation.

SENATE

Under the provisions added by the Senate, an aggrieved party involved in a dispute arising within one of those States or local jurisdictions with a public accommodations law must wait 30 days before filing civil action under the provisions of this bill. After 30 days, during which the State or local agencies can attempt to resolve the dispute, the aggrieved party may file an action in a Federal court. The court is authorized to receive the case without cost, may furnish an attorney for the complainant and may permit the Attorney General to intervene in the action if he certifies the case to be of general public importance.

The court may also stay the proceedings pending termination of State or local enforcement action. This extension authority is necessary because many State public accommodation statutes provide criminal penalties and the State courts must be allowed sufficient time to hear and decide the case.

Where a complaint arises in a State which does not have comparable public accommodation laws, the Federal court may receive the case and refer the complaint to the community relations service for a period of 60 days, which can be extended to not more than 120 days, in an attempt to obtain voluntary compliance with the law.

Under the Senate amendment, title II also authorizes the Attorney General to file action to secure compliance with the law when he has reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of resistance to the law. In such actions, the Attorney General may request a court of three judges to hear and determine the case.

The new language of title II provides effective relief for aggrieved parties both in instances where there are individual violations of the law and in situations where there is massive resistance to the law requiring action by the Federal Government to protect the rights of all citizens.

TITLE III (DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES)

HOUSE

Title III of the bill secures for all citizens the right of equal access to State maintained public facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, or libraries. It authorizes the Attorney General to initiate or intervene in suits to desegregate such facilities when individual citizens are unable to initiate or maintain appropriate legal proceedings.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds language which clarifies the criteria which the Attorney General will use in determining whether to initiate suits authorized by title III.

The Senate amendment deletes section 302 from title III and places it in title IX. This section authorized the Attorney General to intervene in any Federal court action filed for the purpose of seeking relief from the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, religion, color, or national origin.

The Senate also added a new section 304 which classifies a complaint filed under this title as a writing or document under section 1001, title 18, United States Code. That section imposes criminal penalties for knowingly making a false or fictitious statement to a Government agency.

TITLE IV (DISCRIMINATION UNDER PUBLIC EDUCATION)

HOUSE

Title IV of the House bill authorizes the Attorney General to initiate and intervene in public school desegregation cases where students or parents are unable to institute and maintain legal proceedings. It provides for Federal technical and financial assistance when requested by school boards and communities to assist in the desegregation of their schools.

SENATE

The Senate amendment proposes several language changes to clarify the intent of this title. It provides that the Attorney General must receive a complaint in writing which charges that a school board is denying children equal protection and must determine that the complaint is meritorious prior to initiating action. The Attorney General must give notice to a complaint to the appropriate school board or college authority and give them a reasonable time to correct the situation. It deletes authorization for dependents' allowances when school personnel attend special training sessions. A new section 410 states that nothing in this title is intended to prohibit classification and assignment of schoolchildren for reasons other than race, color, religion, or national origin.

The amendment further defines the intent of Congress with respect to the question of racially balanced schools. New language added to section 407(a) provides that nothing contained in this title shall empower the U.S. courts to issue any order which seeks to achieve by busing or any other means racial balance in public schools. Simply stated, this means that this title does not grant to the Federal courts any power which they do not now have to insure the equal protection of the laws.

The Senate amendment also classifies a complaint filed under this title as a writing or document under section 1001, title 18, United States Code—same as Senate amendment to title III.

TITLE V (COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS)

HOUSE

Title V of the House bill extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years and broadens and adds to its duties. The Commission will serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to equal protection of the laws, and is authorized to investigate civil rights for charges of fraud in State or Federal elections.

SENATE

The Senate amendment to title V relates primarily to the rules of procedure for Commission hearings. The new procedural rules will more nearly comply

with those now in effect for other Federal administrative agencies.

TITLE VI (NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS)

HOUSE

Title VI of the House bill would permit the withholding of Federal funds from programs administered on a segregated basis. Final action to withhold such assistance will only be taken after efforts to achieve voluntary compliance with the law have failed.

SENATE

The Senate amendment makes clear that Federal funds will be cut off for only those political entities or particular programs or parts of programs in which discrimination is practiced. This means that all Federal aid to a State or aid to a particular program will not be cut off because one particular part of the program or institution is being operated in violation of the law.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 604 which provides that nothing in this title authorizes Federal department or agency action with respect to employment practices except where a primary objective of Federal financial assistance is to provide employment.

The Senate amendment adds a new section 605 which provides clarifying language.

TITLE VII (EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY)

HOUSE

Title VII of the House bill provides that certain employers, labor unions, and employment agencies whose actions affect interstate commerce are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin against an individual seeking employment.

SENATE

The Senate amendment to title VII, like the amendment to title II, requires increased resort to State antidiscrimination agencies where they exist. This is consistent with the intent of the House bill.

The Senate amendment provides that a charge of an unfair employment practice must be filed by the person aggrieved or by a member of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission which is established by this title. In the case of an alleged unlawful employment practice occurring in a State or local community which have laws prohibiting practices comparable to what is provided in this bill, the person cannot file the charge with the Commission prior to 60 days after he has instituted proceedings under the State or local law, unless such action has been earlier terminated. The bill extends this period to 120 days during the first year after enactment of a comparable State or local law. Where a charge of an unfair practice is filed by a Commission member, the Commission shall notify the appropriate State or local agency and afford them the same period of time in which to resolve the complaint.

The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission is given a maximum of 60 days in which to obtain voluntary compliance with the provisions of the law. If they are not able to do so, the aggrieved party in the case may file an action in the Federal district court in which the practice has occurred. Like title II, the Senate amendment authorizes the court to accept the case without costs, furnish the complainant legal assistance, and permit the Attorney General to intervene in the action. If the court finds that the respondent has intentionally engaged in or is intentionally engaging in unlawful practices, the court may order such affirmative action as may be appropriate.

Again, under this title the Attorney General may bring a civil action where he finds a pattern or practice of resistance to the law and may request a three-judge court to hear the case.

In addition, numerous revisions were made in the recordkeeping section of this title. The substitute language provides that where records on employment practices are required by State laws or Federal Executive orders, any additional information required by this law may be added to what is already being kept.

The Senate amendment also—

First. Validates nondiscriminatory ability tests given by employers—section 703(h);

Second. Provides that compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended satisfies the requirement of the title barring discrimination because of sex—section 703(b);

Third. Deletes the provision exempting discrimination against atheists;

Fourth. Exempts corporations owned by Indian tribes—section 701(b);

Fifth. Subjects all employees of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission to the provisions of the Hatch Act—section 705(j);

Sixth. Exempts educational institutions with respect to employment connected with their educational activities—section 702.

TITLE VIII (REGISTRATION FOR VOTING STATISTICS)

HOUSE

Title VIII of the House bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a survey of registration and voting statistics in geographical areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. A Census Bureau survey would include a count of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin, plus statistics on the extent to which persons are registered to vote and have voted for Members of the House of Representatives since January 1960.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds language to preserve the privacy of census information and provides penalties for disclosure violations. It provides that persons who do not wish to disclose their race, color, national origin, political party affiliation, or voting preference are not required to do so, and must be fully informed of their right to refuse to answer such questions.

TITLE IX

HOUSE

Title IX in the House bill provides the right of appeal from a remand of a civil rights case from a State court from which it was removed.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds a section 902, which was formerly written as section 302 in title III.

TITLE X (COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE)

HOUSE

The House bill establishes a Community Relations Service to assist State and local communities in the solution of racial problems arising out of discriminatory practices. The objective of this agency would be to secure voluntary compliance with the law through conciliation and mediation of these disputes.

SENATE

The Senate amendment deletes the limitation on the number of personnel to be appointed which was fixed in the House version, not to exceed six in number. Other Senate amendments are of a clarifying nature.

TITLE XI (MISCELLANEOUS)

HOUSE

Title XI of the House bill contains sections on separability, appropriations authority, and antipreemption provisions.

SENATE

The Senate amendment adds two new sections.

New section 1101 provides for jury trial in all cases of criminal contempt arising under the bill, except voting rights cases under title I. It further provides that to be punishable as a criminal contempt the disobedience must be intentional. Criminal contempt proceedings under title I would remain subject to the provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

New section 1102 guarantees that no person will be placed in double jeopardy by virtue of criminal contempt proceedings and criminal prosecution being undertaken against him for the same act.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have an overwhelming vote for this bill; that that vote will reverberate throughout the length and breadth of the land so that it can be said that Congress hearkens unto the voice of Leviticus, "proclaiming liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are others who have been paid deserved tributes for their great efforts in this very noble endeavor. I think all of us in this House, all of us who have labored on this great issue will recognize that there is one individual who has given such selfless dedication to this great cause, who has been so painstaking that he needed the patience of Job and who brought us to this fine hour when we now pass legislation which all of us feel is in the great interest of this great country. I refer to the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL CELLER, the great chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to whom this great tribute should be paid.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 126, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—289

Abele	Edwards	McDowell
Adair	Ellsworth	McFall
Addabbo	Fallon	McIntire
Albert	Farbstein	McLoskey
Anderson	Feighan	Macdonald
Andrews,	Findley	MacGregor
N. Dak.	Finnegan	Madden
Arends	Fino	Mailliard
Ashley	Flood	Martin, Mass.
Aspinall	Fogarty	Martin, Nebr.
Auchincloss	Ford	Mathias
Ayres	Fraser	Matsunaga
Baldwin	Frelinghuysen	May
Barrett	Friedel	Michel
Barry	Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Calif.
Bass	Fulton, Tenn.	Milliken
Bates	Gallagher	Minish
Becker	Garmatz	Minshall
Bell	Giaimo	Monagan
Betts	Gilbert	Montoya
Blatnik	Gill	Moore
Boland	Glenn	Moorhead
Bolling	Gonzalez	Morgan
Bolton,	Goodell	Morris
Frances P.	Goodling	Morse
Bolton,	Grabowski	Morton
Oliver P.	Gray	Mosher
Bow	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Multer
Bray	Griffin	Murphy, Ill.
Bromwell	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Grover	Nedzi
Broomfield	Gubser	Nelsen
Brotzman	Hagen, Calif.	Nix
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	O'Brien, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Bruce	Hanna	O'Hara, Mich.
Buckley	Hansen	O'Konski
Burke	Harding	Olsen, Mont.
Burkhalter	Harsha	Olson, Minn.
Burton, Calif.	Harvey, Ind.	O'Neill
Burton, Utah	Harvey, Mich.	Osmers
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Ostertag
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	Patten
Cahill	Healey	Pelly
Cameron	Hechler	Pepper
Carey	Hoeven	Perkins
Cederberg	Hoffman	Philbin
Celler	Holifield	Pickle
Chamberlain	Holland	Pike
Chenoweth	Horan	Pillion
Clancy	Horton	Pirnie
Clausen,	Hosmer	Price
Don H.	Hutchinson	Pucinski
Cleveland	Ichord	Quie
Cohelan	Joelson	Randall
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Reifel
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Reuss
Corman	Karsten	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cunningham	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Pa.
Curtin	Kee	Rich
Curtis	Keith	Riehlman
Daddario	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Dague	Keogh	Robison
Daniels	King, Calif.	Rodino
Dawson	King, N.Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Dent	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Denton	Kunkel	Roosevelt
Derounian	Kyl	Rosenthal
Derwinski	Laird	Rostenkowski
Devine	Langen	Roudebush
Diggs	Latta	Roush
Dingell	Leggett	Roybal
Dole	Libonati	Rumsfeld
Donohue	Lindsay	Ryan, Mich.
Dulski	Long, Md.	Ryan, N.Y.
Duncan	McClory	St. George
Dwyer	McCulloch	St Germain
Edmondson	McDade	St. Onge
Saylor	Springer	Udall
Schadeberg	Staebler	Ullman
Schenck	Stafford	Van Deerlin
Schneebeli	Staggers	Vanik
Schweiker	Steed	Wallhauser
Schwengel	Stinson	Weaver
Secrest	Stratton	Weltner
Senner	Sullivan	Westland
Sheppard	Taft	Whalley
Shipley	Talcott	Wharton
Shriver	Teague, Calif.	White
Sibal	Thomas	Widnall
Sickles	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson,
Sisk	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H.
Skubitz	Toll	Wydler
Slack	Tollefson	Younger
Smith, Iowa	Tupper	Zablocki

NAYS—126

Abbitt	Gathings	Poff
Abernethy	Gibbons	Pool
Alger	Grant	Purcell
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Quillen
Ashbrook	Gurney	Rains
Ashmore	Hagan, Ga.	Reid, Ill.
Baker	Haley	Rivers, S.C.
Baring	Hall	Roberts, Ala.
Battin	Hardy	Roberts, Tex.
Beckworth	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Beermann	Harrison	Scott
Belcher	Henderson	Selden
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	Short
Berry	Huddleston	Sikes
Boggs	Hull	Siler
Bonner	Jarman	Smith, Calif.
Brock	Jennings	Smith, Va.
Broyhill, N.C.	Jensen	Snyder
Broyhill, Va.	Johansen	Stephens
Burleson	Jonas	Stubblefield
Casey	Jones, Ala.	Taylor
Chelf	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Kilgore	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Knox	Thompson, Tex.
Cooley	Kornegay	Trimble
Cramer	Landrum	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Tuten
Davis, Tenn.	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Dorn	Long, La.	Vinson
Dowdy	McMillan	Waggonner
Downing	Mahon	Watson
Elliott	Marsh	Watts
Everett	Martin, Calif.	Whitener
Evins	Matthews	Whitten
Fascell	Meader	Williams
Fisher	Mills	Willis
Flynt	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Foreman	Murray	Wilson, Ind.
Forrester	Natcher	Winstead
Fountain	Passman	Wright
Fuqua	Patman	Wyman
Gary	Poage	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

NOT VOTING—15

Avery	Kilburn	Norblad
Bennett, Mich.	Lankford	Pilcher
Clark	Lesinski	Powell
Hébert	Lloyd	Rogers, Tex.
Karth	Miller, N.Y.	Utt

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Norblad for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. MINSHALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2735. An act for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez;

H.R. 2737. An act for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo;

H.R. 5408. An act for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith;

H.R. 5501. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon;

H.R. 6473. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Loward D. Sparks;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.;

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements;

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; and

H.J. Res. 950. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the State of Ohio and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relating to Pymatuning Lake.

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. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL JULY 20, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 321

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolulows:

H. CON. RES. 322

Resolved, That notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until July 20, 1964, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of

the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TUESDAY, JULY 21, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and consideration of motions to suspend the rules, in order on Monday, July 20, 1964, may be in order on Tuesday, July 21, 1964.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until July 20, 1964, all Members of the House shall have the privilege to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the House.

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

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 323, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 323

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152 (b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965,'."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 795, Rept. No. 1539), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 795

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1965, with respect to the following matters:

(1) The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

(2) The amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving picture films, and automobile and any other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1964 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

(3) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

(4) The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

(5) The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, chapter 120, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

(6) Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1964, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which, in its opinion, will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

(7) The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint, are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-eighth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

(8) The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

(9) Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committee is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1965, as hereinabove provided.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of House Resolution 795, which I have cleared with the minority side.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will consider the resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us simply authorizes the Speaker of the House to appoint a special committee to investigate where necessary and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the office of Representative in Congress. This is customarily known as the Davis resolution in honor of its author. It was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] who for several years past has headed this committee in each election year, and who has by common agreement of all who know about it done each year a careful and outstanding job. I had the privilege of serving for a few years on the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration. In that capacity, I had the privilege and at times I might say the duty of looking into the work Mr. DAVIS' special committee had done in particular, it had investigated. I uniformly found that the quality of its work was high, and its approach thorough.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides that the special committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate the extent and nature of expenditures made by candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office, including the amount subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the purpose of this resolution, it is to give jurisdiction to a select committee to investigate expenditures and so forth in regard to the nomination and election of Members of Congress.

Does it mean when the word "nomination" is used that the Federal Government is assuming investigative jurisdiction over primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Tennessee, the author of the resolution, were here to answer the gentleman's question. However, it has been my understanding throughout all the years that the committee did not have that jurisdiction, or if it did have that jurisdiction it did not exercise it.

Now, as I understand it, this committee has been created each 2 years for approximately the past 20 years. If the committee has had such jurisdiction, I am told by the chairman of the Committee on Rules that it has never exercised it with respect to primaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, can he give me the assurance that this resolution does not give this committee the right to invade the province of the several States in regard to primary elections?

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Well, as I understand the functioning of this committee, as it has functioned in the past, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, under the prevailing law, which we assume will be the law in the next few hours, I would say to the gentleman that this committee could exercise its jurisdiction over every primary campaign in every place where one is held.

Mr. Speaker, heretofore it has only assumed the responsibility of inquiring into irregularities, but not the conduct of the primary election as such. However, under the various laws of the various States governing primaries where there is unfairness or where the violations are such that they reach back into the constitutional processes of the election of Members of Congress, they are brought before the regular Elections Committee of the Committee on House Administration. But I repeat under the present law I believe that the committee could do just about what it wanted to do in this instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in the State of Mississippi we have a Corrupt Practices Act, for instance, that provides a limitation upon the amount of money that a candidate can spend in seeking election in a Democratic or Republican primary.

Would this committee be given the authority to go behind the laws of the State of Mississippi to determine whether they have been obeyed? In other words, is this an attempt to preempt State laws in regard to primary elections?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think I can reasonably assure the gentleman from Mississippi that it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would hope that the Federal Government is not going to extend its long arm further into the jurisdictions that belong exclusively to the several States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I join the gentleman in the expression of that wish.

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

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say to the gentleman that I have had the privilege of serving on this committee, if it can be considered as a privilege in that it meets in December during adjournment and holds hearings. This has occurred on two occasions I know of as a participating member and I may say to the gentleman as a matter of fact to my knowledge on those two occasions relating to the last two sessions of Congress and the last two elections the committee has not seen fit to go into the question of nominations but, rather, only the question of elections. That has been the practice of the committee in the past, and I assume it will be the practice in the future.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been cleared with the minority. There was no objection to it, as far as I know, in the Rules Committee. However, there seems to be a certain amount of discrepancy in that statement now. Several Members on the floor of the House would like to express themselves on that. So I would like to yield more time to the gentleman from Florida, who is thoroughly familiar with this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why we must have this select committee when we have a House Administration Committee that is empowered to go into elections? Why is this necessary?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will say to the gentleman this has been functioning now for at least 6 or 8 years, to my knowledge. It is nothing new.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the procedure of this committee, as I am sure the gentleman knows, is to investigate charges prior to the reconvening of the Congress. The committee to which the gentleman refers is out of business after the adjournment of Congress. So it is obvious some action has to be taken in the form of a select committee to sit during the adjournment of the Congress. The purpose of this is to give the select committee the opportunity to hold hearings, and use subpena powers, and thus fully investigate the matters and report to the very committee the gentleman refers to.

The subcommittee of the select committee makes a report to the full committee. Then, of course, that recommendation is acted upon by the committee the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GROSS. What is the budget, or is there a budget in connection with the operation of this committee?

Mr. CRAMER. It is very nominal. As I recall, it is approximately $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. And the money is turned back by the select committee if it is not used up in full.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. There are two questions involved in this issue. This committee is authorized to act both before and after the fact, in alleged violations in any election. It deals with the conduct of candidates and their representatives in the conduct of campaigns. It should be borne in mind this committee only recommends. It does not take any legislative action.

It recommends to the Committee on House Administration. The Committee on House Administration only assumes responsibility after the fact where there are alleged violations and a contest is filed. That is the distinction.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Another reason is these matters should be, from the investigative standpoint, at least preliminarily disposed of in a recommendation before the Congress convenes, so that Members being seated will not be questioned as to their right to be seated in the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Is this to say that the House Administration Committee cannot seek out any evidence that may be necessary prior to the convening of a session of Congress?

Mr. CRAMER. No. I specifically used the term "preliminary investigation" for the purpose of emphasizing the idea that the House Administration Committee then has an opportunity and right to go into the matter in depth if it believes it is necessary and justified.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the gentleman from Texas, who spoke in the well of the House awhile ago in answer to an inquiry as to the effect this ad hoc committee would have on the primaries, which law of the land was he referring to that might give this select committee power to inquire into primaries? Was the gentleman referring to the new civil rights law that just passed this House?

Mr. BURLESON. My inference was to the bill just passed the House. That is not to say it gives this committee any special or extra power, but because of it, they could assume a great deal more authority than they have ever exercised before.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman explain to the House by what mechanism under the authorization and the new civil rights law this committee might consider those things that went back beyond the original nomination of a Congressman?

Mr. BURLESON. It is not intended to emphasize or raise new issues in connection with the civil rights bill just passed, other than to point out that under the new impetus of a great many things, including the bill just passed, it seems that the Federal Government may go into fields which it has never touched before. This may be one of them; this unlimited power which has been given the Federal Government in elections; all these unpresented powers now given into the hands of Washington officials. Under the guise of protecting civil rights it seems that now the lid is off, and whatever the legislative branch, the executive branch, and certainly the judicial branch may assume in connection with local affairs, it can do so to a degree heretofore unimagined. That is my opinion.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas. If this applies only to the general election, then why all the hurry to get it through now? Why do not we proceed as we have in the past and pass this as one of the resolutions before we adjourn? Why all the hurry now?

Mr. BURLESON. I am not too sure I understand the gentleman's question, but from now on until November we are going to have primaries and conventions. This is not limited to the general election in November.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is different from what we hear so far as the Rules Committee is concerned. They assured us it is not to go into the primaries. We have already had our primaries in California.

Mr. BURLESON. As was stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], this is not a new procedure. This is a historical procedure. I have been on the other side on defending the creation of this committee a few years ago. I think it was to do the thing the gentleman from Iowa mentioned a while ago, to appoint a special committee.

But it would take an expansion of the work of the committee, that is if we did the things that have always been done heretofore—that we have a collection of the evidence of any violation in any election whether it be the primary or whether it be as to the election machinery or even by convention, I would assume, or whether it be with respect to the November election. This committee by its very nature is continuing through the recess of the Congress, assuming that we have one, and they accumulate such facts under allegations which may be made by any candidate or the representatives of any candidates. They submit that after the November election the House Committee on Administration would have a further investigation if it deems it proper and necessary and justified and so forth.

Now back specifically to the gentleman's question as to whether it is necessary and why it is necessary. I say it was not necessary and that the presently constituted machinery of the committees could take care of it. I am not too sure, but I have thought at the time that it was worth trying.

But this committee is empowered with a great deal more authority under this resolution than presently constituted committees are. Because, as I said, it is an after-the-fact thing—a fait accompli so far as the House Committee on House Administration is concerned. Only in cases where elections are contested for a seat in the Senate or a seat in the House of Representatives. So this committee does have a special function. There is always the question as to where the authority of this committee or any other committee for that matter stops, or when it should begin, in deference to State and local authority in these matters. That is the question, and as I said here a little bit ago, I did not intend to inject such an issue here because it is just speculation at this point. But at the same time I say that with the trend of events as of today, it would appear that the Federal Government is becoming all encompassing in all these matters anyway.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman answer this question? Then is it your idea that we are hurrying to pass a resolution which normally comes a week or 2 weeks before the session is adjourned because it is necessitated by the bill we just passed?

Mr. BURLESON. No, I would not think that really has anything to do with it. I think if it is going to be done, it had better be done at this point than to put it off and wait until we are closer to the elections. If there are violations and if accusations are made of irregularities, a record is made, a file established to present to the Elections Committee of the House Administration Committee. Evidence so collected becomes a part of any contested election subsequently filed.

Actually this select committee is in the position of policing elections and it certainly includes primaries. It submits its findings with or without recommendations. That is really its mission and its function.

Incidentally, I would prefer to give this authority to this committee than for the Civil Rights Commission to exercise its powers over the same matter. I have my doubts that the creation of this committee is necessary and about 8 or 10 years ago proposed it not be done but my views did not prevail. I repeat, if this function must be performed I would rather see this committee do it.

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why, if this committee is empowered to go into primary elections, the committee was not constituted at the beginning of this session of Congress and before many of the primary elections were held. If it is empowered to go into primary elections, why was this committee not established several months ago? It is not sufficient to try to justify this resolution simply on the grounds that it has been approved in the past.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am sorry I was momentarily off the floor, but I was called away.

This committee or rather the authority for the existence of this committee, goes back to about 30 or 40 years ago. About this time, almost to the day and the month, this committee is suggested by the Speaker of the House, whoever he may be who happens to be the occupant of the Chair.

This committee is not an investigative committee. But it was suggested first by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn. Some of you are not familiar with some of these names, but the late Percy Priest was chairman of the committee on one occasion. Then a Republican Member, the Honorable Runt Bishop, was chairman of the committee as it was constituted and authorized.

The late Congressman Mansfield from Texas was chairman, and there were a number of others whose names do not immediately come to my mind.

It so happens that I have been named as chairman of the last four committees.

This committee has the approval of the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, the minority leader, and has the approval of the majority leader, and the Speaker has always considered it of importance, because we must police the Corrupt Practices Act and lawful contributions received by candidates and make certain that laws relating to labor-management contributions are complied with.

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

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I believe we understand the committee. I believe we understand what was done before.

We have never been required to file financial statements for primaries on a Federal basis. We are required to file them in the State.

This committee has usually been appointed near the end of the session each time, rather than in the middle of the session. We in California have already held our primary. We have not filed statements. We have not been required to file statements.

Is the committee going back into the primaries?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Certainly not.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield to me?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the committee at this particular time wants to look into any primary which has been held?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Not a single one.

Mr. HALEY. Would the gentleman answer another question?

In previous resolutions of this kind have the words "nomination and" been included? I asked the gentleman from Alabama, and he was not sure.

As I see it, the resolution would give authority never granted before. If you have had it, you have not exercised it. The authority would be to look into primary nominations of various parties. I do not believe that is any place the Federal Government should be.

Would the gentleman consider accepting an amendment to cut out the words "nomination and" and leave the word "election"? In other words, what I am trying to say is, would the gentleman consider an amendment that would merely grant the right to inquire into general elections rather than primaries, where men are nominated?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Why, certainly. I have no objection. I say "I," because it so happens that I have been the chairman for the past 8 years, four times in a row.

The language of this resolution is the same language that has been in the resolution for the past 30 years. We have never gone into primary elections, and we do not intend to now, whoever may be the chairman of the committee. If it will make the gentleman feel easier, certainly I will accept an amendment to strike out the words he mentions.

Mr. HALEY. I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that everybody here knows he has had this responsibility for some time. He has been fair and impartial. Now we are also confronted with a slightly different situation, I say to the gentleman. So long as the gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman of that committee, I feel certain there would not be prying into primary elections or nominations by political parties, but we now have a little different situation. I believe that if the words "nomination and" were stricken from this resolution I could support it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I was seeking recognition to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for the purpose of an amendment?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order temporarily?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withdraw it temporarily.

Will the gentlewoman yield to me for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the purpose of offering an amendment or several amendments.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because I am only working on the rule, as I understand it. We have to wait.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be further debate, then I think there ought to be some people to hear it. Therefore, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, and evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. 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. 180]

Abbitt	Bennett, Mich.	Diggs
Ashley	Berry	Hansen
Ashmore	Bolling	Healey
Auchincloss	Buckley	Hébert
Avery	Clark	Jensen
Baker	Colmer	Jones, Mo.
Bass	Davis, Ga.	Karth
Becker	Derounian	Kee
Kilburn	Miller, N.Y.	Rostenkowski
King, Calif.	Morrison	St Germain
Kluczynski	Moss	Sibal
Lankford	Norblad	Sisk
Lesinski	Ostertag	Smith, Calif.
Lloyd	Passman	Teague, Calif.
McFall	Patman	Thompson, N.J.
McMillan	Pilcher	Utt
MacGregor	Powell	Wharton
Martin, Nebr.	Rains	Willis
Matsunaga	Rogers, Tex.	Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been considerable confusion, I know there has been in my mind and I think there is in the minds of many of the Members, since this resolution came out of the Rules Committee. We were informed at the time that this was the resolution that had been passed every 2 years for a long period of time, the author of the resolution stated since 1940.

The next question that came up on the floor, and I think it is of the greatest importance, is why this great hurry to get this resolution through now? Why can we not wait as we always have in the past until the end of the session and then have this committee appointed and have it work while the House is no longer in session and have the committee bring in its report at the beginning of January for the new Congress?

Why this speed? Why must it come out in the month of July?

Well, there is one very good reason, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and that is if this committee is to go in and investigate primaries—and State primaries at that—we were informed and I am sure he had good reason for making the statement, by the distinguished author of the bill, that that is not contemplated.

However, I would like to call your attention to the wording on page 3, line 4, section (d):

> Any statute or legislative Act of the United States or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that simply because this clause has never been invoked, it does not mean that it is impossible to invoke it. I believe very firmly that the reason for rushing this resolution now is because there are certain reasons which I do not pretend to know anything about, for going into State primaries or having them investigated by this committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to compliment the good gentlewoman on her talk because it is so much to the point. The real reason, of course, for bringing it up at this particular time is because of the passage of the civil rights bill. The question then is whether people whose nominations are

equivalent to election shall have their nominations checked to see whether they have been elected. That means we should decide whether the civil rights bill applies to Congressmen- and Congresswomen-elect as well as to the people generally. This will be a good test of the civil rights bill we have just passed to see whether it applies to Members of Congress. If it does, let us have it apply. If it does not, we should vote against the resolution.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, interested in the interpretation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I would say that in view of the fact that there are so many of us who have not quite understood the import of this legislation, I would like to see this legislation held over for the present and brought up as it always has been toward the end of the session. If not, I believe the House should have the privilege and the right of voting it either up or down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Regardless of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania just said, the past chairman of the committee, the sponsor and author of the resolution, says that this authority is not wanted for the purpose of going into a State primary. Are we supposed to believe the author of the resolution and past chairman of the committee, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In my opinion, if I may say so to the gentleman, if the author of the bill feels that way he should then be willing to take out the part of the resolution I read on page 3, starting at line 4 and ending on line 10.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman. In the absence of an amendment to that effect I certainly would vote against the resolution. If the committee is to be given authority to go into State primary elections, that authority should have been requested several months ago and before any State primaries were held. There is no reason why this resolution cannot be recalled and made acceptable to all Members of the House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is on his feet. Obviously he wishes to reply to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Of course the chairman of the committee previously is a fine gentleman. The gentleman from Tennessee has said that there has been no use to this date of the provisions of this legislation. But I must point out to the gentleman from Iowa that the provisions of the legislation especially cover nominations as well as general elections.

Finally, with respect to this whole subject, this House itself has a right to say who is elected as a Member of this House, and no resolution such as this can derogate from or take away one fraction or 1 minute of that power.

I say, finally, that if we are appointing a committee which is simply an investigating committee we are not taking away from the House Administration Committee the right of action and recommendation to this body. This is merely an investigative committee while Congress is out of session, and has no legislative weight at all. Is that correct?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Only up to a point, I say to the gentleman, in my opinion. I believe that if this committee is going to start work next week, let us say, it will be working while the House is in session and it can do a great deal while the House is in session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It can also do a great deal of damage while this House is in session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The committee will act only if there is a complaint filed and if there is a contest. It will not act otherwise; I believe the chairman of the committee said that.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I agree with the gentleman, but there may well be complaints. There may be complaints in several primaries. I can think of a State primary in my own State as to which there may be quite a serious complaint.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentlewoman not believe that if a complaint is made or a contest is filed there should be a prompt investigation and examination by this House, or by a committee, to quickly save the evidence and to hold it, because we will not meet until next year?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I do not. I do not believe this committee has any right to go into a State primary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania be kind enough to point out the language in the resolution which says that a complaint must be filed before the committee can go into a State primary election or any election, for that matter?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would cite to the gentleman the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, if he was not on the floor at the time it was made.

Mr. GROSS. I have been here all of the time, and I heard him make no such statement.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said they will not act until a complaint is filed. Is the gentleman from Tennessee still on the floor?

Mr. GROSS. I still suggest that the gentleman tell us where in the resolution it provides that a complaint must be filed.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In answer to the gentleman, this has been the practice ever since 1940. In the past 8 years, under the gentleman from Tennessee, as chairman he has followed that practice.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I repeat to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I believe what he says is entirely true, but just because a thing has not happened does not mean it will not happen, and there is nothing in the resolution to prevent the committee from going into a State primary, as I read the language.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to clear up some statements that have been made with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that in 1956—and that is as far back as my research has been permitted to go in the short time that I have had this afternoon—on July 25, 1956, a similar committee was set up by action of the House. In 1958, on July 30, this committee, in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the dates and years involved, was set up by unanimous action of this House. I might add that in each instance the action of the House was unanimous.

On July 2, 1960, exactly 4 years ago today, July 2, 1960, by unanimous action of the U.S. House of Representatives, a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures was set up. That was followed on August 9, 1962, when a special committee was created by a resolution in words and figures the same as the resolution before us, with the exception of the year and dates involved. That resolution was unanimously considered and passed by the House. Let me say also that it has just been called to my attention that on June 19, 1956, this special committee was created in words and figures the same as that in the resolution before us today by action of the House of Representatives. I believe I have already refered to the actual appointment of the committee in 1956 which took place on July 25 that year. It has been further called to my attention that in recent years this committee has been chaired by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], and, serving with him on the Democratic side has been the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and one other member of that committee. The member who served on the Republican side in those previous years was the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. I believe the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] served also for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, at this point it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I shall not require the full 5 minutes. I simply want to make a very quick statement, if I may have the full attention of the House. I am so glad the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], who is handling this rule today made the statement clearing up the fact that there is no rush about this resolution. I said from memory just a few moments ago that there is no rush, and certainly he has read from the record showing that 4 years ago exactly to this day, on July 2, 1960, this was brought to the attention of the House of Representatives. I simply say for the benefit of some of the Members who were not present a few moments ago that this com-

mittee was instituted and was suggested by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, who at that time was serving as majority leader. I am sure of the facts that far back. I think it is my recollection that this committee has been approved unanimously every 2 years in the exact language in which it has been brought to the House today.

I would remind the House that one of the early chairmen of this committee was the present distinguished occupant of the Chair, Speaker McCORMACK. The late Percy Priest was chairman one time. My good friend, the former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], when he was presiding as Speaker, as you will recall, appointed the distinguished gentleman, Mr. "Runt" Bishop, of Illinois, as Chairman. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], has been chairman. I have been appointed three times by the late Speaker Rayburn and once by Speaker McCORMACK to head this committee.

I can assure you it is a job you do not go out and seek but it has been worth while to the Members of this House because the committee polices corrupt practices. Some of you have found that some people go far afield from the Federal statutes, such as the Hatch Act, and the Labor-Management Act as they relate to campaign expenditures, and so on. So I am surprised that some of my friends on this floor today have become nervous about this situation, thinking that this committee will go into a primary.

I want you to know that the records will show that the committee has never gone into a primary election. I have been sitting here with some wonderful friends and associates and colleagues who have been on this committee with me before; the Honorable BOB JONES of Alabama, the Honorable LEO O'BRIEN of New York, and I see WILLIAM CRAMER and SAM DEVINE. I have never been associated with finer men on a committee. And they will tell you that never have we gone into a primary.

This committee has been fair. There is a great deal of staff work that has to be done. From the Secretaries of State we find the names of the nominees and they are advised of the written law governing elections. We have gone so far as to protect sitting Members and others. We have gone so far as to require a complaintant to file his complaint in writing of violations or any corrupt practices.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I point out the reason for the inquiry this time. I feel Members should have it pointed out—although I disagree—that the committee on page 3, paragraph 7 is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable.

There is this other provision that:

Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate.

And so forth.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to vote this resolution so that the committee in its time may go to work but in advance that the competent staff may advise the candidates for this office of their rights under the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support House Resolution 795. My objection to the resolution primarily springs from a conviction that the supervision of primaries in which candidates are nominated should be reserved to the States. This resolution would appear to transfer that authority to the Congress.

My more serious objection, however, is to the provisions of subsection (8). There it is provided that the committee created by the resolution shall report promptly to the Attorney General of the United States all violations of any Federal or State statutes in order that "he may take such official action as may be proper."

This is a clear case of preemption of jurisdiction by the Federal Government. Under the decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years I am convinced that the Court would construe this language to deprive States of authority to prosecute violators of State election laws in cases where the election of Members of the House of Representatives is involved. This is not a desirable result. I suspect that even the proponents of the resolution would agree with this premise.

I would hope that in the future when such resolutions are drafted the proponents would engraft upon them a savings clause preserving to the States unquestioned authority to enforce the criminal laws of the States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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. 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 264, nays 92, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—264

Addabbo	Bell	Brooks
Albert	Bennett, Fla.	Brotzman
Anderson	Blatnik	Broyhill, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boland	Broyhill, Va.
Aspinall	Bolton, Oliver P.	Burke
Baldwin	Bonner	Burkhalter
Barry	Brademas	Burleson
Beckworth	Bromwell	Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.	Hoeven	Poage
Cahill	Holifield	Poff
Cameron	Holland	Price
Carey	Horan	Pucinski
Casey	Hull	Purcell
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Quie
Chelf	Ichord	Quillen
Clancy	Jarman	Randall
Cohelan	Jennings	Reid, N.Y.
Collier	Joelson	Reifel
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Riehlman
Cooley	Jonas	Rivers, Alaska
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Roberts, Tex.
Corman	Karsten	Robison
Cramer	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Curtin	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Daddario	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Dague	Kilgore	Rooney, N.Y.
Daniels	King, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	King, N.Y.	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Dent	Knox	Rostenkowski
Denton	Kornegay	Roudebush
Derwinski	Kunkel	Roush
Devine	Landrum	Rumsfeld
Dingell	Latta	Ryan, Mich.
Dole	Leggett	Ryan, N.Y.
Dorn	Lennon	St Germain
Dowdy	Libonati	St. Onge
Downing	Lindsay	Saylor
Dulski	Long, La.	Schneebeli
Duncan	Long, Md.	Schweiker
Dwyer	McClory	Scott
Edmondson	McCulloch	Secrest
Edwards	McDade	Selden
Elliott	McDowell	Senner
Ellsworth	McFall	Sheppard
Everett	McIntire	Shipley
Evins	McLoskey	Shriver
Fallon	MacGregor	Sickles
Farbstein	Madden	Slack
Fascell	Mahon	Smith, Iowa
Feighan	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Findley	Marsh	Springer
Flood	Martin, Mass.	Staebler
Flynt	Mathias	Steed
Fogarty	Matsunaga	Stephens
Ford	Meader	Stinson
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Stratton
Frelinghuysen	Minish	Stubblefield
Friedel	Monagan	Sullivan
Fulton, Pa.	Moore	Taft
Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead	Taylor
Gallagher	Morgan	Teague, Tex.
Garmatz	Morris	Thomas
Gary	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Giaimo	Morse	Tollefson
Gibbons	Morton	Trimble
Gilbert	Mosher	Tuck
Gill	Multer	Tupper
Glenn	Murphy, Ill.	Tuten
Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.	Udall
Goodell	Murray	Ullman
Grabowski	Nedzi	Van Deerlin
Gray	Nix	Vanik
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Vinson
Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wallhauser
Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.	Watts
Griffiths	O'Konski	Weltner
Grover	Olsen, Mont.	Whalley
Hagen, Calif.	Olson, Minn.	White
Halpern	O'Neill	Wickersham
Hansen	Osmers	Widnall
Harding	Patten	Willis
Hardy	Pelly	Wilson, Charles H.
Harvey, Ind.	Pepper	Wright
Harvey, Mich.	Perkins	Young
Hechler	Pickle	Zablocki
Henderson	Pike	

NAYS—92

Abele	Clawson, Del	Langen
Abernethy	Cleveland	Lipscomb
Adair	Cunningham	McMillan
Alger	Curtis	Martin, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Foreman	Martin, Nebr.
Arends	Fountain	Matthews
Ashbrook	Fuqua	May
Ayres	Goodling	Michel
Baring	Grant	Minshall
Bates	Gross	Natcher
Battin	Gubser	Nelsen
Beermann	Gurney	Ostertag
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Pillion
Betts	Haley	Pirnie
Bow	Hall	Pool
Bray	Harsha	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Herlong	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rich
Bruce	Horton	Rivers, S.C.
Burton, Utah	Hosmer	Roberts, Ala.
Chamberlain	Huddleston	St. George
Chenoweth	Johansen	Schadeberg
Clausen, Don H.	Kyl	Schenck
	Laird	Schwengel

Short	Talcott	Whitener
Sikes	Teague, Calif.	Whitten
Siler	Thomson, Wis.	Williams
Skubitz	Van Pelt	Wilson, Ind.
Smith, Calif.	Waggonner	Winstead
Snyder	Weaver	Wyman
Stafford	Westland	Younger

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt	Fino	Mills
Ashley	Fisher	Montoya
Ashmore	Forrester	Moss
Auchincloss	Gathings	Norblad
Avery	Halleck	Passman
Baker	Hanna	Patman
Barrett	Harris	Philbin
Bass	Harrison	Pilcher
Becker	Hawkins	Powell
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	Rains
Berry	Healey	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Jensen	Roybal
Bolton, Frances P.	Johnson, Wis.	Sibal
	Jones, Mo.	Sisk
Broomfield	Karth	Staggers
Brown, Calif.	Kee	Thompson, La.
Buckley	Kelly	Thompson, Tex.
Celler	Kilburn	Toll
Clark	Kirwan	Utt
Davis, Ga.	Lankford	Watson
Delaney	Lesinski	Wharton
Derounian	Lloyd	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Macdonald	Wydler
Donohue	Miller, N.Y.	
Finnegan	Milliken	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Sibal
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. McMILLAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DAGUE, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROMWELL, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PURCELL, and Mr. ROBERTS of Texas changed their votes 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. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 795 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Kerchner" and insert "Kercher".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine;".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Truner" and insert "Turner".

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6455) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight July 9 to file a report on the bill H.R. 11611, a matter which has been cleared with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], who is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2 (to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research), and as unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1526)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a) this Act may be cited as the 'Water Resources Research Act of 1964.'

"(b) In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the field of water and of resources which affect water.

"TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

"SEC. 100. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums adequate to provide $75,000 to each of the several States in the first year, $87,500 in each of the second and third years, and $100,000 each year thereafter to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a

competent and qualified water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency (hereinafter referred to as 'institute') at one college or university in that State, which college or university shall be a college or university established in accordance with the Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts' or some other institution designated by Act of the legislature of the State concerned: *Provided*, That (1) if there is more than one such college or university in a State, established in accordance with said Act of July 2, 1862, funds under this Act shall, in the absence of a designation to the contrary by act of the legislature of the State, be paid to the one such college or university designated by the Governor of the State to receive the same subject to the Secretary's determination that such college or university has, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work under this Act; (2) two or more States may cooperate in the designation of a single interstate or regional institute, in which event the sums assignable to all of the cooperating States shall be paid to such institute; and (3) a designated college or university may, as authorized by appropriate State authority, arrange with other colleges and universities within the State to participate in the work of the institute.

"(b) It shall be the duty of each such institute to plan and conduct and/or arrange for a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated to conduct competent research, investigations, and experiments of either a basic or practical nature, or both, in relation to water resources and to provide for the training of scientists through such research, investigations, and experiments. Such research, investigations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the hydrologic cycle; supply and demand for water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States, to water research projects being conducted by agencies of the Federal and State Governments, the agricultural experiment stations, and others, and to avoidance of any undue displacement of scientists and engineers elsewhere engaged in water resources research.

"SEC. 101. (a) There is further authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 and each subsequent year thereafter sums not in excess of the following: 1965, $1,000,000; 1966, $2,000,000; 1967, $3,000,000; 1968, $4,000,000; and 1969 and each of the succeeding years, $5,000,000. Such moneys when appropriated, shall be available to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, funds made available to institutes by States or other non-Federal sources to meet the necessary expenses of specific water resources research projects which could not otherwise be undertaken, including the expenses of planning and coordinating regional water resources research projects by two or more institutes.

"(b) Each application for a grant pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall, among other things, state the nature of the project to be undertaken, the period during which it will be pursued, the qualifications of the personnel who will direct and conduct it, the importance of the project to the water economy of the Nation, the region, and the State concerned, its relation to other known research projects theretofore pursued or currently being pursued, and the extent to which it will provide opportunity for the training of water resources scientists. No grant shall be made under said subsection (a) except for a project approved by the Secretary, and all grants shall be made upon the basis of the merit of the project, the need for the knowledge which it is expected to produce when completed, and the opportunity it provides for the training of water resources scientists.

"SEC. 102. Sums available to the States under the terms of sections 100 and 101 of this Act shall be paid to their designated institutes at such times and in such amounts during each fiscal year as determined by the Secretary, and upon vouchers approved by him. Each institute shall have an officer appointed by its governing authority who shall receive and account for all funds paid under the provisions of this Act and shall make an annual report to the Secretary on or before the 1st day of September of each year, on work accomplished and the status of projects underway, together with a detailed statement of the amounts received under any of the provisions of this Act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursement, on schedules prescribed by the Secretary. If any of the moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any institute under the provisions of this Act shall by any action or contingency be found by the Secretary to have been improperly diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to any institute of such State.

"SEC. 103. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act, in addition to being available for expenses for research, investigations, experiments, and training conducted under authority of this Act, shall also be available for printing and publishing the results thereof and for administrative planning and direction. The institutes are hereby authorized and encouraged to plan and conduct programs financed under this Act in cooperation with each other and with such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the solution of the water problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this Act, and, after full consultation with other interested Federal agencies, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. He shall require a showing that institutes designated to receive funds have, or may reasonably be expected to have, the capability of doing effective work. He shall furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this Act, participate in coordinating research initiated under this Act by the institutes, indicate to them such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the institutes and between them and other research organizations, the United States Department of the Interior, and other Federal establishments.

"On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary shall ascertain whether the requirements of section 102 have been met as to each State, whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for water resources research under section 100 of this Act, and the amount which it is entitled to receive.

"The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of the receipts and expenditures and work of the institutes in all States under the provisions of this Act. His report shall indicate whether any portion of an appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor.

"SEC. 105. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction an institute is established and the government of the State in which it is located, and nothing in this Act shall in any way be construed to authorize Federal control or direction of education at any college or university.

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

"SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $1,000,000 in fiscal year 1965 and $1,000,000 in each of the nine fiscal years thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions (other than those establishing institutes under Title I of this Act), private foundations or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied. The Secretary shall submit each such proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and no appropriation shall be made to finance the same until 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days) after such submission and then only if, within said 60 days, neither the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives nor the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate disapproves the same.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 300. The Secretary of the Interior shall obtain the continuing advice and cooperation of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned with water problems, of State and local governments, and of private institutions and individuals, to assure that the programs authorized in this Act will supplement and not duplicate established water research programs, to stimulate research in otherwise neglected areas, and to contribute to a comprehensive, nationwide program of water and related resources research. He shall make generally available information and reports on projects completed, in progress, or planned under the provisions of this Act, in addition to any direct publication of information by the institutes themselves.

"SEC. 301. Nothing in this Act is intended to give or shall be construed as giving the Secretary of the Interior any authority or surveillance over water resources research conducted by any other agency of the Federal Government, or as repealing, superseding, or diminishing existing authorities or responsibilities of any agency of the Federal Government to plan and conduct, contract for, or assist in research in its areas of responsibility and concern with water resources.

"SEC. 302. Contracts or other arrangements for water resources work authorized under this Act with an institute, educational institution, or non-profit organization may be undertaken without regard to the provisions of section 3684 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, advance payments of initial expense are necessary to facilitate such work.

"SEC. 303. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is

conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Secretary may determine, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any rights which that owner may have under that patent.

"SEC. 304. There shall be established, in such agency and location as the President determines to be desirable, a center for cataloging current and projected scientific research in all fields of water resources. Each Federal agency doing water resources research shall cooperate by providing the cataloging center with information on work underway or scheduled by it. The cataloging center shall classify and maintain for general use a catalog of water resources research and investigation projects in progress or scheduled by all Federal agencies and by such non-Federal agencies of government, colleges, universities, private institutions, firms, and individuals as voluntarily may make such information available.

"SEC. 305. The President shall, by such means as he deems appropriate, clarify agency responsibilities for Federal water resources research and provide for interagency coordination of such research, including the research authorized by this Act. Such coordination shall include (a) continuing review of the adequacy of the Government-wide program in water resources research, (b) identification and elimination of duplication and overlaps between two or more agency programs, (c) identification of technical needs in various water resources research categories, (d) recommendations with respect to allocation of technical effort among the Federal agencies, (e) review of technical manpower needs and findings concerning the technical manpower base of the program, (f) recommendations concerning management policies to improve the quality of the Government-wide research effort, and (g) actions to facilitate interagency communication at management levels.

"SEC. 306. As used in this Act, the term 'State', includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to establish water resources research centers, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and for other purposes."

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
LAURENCE J. BURTON,
Manager on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
LEN B. JORDAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language agreed upon is the language of the House amendment except as herein noted.

LIFE OF PROGRAM UNDER TITLE I—STATE WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

The Senate-passed bill would authorize a permanent program of grants to establish water resources research institutes in each State and help finance research projects at such institutes. The House amendment limited the program to 10 years. The conference committee agreed to authorizing a permanent program with the understanding that the program will be reviewed periodically by the legislative committees to determine whether it is providing the water research expected, whether satisfactory results are being obtained, and whether modifications in the program are needed. The annual report of the Secretary of the Interior should be prepared with the objective of keeping the Congress fully informed with respect to this research program.

DESIGNATION OF INSTITUTIONS TO RECEIVE GRANTS

The Senate-passed bill would permit the designation of a land grant college and one or more other institutions in each State to receive grants for the establishment of research institutes. The House amendment provides for establishing a water resources research institute at only one college or university in each State, with such institute to be established at the land grant college unless otherwise provided by an act of the State legislature. The conference committee agreed that there should be not more than one water resources research institute in each State in order to prevent fragmentation of the funds available to conduct research work. The language agreed upon, differing somewhat with the House language, provides for the establishment of the institute at the land grant college or some other institution designated by act of the State legislature. Where there are two land grant colleges in one State the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, may make the designation as between the two.

ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Senate-passed bill included, under title II, additional water resources research programs involving the appropriation of $5 million in the first year increasing to $10 million in the 6th year and thereafter. These funds would be appropriated to the Secretary to make grants, contracts, matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior. The House amendment deletes this title entirely. The conference committee agreed to retain the additional water resources research programs in title II of the Senate-passed bill but to limit the amount authorized to be appropriated to $1 million a year for a period of 10 years, with the further provision that any proposed grant, contract or other arrangement financed under this title must be submitted to the Congress for the consideration of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and the House of Representatives and funds will not be appropriated for implementation thereof until 60 calendar days after such submission, and then only if, within said period, neither committee disapproves.

PATENT PROVISIONS

Section 203 of the Senate-passed bill, relating primarily to patents, provides that no part of the funds made available under the act may be expended for research work unless the expenditure is conditioned upon provisions which insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, etc. will be made fully and freely available to the general public. The House amendment deletes the language of this section and adds in lieu thereof language requiring the Secretary of the Interior to adhere to the Statement of Government Patent Policy which was promulgated by President Kennedy in his memorandum of October 10, 1963. The conference committee agreed to retain the Senate language.

In all other respects the conference committee agreed to language of the House amendment to the Senate-passed bill.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
LAURENCE J. BURTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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. 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 348, nays 0, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—348

Abele	Burkhalter	Edmondson
Abernethy	Burleson	Edwards
Adair	Burton, Calif.	Elliott
Addabbo	Burton, Utah	Ellsworth
Albert	Byrne, Pa.	Fallon
Anderson	Byrnes, Wis.	Farbstein
Andrews, Ala.	Cahill	Fascell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cameron	Feighan
	Carey	Findley
Ashbrook	Casey	Fisher
Aspinall	Cederberg	Flood
Ayres	Chamberlain	Flynt
Baldwin	Chelf	Fogarty
Baring	Chenoweth	Ford
Barry	Clancy	Foreman
Bates	Clausen, Don H.	Forrester
Battin	Clawson, Del	Fountain
Beckworth	Cleveland	Fraser
Beermann	Cohelan	Friedel
Bell	Collier	Fulton, Pa.
Bennett, Fla.	Colmer	Fulton, Tenn.
Betts	Conte	Fuqua
Blatnik	Cooley	Gallagher
Boggs	Corbett	Garmatz
Boland	Corman	Gary
Bolton, Frances P.	Cramer	Giaimo
	Cunningham	Gibbons
Bolton, Oliver P.	Curtin	Gilbert
	Daddario	Gill
Bonner	Dague	Glenn
Bow	Daniels	Gonzalez
Brademas	Davis, Tenn.	Goodell
Bray	Dawson	Goodling
Brock	Derwinski	Grabowski
Bromwell	Devine	Grant
Brooks	Dingell	Gray
Broomfield	Dole	Green, Oreg.
Brotzman	Dorn	Green, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Dowdy	Griffin
Brown, Ohio	Downing	Griffiths
Broyhill, N.C.	Dulski	Gross
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan	Grover
Bruce	Dwyer	Gubser
Burke		Gurney

Hagan, Ga.	Michel	St. Onge
Hagen, Calif.	Miller, Calif.	Saylor
Haley	Minish	Schadeberg
Hall	Minshall	Schenck
Halleck	Monagan	Schneebeli
Halpern	Montoya	Schweiker
Hanna	Moore	Schwengel
Hansen	Moorhead	Scott
Harding	Morgan	Secrest
Hardy	Morris	Selden
Harsha	Morrison	Senner
Harvey, Ind.	Morse	Sheppard
Harvey, Mich.	Morton	Shipley
Hawkins	Mosher	Short
Hechler	Moss	Shriver
Henderson	Multer	Sickles
Herlong	Murphy, Ill.	Sikes
Hoeven	Murphy, N.Y.	Siler
Holifield	Murray	Sisk
Horan	Natcher	Skubitz
Horton	Nedzi	Slack
Hosmer	Nelsen	Smith, Va.
Huddleston	Nix	Snyder
Hull	O'Brien, N.Y.	Springer
Hutchinson	O'Hara, Ill.	Staebler
Ichord	O'Hara, Mich.	Stafford
Jarman	O'Konski	Steed
Jennings	Olsen, Mont.	Stephens
Joelson	Olson, Minn.	Stinson
Johansen	O'Neill	Stratton
Johnson, Calif.	Ostertag	Stubblefield
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Sullivan
Jonas	Pelly	Taft
Jones, Ala.	Pepper	Talcott
Karsten	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
Kastenmeier	Pickle	Teague, Tex.
Keith	Pike	Thomas
Keogh	Pillion	Thompson, La.
Kilgore	Pirnie	Thompson, N.J.
King, Calif.	Poage	Thompson, Tex.
King, N.Y.	Pool	Thomson, Wis.
Kluczynski	Price	Tollefson
Knox	Pucinski	Trimble
Kornegay	Purcell	Tuck
Kunkel	Quie	Tupper
Kyl	Quillen	Tuten
Laird	Randall	Udall
Landrum	Reid, Ill.	Ullman
Langen	Reid, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Latta	Reifel	Vanik
Leggett	Reuss	Van Pelt
Lennon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Waggonner
Libonati	Rich	Wallhauser
Lindsay	Rielhman	Watts
Lipscomb	Rivers, Alaska	Weaver
Long, La.	Rivers, S.C.	Weltner
McClory	Roberts, Ala.	Westland
McCulloch	Roberts, Tex.	Whalley
McDade	Robison	White
McDowell	Rodino	Whitener
McFall	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
McIntire	Rogers, Fla.	Wickersham
McLoskey	Rooney, N.Y.	Widnall
McMillan	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Madden	Roosevelt	Wilson,
Mahon	Rosenthal	Charles H.
Marsh	Rostenkowski	Winstead
Martin, Calif.	Roudebush	Wright
Martin, Mass.	Roush	Wyman
Mathias	Roybal	Young
Matsunaga	Ryan, Mich.	Younger
Matthews	Ryan, N.Y.	Zablocki
May	St. George	
Meader	St Germain	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—84

Abbitt	Everett	MacGregor
Alger	Evins	Mailliard
Arends	Finnegan	Martin, Nebr.
Ashley	Fino	Miller, N.Y.
Ashmore	Frelinghuysen	Milliken
Auchincloss	Gathings	Mills
Avery	Harris	Norblad
Baker	Harrison	Osmers
Barrett	Hays	Passman
Bass	Healey	Patman
Becker	Hébert	Philbin
Belcher	Hoffman	Pilcher
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Poff
Berry	Jensen	Powell
Bolling	Johnson, Wis.	Rains
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Celler	Karth	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Kee	Rumsfeld
Curtis	Kelly	Sibal
Davis, Ga.	Kilburn	Smith, Calif.
Delaney	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Lankford	Staggers
Denton	Lesinski	Taylor
Derounian	Lloyd	Toll
Diggs	Long, Md.	Utt
Donohue	Macdonald	Vinson
Watson	Willis	Wilson, Ind.
Wharton	Wilson, Bob	Wydler

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Karth with Mrs. Baker.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Derounian.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Toll.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Healey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly the changes in the House-passed language in S. 2 resulting from the agreements reached in the committee on conference. For the most part the House language prevailed. The House language was used as the basis for markup in the committee on conference and only four changes were made thereto.

The House-passed bill limited the life of the program under title I, which establishes State water resources research institutes, to 10 years in order that there might be a review of the program to determine whether it was providing the water research expected and whether modifications in the program were needed. The committee on conference agreed to authorizing a permanent program with the understanding that it would be reviewed periodically by the legislative committees. The statement of managers on the part of the House carries a direction to the Secretary of the Interior to keep the Congress fully informed with respect to the program.

The second change in House language involved the designation of institutions to receive grants. The Senate-passed bill would have permitted the designation of a land-grant college and one or more other institutions in each State to receive grants for the establishment of research institutes.

The House language provided for establishing water resources research institutes at only one college or university in each State, with such institute to be established at the land-grant college unless otherwise provided by an act of the State legislature. The committee on conference agreed with the House language limiting the number of institutes to not more than one in each State, but the language permitting the State legislature to designate some other institution in lieu of the land-grant college was changed somewhat to make it a little easier for the State legislature to assume this responsibility if it chose to do so. Under the language agreed upon the land-grant college would still be designated automatically unless the State legislature acted to designate some other institution. Where there are two land-grant colleges in one State, the Governor, in the absence of a designation by the State legislature, could make the designation as between the two.

The third change in the House-approved language relates to the additional water resources research programs that would have been authorized under title II in the Senate-passed bill. In the Senate-passed bill these programs involve the appropriation of $5 million in the first year, increasing to $10 million in the sixth year and thereafter. The House-approved language deleted this title entirely.

The committee of conference agreed to retain the additional water resources research programs described in title II of the Senate-passed bill but to limit the amounts authorized to be appropriated to $1 million a year for a period of 10 years, with the further provision that any proposed grant, contract, or other arrangement under the authority given in this title would have to be reported to the Congress for a 60-day review period and funds could be appropriated for implementation only if, during this review period, neither of the legislative committees disapproved.

The fourth change in the House-approved language relates to patents in connection with the research work authorized. The committee on conference accepted the Senate language providing that no part of the funds made available under the act could be expended for research work unless the expenditures were conditioned upon provisions which insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and so forth, would be made fully and freely available to the public.

The committee on conference retained the language which the House added to the Senate-passed bill directing the establishment of some effective means for

clarifying Federal agency responsibilities in water resources research and providing effective interagency coordination of such research. This provision in the House bill which goes to all water resources research within the Federal establishment was considered by our committee as one of the most important provisions in the bill. We believe it will result in substantial savings and will eliminate duplication of research effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to the House my satisfaction with S. 2 as it has emerged from the conference committee. The reasonableness with which the conferees approached their task and resolved the differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill is apparent in the results.

I am particularly pleased with two features of the bill as it will go to the President. First, in restoring a part of the bill that had been stricken, language was added which will make it possible for the Congress to exercise control over the carrying out of the program authorized in title II. Appropriations will not be made for any grant or contract under this title until the proposal has laid before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and Senate for 60 days, and either of these committees may disapprove the proposal if it finds reason to do so.

The second is the retention of the House-sponsored language relating to coordination of water resource research activities of the Federal agencies. We have altogether too many downtown agencies operating independently in this field. We want results and we need results from water research but we do not want a continuous scramble among the agencies—the Public Health Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Geological Survey, the Forest Service, the Weather Bureau, the National Science Foundation, and a whole host of others—to outdo each other. We need to cover the whole field, to do so in a planful and systematic way, and to be sure that nothing is left undone that ought to be done and nothing done that ought not to be done. Above all we do not want wasteful duplication. Here is the nub of the problem. Section 305, I am glad to say, gives the President a tool to enforce order among the agencies. It gives him a power that must be used wisely and forcefully. If this is done, the benefits that will flow to the American people from S. 2 will be immeasurable and the pattern that is here set up for water research will be followed in other fields where similar problems exist.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentelman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the conference report regarding S. 2. The conferees have worked hard on this matter, and I believe have come up with what is the best we could hope for under the circumstances. When this bill was originally discussed in the House, I objected because the language was so strict that it made any grant for a water resources project automatically to be designated for a land-grant college. This would have practically eliminated the possibility of the University of Texas, which has an excellent water resources project underway now, to have participated in these grants. This conference report does soften that language some and makes these grants available to "land-grant schools or some other institution designated by act of the legislature." It also provides that one school can cooperate with another school in the same State to carry out the purposes of the act.

Title II has been reinserted in this bill and this provides at least $1 million per year for a total of 9 years wherein educational institutions—other than those establishing institutions under title I of this act—can undertake research into any aspect of water problems which may be related to the mission of the Department of Interior.

While this bill does not give those institutions other than land-grant schools throughout the country the exact language they want, I do believe it is a reasonable compromise. I can envision that Texas A. & M. University and the University of Texas, both excellent schools, can work together closely in this broad and important field of water research.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, S. 2, agreed to by the conferees, contains the original Senate language with regard to patents.

You will recall that in passing the bill, the House amended S. 2 to delete this language and insert a provision calling for those administering research and development to adhere to the Statement of Government Patent Policy promulgated by the late President Kennedy last October, which is fully supported by President Johnson.

The controversy over the disposition of inventions made in the performance of Government-financed research is not a new one, and, in fact, has grown over the years as the Government has become involved in more and more technical effort.

From a position of not more than 4 years ago, when industry and Government were poles apart on their views, substantial progress has been made through the normal, although admittedly slow, legislative process, aided by changes in administrative regulations.

Largely through comprehensive hearings held by the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions, which I had the honor to chair, on legislation to amend the patent provisions of the 1958 Space Act, and hearings on governmentwide patent policy before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, there evolved a much better understanding of the equities involved in Government research and development contracting with private industry, universities, and other research organizations.

One point on which there was general agreement is that Government patent policy must assure the Government of fulfilling objectives of its technical efforts, whether these be a new missile system, a large booster capability for space exploration, new processes of water purification, or methods of purifying the air we breathe, to mention but a few. In order that these, and other research and development objectives, may be accomplished quickly and at realistic cost the Government must be in a position to attract the best technical competence available, whether it be a private industry or the university. We must take into consideration the experience, background, knowledge, and technical capability required for the solution of highly complex technical problems.

It is generally recognized that patent ownership is a very complex subject and one that does not lend itself to easy solution. The varying equities involved in government-industry relationships require a great deal of flexibility and at times detailed negotiation.

Recognizing all these factors and being fully aware that a legislative solution to the overall problem of Government patent policy would be a long time developing, the President issued a statement of policy for the guidance of agencies not covered by law. The policy was developed with the advice of his Science Adviser, and with the cooperation of all Federal departments and agencies. I have spoken on this policy on several occasions in the past—to commend the President for issuing it and when the House rejected restrictive patent language in the Clean Air Act.

The President did not intend that the statement of policy would provide the final solution to the problem. He included a mechanism for review and revision, base on experience, after careful study by the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A patent advisory panel has been formed to work with agencies in the the promulgation of implementing regulations and to study the results of contractual experience. Even now every effort is being made to see that the intent of the President's policy is carried out, with due consideration of the varying governmental missions and research needs.

The Bureau of the Budget has asked that governmentwide patent policy legislation not be passed until Federal agencies have gained experience under

the policy statement and a record of performance established.

It is my sincere conviction that progress in the development of reasonable and equitable Government patent policy will be retarded by the continued adoption of restrictive patent provisions such as contained in S. 2. This language is at best ambiguous. Legal authorities have argued since its first adoption in the Helium and Coal Research Acts that they could not understand what "fully and freely available to the general public" meant. The Department of Interior has interpreted this to mean outright Government ownership of all inventions, regardless of the equities involved or the amount of public as contrasted with private, investment involved. Moreover, it has been brought to my attention on several occasions that this language has also been interpreted by the Interior Department as justification for demanding background patents—in spite of the fact that this is specifically prohibited.

Adoption of the Senate language will lead to delay in much-needed water resources research and to increased cost to the Government. This has been the experience under other research programs in agencies bound by restrictive patent provisions. An example is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This was borne out in two separate reports by the Committee on Science and Astronautics in reporting legislation to amend the patent provisions of the Space Act. In 1960 the House, acting on the committee's recommendation, passed this legislation. The Senate failed to act.

Of even greater significance, this language is not in keeping with the President's policy. In a letter to the Chairman of the House and Senate Interior Committees, Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, assistant director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, stated:

> As reported by your committee, the pertinent provisions of section 203 (section 303 of the bill) would inhibit the desirable flexibility of the administration's policy with respect to patent rights and we, therefore, recommend the deletion of those provisions from S. 2.

Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the conference report on S. 2 has been brought before the House, without opportunity to discuss the important patent provisions, is deplorable.

I do not want to belabor this point. I have stated my position on this matter as forcefully as possible under the circumstances in the hope that this will alert the Members of the House to the dangers of adopting the Senate patent language.

This is contrary to the traditional position of the House which has either initiated provisions consistent with the administration's flexible position or has rejected title provisions inserted by the other body.

The time will come when Congress will face up to its responsibilities and enact a governmentwide policy. Until this happens, I would urge that no further attempts be made to restrict Federal research programs and that the House support the President's efforts to arrive at a reasonable solution.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Congress has finally taken action on the subject of water research legislation. I introduced one of the original bills in the House of Representatives on this subject and appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of it. The bill, S. 2, when signed into law and implemented will meet two national needs—the acceleration of research in water problems and the acceleration of the training of hydroscientists, who are desperately needed to deal with the regional and national water problems that are growing so swiftly.

The bill is designed to enlist the competence of our university faculties and facilities in needed water research work and at the same time to develop and train new additional new scientists and engineers. It proposes to do this patterned after the original Hatch Act which created the system of State agriculture experiment stations. I do not believe there is a person in this Congress who has any knowledge of these facilities who could not attest to the fact of the fine work and contributions they have made to our everyday life.

Many schools throughout the country have done pioneer work in the field of water research and conservation. One of the leaders in this work is my own alma mater, the Texas A. & M. University located at College Station, Tex. Early in 1952, a water advisory council was organized at Texas A. & M. to study the water problems of Texas and to submit recommendations which would enable them to more effectively discharge the responsibility of education and research in the important area of water resources. Following this action on the part of Texas A. & M., the board of directors of the A. & M. University established the water research and information center. By this action, the board of directors directed that Texas A. & M. University take leadership in education and research programs in water resources. Also, the responsibility for publication and dispensing of research results to the public was emphasized. Since that time, A. & M. has developed an increasingly effective interdisciplinary program of cooperation between the many parts of the institution concerned with water problems. One specific result of the establishment of the water research and information center has been the successful conduct of eight Water for Texas conferences held on the campus with published proceedings available the country over.

Another result of past emphasis on water problems has been the bringing together of many documents on water and hydrology in the form of a collection. This collection, which includes many publications not available anywhere in the country, is housed in the Texas Professional Engineers Library located on the Texas A. & M. University campus.

In the field of research, over 100 Texas Agricultural Experiment Station research projects deal either directly or indirectly with water. In addition, many water projects are included in the research activities of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station and the Texas A. & M. Research Foundation. In the past 4 years, there have been over 100 graduate theses having some bearing on hydrology completed at the Texas A. & M. University. During the past year Texas A. & M. has become a member of the university council on hydrology, a voluntary organization of leading universities with a demonstrated interest in strong programs of teaching and research in the field of hydrology.

The Texas A. & M. University board of directors has just recently approved the renaming of the water research and information center to the water resources institute. At the same time the organization is being given added strength so that greater emphasis can be placed on research and education in water resources on a multidisciplinary basis. The institute will provide a focal point for concentrating the many aspects of A. & M.'s total resources effort toward a unified plan for the better understanding and solution of water problems.

The Texas A. & M. University is ready, willing, and able to assume the leadership for the research activities provided for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that I had a personal part in its passage.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight July 9 to file a report on H.R. 11611. This matter has been cleared.

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

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE AVIATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Kerchner" and insert "Kercher".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "A. M. Pride, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine;".

Page 2, line 20, strike out "Truner" and insert "Turner".

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been objecting to these late afternoon unanimous-consent requests for the passage

of legislation, some of which has been minor legislation and some of which has been rather far reaching. The particular bill which is presently before the House, as I understand it, would merely grant a Federal charter to a group in Ohio; is that correct?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the purpose of setting up an air museum into which there will be no Federal money. Is that correct?

Mr. FORRESTER. Not only no Federal money but let me say it has already been passed by the House. This is simply to concur in a Senate amendment which simply changes the name of a person erroneously placed in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has previously explained the bill to me and I shall not object at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6455), to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—dealing with unrelated business taxable income—with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. A few moments ago I objected to the consideration of this bill in line with the statement that I just made. The bill has been explained to me as being one of an emergency nature. If it is not passed at this time I understand that damage may result. Therefore, I will withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, as passed unanimously by the House on April 14, 1964, H.R. 6455 provided an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in the case of labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations where certain conditions are met. These conditions were that, first, the income must be used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of aged and infirm members of the labor union or agricultural or horticultural organization; second, the income must be derived from agricultural pursuits conducted on ground contiguous to the home, hospital, and so forth; and third, this income may not represent more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the home, and so forth.

The bill was passed by the other body with one amendment only, relating to the effective date of the bill. Under the Senate amendment, the provisions of the bill would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, instead of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, as provided in the House-passed bill.

I urge that the House accept the amendment of the Senate.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1529)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $5,227,506,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $4,341,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $177,450,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $261,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following sum: $623,525,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
JAMES FULTON,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN STENNIS,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendments were $5,246,293,250. This represented an increase over the House bill of $52,482,750. As a result of the conference this figure was adjusted so that total appropriations authorized are $5,227,506,000.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are conforming amendments reflecting the total revised authorizations resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Amendment No. 3: NASA requested a total of $26 million to fund its advanced missions program which is designed to plan an extension of the national space capability. The House reduced this amount by $3,900,000. The Senate amendment No. 3 restored this reduction. Since subsequent developments and NASA testimony disclosed that this funding will facilitate better programing and provide essential information for future program decisions, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration. Thus the total amount approved for advanced missions program is $26 million.

Amendment No. 4: NASA requested $190,200,000 for the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill reduced this

amount to $174,200,000, representing reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory, Orbiting Solar Observatory and Orbiting Geophysical Observatory projects. The Senate amendment No. 4 concurred in the reductions in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory and Orbiting Solar Observatory projects, but restored the full amount of the House reduction in the Orbiting Geophysical Observatory project. The House bill provided for a reduction of $6,500,000 for this project from a total request of $55,400,000. This reduction was justified by the House on the basis that the $6,500,000 pertained to the last three of a total of eight Orbiting Geophysical Observatories which NASA planned to launch during the period calendar year 1964 through 1968 and that the last three observatories might not be required during this period. The House was not convinced, in view of past launch experience, that the planned launching of two geophysical observatories each year was realistic or that the lifetime of an observatory would not be increased beyond the 1-year lifetime predicted by NASA. Therefore, the House recommended that the NASA launch schedule be amended to provide for the launching of one geophysical observatory each year, thereby rescheduling the launching of the last three observatories during the 1969–71 period. Under the House-recommended launch schedule, it was considered inappropriate to provide funds at this time for activities which would take place 5 to 7 years after the date that funds were provided. Therefore, the House recommended deferring any action on the last three observatories until future year presentations, at which time a more meaningful evaluation could be made of future geophysical observatory requirements. The restoration was made by the Senate because of persuasive NASA testimony that the launching of two observatories each year was necessary for the timely and proper phasing of support to the Apollo program. The managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $3,250,000, instead of the $6,500,000 included in the Senate amendment No. 4. The managers on the part of the House stipulated, and the Senate conferees agreed that this limited restoration would be used only for the sixth planned geophysical observatory and that action on subsequent observatories would be deferred until future year presentations.

Amendment No. 5: NASA requested $300,400,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program. The House bill reduced this amount to $282,100,000, representing a reduction of $12,300,000 in the Surveyor project and $5,000,000 in the Lunar Orbiter project. The Senate version of the bill restored $12,300,000 for the Surveyor project, but concurred with the House reduction of $5,000,000 in the Lunar Orbiter project.

The managers on the part of the Senate, noting that the Surveyor project has recently experienced delays in its schedule, and being convinced by the reasoning of the House regarding the last two of the lightweight, limited capability series of Surveyor spacecraft, receded and agreed to the original House action.

Amendment No. 6: NASA requested $46,000,000 for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount. The Senate amendment No. 6 reduced this amount by $6 million for the purpose of stabilizing this program at the funding level of fiscal year 1964; that is, $40 million.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to the original House action. Accordingly, the full amount of the request is authorized. This action was taken on the basis that the requested amount represents a very modest increase in the level of effort in this important program over fiscal year 1964. Any reduction would result in disruption of long-term planning, particularly in the training grants part of the program which provides 3-year predoctoral opportunities for selected graduate students at qualified universities.

Amendment No. 7: NASA requested $267,900,000 for tracking and data acquisition. The House bill approved a total authorization of $255,900,000, reducing this item by $12 million. Senate amendment No. 7 restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. In view of additional NASA testimony presented to the Senate on this item, the managers on the part of the House agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million. Of these funds, $2,500,000 is to be applied to the equipments and components portion of the program, and $3,500,000 is to be applied to network operations. The total amount authorized for this item is $261,900,000.

Amendment No. 8: This is a conforming amendment which specifies the revised total authorization for construction of facilities resulting from the restoration of funds included in Senate amendments Nos. 9, and 11 through 16.

Amendment No. 9: NASA requested $2,630,000 for the construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. The House deferred this project. The Senate amendment No. 9 restored this item. Testimony taken by the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a need exists for this simulator in order to conduct experiments in connection with supersonic transports and to meet requirements of FAA and DOD. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendment No. 10: The Senate amendment specifies the location of the Electronics Research Center as the Boston, Mass., area.

Amendments Nos. 11 through 16: NASA requested $224,910,000 for the Office of Manned Space Flight for construction of facilities. The House reduced this amount by $21,491,000. The Senate amendments Nos. 11 through 16 restored $10,245,500 of this amount. In conference, the managers on the part of the House agreed that the House reduction was too severe because the major portion of the facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedules for Gemini and Apollo. Consequently, the House receded and agreed to the restoration of these construction items. Further, the conferees recognized the need for public facilities at the John F. Kennedy Space Center. It is the sense of the conferees that the restored funds will allow start of construction of the necessary public facilities.

An additional restoration of $1,670,000 for an Apollo Network Ground Station in the Northwest Pacific area contained in Senate amendment No. 16 was originally deferred by the House. Subsequently, NASA selected a site at Guam for this tracking station. Later testimony before the Senate showed that construction of this station must be started at once if it is to be operational when needed. In view of the foregoing, the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration.

Amendment No. 17: NASA requested $641 million for administrative operations. The House approved $617,525,500. The Senate amendment No. 17 restored $11,737,250. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to limit the restoration to $6 million. The total reduction is therefore $17,474,500, resulting in an authorization of $623,525,500 for administrative operations.

Amendment No. 18: This is a conforming amendment which revises the ceiling related to construction of facilities in keeping with the actions of the conferees.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
JAMES FULTON,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the results of the conference on H.R. 10456, the 1965 space authorization bill, follow the policy of our House Science and Astronautics Committee in strictly evaluating NASA budgetary needs.

The House conferees went to the conference fully aware that the Senate conferees had been guided by the more lenient policy of the Senate Space Committee in the restoration to NASA of better than $52 million. NASA originally requested $5,304 million. The House on the recommendation and report of the House Science and Astronautics Committee reduced this by $110,189,500 to a total of $5,193,810,500, the amount passed by the House.

I should point out that the House committee action was based upon information given in testimony during the early part of this year. As the Members well know, technology moves at such a rapid pace today that considerable change in projects and programs can occur in a few months.

To some degree this is the case with regard to the Senate committee action. The Senate committee received testimony from NASA at a later date than the House Committee. This testimony contained new information that, to a modest degree, modified the House committee position.

The House conferees, therefore, agreed to restore to NASA $33,695,500 of the $110 million originally eliminated. Restoration mostly resulted from more specific planning and programing and introduction of new information pertaining to more recent progress in specific programs.

In any event, the original NASA request has been reduced by $76,494,000, which is a substantial saving, without hurting the space program. It is personally rewarding to me to have been part of the people in the House working to save this $76,494,000 during the coming fiscal year, for the American taxpayers.

We have attempted to provide NASA with the money adequate to fulfill its objectives. At the same time, we have tried to impress upon NASA the need for strict and economic procedures.

In a real way, NASA has been experiencing the critical review of the House Science and Astronautics Committee through its NASA Oversight Subcommittee. I need only to point to what the

subcommittee has done to improve the Centaur program. More recently, its investigation into the Ranger program has already produced marked managerial improvements in NASA. Such activities inevitably result in efficiency and in the eventual reductions in cost. I cite these only to show the committee's continuing concern with the efficiency of NASA management and the judicious expenditures of its funds.

I believe the results of the conference are realistic and reasonable. The House in good conscience should have no difficulty in agreeing to the acceptance of the conference report. As a conferee, I signed the unanimous conference report, and favor passage of this conference report.

In order that the Members will have complete and adequate information on the legislative action taken at this time on the NASA fiscal year 1965 authorization, I submit to the House the following figures:

Action on conference committee on NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1965 (H.R. 10456)

	Budget request	House approved	Senate approved	Conference committee approved (June 30, 1964)
Research and development:				
Gemini	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000	$308,400,000
Apollo	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000	2,677,500,000
Advanced missions	26,000,000	22,100,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Geophysics and astronomy	190,200,000	174,200,000	180,700,000	177,450,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	300,400,000	283,100,000	295,400,000	283,100,000
Sustaining university program	46,000,000	46,000,000	40,000,000	46,000,000
Launch vehicle development	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000	128,200,000
Bioscience	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Meteorological satellites	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Communication satellites	12,600,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
Advanced technological satellites	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Basic research	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
Space vehicles systems	38,800,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Electronic systems	28,400,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Human factor systems	16,200,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Nuclear-electric systems	48,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Nuclear rockets	58,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000
Chemical propulsion	59,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000	62,800,000
Space power	13,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Aeronautics	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
Tracking and data acquisition	267,900,000	255,900,000	265,400,000	261,900,000
Technology utilization	5,000,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Administrative operations	641,000,000	617,525,500	629,262,750	623,525,500
Construction of facilities:				
Ames Research Center	6,081,000	3,038,000	5,668,000	5,668,000
Electronics Research Center	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Goddard Space Flight Center	1,300,000	1,221,000	1,221,000	1,221,000
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	3,714,000	3,582,000	3,582,000	3,582,000
John F. Kennedy Space Center	[1] 91,561,000	83,594,000	87,070,000	87,070,000
Langley Research Center	4,454,000	3,938,000	3,938,000	3,938,000
Lewis Research Center	810,000	770,000	770,000	770,000
Manned Spacecraft Center	25,166,000	22,649,000	23,907,500	23,907,500
Marshall Space Flight Center	15,288,000	13,759,000	14,523,500	14,523,500
Michoud Plant	6,534,000	5,881,000	6,207,500	6,207,500
Mississippi Test Facility	61,999,000	55,792,000	58,891,500	58,891,500
Wallops Station	1,804,000	1,749,000	1,749,000	1,749,000
Various locations	[1] 37,297,000	32,362,000	35,352,500	35,352,500
Facility planning and design	15,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total	281,000,000	248,335,000	262,880,500	262,880,500
Grand total	5,304,000,000	5,193,810,500	5,246,293,250	5,227,506,000

	Research and development	Construction of facilities	Administrative	Total
Total	$4,341,100,000	$622,880,500	$623,525,500	$5,227,506,000
Less than NASA request	40,900,000	18,119,500	17,474,500	76,494,000
Less than Senate approved	13,050,000	0	5,737,250	18,787,250
More than House approved	13,150,000	14,545,500	6,000,000	33,695,500

[1] Original budget request showed $300,000 less for John F. Kennedy Space Center and $300,000 more for various locations. House and Senate action include an Apollo network ground station in the John F. Kennedy Space Center budget item.

Mr. MILLER of California. 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. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in a bill authorizing over $5 billion there were relatively few differences between the House and the Senate. As a matter of fact, there was approximately $52 million difference between the two Houses, and you can readily see that this represents only approximately 1 percent of the total.

After conference we have adjusted total appropriations authorized in H.R. 10456 to slightly over $5.2 billion. Permit me to take just a few moments to briefly advise the House of the results of the conference.

The first item to be considered was NASA's advanced missions program, for which it was asking $26 million. The House reduced this by $3,900,000 but receded in conference, because we became convinced that full funding for this program will facilitate better programing and provide essential information for future program decisions.

We compromised with the Senate on the geophysics and astronomy program. The House bill provided for a reduction of $6,500,000 for this program, and the Senate restored that amount. We agreed to a limited restoration of $3,250,000 instead of the $6,500,000 in order to provide for an additional geophysical observatory launch and obtained agreement with the Senate that action on subsequent observatories would be deferred until future year presentations.

The Senate amendment restored $12,300,000 for the lunar and planetary exploration program whereas the House had cut that amount from the NASA budgetary request. We were successful in maintaining our position, and the Senate receded and agreed to the full $12,300,000 reduction.

NASA requested $46 million for the sustaining university program. The House bill authorized the entire amount because this represented only a very modest increase in the level of effort of fiscal year 1964, and it was felt that the $6 million reduction provided by the Senate amendment would result in disruption of long-term planning, particularly in the training-grant part of the program, which provides 3-year predoctoral opportunities for selected graduate students at qualified universities. The Senate agreed with the House figure and thus the $6 million cut in the program was restored.

In the tracking and data acquisition program the House bill reduced this amount by $12 million. The Senate amendment restored $9,500,000 of this reduction. The House agreed to a limited restoration of $6 million and thus compromised with the Senate on this program.

The House eliminated NASA's request for construction of a flight simulator for the advanced aircraft facility at Ames Research Center. Testimony given the Senate subsequent to the House action convinced the managers on the part of the House that a real need exists for this simulator in order to conduct necessary experiments in connection with supersonic transports and to meet requirements of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Defense Department. For this reason the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration of this item.

Amendments 11 through 16 in the conference report all pertain to construction items. The House had reduced these items by $21,490,000 in order to require NASA to perform more austere construction. The Senate amendment had reduced the NASA budgetary request for these items by 5 percent, and the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate figure, because it was felt that the House reduction had been too severe.

The major portion of these facilities are operational in nature and are in support of the flight schedule for Gemini and Apollo, and because of the fact take on added significance.

In an additional restoration the House receded and agreed to a $1,670,000 item for an Apollo network ground station in the Northwest Pacific area. When NASA appeared before the House Committee to justify its budget requests it

was not known where this station would be located, and as a result the House committee felt it was justified in deferring the item until the selection had been made. Subsequently, testimony before the Senate fixed the location of the station at Guam, and consequently the managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to restore this item.

The House reduced NASA's request for administrative operations by approximately $24 million and the Senate, although reducing the request, restored about $11 million. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to limit the restoration to only $6 million. Therefore there is a total reduction in the administrative operations item of $17,474,500.

There are other amendments listed in the conference report but these are merely conforming amendments reflecting total revised authorizations resulting from the actions of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have reached a fair and equitable final authorization figure for NASA. Naturally it was necessary for us to compromise with the Senate conferees, but we found that on more than one occasion additional testimony given to the Senate after the House action on the bill had been completed changed the picture, and when we found this to be true, in all good conscience we felt that we should recede to the Senate position which was based on later information than had been available to the House. In other areas we found it necessary to recede when we were honestly convinced that we probably had been too severe in reducing some of NASA's budgetary requests. However, in other items we stood for the House position and were able to obtain substantial reductions in the overall Senate figure.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House today provides to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration approximately the amount requested by that agency to fulfill its programs for the next year. It provides for the orderly accomplishment of our important national space effort. The necessary funds for research and development, administrative operations and construction of facilities were agreed to by House and Senate conferees to assure these objectives.

It is notable among these items that a public facility at the John F. Kennedy Space Center is provided for, filling a much-needed gap in our ability to bring to the public the accomplishments and growth of the space program so graphically portrayed by the work of this Center.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conference committee on H.R. 10456, I commend my colleagues who served as House conferees for the excellent work which they did in the House-Senate conference. The able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER of California, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], the able former Speaker of the House, the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] performed yeoman service in the conference.

There are several decisions of the conference committee to which I would like to call the attention of the House. The NASA request for tracking and data acquisition amounted to $267,900,000, of which the House initially approved $255,900,000. The Senate had recommended $265,400,000. The conference voted $261,900,000 because it was felt that the operation of the worldwide tracking network and more particularly the necessary equipment and components for that networks warranted the authorization of this amount.

I would like to mention that some increases were made in the conference over the House position in the area of construction of facilities. Under the heading of "Various locations," some increases were held to be necessary because at the time of our authorization hearings the site had not yet been selected for the Northwest Pacific Tracking Station, and the House committee had initially voted to defer this item when it was considered last March. However, a site was subsequently selected in Guam, and NASA has informed the committee that with the required operational date of March 1967, the year of authorization and funding became particularly critical for this station. This has been coordinated with the Department of Defense. The Senate, in the light of these developments, voted to retain funds for this station, and the conference committee decided because of this late information to support the funding of this Apollo tracking station.

Among the other items discussed in conference, Mr. Speaker, I want to call particular attention to NASA's program for aircraft noise abatement research. Thanks to the able work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD], we had some excellent hearings on this subject during which the point was forcefully made that more aggressive work needed to be carried forward on this subject.

For the fiscal year 1964, NASA programed $750,000. For the fiscal year 1965, NASA asked for only $485,000. Following our authorization hearings in the House, the House committee voted to require NASA to expend a total of $2 million out of the $37 million authorized in the field of aeronautics for the specific purpose of noise abatement research. The Senate felt that, after testimony by NASA, this additional amount could not be "expended efficiently." The House conferees felt very strongly that additional stress should be placed on this serious and growing problem, and as a result the conference voted to authorize NASA to expend $1,485,000 of the $37 million for noise abatement, and to report by January 15, 1965 on the progress made and the future plans for research in this vital area.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe the conference report constitutes a constructive compromise and it is deserving of support by the House.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight July 11 to file reports on the following bills: H.R. 4731, H.R. 11083, H.R. 11241, S. 1451, and H.R. 5673.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile; and

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until July 20, 1964.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have lived through many years, and have seen many changes. Life is change and there is no enduring status quo. This is the second day of July and all about us are the signs and insignia of summer and ahead are weeks of the heat and the sunshine and the glory and the beauty of summertime. Yet for 11 days summer has been in the path of death. After June 21 the days started to shorten and even while we were in the midst of summer we had started on our course to fall and the chills of winter. Without change, constant change, that we fight from noticing and acknowledging there could be no life.

May I say to the Yankee from New Hampshire, who weeps and wails with my good and beloved friends from the Southland at the grave of the status quo of the yesteryear, that there will be a new today and a new tomorrow and that life will go on. May I say to him that life could not go on, because change is the very essence of life, if it remained handcuffed to a status quo as remote as the old slave days when the ancestors of many fellow Americans were brought to our shores, slaves to be bartered in as animals in the field.

Mr. Speaker, the old order has passed. Ours is a God-fearing and a God-respecting country. I am 82 and the farther I walk toward the western sunset the more I am confirmed in my own faith that all individuals and all nations are the instruments of a Divine purpose. That, Mr. Speaker, is my faith. That, Mr. Speaker, is my interpretation of my wide reading of the history of mankind in all the centuries as it has been recorded.

I have lived a long life. I am the oldest Member of this great, distinguished, and historic body. I regard today as one of the great and meaningful dates in the history of mankind in its long and tedious climb to the heights. Mr. Speaker, in the closeness we have come to the brotherhood of men with the purpose of the Divine, this has been one of the happiest and most soul-satisfying days of my life.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 321

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House, House Concurrent Resolution 321 with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 4, insert:

"*Resolved further,* That when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 10, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, July 20, 1964."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 20, 1964

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader concerning the program for the week of July 20, 1964.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the minority leader, the program for the week of July 20 is as follows:

There is no legislative business on Monday, when the House will reconvene.

For Tuesday, we will have the Consent Calendar, the Private Calendar, and nine suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 11241, Nurses Training Act of 1964.

H.R. 11083, graduate public health training amendments.

H.R. 319, protection of postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter.

H.R. 11438, to amend the 1959 Alaska Omnibus Act.

H.R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

H.R. 10485, Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964.

H.R. 11754, amendments to Foreign Service Buildings Act.

H.R. 11832, amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended.

H.R. 1341, safety standards for federally purchased vehicles.

For the balance of the week, H.R. 3846, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

There is an open rule, except closed for provisions of the bill dealing with gasoline taxes and provides 4 hours of general debate.

This statement is made, subject, of course, to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

PUERTO RICANS CONTRIBUTE TO AMERICAN CULTURE AS DEMONSTRATED BY THIRD ANNUAL SAN JUAN FESTIVAL IN SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, ever since the English settlers landed at Jamestown, Va., and the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts, there has been constant migration of peoples from all over the world to America's shores, and they have been absorbed into the mainstream of American continental life. The latest group to come to our continental shores to work, thrive, prosper, and produce in the manner of good Americans are the Puerto Ricans.

There are many examples of successful Puerto Ricans in present-day American business, professions, and culture. He or she has an opportunity to achieve success in this land of opportunity and the Puerto Rican's will to win is certain to elevate him to a position of prominence on the American scene.

Already recognized as persons of great genius are several Puerto Ricans of superior ability. Of these, the outstanding examples are José Ferrer, the stage and screen star; Jesus Maria Sanroma, famous pianist; Graciela Rivera, of the Metropolitan Opera; Noro Morales, orchestra leader; and Mapy Cortes, Dioso Costello, Olga San Juan, Maria del Pilay, and Juano Hernandez, of Hollywood, and Brig. Gen. Pedro del Valle, of the U.S. Marines, decorated for bravery at Guadalcanal in World War II.

The Puerto Rican community also has produced doctors, dentists, social workers, lawyers, and businessmen of the highest caliber.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Puerto Ricans who have come to our continental shores have settled in my home city of Springfield, Mass. They are overcoming the language barrier problem and have become good neighbors. It is a joy to see these Puerto Ricans in Springfield absorbing the new continental culture while cherishing and maintaining some of the culture of their island homeland. This is demonstrated particularly during their annual San Juan festival in Springfield, which is a period of gaiety, sentimentalism, folk dancing, and religious observance. Under permission granted, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield Daily News of June 27 entitled "San Juan Festival," and a news story about the festival taken from the Springfield Republican of June 28:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, June 27, 1964]

SAN JUAN FESTIVAL

Springfielders of Puerto Rican origin are today launching their third annual 2-day San Juan festival.

The celebration is a reminder that this relatively new group of arrivals is becoming more and more firmly rooted in the city.

Living is by no means easy for perhaps the majority of Puerto Ricans who have decided to settle permanently in the continental United States. Certainly, they have many problems of adjustment in Springfield. There are cultural and language barriers to be removed before many Puerto Ricans can really feel at home here and in most of the other areas where they are newcomers.

However, we believe Springfield as a whole is conscious of these problems—and has the dedicated people of good will on hand to insure, by extending help, that, in the long run the transition will be successful. There has been marked progress in this direction already.

That it will continue, despite hindrances and handicaps, we are confident.

We salute this group of Springfielders on the occasion of their festival days.

[From the Springfield Republican, June 28, 1964]

PUERTO RICAN COMMUNITY OPENS SAN JUAN FESTIVAL

Puerto Ricans of Springfield, Holyoke, and other western Massachusetts communities brightened the downtown here Saturday night with a parade of lovely ladies, a queen enthroned on a float, and a group of children, clad in white, who recently received their first communion.

The occasion was the annual San Juan Fiesta, which is the Puerto Rican's special cultural contribution to Springfield area, echoing a gay traditional festival in Puerto Rico dedicated to St. John the Baptist.

STATUE IN PROCESSIONS

A statue of St. John was borne during the procession from Bond Street to Sacred Heart Church by Louis Jusino, Carmel Perez, Feliz Leon, and Nazario Gutierre.

The 2-day celebration was launched with the procession to Sacred Heart Church for a mass celebrated by Rev. Thomas McCarthy, assisted by Rev. Santiago Nunez. Both priests are closely associated with Puerto Rican activities in this area.

QUEEN IN PROCESSION

Following the mass, the queen for 1964, Miss Maria Perez, and her two attendants, Miss Luiz Olivera and Miss Josephine Rosario, and a flower girl, joined the procession on a colorful float.

The Mount Carmel Drum and Bugle Corps supplied a lively drum beat, flutes, and bugles for the procession as it went south on Chestnut Street to Bridge, then west to Main Street and north to Memorial Square where the dance plaza was set up in a parking lot between Bond and Carew Streets.

Miss Sarita Balles and Miss Olga Ramos led the procession carrying the flag of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The commonwealth, Puerto Ricans are quick to point out, is a U.S. territory, and its citizens are U.S. citizens.

CROWDS CHEER

As the procession approached Memorial Square, the heart of the Puerto Rican district, hundreds lined the sidewalks and cheered for the queen and her entourage.

Riding in one of the shiny convertibles in the procession was Miss Maria Sylvester Romon, 75, of 79 Sargeant St., who will be honored today as the senior citizen of the Puerto Rican community.

The park and recreation department's mobile music shell was set up in the dance plaza but the coronation was delayed by two power failures. The first was apparently caused by children who kicked a wire loose.

GENERATOR STALLS

A portable generator was pressed into use, but it stalled a few minutes later, and refused to restart. Finally, the attendants got permission from Manuel Silva of the nearby "Famous Dog" restaurant to pick up the power from his establishment.

The queen was crowned by Miss Anna Burgos who was fiesta queen in 1962. The new queen, 21, is employed as a fitter for the American Linen Supply Co. and is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Regustine Perez of 45 Holyoke St.

Genaro Medina was master of ceremonies for the coronation dance, and music was furnished by the Catala Trio.

TRIBUTES TODAY

Among those who will receive fiesta tribute today will be Mrs. Romon, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Deleon of 122 Clyde St., parents of the largest family in the Puerto Rican community with 11 children, and Victor Lopez and Daniel Diaz, best students of the year.

Also to be honored will be the queen's attendants and entourage, who were runners-up in the balloting for queen: Miss Rosario, Miss Oliver, Miss Myrta Jusino, Miss Alicia Gonzalez, Miss Aida Lopez, Miss Milta Garcia, Miss Gladys Rodriguez, and Miss Carmen Cordero.

The program will resume today at 2 p.m. with games for the children and a domino tournament for the men.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE STUDENTS AID AND ABET VIETCONG

Mr. HUDDLESTON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have followed with increasing interest a situation at Haverford College, Philadelphia, Pa., involving a student group that has been organized to collect money to buy medical supplies for the Vietcong forces in southeast Asia.

The existence of such a student movement is an appalling commentary on the failure of certain segments of our educational system to instill in our youth a proper appreciation and understanding of their benefits and responsibilities as Americans. Fortunately, the Haverford movement is limited in scope. Yet the existence of such a movement, while other Americans are giving their very lives to defend Vietnam from Vietcong aggression, should not be permitted to go unnoticed.

The facts of the Haverford College movement are these: Four students announced in mid-April that they were collecting funds to purchase medical supplies to ship to what the leader of the group termed "The Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam." At that time they claimed that the movement was spreading to other colleges and universities and that the total membership of their group numbered 50. The name given the group was the "Student Committee To Send Medical Aid to the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam."

The community response to the formation of this student group was best summed up by an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which stated in part:

College students in the United States are traditionally free thinkers and free talkers, which is all well and good. As they go through the process of acquiring an education, many of them move through a phase of questioning the status quo, of rebelling intellectually against the mores of the times. * * * There is no harm in this—provided it is kept within reasonable bounds. But the American GI's in Vietnam, who understand the threat of communism, would be high on the list of those who believe that what these Haverford youngsters are doing constitutes aiding and abetting an enemy—an enemy not only of their country but of human freedom.

Further emphasizing this last point, the chairman of the Philadelphia Veterans Advisory Commission, Mr. William J. Lederer, stated:

Over 200 American youths have died for their country in Vietnam. These (students') stupid utterances can cost many more lives in Vietnam.

Considering the nature and extent of this country's commitment in South Vietnam, any effort to furnish supplies of any kind to Communist forces in South Vietnam does indeed constitute furnishing aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies. In recent days high American officials, including the President, have made it known to the world that this country is prepared to risk a general war if necessary to defend the free world's interests in South Vietnam and southeast Asia. Not only the lives of our servicemen involved in South Vietnam, but the lives and the national interest of every American are therefore at stake in this war. Considering these factors, I am of the opinion that the activities of the Haverford students' group are not merely the actions of foolish youth, but dangerous and intolerable disloyalty to the country and the cause of freedom everywhere.

Yet, despite the paramount interests involved in this matter, it is regrettable, to say the least, that some highly placed Haverford spokesmen have in effect encouraged these misguided students in their pernicious conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the Haverford Vietcong sympathizers can be neither excused nor justified in the name of academic freedom, as some college spokesmen would have us believe. We are in a deadly war in southeast Asia, just as deadly to those directly involved as was World War II to those of us who served our country two decades ago. Consider what would be said of a group of students who had organized in the mid-1940's to furnish medical supplies to the country's Nazi enemies. Yet Dr. Hugh Borton, president of Haverford, had this to say about his students' pro-Vietcong committee:

Haverford College holds that openminded and free inquiry is essential to a student's educational development. Thus, the college recognizes the right of all students to engage in discussion, to exchange thought and opinion and to speak or write freely on any subject. The freedom to learn, to inquire, to speak, to organize, and to act with conviction within the bounds of law are held

at Haverford College to be a cornerstone of education in a free society.

But, we may ask Dr. Borton, how long will the society stay free when the furnishing of aid and comfort to the enemies of our freedom is regarded permissively by our educational leaders? To categorize the activities of the Haverford Vietcong sympathizers as "openminded and free inquiry" is a new height not in academic freedom but in academic fatuousness. With this kind of attitude prevalent among their educational leaders, it is small wonder that some Haverford students are so misguided as to have embarked on such a misguided venture.

Dr. Borton refers to acting with conviction "within the bounds of law." In this regard, I have sent a letter of inquiry to the Department of Justice to ascertain pertinent laws covering the Haverford pro-Vietcong movement, and to ask what action, if any, is possible to curb this and similar movements to assist the Nation's enemies. While it is true that this country is not officially at war in southeast Asia, it is equally true that American lives and resources are involved in the defense of our national interests in that theater of the world. Call it what you will, it is war to the American fighting man engaged in the struggle against the Vietcong. And if laws sufficient to cover the Haverford situation are not presently on the books, I then propose to look into the feasibility of preparing legislation which will prevent the furnishing of aid and comfort to the Nation's enemies in those specific areas of the world where American lives and the national interest are directly threatened.

ROA HONORS CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, under the leadership of the new national president, Adm. Edgar H. Reeder, of Montana, honored on today three congressional leaders for distinguished service to the national defense and Organized Reserve. Those honored are: KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York; DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; and HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California.

At a luncheon attended by Members of Congress, Reserve Officers Association officers and press representatives, the honorees were presented with honorary life memberships in the Reserve Officers Association. Col. John T. Carlton, well known on Capitol Hill, is the executive director of the Reserve Officers Association.

AMERICA SHOULD REMAIN A SANCTUARY FOR DIVERSITY

Mr. POOL. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, as persons and as a people, we construct our lives upon certain foundation principles.

When those principles change, the change should come as the result of painful decision, accompanied by clear recognition of the alteration and its significance.

I am deeply disturbed that we as a people are not cognizant of an alteration in basic American political theory which has taken place here in the early days of this midcentury summer.

Our Government, as our schoolchildren can recite, is based on a system of checks and balances. But the balance goes beyond the formal division of the Government into legislative, judicial, and executive branches, and even beyond the deliberate diffusion of powers to create natural jealousy of each branch toward growth of power of another.

Our system is based upon the belief, which Madison and Hamilton enunciated for us in the Federalist Papers, that government by the people could not long endure without checks upon the power of a numerical majority to override a minority.

Madison and Hamilton wrote:

> In a society, under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger.

The tender balance of majority rule and minority right was to be maintained through the division of government into a many-layered structure. Its parts would be appointed in dissimilar manner, to give representation and voice to the diversity of groups, interests, factions, and sects which underline the American Nation.

The notion of a plebiscitary form of government, of a people speaking directly, through force of numbers alone, was rejected. To the founders, the people were not a mass, but collections of persons united into groups by their varying interests.

In Federalist 10, Madison wrote of the dangers of the plebiscitary form. When numerical majority elects directly, he warned:

> There is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party, or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property: and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

On June 15, the U.S. Supreme Court altered this political theory drastically, through its decision that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be elected on the same principle, that of population.

Both houses must be elected on the same basis, and diversity where it exists must cease. Numbers alone must rule, the Court has declared, taking still another step toward the plebiscitary form of government which the founders so greatly feared.

I shall not detail my objections to the Court's position that it has authority over a State's form of government. They are strong objections.

But I cannot let this decision pass without urging that we recognize its vast significance and the drastic change which it makes in our traditional American political theory. This change is too important to come about without great thought, debate and deliberation, and painful decision.

The premise upon which our Government was constructed must not be changed by an act of will on the part of a few who, no matter how fine their motives or character, do not represent the wonderful diversity of America which their decision works to injure.

CONSOLIDATED DEPOSITS OF SALARY CHECKS FOR FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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 Calfiornia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to authorize the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government to deposit amounts due to military and civilian personnel as salary by means of single checks payable to banks and other financial institutions for the accounts of individuals. The bill is intended to facilitate such deposits to the accounts of employees at less cost to the Government, and with greater convenience to the employees, the agencies, and the financial institutions concerned.

The mailing of salary checks directly to banks is an entirely voluntary practice which may be requested by employees, and which is in fact used by many personnel for their convenience. In the military services, many officers and enlisted personnel have long requested this service, and frequently the disbursing offices have simply consolidated the amounts due to any individuals who use the same bank, and mailed a single check. Accompanying lists make clear the names and amounts due to each individual. The procedures save the time of distributing checks on the job, of cashing the checks, and the costs of handling and mailing individual checks instead of single ones to banks used by many employes.

The bill is necessary to overcome a technical objection of the Comptroller General that payments by this method appear to violate a section of law that requires that a check be written only in favor of the employee. The Comptroller is permitting the current practice to continue in the expectation that this legislation will bring the laws up to date with the improved financial practices that can be achieved with modern data equipment. If the bill is enacted to au-

thorize these procedures by all the agencies of Government, it is expected that the savings in time, cost, and mailing will be available not only to the military departments, but to all agencies and their employees. In short, this is a bill to promote economy and efficiency in administration of the Government.

SENATE RINGS DOWN CURTAIN ON THE BOBBY BAKER SCANDALS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, the Rules Committee of the other body says the curtain has been rung down on the Bobby Baker scandals. There is no more ground to be covered, it is said.

That apparently means the rug under which it has been swept is big enough to cover all the ground.

What about the testimony of Don Reynolds, the Maryland insurance broker and the statements of Walter Jenkins, White House adviser? Either Reynolds or Jenkins committed perjury.

What about the expensive stereophonic set? President Johnson says it was a gift from his onetime protege, Bobby Baker. Reynolds testified under oath that he bought and paid for it.

Who caused Elly Rometsch, the German call girl, to be deported overnight. and why?

These and scores of other questions dealing with this sordid mess demand answers, not evasion and alibis.

MEMBERS ATTENDING THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place the list of Members who are going to attend the Interparliamentary Conference in August in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

W. R. POAGE; CHARLES B. HOEVEN; THOR C. TOLLEFSON; E. ROSS ADAIR; H. ALLEN SMITH of California; EMILIO Q. DADDARIO; ALEXANDER PIRNIE; EDWARD J. DERWINSKI; F. BRADFORD MORSE; ROBERT MCCLORY; and KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, president.

Alternates: PAUL C. JONES of Missouri and GERALD R. FORD.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONVEY EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY THE CONGRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Convey to the Members of the American Association of State Highway Officials an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. FALLON and Mr. CRAMER.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE, JULY 22, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 22.

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

There was no objection.

THE AMAZING STORY OF THE TFX

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1962, some 6 weeks before I took office, the TFX supersonic airplane contract was awarded to the General Dynamics Co. in Fort Worth, Tex. Although I was not a Member of Congress in 1962 while the negotiations for the contract were being conducted, like many of the residents of Seattle, I was keenly interested. Since taking office, I have made an effort to determine the facts of the case. The amazing thing about the awarding of this contract was that the Boeing Co. proposed to build the supersonic TFX at an estimated $415 million less than did General Dynamics. At the same time, the Boeing design offered superior design and flight characteristics over the competing proposal.

It is my opinion that all the facts of this case should be made public so that the unjust methods of awarding this contract will never be used again. There are some who would prefer to sweep the whole TFX mess under the rug even though they know that this contract was awarded on an unfair basis. I feel that I have an obligation to bring the known facts of the case before the public so that they might judge the case for themselves.

The TFX supersonic fighter-bomber was originally conceived in 1959 by the Air Force Tactical Air Command. It will be a Mach III aircraft at high altitude and a Mach II aircraft at treetop level. It will have the capability of flying nonstop to Europe, carrying a nuclear weapon, and then it will have the capability of loitering over a given area at subsonic speed to conserve fuel. It will be able to land on a 1,700-foot strip.

Mr. McNamara, when he became Secretary of Defense, decided he would expand the concept of the TFX and make it available to both the Air Force and the Navy. This created a problem because the aircraft, as conceived, was much too long to fit into the elevators of aircraft carriers and it had to be redesigned to be made shorter and to have a beefed-up tail section to absorb the shock-landing. There were to have been 1,700 TFX aircraft built; 235 of which were to go to the Navy. That number has been expanded somewhat now in the light of Australia's order. The total contract will be worth about $7 billion. The fact that the TFX is the largest defense contract ever awarded makes this affair of national interest.

Now let us examine a chronology of the evaluations of the Military Source Selection Board made up of both the Air Force and the Navy and see to whom they would have awarded this contract. The source selection boards are the groups that are normally used to evaluate airplane contracts.

The source selection board made its first decision in January of 1962 when the board voted unanimously in favor of the Boeing design. Next, it was decided to reevaluate and the companies submitted new proposals. The source selection board made its second recommendation in May of 1962 and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing Co. Another reevaluation was ordered and on June 21, the source selection board made its third recommendation, and once again it was unanimous in favor of the Boeing design. At this particular stage there was complete accord by both the Navy and the Air Force in favor of the Boeing design, and this design was considered to be fit for immediate production. But, once again, for some unknown reason the decision was made to reevaluate. Then an interesting thing happened. On October 24, 1962, a newspaper reporter by the name of Seth Kantor published an article in the Fort Worth Press that said that the General Dynamics Co. was going to be awarded the TFX contract. On November 2, 1962, the source selection board met once again and unanimously recommended that the Boeing Co. be awarded the TFX contract. The Air Force Council on November 8, 1962, recommended the Boeing Co. for the contract. The reasons for the recommendation of the Boeing Co. were that they had a superior design, superior performance and a price that was an estimated $415 million less than the General Dynamics bid. But then, on November 24, 1962, the Department of Defense announced that the award was to be made to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth, Tex.

On February 26, 1963, the Senate Investigating Subcommittee began hearings on the TFX which have not been completed to this day. The hearings, though not complete have been enlightening. A gentleman by the name of Albert Blackburn, who was a former Marine major and test pilot, worked on the TFX evaluation for the Department of Defense. A New York Times article said that he had implied that General Dynamics copied most of the superior design features of the Boeing proposal. Then Colonel Gayle of the Air Force, in his testimony before the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, said that by constant reevaluation, both companies would eventually solve the problems and

that this was the reason for having so many reevaluations by the source selection board.

The previous performance of the two companies is very revealing. I mentioned earlier that the Boeing price was an estimated $415 million under that of the General Dynamics Co. and in times past the price has been a rather significant factor in the awarding of a contract. This is especially true when the accompanying design has superior performance capabilities.

The terms of the contract provided that the builder was liable for all costs over 120 percent of the bid price. The contract provided that the excess costs over 100 percent of the bid and up to 120 percent of the bid would be shared 90 percent by the Government and 10 percent by the contractor. The Boeing bid was at least 22 percent less than the General Dynamics bid. If the Boeing Co. had actually been so far wrong in their estimates that they had gone over 120 percent of their bid price, the cost to the Government and the taxpayers still would have been less than the General Dynamics' bid. So there was no foundation to the charge that the Boeing costs were unrealistically low.

The General Dynamics Co. has built the F–102, the F–106, and the B–58. On these contracts, which are their major military airplane contracts, their performance cost was 4.8 percent over their bid price. This cost the American taxpayers $210 million more than they had planned on spending. On the other hand, the Boeing Co. in the same period of time has built the C–97, the B–47, the KC–135, and the B–52. We find that they had actually been 1.1 percent under their bid price. This saved the American taxpayers about $103 million. Obviously, the Boeing Co. had a history of completing their contracts at costs less than their bid price.

On March 5, 1963, on the floor of the House I proposed that we have a competition between the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. and that both companies would build prototypes. This has been done before in the awarding of airplane contracts. On May 1, 1963, Senator McCLELLAN became interested in this idea. After making an inquiry, he found that the Boeing Co. could provide four prototypes of the TFX for less than $200 million. The General Dynamics Co. never did come up with a definite cost proposal, but it was estimated that it would probably cost them something under $300 million. If we had had a prototype competition, we could still end up saving the American taxpayers quite a bit of money and still get a superior airplane for both the Air Force and the Navy. Just a small superiority in the air would mean a lot should the shooting actually start.

One of the results of the TFX award was that the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson, was fired from office because he protested the overriding of the source selection board by McNamara, Gilpatric, Korth, and Zuckert, the civilian leaders in the Department of Defense. Chief of the Air Force, General LeMay, protested almost as hard and was put on probation for 1 year.

A very serious ramification of this new method of awarding military contracts is the morale factor of the military in the Pentagon. I have talked to military people who say that the morale of the mililtary is at an alltime low because of the method used in awarding the TFX contract.

Another ramification is the lowering of morale of American industry. In times past, in our free enterprise system, companies have felt that it was rewarding to bid on various defense contracts because the company that came up with the best design and had the lowest price was going to get the contract. We have reason to believe that now other factors may have some bearing on awarding defense contracts. If contracts are not to be awarded on a best performance basis and best price basis, then industry will question whether or not it should go to the bother and spend the time and the money that are necessary to make bids on large military contracts.

I would like to examine some of the principal overt characters who played major roles in the award of the TFX contract. The first of these is Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert. Mr. Zuckert admitted in his testimony that he had made a bad mistake in a memorandum that went to Secretary of Defense McNamara. In this particular memorandum, the Boeing bid was inflated by $77 million. Now, that was not a minor mistake, but during the hearings Mr. Zuckert argued that this actually helped the Boeing Co. because their bid was already too low. This is rather a difficult thing for most of us to understand in view of Boeing's performance on previous contracts. This error was corrected some time after the award was made. Then, the memorandum erred in four areas where the Boeing performance data was attributed to the General Dynamics design. The Boeing ferry range, the Boeing takeoff distance, the Boeing landing distance and the Boeing ability to handle certain intercept missions were incorrectly assigned to the General Dynamics design. Of course, these mistakes made the General Dynamics design look somewhat better than it was. Colonel Gayle of the Air Force, said that all errors in the memorandum favored the General Dynamics Co. design and that he just could not figure out how all of this had happened.

I would now like to get into the part played by then Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth. First of all, he was Assistant Secretary of the Army while a gentleman by the name of Frank Pace was Secretary of the Army. After Frank Pace resigned as Secretary of the Army he became president of General Dynamics in 1952. He now serves as a member of the board. Mr. Korth resigned and became president of the Continental National Bank in Fort Worth.

In 1955 Mr. Pace sent a man by the name of B. F. Biggers over to see Fred Korth and suggested that Mr. Biggers make Mr. Korth a board member of an insurance company that was being formed in Texas. Mr. Korth was to receive a portion of stock in the new company but was not required to put up any money for this stock. He had to sign a non-interest-bearing note for 3 years. The stock was to be purchased at 20 cents a share. It was predicted that the stock value would go up to about $5.25 a share in a relatively short period of time. Mr. Korth stood to profit by a quarter of a million dollars. The stockholders became somewhat suspicious of what was going on in the insurance company and they brought a conspiracy and fraud suit against Mr. Biggers, Mr. Korth, and another director by the name of Ben Jack Cage. Ben Jack Cage became a fugitive from justice in Brazil after having been convicted of another insurance scandal. Strangely enough, Mr. Korth had the conspiracy and fraud charge pending against him at the very moment he was appointed Secretary of the Navy. The case was settled out of court for nearly a million dollars. The judge said that the defendants did not admit guilt by settling it out of court.

There have been financial dealings between Mr. Korth's bank, the Continental National Bank of Fort Worth and the General Dynamics Co. For example, the General Dynamics Co. had a payroll account of between $25,000 and $40,000 on deposit in the Continental National Bank. That is perfectly legitimate. But, there was also an account at the time of the TFX award that ranged up to a half million dollars that was completely inactive and had no interest paid on it. The Continental National Bank was able to reinvest this money and they very probably made a considerable profit by so doing.

Fred Korth was the president of the Continental National Bank when it approved a loan for some $400,000 to the General Dynamics Co. after the General Dynamics Co. had suffered a $425 million loss on the Convair 880 transport. This is the largest loss of any private company in the history of the world. By coincidence this figure is amazingly similar to the estimated $415 million difference between the General Dynamics and Boeing bids. I might add that the second largest loss was that suffered on the Edsel while Robert McNamara was still with Ford Motors. This $400,000 loan was paid off in April of 1963 so that is completely out of the way. When Secretary Korth became Secretary of the Navy, he retained his stock in the Continental National Bank.

Fred Korth was active in behalf of the bank after he became Navy Secretary. On October 19, 1962, Leon Jordan, vice president and comptroller of the Continental National Bank, wrote Fred Korth as follows:

> While it is true that our deposits have shown very good increases, I happen to know that it has been you who has sent some of these deposits to us and I also happen to know that there could and would be a great many more if you were here under different circumstances than before you left.

On September 14, 1962, Mr. Jordan wrote to Mr. Korth:

> I note on today's new account list that you have secured a $25,000 account from the Nieman-Marcus Co. for us and only a few days ago another $25,000 savings account, the name of which I don't recall at the moment, but suffice to say that this is probably more

business than the people who are primarily responsible for new business have gotten in the past 2 or 3 months. So may I add my thanks to you.

Mr. Korth also used the U.S. Navy yacht *Sequoia* to entertain officials of the bank and clients of the bank. A fellow by the name of Phil Reagan, who is quite a famous singer, I understand, deposited $50,000 in the Continental National Bank shortly after an excursion on the *Sequoia*. Reagan quipped in a letter to Korth:

If you keep your fingers crossed and my good luck continues, my deposit might well be there until hell freezes over.

And Korth replied:

We were indeed fortunate that we were able to have you and Jo aboard the *Sequoia* when you were here in Washington, and I hope you will let me know when you plan on having another visit with us.

If this is not a clear case of conflict of interest, then I doubt if one exists. Mr. Korth was allowed to resign his post as Secretary of the Navy.

Before becoming Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric was a partner in the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore. Mr. Gilpatric said in his testimony that the law firm worked for both the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. This was denied and refuted by the Boeing Co. They said that all Mr. Gilpatric had ever done for them was to appear as a witness in a court case and had received no attorney's fees whatever from the Boeing Co.

Mr. Gilpatric was in charge of the General Dynamics account for his law firm. The interesting thing about the relationship was that Cravath, Swaine & Moore received $268,000 in legal fees from General Dynamics between 1958 and 1962. In the first quarter of 1963 they were paid $31,500. Obviously, General Dynamics was a very lucrative account for Cravath, Swaine & Moore.

When Mr. Gilpatric took a leave of absence from his law firm and became Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1961, Mr. Moore of that firm took over the General Dynamics account. Mr. Moore and the law firm were so highly thought of by General Dynamics that they made Mr. Moore a member of the board of directors of their company. Because of the closeness of the relationship between Mr. Gilpatric and the General Dynamics Co., I doubt very much if he could render an objective judgment on any contract in which they might be involved. I do not think there is any doubt that there is a clearcut case of conflict of interest on the part of Mr. Gilpatric.

Mr. Gilpatric was also allowed to resign and has returned to his law firm of Cravath, Swaine, and Moore.

The fourth character that we should examine is Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Mr. McNamara has not been fully examined by the subcommittee as yet, so all of the facts of his role are not known. That he was boss of the other three, there is no doubt.

One of his principal arguments against the Boeing design was that it used too much titanium. He indicated that titanium was untested and that he was not sure it would be satisfactory for use in supersonic airplanes. While he was making these statements, the top secret A–11 aircraft which utilizes large quantities of titanium was successfully flying. Either McNamara does not know what is going on in the Defense Department or he was deliberately trying to mislead the subcommittee.

McNamara also argued that the "commonality" of the Air Force and Navy versions proposed by General Dynamics was great. This myth has since been exploded and reports indicate that their Navy version will have to be drastically changed in order to be usable. The "commonality" of the two versions is less day by day.

Mr. McNamara should be recalled before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee for a full explanation of his past statements.

That there were highly irregular methods used in the awarding of the TFX, there is no doubt. Just how far out of line all of the characters wandered, we will not know until the matter is fully examined by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee. This committee has a responsibility to the American people to investigate completely and disclose their findings.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED: 100,000 NEW NURSING HOME BEDS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in following the progress of medical facilities available to the general population of the United States. Here along with more trained people in the healing arts field and increased quality, quantity, and variety of health insurance are the areas where we really can best solve the problems that the success of our great health system has created by enabling people to live 10 to 15 years longer.

One facet of the facilities problem has been in the area of nursing homes. Just a little over a year ago I reported to the House of Representatives on the part being played by an agency of Government; namely, the Federal Housing Administration. I recalled to the House that I had initiated and sponsored legislation authorizing FHA to insure nursing home construction mortgages. I reported at that time that there was a possibility that FHA alone within the few years the program has been in effect might have been responsible for bringing 20,000 new nursing beds into being. I have just received new figures, as of May 31, 1964, which are as follows:

Projects finally endorsed, 108; mortgage amount, $48,811,389; beds, 8,551.

Projects initially endorsed, 132; mortgage amount, $84,356,337; beds, 12,899.

Projects with commitment outstanding, 86; mortgage amount, $56,130,400; beds, 8,431.

Projects with applications in process, 126; mortgage amount, $93,788,234; beds, 12,056.

If these projects materialize, then it might be said that within just 5 years the FHA program will have been responsible for the creation of 41,937 beds.

The FHA statistics, according to Mrs. Rush Holt, Special FHA Assistant for Nursing Homes, are only a part of the story. Publicity given the Federal program has aroused widespread interest in nursing home construction. Many applicants, after discussing FHA mortgage insurance, after having received FHA approval, have secured conventional loans instead. The Government's willingness to back up such loans has given lenders more confidence in both the future and the stability of the nursing home industry.

According to Alfred Ercolano, executive secretary of the American Nursing Home Association, Washington, D.C., only one out of every three beds currently being constructed are assisted in some way by the Government agency. So we can say with some confidence that within just a few years over 100,000 new nursing home beds have come into existence.

Mr. Ercolano reports that a 1957 study indicated that the average member of the American Nursing Home Association operated only 18 beds. A new study, just concluded, using 1964 data, shows that the average member now has a facility averaging 41 beds. There is no question that the newly constructed nursing homes designed as nursing homes are safer, more efficient, less costly to operate, more pleasant, more beneficial, and less costly to the patient than are the older homes.

I will continue to be interested in well-planned, properly staffed, and equipped nursing homes providing high-caliber medical and rehabilitation care beyond that available in the home, where conditions might not be appropriate for caring especially for those persons with incapacitating infirmities, who do not need the much more costly hospital care. Those interested in keeping down the cost of medical care to a reasonable level must keep alert to any opportunity to bring about facilities and other improvements which reduce those costs.

Now, if I may say so, it is about time the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare started reporting to the people and to the Congress the amazing progress being made in recent years in the improved, number and quality of medical facilities, the increased number, the increased productivity and the improved quality of skills of the people engaged in the healing arts field of endeavor, and in the extension of health insurance to cover more of our people with broader coverage and with a greater selectivity of the kind of policy best suited to the individual person or family needs.

To date the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its supporting clique in the Congress and outside Government has not been accentuating the positive and eliminating the negative. On the contrary it has been accentuating the negative, messing with

Mr. Inbetween and in the process actually slowing down the positive.

Now that medicare has been put on the shelf, I hope for good, cannot the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and its allies get into the spirit of progress in our society to work with it and not against it? Let the Department start reporting what is good about America. Studying and reporting success is the best way to help to eliminate failure and put those in between up on the high road of better living.

In the next week or so the Health Insurance Council will be putting out its 18th annual survey of the extent of voluntary health insurance coverage in the United States and I will again take the floor to point up the amazing progress which has been going on in this field. I again want to emphasize that this progress is being made in spite of the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare officials not with, which should be the case, their understanding and cooperation.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY UNDERTAKES EXTENSIVE WATER RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution, from all sources, has long been of major concern to our people. Long before there was legislation on the Federal level, State, and local efforts had been directed toward the control of water pollution. The earliest of these programs seems to have been the statute that was enacted in Pennsylvania in 1905. Even hasty research will disclose that about 14 different States had passed similar legislation before Congress, in 1948, enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This act declared a congressional policy of support and aid to States and municipalities conducting technical research in the field of prevention and control of water pollution. While these efforts have yielded significant results in the past, much more has yet to be accomplished.

Federal, State, and local governments are not alone in their concern for the preservation of water quality. For some time the American chemical industry has translated concern into action and embarked last month upon an extensive research program designed to determine how organic chemicals act in streams, lakes, and rivers and how treatment processes for sanitary sewage react upon these chemicals.

This research program, under the sponsorship of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, will be under the direction of Dr. D. W. Ryckman, chairman of the environment and sanitary engineering division of Washington University at St. Louis. Dr. Ryckman, who is widely recognized as a specialist in biochemistry and bioengineering, is a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, has a master of science degree from Michigan State University, and doctor of science degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This research project is expected to run from 3 to 5 years and has been developed into three basic activities. They are:

First. A compilation and critical examination of related technical data on organic chemicals;

Second. A laboratory research program on the degree and rate at which organic chemicals break down and disappear under biological action, and classification of bio-organisms with regard to their relative effectiveness in this regard;

Third. A field study to verify the laboratory program.

It is expected that the information developed from this research program will not only help chemical companies, but will help other industries plan their water resources management.

I think it might be well to note the remarks made by Gen. George H. Decker, president of MCA, when he announced this program. He said:

> This research project reflects a continuing effort on the part of the industry to help maintain a high degree of clean water both for the general public and for its own use. Results from this research should enable chemical companies to plan more soundly with regard to manufacturing wastes and also to better advise their customers concerning the handling and use of their products.

In this current research effort and in other programs, the chemical industry has been responsive to its responsibilities in the field of water pollution control. For more than 25 years, the industry, through the Manufacturing Chemists Association, has maintained a constant watch on water quality problems caused by chemical production. Just recently the MCA has undertaken a survey of the chemical industry's investment in water pollution control facilities at 875 chemical plants, involving 125 different chemical manufacturing concerns throughout the United States. I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the tabulation by States of the wastes treatment and water pollution control facilities of these responsible members of our private enterprise system:

TABLE NO. 1–A.—*Wastes treatment and water pollution control facilities, by States*

State	Number of reporting chemical plants	Number of different communities	Total employment represented	Capital investment to date [1]	Projected additional investment next 5 years [1]	Current annual operating cost [1]	Current annual manpower requirements (man-years)
Alabama	17	13	3,757	1,752,000	480,000	362,000	12.1
Alaska, Oregon, Washington	20	13	1,605	1,083,000	262,000	211,000	8.3
Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Utah	18	15	9,077	1,308,000	553,000	120,000	8.5
Arkansas	12	8	2,205	864,000	180,000	183,000	15.9
California	67	43	10,889	4,845,000	1,206,000	1,207,000	67.5
Connecticut	8	8	6,723	2,861,000	1,050,000	215,000	18.2
Delaware	17	8	11,226	2,684,000	130,000	279,000	18.6
Florida	17	11	11,279	7,051,000	2,894,000	1,636,000	61.1
Georgia	15	10	3,648	1,352,000	208,000	260,000	5.6
Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming	12	10	2,469	1,361,000	890,000	160,000	11.6
Illinois	51	29	19,040	14,196,000	3,523,000	1,325,000	65.5
Indiana	14	10	2,364	2,381,000	660,000	302,000	9.4
Iowa	10	9	2,251	33,000	109,000	109,000	3.9
Kentucky	19	10	6,429	6,496,000	1,229,000	850,000	39.1
Louisiana	36	21	13,354	13,514,000	1,581,000	2,777,000	92.8
Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont	4	4	415	1,000	[2]	[2]	0
Maryland	18	5	6,726	2,351,000	1,468,000	313,000	24.3
Massachusetts	25	18	6,918	788,000	922,000	83,000	61.5
Michigan	33	21	18,806	14,726,000	2,303,000	2,379,000	87.8
Mississippi	6	6	1,254	248,000	227,000	21,000	2.8
Missouri	17	9	7,896	3,643,000	1,707,000	1,940,000	85.1
New Jersey	83	52	43,954	35,548,000	7,859,000	5,219,000	108.0
New York	51	28	51,823	28,300,000	7,423,000	2,182,000	85.5
North Carolina	16	14	2,949	565,000	344,000	89,000	11.8
Ohio	72	42	25,956	17,673,000	3,413,000	1,759,000	97.5
Pennsylvania	43	35	18,597	27,842,000	2,412,000	3,134,000	141.4
South Carolina	12	8	5,712	1,583,000	804,000	99,000	5.9
Tennessee	26	15	11,543	9,153,000	3,387,000	1,749,000	103.4
Texas	80	38	40,463	32,593,000	6,622,000	6,254,000	293.2
Virginia	24	19	22,698	12,593,000	3,079,000	1,183,000	72.1
West Virginia	23	16	19,099	10,400,000	10,405,000	3,257,000	137.3
Wisconsin	9	8	1,915	3,497,000	2,356,000	696,000	9.2
Total	875	556	393,040	263,585,000	69,686,000	40,353,000	1,764.9

[1] Rounded to nearest $1,000. [2] Less than 1,000.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will note that over $263 million has been spent in the past, and another $69.7 million is to be spent in the next 5 years. These same concerns are spending $5.5 million annually for research in this field alone. In Missouri, for example, capital investment by chemical facilities on waste treatment amounts to more than $3.6 million. In addition, 17 chemical plants

in 9 Missouri communities plan to spend over $1.7 million during the next 5 years to improve water quality.

I have been saying over the years that private enterprise can and often does accept its responsibility in preserving our natural resources. This example of one industry in one specific field is not a mere isolated incident. The same is being done in many other fields which impinge on our American way of life. I think that the chemical industry is to be commended for its efforts in water quality preservation. Continued research and self-regulation by all industries, coupled with State and local programs, will do much to prevent the contamination of this valuable natural asset and preserve it for future generations.

HELLER-WALLICH CORRESPONDENCE ILLUMINATES CONCEPT OF THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debate over the tax cut the administration made widespread use of the concept of the "full employment budget" as a tool of analysis designed to demonstrate the magnitude of the "brake" on the economy exerted by Federal fiscal policy.

In simplest terms, the "full employment budget" is intended to show what the budget surplus or deficit—national income accounts basis—would be if the economy were operating at full employment, defined at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate. The surplus in the "full employment budget" is considered too large when Government spending, plus private spending, is insufficient to bring total output to the full employment level. This was the situation which the administration said existed prior to the recent tax cut .

The importance which the administration attached to the concept in the tax cut debate led me to believe that in the future it was likely to be used as an even more important guide to fiscal policy. For that reason I wrote Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, on February 11, asking a number of questions about the concept and about the administration's assertion that its fiscal program would provide a greater net fiscal stimulus to the economy this year than in any other peacetime year in history. I also asked for estimates of the full employment surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Dr. Heller replied to my letter on April 27, setting forth the information which I requested. I then sent Dr. Heller's reply to Dr. Henry Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University and former member of President Eisenhower's Council, requesting his comment on Dr. Heller's letter.

I have now received a reply from Dr. Wallich which is critical of the statistical precision given to the "full employment budget" concept by the Council. After summarizing the weaknesses of the concept, Dr. Wallich concludes that it is "a very much less than adequate description of the effects of a particular budget."

Because of the light which this correspondence sheds on the "full employment budget," I believe it would be useful if it were brought to the attention of Members of Congress, economists, financial writers, and others. Under unanimous consent, I include my letter of February 11 to Dr. Heller, his reply to me of April 27, and Dr. Wallich's letter of June 25 in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 11, 1964.

Dr. WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HELLER: In his economic report the President says that the administration's program will provide a greater net stimulus to the economy this year than in any other peacetime year in history. I would appreciate it if you would set forth the reasoning and the figures upon which this statement is based.

I am also curious about whether you consider the administration's expenditure policy this year stimulative or not. In the Council's economic report you state that "The tax and expenditure program will give a bigger fiscal stimulus in calendar 1964 than in any of the past 3 years." However, in reply to questions which I submitted to you at the Joint Economic Committee's annual hearings you say "the spending side of the Federal budget can hardly be considered stimulative in 1964."

Because of the importance of a correct understanding of the concept of the full employment surplus, I would also appreciate your setting down in detail the figures upon which the estimates of the full employment surplus for 1962, 1963, and 1964 are based.

With best wishes and many thanks for your cooperation,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 11, 1964, requesting us to set forth the reasoning and figures on which the President based his statement that the 1964 fiscal program will provide a greater net stimulus than in any previous peacetime year.

We delayed our reply because at the time of receipt of your request, there was underway a full-scale interagency review of the full employment budget estimates on the President's statement was based. This review was expected to produce new and more refined estimates of the full employment budget. This work is now completed, and I am pleased to report that the new estimates do not differ significantly from the previous ones.

As you know, the Council holds that the full employment budget on a national income accounts basis provides the best single summary of the impact of the Federal fiscal system on our national product and income. The expenditures side of this budget is an estimate of what, under conditions of full employment, would be the total of:

(a) Federal purchases of goods and services, and

(b) Federal transfer payments, interests, subsidies, and grants-in-aid—all of which add to the purchasing power of households, businesses, and State and local governments.

The revenue figures show the withdrawal of potential private purchasing power that would result from Federal tax collections at full employment.

Since the full employment budget is estimated at a constant 4-percent unemployment rate, it shows the impact of the Federal fiscal program independently of the strength or weakness of the forces (other than Federal expenditures and taxes) affecting private demand. Since the receipts and expenditures actually realized in any year are not independent of these forces, the actual budget outcome does not provide an adequate measure of the budget impact taken by itself. The basis for this analysis is set forth more fully in the 1962 and 1964 Economic Reports.

Under the Employment Act of 1946, responsible fiscal policy must—so far as practicable, and consistent with the strengthening of free enterprise—respond to the strength or weakness of private demand in such a way as to maintain "maximum employment" and "maximum production," in a context of reasonable price stability (needed to maintain "maximum purchasing power"). With existing labor-market conditions and with responsible price and wage decisionmaking, we believe that our interim objective, under this criterion, should be to bring the unemployment rate down to no more than 4 percent. (As habits of responsible wage and price making become entrenched and as structural imperfections in the labor market are reduced, we should find it possible to bring unemployment below this level.)

The long-standing problem of excessive unemployment that had persisted since 1957 clearly demonstrated the need for a Federal fiscal program considerably more stimulating than was in effect prior to 1964.

Making the Federal budget more stimulating requires either a substantial year-to-year increase in expenditures or reduction in tax rates, simply because of the large built-in revenues—as our potential gross national product grows.

If the constant-dollar potential GNP grows by 3½ percent a year, and the GNP deflator rises about 1½ percent a year, then the potential GNP in current prices will rise at about 5 percent a year. We estimate full employment revenues on a national income accounts basis to have been $122.4 billion for 1963. Since, with our present tax system, these revenues grow only slightly more than in proportion to GNP, a 5-percent rise of GNP would yield a rise of approximately $6 billion in Federal tax collections.

In order to avoid an increasingly restrictive budget under the 1963 tax laws, therefore, Federal expenditures—on national income account, including trust account outlays—would also have had to rise by about $6 billion. As a matter of economic arithmetic—not value judgment—this much expenditure rise would have been needed just to avoid an increasing fiscal restraint in a growing economy. Taken by itself, any smaller expenditure growth would contribute to a growing full employment surplus. However, with a reduction in tax schedules, it becomes possible to have a smaller expenditure rise (or even a decline), and still have the budget move toward a more stimulating position. This is what is being done by the Congress and administration in the 1964 program.

The two tables which follow set forth the movements in the full employment budget over the past few years and the projected movements in 1964.

Table 1 shows estimated full employment Federal revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit—estimated on the basis of the tax-rate structure that was in effect in 1960–61, on the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and on the contribution rate to the unemployment compensation system that would have prevailed under full employment conditions.

Table 2 differs from table 1 in that the revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, of the revised 1962 depreciation guidelines, and of the 1964 Revenue Act.

Since these numbers represent estimates of what would have happened if the economy had been operating at a 4-percent unemployment rate rather than the actual higher unemployment rates, the figures contain some element of conjecture. This is necessarily even more true for the 1964 estimates. Hence honest disagreement could arise over these numbers. However, we are confident that the margin for dispute would be small.

As these figures show, the budget became somewhat less restrictive in 1961 and 1962, somewhat more restrictive in 1963. The 1964 program involves a large shift—namely $8 billion—in the direction of fiscal stimulus. This is above the combined stimulus of the preceding 3 years and exceeds the stimulus of any other peacetime year.

I hope that this exposition and the accompanying tables will serve to answer your inquiry. If we can be of further help, please call on us.

Sincerely,

WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—*Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit under 1960–61 revenue system* [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (−)	Net fiscal stimulus [2]
1960	104.4	92.0	12.4	
1961	110.2	100.6	9.6	+2.8
1962	116.5	108.7	7.8	+1.8
1963	125.0	115.2	9.8	−2.0
1964	131.2	119.2	12.0	−2.2

[1] Revenues estimated on the basis of the 1960–61 tax-rate structure, the actual contribution rate for the OASDI program, and the rate of contributions to the unemployment compensation system that was estimated would prevail under full-employment conditions.
[2] Reduction of surplus from preceding year.

TABLE 2.—*Full-employment revenues, expenditures, and surplus or deficit reflecting 1962 tax and 1964 changes* [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Revenues	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit (−)	Net fiscal stimulus [2]
1960	104.4	92.0	12.4	
1961	110.2	100.6	9.6	+2.8
1962	113.6	108.7	4.9	+4.7
1963	122.4	115.2	7.2	−2.3
1964	118.7	119.2	−.5	+7.7

[1] Revenue estimates reflect the effects of the 1962 Revenue Act, the 1962 new depreciation guidelines, and the 1964 Revenue Act.
[2] Reduction of surplus from preceding year.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I have read with great interest your correspondence with Dr. Heller bearing on the full employment surplus and the estimates related to it. In responding to your request for comments, I would like to make the following points:

1. The concept of the full employment surplus as a guide to fiscal policy has been in use for some time. One such use has been that made by the Committee for Economic Development in its policy statements on the budget, "Taxes and the Budget: A Program for Prosperity in a Free Economy" (New York, November 1947), which was analyzed in an article by Dr. Heller in the American Economic Review of September 1957. The statistical precision given to the full employment surplus by the Council of Economic Advisers, I believe, represents a new step in economic analysis.

This statistical precision nevertheless brings into focus various weaknesses of the concept. One weakness derives from the uncertainty of what constitutes "full employment," which the CEA today, as well as the CED in 1947, place at 4-percent unemployment. This has also been the target concept of the Eisenhower administration. We do not know, however, how far unemployment can be reduced without inflationary consequences. Recently, Senator CLARK's subcommittee came out in favor of a 3-percent standard. Personally I fear that, with unemployment of all but teenagers already close to 4 percent, and teenage unemployment at about 15 percent, constituting about one-fourth of the total, the noninflationary definition of full employment will have to be well above 4 percent, until a solution is found to the recent extraordinary bulge in teenage unemployment.

A difference of 1-percent unemployment, on the Council's calculation, means a difference of about 3 percent of GNP and a slightly larger percentage of Government revenues. Thus a change of 1 percent in the full employment standard, one way or the other, may mean a difference of 4 to 5 million in the full employment surplus.

2. The full employment surplus depends not only on the level of national income, given the expenditures of the Government, but also on the share of corporate profits in that income. Usually the share of profits rises sharply as unemployment falls from high levels. The Council's estimates have involved a 10-percent ratio of corporate profits to GNP at full employment. While this relationship has prevailed at certain times in the past, it has not recently been tested owing to our failure to reach full employment. At the present level of GNP and corporate profits, we are still well below 10 percent, and nevertheless it has been argued by some on the labor side that profits are already unfairly high. If in future periods of full employment the share of corporate profits, with their high tax yield, should be lower than in the past, the full employment surplus will also be lower. This uncertaintly is compounded by recent changes in depreciation techniques which have obfuscated the concept of corporate profits.

3. Dr. Heller in his 1957 article points out some further factors that interfere with a precise calculation of the full employment surplus:

(1) The Mills plan for speeding up corporate income tax payments, a new version of which was introduced with the recent tax cut. (But this does not affect the income and product account surplus.)

(2) Transfers of public expenditures from the budget into the banking system.

(3) Yearend manipulations to retard processing of taxpayments and accelerating present payments.

(4) The Federal credit programs.

4. The full employment surplus by itself is not an adequate way of describing the stimulating or restraining character of a given Federal budget. The absolute size of the budget also counts. That is to say, a full employment surplus of 5 billion when revenues are 95 and expenditures 90 is not the same thing as when revenues are 105 and expenditures 100. This is attributable to what economists refer to as the "balanced budget multiplier." In simplest terms, the "balanced budget multiplier" proposition says that because the Government does not, like the consumer, save a fraction of every marginal dollar of receipts, savings in the economy are not increased when the Government raises its receipts and its expenditures by the same amount. Assuming the presence of unemployed resources, it then follows that for a given level of private saving and investment, GNP will tend to be increased by the amount of the budget increase.

The Council of Economic Advisers takes account of the balanced budget multiplier by describing the full employment surplus as the "single most important" measure of the impact of the budget. But in order fully to describe the impact of a given budget, not only its full employment surplus but also its absolute magnitude would have to be considered. Very roughly speaking, an increase in both revenues and expenditures by some particular amount tends to be equivalent, in stimulating effect, to a reduction in the full employment surplus of one-half that amount. For example, if at any given moment Government expenditures were to be raised by $1 billion and matched by an increase in tax rates to produce $1 billion in revenues, this would have about the same effect upon the level of GNP as would a $0.5 billion increase in expenditures without an increase in tax rates.

Thus, budget A that has a larger full employment surplus than budget B may nevertheless be more expansionary if the absolute levels of revenues and expenditures are also higher than in budget B. Failure to emphasize this, and stressing only the full employment surplus, can mislead as regards the true impact of the budget. It also draws away attention from the magnitude of the budget which is important also for other reasons. The magnitude of the budget should, of course, always be viewed in relation to the level of GNP.

5. The use of the full employment surplus as a means of defining the stimulating or restraining character of a budget also abstracts from the monetary consequences of surpluses and deficits. Surpluses permit debt repayment, deficits must be financed. Following the logic of the full employment surplus, we are compelled to say that the budget with a larger full employment surplus is always more restraining than a budget with a smaller one. For instance, if budget A has a full employment surplus of $5 billion, but because of recession is currently producing a deficit of $10 billion, it is nevertheless more restraining than budget B that has a full employment surplus of $3 billion and, owing to better business conditions, is currently producing a surplus of $2 billion. Yet the financing of the deficit under budget A may have very stimulating effects, if bank credit is used. Debt repayment under budget B may contract the money supply, if bank held debt is repaid. The overall effects—income plus monetary—of deficit budget A may therefore be more expansionary than those of surplus budget B, despite their different full employment surpluses.

6. The distinction between the income and monetary effects of a budget would be appropriate, although practically difficult, if assurance could be had that in practice the Federal Reserve would be quite free to handle the monetary side. This, however, is uncertain. The politics as well as the economics of the full employment surplus tend to obscure the inflationary dangers of deficits with inadequately controlled financing. The financial aspects of deficits tend to be ignored. We are led to think in terms of surpluses that may be a statistical illusion.

7. Exclusive stress upon the concept of full employment surplus is likely further to con-

fuse the discussion of fiscal policy in this country. A great deal of unreasoning prejudice exists against the use of deficits when they are appropriate, just as there exists, in other quarters, a lack of concern about them when they are not appropriate. If the full employment surplus is used as the principal guide, we shall at times find ourselves in the position of having to argue that a particular deficit is restraining and that a particular surplus is expansionary. It is more plausible to say that a particular deficit is not sufficiently expansionary or a particular surplus not restrictive enough. While the distinction is one of semantics, it also has an influence on people and on votes.

8. To summarize my remarks, I regard the full employment surplus as a valuable concept, but as statistically uncertain and as a very much less than adequate description of the effects of a particular budget. It would be regrettable if its elegance and seeming simplicity should tempt us to make more use of it than it can give.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. WALLICH.

CURB FCC

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of correspondence between Mr. Philip McMartin, assistant public relations director of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of radio station KTTR, operated by the "Show-Me" Broadcasting Co., of Rolla, Mo.

Mr. McMartin's letter under date of June 15 calls on radio station KTTR to broadcast a taped interview by Mr. McMartin with Clyde Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, a former member of this House and well-known lobbyist in Washington, and Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, director of the so-called war on poverty program.

The request—which includes no offer of payment for time for the broadcast—is based on the alleged grounds that station KTTR carried a commercially sponsored "Life Line" program "in which President Johnson's war on poverty legislation was attacked." In making this request, Mr. McMartin quotes a letter from the Federal Communications Commission under date of September 19 to two licensees, which reads:

It is clear that the public's paramount right to hear contrasting views on controversial issues of public importance cannot be nullified by the inability of the licensee to obtain paid sponsorship of time for the broadcast of a view contrary to one already presented in a sponsored program.

In reply, Mr. Martin wrote Mr. McMartin stating, among other things:

We still desire a more specific directive from the FCC before we provide free time in reply to commercial time.

I believe the position taken by the radio station owner, Mr. Martin, is eminently reasonable and proper.

I believe, however, that the answer to Mr. Martin—and to Mr. Ellis, and others as well—ought to come from the Congress of the United States.

I believe it ought to come in the form of enactment of the bill H.R. 9158, introduced by our able colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER], calling for an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, as follows:

If a licensee permits the use of his station for the broadcasting of any views regarding any controversial issue, for which use any charges are made by such licensee, he shall not be required to afford the use of such station for the presentation of contrasting views with respect to such issue without making comparable charges for such use.

Meanwhile, I have written Mr. Ellis the following letter, which, under permission to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I insert at this point:

JUNE 24, 1964.

Mr. CLYDE ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: I have had my attention called to a letter of June 15, 1964, from your Mr. McMartin to the program director of station KTTR, Rolla, Mo., and the reply thereto under date of June 16, of Mr. Luther W. Martin, general manager and owner of the station.

Please be advised that I am directing this correspondence to the attention of the House of Representatives, and to the attention of the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has legislative jurisdiction over the Federal Communications Commission.

In doing so, I am urging the committee and the House to take prompt and effective action to counteract the iniquitous dictate in the FCC letter of September 19, quoted by your Mr. McMartin, and to counteract the equally iniquitous exploitation of this FCC ruling by you and your organization.

The import of this FCC dictate clearly is to force the communications media to choose between silence on controversial issues, or bankruptcy.

Yours very truly,

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

CAPTIVE NATIONS, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at this time many U.S. Representatives rise in this Chamber to address their remarks to the subject of Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we do this, for the subject is close to the hearts of millions of Americans. The term "captive nations" applies to those European nations which the Communists seized in the relatively short time between 1940 and 1948. The largest part of this takeover resulted from Communist expansion following the last World War, a legacy most disheartening when we consider World War II was a great effort of mankind in behalf of freedom and democracy. The sordid record of Soviet deceit and inhumanity resulted in the denial of freedom for almost one-quarter of Europe's people, living on one-third of the territory of that Continent.

The word "captive" means something to us when we realize that the formerly independent countries of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and East Germany are now in total political and social captivity under an imposed totalitarian regime. The Iron Curtain, which separates these countries from their free brothers in Europe and elsewhere in the world, was forged by the strong arm of the Soviet Army under orders of the foreign government in Moscow.

For what purpose, then, do we make this proclamation in 1964, here in that great representative body—the U.S. House of Representatives? I believe there are two benefits from the words that echo through this body. First, it serves to focus worldwide attention on the fact that so many people live in political bondage. We must never forget that these once independent peoples lost their freedom by outside imposed force, terror, and violence. Secondly, this observance serves to remind Americans that millions have lost that cherished goal of mankind which we Americans live with every minute of every day—the freedom to think, say, and act as we wish.

America stands in striking contrast to life behind the Iron Curtain. We must never permit the Communists to overshadow or extinguish the light this contrast tells the world. We must continue to stir men's minds with the freedom we now own. Men have always fought for what we have. Mankind has always been pulled toward the light of freedom, and fences and walls have never been able to stop them.

Let us be solemn about this occasion and in our observance let us prayerfully hope that someday these peoples in the captive nations own what is rightfully theirs—the freedom to guide their own life.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights problem is our Nation's greatest sickness which can only be cured by a moral revival.

Reestablishing that everyone is equal under the law by defining the rights guaranteed by the Constitution will help, but the only truly meaningful gain is when racial barriers are broken down by human hearts.

This will take some persuasion, but today, in our time, the civil rights bill paves the way for this eventuality. I hail its passage.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT TAFT, JR., ON SUBJECT OF APPORTIONMENT, JULY 2, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH and other Congressmen have introduced joint resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. The necessity for this action arises from the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States recently. These decisions have the effect of dictating to the States an inflexible and rigid formula of equally populated legislative districts. While the Supreme Court decision now becomes the law of the land, it is contrary to the principles of representative government upon which our Nation has been based. Just as the principle of territorial representation was incorporated into the Federal Constitution in the formation of the U.S. Senate, the principle of some degree of geographical representation, as well as considerations which give weight to common interests of the people represented, have been a part of our State and local governmental systems since the conception of this Nation. The strongest principle of our system of government has been that of representation on a fair and equal basis for all concerned, not merely majority rule. Protection of the rights of the minority is guaranteed by the Constitution. Conditions relating to fairness and equality of representation differ widely throughout the various States of the Nation, and can even differ widely within a particular State. For instance, to deprive southeastern Ohio of its present representation at a time when the problems of that area require direct attention under numerous State and Federal programs, would seem to me to be extremely unwise. Randall Metcalf, the Republican candidate for Congress in the 15th District in southeast Ohio, has been pointing out the threat of the Court decisions to any reasonable voice for that area in the State councils in Columbus. After discussions with him, I have renewed concern as to the implications of the Supreme Court decisions, and I believe that it is vital that we move with dispatch to correct them. My experience in the Ohio House of Representatives, where the southeast area is given voice related to geographic factors, concinces me that no undue favoritism was shown toward the problems of that area. By comparison, it was the Ohio Senate, elected on a straight population basis, that has defeated more proposals said to favor urban areas.

For these reasons, I have followed the lead of Congressman MCCULLOCH and others and introduced on my own behalf a joint resolution differing slightly from the McCulloch proposal. It makes clear that population is one of the factors that can be considered, but not the exclusive factor. It also attempts to avoid the necessity for voter action statewide where that action has already taken place by constitutional amendment or initiative petition previously or where such a remedy is immediately available.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 27, Washington was the scene of a dramatic series of events revolving around the dedication of the Taras Shevchenko statue at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW. The dramatic climax to this great day took place at the unveiling of the statue with a major foreign policy address delivered by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask to have the full text of General Eisenhower's address printed in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER AT THE UNVEILING OF THE MONUMENT TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 27, 1964

First, let me thank you for your generous welcome.

On September 13, 1960, when I signed into law a measure to authorize the erection of this statue, it was my expectation that you would arrange a ceremony of dedication commensurate with the greatness of Taras Shevchenko.

That day is here and you have come by the thousands from all over the United States; you have come from Canada, from Latin America, and Europe, and from as far away as Australia, to honor the memory of a poet who expressed so eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory.

This outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expectation.

But its meaning does not exceed my hope.

For my hope is that your magnificent march from the shadow of the Washington Monument to the foot of the statue of Taras Shevchenko will here kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men.

A never-ending movement dedicated to the independence and freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the entire world.

During my boyhood it was confidently predicted that within the lifetime of my generation the principles of our free society would become known to all people everywhere and would be universally accepted around the world.

That dream has faded.

Within the past few decades, the concepts of liberty and human dignity have been scorned and rejected by powerful men who control great areas of our planet.

The revolutionary doctrines of our free society are far from universal application in the earth.

Rather, we have seen the counterattacks of facism and communism substitute for them the totalitarian state, the suppression of personal freedom, the denial of national independence, and even the destruction of free inquiry and discussion.

Tyranny and oppression today are not different from tyranny and oppression in the days of Taras Shevchenko.

Now, as then, tyranny means the concentration of all power in an elite body, in a government bureau, in a single man.

It means that the ultimate decisions affecting every aspect of life rest not with the people themselves, but with tyrants.

Shevchenko experienced this kind of governmental usurpation of decisions he believed he should make for himself.

And he was a champion of freedom not solely for himself.

When he spoke out for Ukrainian independence from Russian colonial rule, he endangered his own liberty.

When he joined a society whose aim was to establish a republican form of government in countries of Eastern Europe, he was jailed—even denied the right to use pencil and paper to record his thoughts about freedom.

Today the same pattern of life exists in the Soviet Union and in all captive nations.

Wherever communism rules there is forceful control of thought, of expression, and indeed of every phase of human existence that the state may choose to dominate.

The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well.

Our own Nation was created as this kind of society in a devout belief that where men are free, where they have the right to think, to worship, to act as they may choose—subject only to the provision that they transgress not on the equal rights of others—there will be rapid human progress.

We believe also that when this kind of freedom is guaranteed universally, there will be peace among all nations.

Though the world today stands divided between tyranny and freedom we can hope and have faith that it will not always so remain.

Of all who inhabit the globe, only a relatively few in each of the captive nations—only a handful even in Russia itself—form the evil conspiracies that dominate their fellow men by force or by fraud.

Because man instinctively rebels against regimentation—he hungers for freedom, for well-being, and for peace, even though he may not, in some regions, always comprehend the full meaning of these words.

Yet the will of a few men thwarts the will of hundreds of millions and freedom stands aghast that this is so.

But let us not forget the ageless truth, "This, too, shall pass," and, until it does, we can be sure that this Nation will with its allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to fill any ill-advised attempt of dictators to seize any area where the love of freedom lives and blazes.

In the nations of East and Central Europe, in the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., and in Russia itself—where the poetry of Shevchenko is well known—there are millions of individual human beings who earnestly want the right of self-determination and self-government.

His statue, standing here in the heart of the Nation's Capital, near the embassies where representatives of nearly all the countries of the world can see it, is a shining symbol of his love of liberty.

It speaks to these millions of oppressed.

It gives them constant encouragement to struggle forever against Communist tyranny, until, one day final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be.

Most of you here today are of Ukrainian descent or origin.

All of us—if we go back 1 generation, or 2, or 10, find family roots in some other nation, some other continent.

But today, we stand together as Americans, bound by our common devotion to a system of self-government—a system that makes it possible for us to be different, and yet united; independent, yet interdependent; diverse, and yet inseparable.

To be successful in bringing peace with freedom and justice to the world, we must increase our joint efforts to make peoples around the world more aware that only in freedom can be found the right road to human progress, happiness, and fulfillment.

Shevchenko lived and taught this truth.

In unveiling this memorial to the great 19th century Ukrainian poet we encourage today's poets in Ukraine, in Eastern Europe, and around the world to embody in their poetry mankind's demands for freedom for self-expression, for national independence, and for liberty for all mankind.

Were he alive today, he would be in the forefront of that great struggle.

And now I recall the words of one of America's greatest sons, Abraham Lincoln.

Speaking here just 100 years ago he said:

"It is not merely for today, but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children's children that great and free government, which we have enjoyed all our lives."

In the same spirit, it is not merely for today, but for all time to come that we today present to the world this statue of Taras Shevchenko, bard of Ukraine and freedom fighter, to perpetuate man's faith in the ultimate victory of freedom.

With incessant work, and with God's help, there will emerge, one day, a new era, an era of universal peace with freedom, and justice for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, a representative group of Members of the House including the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, whose interest in the cause of oppressed peoples is internationally known; the gentleman from New York the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, who has led the legislative battle for the issuance of a stamp commemorating Taras Shevchenko, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, the House sparkplug in the struggle for the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, and myself—all briefly addressed the huge gathering. I ask leave that our remarks be carried in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN AT THE UNVEILING OF THE TARAS SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL

The unveiling of this memorial statue of Taras Shevchenko is a meaningful addition to the other memorials to human freedom which grace our Nation's Capital.

In this citadel of human freedom, the birthplace of representative self-government, we are proud of the grand memorials erected to the memory of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and other dedicated Americans who have blazed and enlightened the path of human freedom. We are equally proud of the memorials which stand in this citadel to such men as Lafayette, Kosciuszko, and Steuben, who gave their all to the winning of our national independence. The memorials to such great men as Bolivar, among others, attest to our close kinship with those in other lands who held high the torch of freedom and hope, lighted by our Founding Fathers. All of these memorials serve to remind us of the timeless and unending struggles of mankind to reject tyranny and oppression—to win freedom and to protect it as a priceless quality of life.

It is indeed fitting that we here should memorialize the poet patriot of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko. For above all else, he demonstrated that in the long course of history, the pen is mightier than the sword.

Born into serfdom, at a time when the unique culture and national identity of his homeland was threatened with extinction, he rose up from his dismal beginnings to relight the torch of hope in his native land. At an early age the happy hand of destiny rested upon his shoulder, bringing him to St. Petersburg where he met a French Huguenot painter who recognized his talents and became his benefactor. From the time of his liberation from serfdom until his death in 1861, Shevchenko composed poetry and verse dedicated to the dignity of man and the hopes of his oppressed homeland for freedom and independence. The popular power of his poetry and verse as a sustainer of the spirit of his people is attested to by his banishment into exile under a ukase of Czar Nicholas I, that he be prohibited from writing or painting for an indefinite period.

A century has passed since the death of Shevchenko, but the message of his literary works burns even more brightly today in the hearts of his countrymen. The sword has been laid upon his homeland many times since his passing. A long line of despots have attempted to stamp out the spirit of Ukraine rekindled by the power of his pen. The despots have passed into the silence of history and while the sword still rests upon Ukraine, the spirit of her people remains in tune with the literary testament of Shevchenko.

We in our time are seeking to strengthen old bridges of friendship with central-east Europe and to build new ones where ever possible. The only lasting bridges between nations are those whose foundations are built upon the ideals and moral values which sustain the dignity of man.

The ancient bridge between the United States and Ukraine rests upon those foundations. It will endure forever. So, too, will the memory of Taras Shevchenko who, more than a century ago, expressed the hope of his people for a George Washington, with a new and righteous law. This statue will serve to remind all who visit our Nation's Capital that we, as a people, share that fervent hope, and pray that happy day may soon come.

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE T. J. DULSKI, 41ST DISTRICT, NEW YORK, AT UNVEILING OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO STATUE, SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1964

We are here today to honor a poet who has become a national hero, and a universal inspiration.

For over 100 years he has been the champion of national independence for Ukraine. Today, he stands as a champion of liberty for all mankind.

The brave spirit and high aspirations of Ukraine can be seen clearly in the moving poetry of Taras Shevchenko. Yet, Shevchenko is not limited to Ukraine alone.

All those who struggle for freedom and against tyranny draw strength from his unwavering faith that—in his own words: "Our soul shall never perish * * * freedom knows no dying."

As we stand before this noble statue we can see that, were Shevchenko alive in the flesh today as he is alive in the spirit, he would tell the Russian Communist imperialists: You shall never bury us. The courageous spirit of millions of captive people who seek freedom will inevitably prevail.

Mankind hungers for national independence and personal freedom. Mankind will not be denied.

What cruel irony for Nikita Khrushchev to unveil a statue to Shevchenko in Moscow just 17 days ago. Those in Moscow who have imposed a new colonial rule on Ukraine, on Poland, on Hungary, on Latvia and on all the other captive nations, so fear Shevchenko's power to move men that they now seek to capture him, to tame him, and to distort his message of freedom to their aggressive ends.

They will never succeed. Never. It cannot be done.

Freedom is the spirit of Shevchenko. Freedom is the spirit of the statue unveiled to him on the free soil of the United States today.

Let this statue stand as a constant reminder to the world of mankind's unfinished struggle for national independence and freedom.

Let this statue be a pledge of all free people to work in peaceful ways so that one day people in all the captive nations may once again be free.

And, let those who view the statue of Shevchenko in Moscow ponder upon the messages of freedom projected by this statue of Shevchenko which we dedicate here today to the liberation of all captive nations.

SHEVCHENKO AND UNIVERSAL FREEDOM

(Remarks of the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Monument on June 27, 1964, in Washington, D.C.)

President Eisenhower, Your Excellencies metropolitans, archbishops and bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, distinguished guests, friends of freedom, and ladies and gentlemen, today we observe a great American holiday, the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko Monument in the capital of the free world—Washington.

This is an event whose repercussion and significance reach far beyond the border of our beloved country—the United States of America.

Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th anniversary is observed this year by all Ukrainians and lovers of freedom, is more than just an outstanding Ukrainian bard and advocate of a free and independent Ukraine. Taras Shevchenko was an Abraham Lincoln of his time; he visualized a voluntary union of all Slavic nations in Eastern Europe. He was an ardent believer in the freedom of all peoples regardless of race, religion or nationality. In the large sense of the word, Taras Shevchenko embodied all these principles on which our own American Nation has been founded, and his political and social philosophy is reflected in the U.N. Charter on Human Rights.

We honor Taras Shevchenko today not only because he prayed for a Ukrainian George Washington who would bring "a new and righteous law" to the downtrodden and enslaved people of Ukraine, but also because of his unwavering faith in the right of all men to be free and independent.

It is a bit of irony that the Russian Communists suddenly became aware of the greatness of Taras Shevchenko. Mr. Khrushchev, in unveiling a monument to his honor in Moscow 2 weeks ago, assailed the free Ukrainians for alleged attempts to twist the essence of Shevchenko's works. But Mr. Khrushchev cannot fool either the Ukrainian people or, for that matter, the U.S. Congress, in stating that the Ukranians outside their enslaved Ukraine have been tampering with the works of the greatest of their sons—Taras Shevchenko. It was Mr. Khrushchev, an old master of ruse and trickery himself, who is guilty of gross ignominy and falsification of the works of Shevchenko. Under his iron hand, the Kremlin masters had consistently falsified the works of Shevchenko so as to make him a "precursor" of their tyrannical regime which they forcibly imposed upon Ukraine.

Now, when Americans of Ukrainian descent undertook to honor Taras Shevchenko in erecting a statue in his honor in this capital of freedom, the Kremlin decided to perform

its old trick, to be the first in everything, so they unveiled a monument of the Ukrainian poet in Moscow on June 10, 1964, and Khrushchev made his usual attack on us for honoring Shevchenko here in Washington, a capital founded by a man to whom Shevchenko looked as ideal and inspiration of the Ukrainian nation.

My friends, Shevchenko belongs to you and to all of us who oppose the Russian Communist tyranny, because he opposed this ruthless and inhuman tyranny which oppressed Ukraine a hundred years ago.

Yes, Taras Shevchenko is ours because he is a symbol of human liberty and justice, and he will remain an eternal beacon for all humanity to follow. Thank you.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. DERWINSKI AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, JUNE 27, 1964

Mr. Chairman, General Eisenhower, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is especially appropriate that we dedicate this statue to Taras Shevchenko at a time when the Soviet Union is using propaganda and falsehoods to an unprecedented degree in the cold war. The Communists have persistently attempted to distort the voice of Shevchenko for their own diabolic purposes. The dedication of this statue and the international interest that it is receiving reduces the Red propaganda vehicle to shambles.

And it is especially appropriate that General Eisenhower has joined us in this dedication, just as Prime Minister Diefenbaker of Canada joined in the unveiling of a statue to Shevchenko which was erected by the citizens of Canada.

I direct your special attention to the fact as dramatized by the inscription on the statue, that Shevchenko was a brave and clear voice for freedom, not only for his native Ukraine, but for all the captive people of the czarist Russian Empire.

As the Soviet Union continues its colonial policy, which in Eastern Europe is immediately identifiable with czarist imperial policies, Shevchenko's historic role as a symbol of resistance to autocracy and as a prophet of liberty is as important today as it was in his day. Shevchenko was a patriot, a nationalist, a firm advocate of freedom and of national independence for the Ukraine, and for all the subjugated non-Russian nations. His voice, therefore, is as true and effective today as in his day.

Shevchenko was opposed to serfdom because he was an advocate of personal liberty and freedom. He was opposed to the tyrannical czarist regime because he was an advocate of human rights. Shevchenko was an advocate of freedom for all the people in the old Russian empire, and his voice contributed directly to the abolishment of serfdom and the eventual collapse of the czarist government. It is our hope that his voice will contribute effectively to the collapse of the present Russian Government.

The serfdom of his time in Russia has been replaced by Communist regimentation. The denial of human rights under the czarist regime is perpetuated today by communism. Denial of self-determination to the non-Russian people of Eastern Europe is practiced today as it was under the czar.

Therefore, the unveiling of this statue to Shevchenko in the free environment of Washington, the capital of the free world, is especially symbolic. In the Ukraine, the tomb of Shevchenko was marked by a huge iron cross to dramatize his belief in the hope of Christianity for his people. But, as you know, the Russian Communists removed the cross and replaced it with a monument, in a deliberate attempt to falsify the ideals of Shevchenko.

Here in Washington his ideals, his principles, and his message cannot be falsified. The erection of this statue is an especially dramatic step in the preservation of the true purity of Shevchenko's message, the hope that his voice continues to give to the oppressed people of the Ukraine.

This afternoon, as we all join together in honoring Taras Shevchenko, the prophet of liberty, I express a fervent wish that his dream of freedom for the people of Ukraine and all other captive lands will soon be realized.

Saturday evening, Mr. Speaker, a great throng that overflowed the District of Columbia Armory, attended a banquet and heard a major address by the Honorable THURSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, whose interest and relationships in the field of foreign affairs is widely recognized. I include at this point excerpts from a press release covering Senator MORTON's address:

SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON CITES SHEVCHENKO STATUE AS "A PROMISE OF THE FUTURE FREEDOM AND SELF-DETERMINATION OF UKRAINE AND ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, said here Saturday night that the unveiling of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko, 19th century Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, is "a promise to the future freedom and self-determination of Ukraine and of all captive nations."

The statue was unveiled at 22d, 23d, and P Streets NW., here earlier in the day by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had flown from Gettysburg to Washington by helicopter for the event. This year is the 150th anniversary of the birth of Shevchenko, who is the national hero of Ukraine.

Speaking at a Shevchenko Jubilee Banquet in Washington's National Guard Armory, Senator MORTON called the Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C., "a political element which can well act as a catalyst to bring forth a new era of freedom to humanity."

Senator MORTON said:

"It makes me proud to be an American when I see the U.S. Congress with the support of the U.S. President make available U.S. soil where such a symbol of freedom, as this statue to Taras Shevchenko, is erected."

Commenting on Shevchenko's call for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington with his new and righteous law, Senator MORTON said:

"It is interesting indeed to learn that our Declaration of Independence and Constitution brought too much inspiration and encouragement to men like Taras Shevchenko who, in turn, inspired the Ukrainian people and all peoples in Eastern Europe to fight for freedom and independence."

"The price in blood and tears which so many have paid for freedom will not go unrewarded forever," he said. "The Russian Empire cannot forever escape the realities of history. It, too, will reap its retributions. The enslaved people and the captive nations will be free and independent."

Mr. Speaker, four outstanding Members of Congress attended the banquet and I ask leave to place into the RECORD at this point remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana, who is the author of a most significant book on the history of the captive nations; the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, who has served on House committees of special significance; the Honorable AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, an outstanding member of the Un-American Activities Committee, whose interest in the liberation of captive peoples of communism is well known, and the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, gave an eloquent "off the cuff" address which, unfortunately, was not recorded, and is lost to posterity.

The material follows:

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BANQUET, SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1964

Tonight we are honoring one of the greatest freedom fighters, Taras Shevchenko, an Ukrainian who typifies the very finest of those great characters who have spent a lifetime fighting against those tyrants who would destroy the freedom of man.

Shevchenko's story is typical of the courage and perseverance of the Ukrainian people. You come from one of the most fertile areas in the world and that very fertility of the soil through the ages has caused greedy and ambitious peoples to aspire to steal your heritage.

The Ukrainian people are second to none in determination and perseverance. The centuries of persecution of your people have perhaps made you of stronger character. You whose ancestors came from the Ukraine can teach the rest of us in America lessons in courage and perseverance, and you also can and should teach us not to trust the Russian bear.

In order to subjugate, enslave and break the will of the Ukrainian people you were mistreated under the czars. However, the real blood bath of the Ukrainian people took place under the commissars—under Lenin and Trotsky—under Stalin, and, yes, under Khrushchev.

More than 300 years ago the Ukrainians learned to their eternal sorrow that treaties with Russia are used as vehicles of enslavement. By taking advantage of a vague oral treaty made in 1654, the czars ultimately took over the Ukraine.

I have had occasion to do considerable research on Ukrainian history; I do not have time to go into this matter in any detail, but I do want to say that a documentation of Russian relations with the Ukraine provides a clear and concise proof of Russian duplicity and aggression. The same 300 years also provide a history of courage and dedication to freedom of the Ukrainian people that has not been excelled.

Today freedom has a great chance to achieve victory over Communist slavery if we of the free world do not falter. Today we are not only failing to push the great advantage we have over the Communist world, but I am sorry to say that many of our leaders apparently are fearful of victory.

Today freedom has a clear opportunity to win over communism if our leadership will only change our "no win" policy to a "will win" policy. Today the odds are on our side to win if we have the will to win. Today Russia is confronted with economic failure and growing dissension and deterioration between her captive peoples and satellite nations.

While the problems of the Communist world involve increasing scarcities, those of the free world involve increasing surpluses. The Berlin wall is only one symbol of Russia's worsening plight, which is so manifest to all that no further documentation is necessary.

Khrushchev is well aware that his Communist world is in serious trouble. He is fearful and bitter. Just this week in Sweden he taunted and threatened the fugitives from Russian-dominated lands that now live in Sweden. He bragged about the defeat of the Ukraine by Peter the Great of Russia in 1709. He is a man afraid and now is the time for America to be firm.

It is unthinkable to you and me that, as freedom is just ahead, we should allow a "no win" policy to lengthen Russia's police state control over her captive peoples and countries. Yet, a "no win" philosophy is coloring our national objectives and procedure.

Last year's annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted by President Kennedy, Congress refers to the studies made by that Agency. Quoting verbatim from one of these studies:

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200-million-odd Russians and many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1919."

This is purely the philosophy of those who would surrender freedom to Communist tyranny to gain a temporary peace and tranquility.

Today the Kremlin goal is for the rest of the world to surrender to its rule and then we would have peace—peace with slavery. Mao Tse-tung has the same ambition only he would have us surrender to him.

Another startling example of our no win policy is that on December 20, 1962, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations caused the United Nations General Assembly to rescind the resolution creating a watchdog committee on Russian aggression in Hungary. It is unbelievable that our country could have taken such a step, but we did.

If today we in the free world will exploit the truth with the same fervor and dedication that the Communists exploit their lies, then freedom will win.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN AT SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BANQUET, WASHINGTON, D.C., ARMORY, JUNE 27, 1964

I wish to congratulate the Shevchenko Memorial Committee for this great day in which we are commemorating the memory of one of the world's great poets and freedom fighters.

Although the accomplishments of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian hero of a century ago, are forgotten by many in this modern age, his messages in poetry and deeds of valor have been handed down to the generations and helped instill into the minds of millions of Ukrainians and all nationalities who believe in freedom that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The messages and teaching sent out by this historic Ukrainian have reawakened in the minds of millions the human desire to resist tyranny and continue the fight for liberty and self-government.

The Ukraine of Shevchenko's life was identical with the Ukraine of the last half century in patriotic spirit for freedom and self-government. A modern example of the spirit of the Ukrainian people was exemplified in December 1917. At that time the Congress of Soviet Delegates issued the ultimatum of submission to declare Ukraine a Soviet republic. Members of the Ukrainian plebiscite voted 1,198 to 2 to endorse the independent Ukrainian Government and resist Soviet Russia. To the everlasting credit of the Ukrainian people they fought and resisted Soviet Communist military aggression against overwhelming odds. Ukrainian people, to this modern day, have the determination to continue the battle for freedom and self-government.

This demonstration by the Ukrainian people was nothing but a continuation of the historic resistance which their ancestors demonstrated back in the days of Taras Shevchenko. All true historians place Shevchenko as a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny. During his lifetime he did not retreat from the fight for his nation's independence and freedom from Russian tyranny.

In the 82d Congress I was a member of the special committee which was authorized by the Congress to investigate Communist aggression in the satellite nations of Europe. Testimony was presented to the committee exposing the deplorable tortures, tyranny, and food scarcity conditions inflicted upon the Ukrainian people by the Soviet Communist tyrants.

The committee heard extensive testimony on the manmade famine in the Ukraine during the years 1932–33 at a time when the harvest was better than average. Mr. Fedir Pihido, a Ukrainian national who provided extensive testimony and documentation for the committee, was asked how many people died as a result of this manmade famine.

He replied as follows: "according to unofficial statistics, the number of victims can be placed between 6 and 7 million."

Other witnesses testified about the way the Communists had confiscated and desecrated churches and turned them into warehouses where the grain was stored. Armed guards were placed around the churches and other buildings where stored grain was allowed to spoil while millions of people were starving. Mrs. Anna Kravchenko testified that approximately one-half of the people in the village where she lived perished from starvation, and that special brigades of Communists were sent from Moscow to her village to search out all food and to confiscate it. Another witness, who requested that his true identity not be disclosed because a number of his relatives still live in the Ukraine, gave vivid testimony of the way in which the Communists covered up the millions of deaths they caused by their planned famine.

Other witnesses testified that the purposes of the manmade famine was to break the national spirit in the Ukraine, to force the peasants into the collectivization program, and to enrich the Communist rulers by confiscation of grain and cattle. Regardless of overwhelming odds the spirit of Ukrainian resistance and desire for freedom has not changed over the centuries.

I mention the above because the highly organized worldwide propaganda machine of the Communist conspiracy has successfully covered up in the minds of too many people throughout the world the true facts about Communist tyranny and inhumanity inflicted on its conquered victims. As time passes, the people of the world are gradually learning the true facts and exposed Communist lies and propaganda concerning their barbarous methods of aggression. Their economy is proving a failure; their agriculture program in both Communist Russia and China is unsuccessful and starvation is rampant in Communist metropolitan areas.

Shevchenko served the cause of freedom with all his native talents and genius. He was a fighter for liberty and awakened the enslaved nations to fight for freedom against czarist, and later Communist, tyranny. In his poems and writings he appealed to God for a George Washington in the Ukraine who would lead his nation to independence. Poets and writers of all nationalities have paid tribute to Shevchenko over the years. His poems and writings have been translated into 50 different languages. His greatness has been noted by scholars of all nationalities throughout the world. Americans of Ukrainian descent strongly feel that a statue of Shevchenko has much to offer, not only to Washington but to all Americans and people from foreign lands who visit our National Capital. This statue which is unveiled today will always be a symbol of Ukrainian effort and mankind's desire to spread the ideals and messages of freedom, liberty, and self-government to all mankind.

His messages of continued resistance by liberty-loving people will encourage millions behind the Iron Curtain and, with the aid of the free world, some day restore liberty and freedom to Ukraine and other enslaved nations throughout the globe.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN, SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BANQUET, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY

Across the miles and years, across the barriers of language and nationality, we return today the salute of a valiant champion and prophet of human freedom.

One hundred and seven years ago, Taras Shevchenko, poet-patriot of the Ukraine, wrote the lines:

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington?
To promulgate his new and righteous law."

Today, under authorization of the Congress of the United States, we have dedicated a statue of Taras Shevchenko in the Capital City which bears the name of his hero—Washington.

My personal pride in being privileged to participate in this observance is heightened by the knowledge that two distinguished Members of Congress from my own State of Michigan had a leading role in the congressional authorization for this statue voted by the 86th Congress in September 1960. I refer, of course, to my able colleague, the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley.

Shevchenko and Washington alike knew what every tyrant has known—that national independence is merely individual freedom writ large, and that each is essential to the other.

The tyranny of international communism and Soviet imperialism can no more tolerate national independence than it can tolerate personal liberty and hope to survive.

That, I suspect, is the key to the always violent reaction of the Red Fascists of Russia to the Captive Nations Week resolution adopted by the Congress in July 1959.

One of the greatest rewards and personal satisfactions of my own service in the Congress was the opportunity to vote for this resolution July 9, 1959. In doing so, I warned on the floor of the House that we should match words with deeds, and I recalled the statement of Ralph Waldo Emerson that "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say." I called attention to the fact that we fall all over ourselves to extend hospitality to the visting leaders of Soviet Russia, the captors of the very peoples in whose behalf the resolution was drafted.

Only a few weeks later, on the eve of the shameful first visit of Khrushchev to the United States, that hangman of the Ukraine, in an article written for publication in this country, branded the Captive Nations resolution as an act of provocation. With a frankness American leadership has not always matched, Khrushchev described the resolution as contrary to the concept of "peaceful coexistence" and declared that "the policy of 'rolling back' communism can only poison the international atmosphere."

Despite this clear declaration of tyranny's intention, the invitation to Khrushchev was not withdrawn and Washington's city became his official host.

The lesson of that experience is still not learned.

We maintain cultural exchanges with the regime whose avowed and demonstrated purpose is further enslavement of nations and people.

The lesson is still not learned.

We continue to send businessmen to Moscow, even after one member of such a delegation had offered this commentary:

"What shocked me most about the meeting (with Khrushchev) was the complete disregard for facts. I went away with a sense of frustration. How do you deal with people who lie to you and to whom facts mean nothing?"

Obviously, we have not yet learned, or acknowledged, the true answer to that question: You don't.

The lesson is still not learned—and Congress was kept in session last year until Christmas Eve so that it might reverse itself and approve underwriting of credit for wheat sales to the Soviet captors of the Ukraine.

The lesson is still not learned—and only last week our highest Court held invalid the ban on issuance of passports to American partners of the Communist tyranny, thereby, in the powerful dissenting words of Mr. Justice Clark, enabling "the leaders of the world Communist movement in the Soviet Union to give orders to its comrades in the United States and to exchange vital secrets as well."

The lesson is still not learned—and by making "the lessening of tensions" the chief object of our foreign policy we invite and, indeed, assure nuclear blackmail. Thereby, we become captives of our fears and place ourselves at the mercy of our blackmailers.

We do well to honor Shevchenko.

For the sake of our own freedom—and the freedom of men and nations everywhere—let us honor him in deed as well as in word, in substance as well as in statuary symbol.

"When shall we get ourselves a Washington?"

Mr. Speaker, because of the unprecedented nature of the Shevchenko statue unveiling—the new records scored in our Nation's Capital, a tremendous parade of 36,000 participants and over 100,000 persons witnessing the unveiling of a statue—I believe all will agree that this event, in all its significant aspects, should become a permanent part of our Nation's history. I therefore request that the following items be printed in the RECORD: First, a short account on "Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine—Fighter for Human Liberty"; second, an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "America Hails Shevchenko," which appeared in the Shevchenko Jubilee Memorial Book; third, a brief background account on "Ukraine: History and Present Status"; fourth, a concise statement on the "Significance of the Memorial Statute to Taras Shevchenko, Bard of Ukraine, and Fighter for Human Liberty"; fifth, a UPI article by Neil A. Martin on "Controversial Statue—World Horizons"; sixth, another article by Dr. Dobriansky on "America Meets Shevchenko," which appeared in the leading Ukrainian Catholic newspaper America on June 25; seventh, a commentary in Freedom's Facts, the publication of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, titled, "Memorial to a Great Fighter for Freedom"; eighth, a short background story on the "Ukrainian Immigration to America"; ninth, a most interesting article by Philip Love, feature editor of the Washington Star, on "Taras Shevchenko, Both America and Russia Claim Ukrainian Nationalist As Hero"; tenth, the significant roster of the National Shevchenko Memorial Honorary Sponsoring Committee, headed by the 33d President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; eleventh, the penetrating article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, on the "New Statue of Liberty," which appeared in the June 28 Sunday Star; twelfth, an additional article by Dr. Dobriansky on "The 'Controversial' Statue," which was prepared for Svoboda, a major fraternal newspaper; thirteenth, a Washington Post article on "Unveiling Rites Set Today for Statue of Shevchenko"; fourteenth, a June 27 article in the Evening Star written by Robert J. Lewis on "Parade and Dedication Here To Honor Ukrainian Poet"; fifteenth, the opening address at the unveiling by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University; sixteenth, an article by Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Quarterly, on the "Shevchenko Monument: A Challenge to Moscow," which was published in the Ukrainian Catholic organ America; seventeenth, another article by Robert J. Lewis in the June 28 Sunday Star on "Shevchenko Statue Here Unveiled by Eisenhower"; eighteenth, two short reports that appeared in the June 28 Washington Post, "Ukrainians Make Eisenhower Feel 'Like I Were Back in Politics,'" and "Ukrainians Have History of Freedom-Seeking"; nineteenth, another Washington Post account on "36,000 Ukrainian-Americans March in Heat to Unveiling of Poet's Statue"; twentieth, a statement by the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI at the Shevchenko Memorial Banquet; twenty-first, a message from Senator HUGH SCOTT to the banquet; twenty-second, the commemorative scroll read in two languages at the unveiling ceremony by Joseph Lesawyer, executive director of the memorial committee, and Ignatius Billinsky, secretary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; twenty-third, the biography of Leo Mol, sculptor of the Shevchenko statue; twenty-fourth, the physical details of the statue; and twenty-fifth, the dedication inscription on the statue, which was written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky:

TARAS SHEVCHENKO (1914–61), BARD OF UKRAINE—FIGHTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

Taras Shevchenko was born in serfdom in Ukraine in 1814.

He was orphaned at the age of 12.

In 1838, at the age of 24, he gained freedom and began to study art and write poetry in St. Petersburg.

His first volume of poetry, "Kobzar," was published in 1840. "Kobzar" marked an epoch in modern Ukrainian literature. It was written in Ukrainian about the fate of the Kozaks, the decay of old Ukraine, and the bitter struggles of Ukrainians for independence. In a short period of time more than 8 million copies of "Kobzar" were sold.

His longest and greatest poem, "Haydamaki," was published in 1841. This described the Ukrainian nature and the revolt of Ukrainians against their overlords.

Shevchenko returned to Ukraine a free man and a national hero in 1845. In this year he published the poem, "The Caucasus." From this poem has been taken the "Prometheus" theme for the memorial statue to Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.

Stirred by political currents which led to the revolutions that swept Europe in 1848, Shevchenko joined in forming the Society of Saints Cyril and Methodius. Their aim was to support a free union of Slavonic peoples under a republican form of government.

Shevchenko and his friends were arrested by the Czar's police. Shevchenko was sentenced to military exile in eastern Russia, where he met many Polish and Ukrainian exiles.

He was pardoned and returned to St. Petersburg in 1858.

On his release he wrote another great poem, "The Neophytes," a tale of ancient Rome and the persecution of the Christians. The parallel between the tyrannical Nero and the Russian Czar was unmistakable.

Shevchenko succeeded in freeing his family from serfdom in 1859.

He died February 26, 1861, on the eve of the liberation of the serfs for whose freedom he had fought.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SHEVCHENKO'S POETRY

Shevchenko began his writing career with the dream of perpetuating the memory of the old days when the free Kozaks carved out a precarious liberty for themselves and their people. He valued the positive ideals of liberty, and the courage and heroism of those who fought for it.

His revolutionary poems, the martyrdom of his life, contributed to the liberation of the serfs in Ukraine and throughout the Russian Empire. Shevchenko also defended freedom for the non-Russian people in the Russian Empire and called for their independence.

In his struggle for social justice and national independence, he was a champion of George Washington's just and righteous law, which he regarded as an ideal for Ukraine and for all nations seeking independence.

Taras Shevchenko, the son of a serf, with an unshakeable faith in the victory of democratic ideals, made himself one of mankind's most effective spokesmen for freedom for all, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, and, he became one of the world's great poets. His works have been translated from his native Ukrainian into 60 different languages.

EXCERPTS FROM THE POETRY OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

From "The Neophytes":

"Ye sons of night,
Insensate dogs, deprived in truth of sight,
You cannot see at all! Flat on the ground
Your greasy, praying carcasses are found;
Behind a cross from devils you would hide,
And then beneath your breath a prayer of pride
Asks God to send the worst adversity
And every kind of plague in high degree
Upon your fellow Christians, doomed your foes—
May God appoint your condign overthrows,
All ye new pharaohs with your hearts of clay,
Rapacious Caesars of this later day!"
—Translated by WATSON KIRKCONNELL.

From "God's Fool":

"You were not fit,
Clad in laced liveries, toads, pharisees,
You were not fit to raise in the defense
Of justice and our sacred liberty!
You have been taught to torture your own brothers,
And not to love them! Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But someday we shall surely find the man."
(1858) Translated by Watson Kirkconnell.

From "O My Thoughts, My Heartfelt Thoughts":

"There is Ukraina;
From end to end, there, it is broad
And joyful like freedom
Which has long since passed away;
Broad as a sea, the Dnipro,
Steppe and steppe, the rapids roar,
And gravemounds high as mountains.
There was born the Kozak freedom,
There she galloped round,
With Tartars and with Polish lords
She strewed the plain about
Till it could take no more; with corpses
All the plain she strewed.
Freedom lay down to take her rest;
Meanwhile the gravemound grew,
And high above it, as a warder,
Hovers the Black Eagle,
And Minstrels come an ! sing about
The gravemound to the people."
(1839) Translated by Vera Rich.

From "The Dream":

"The desert wilderness has stirred
As from a coffn's narrow girth
For the Last Judgment-day of doom,
The dead are rising for the truth.
These are not the dead, the slain,
They come not seeking Judgment-day:
No! They are people, living people,
Put in irons, they draw
Gold up out of holes, to pour it
Down the Glutton's maw.
Among them, the old lags, in chains
Is the King of freedom,
The King of all the world, the King
Wearing a brand for crown.
In torment, in hard labor, he
Pleads not, nor weeps, nor groans
Once the heart is warmed by goodness,
Cold it will never grow.
Where, then, are your thoughts, your rosy-pink flowers?
Well-cared-for and brave, these dear children of yours?
To whom, then, to whom, my friend, did you give them?
Or perhaps in your heart for all ages you hid them?
Do not hide them, my brother! But scatter them far!
They will germinate, grow—and go into the world."

(1844) Translated by Vera Rich.

From "The Caucasus":

"Mountains beyond mountains, crags in stormclouds cloaked,
Wild heights sown with sorrow, soil that blood has soaked.
From the dawn of time, Prometheus
Hangs, the eagle's victim;
All God's days, it pecks his ribs,
Tears the heart within him.
Tears, but cannot drink away
The blood that throbs with life,
Still it lives and lives again
And still once more he smiles.
For our soul shall never perish,
Freedom knows no dying,
And the Glutton cannot harvest
Fields where seas are lying;
Cannot bind the living spirit;
Nor the living word,
Cannot smirch the sacred glory,
Of almighty God."

(1845) Translated by Vera Rich.

AMERICA HAILS SHEVCHENKO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

"We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage." John Fitzgerald Kennedy

These inspiring and well-founded words of our late President were expressed in March 1961. They epitomize the greatness of Taras Shevchenko and the immortality of his works not only for the people of Ukraine but for humanity at large. The historical heritage, of which the poet's accomplishments are indeed a noble part, is the precious heritage of freedom, of man's relentless fight for personal liberty and national independence. In this critical period of world history the people of the United States hail Shevchenko both as a cultural giant and one of Europe's earliest freedom fighters against the dark and barbaric forces of traditional Russian imperio-colonialism which today is masked by deceptive ideologic communism.

June 27, 1964, will be a day long remembered in the annals of American history. For the first time in the capital of any free world nation, the unveiling of a statue in honor of Ukraine's poet laureate signalizes the forging of bonds of freedom between our country and the 45-million Ukrainian nation, as well as all the captive nations in Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. The Shevchenko statue is singularly dedicated to the liberation, freedom, and independence of all captive nations. In truth, Washington is not only the capital of these United States but also of the free world. To crystallize the complete meaning and importance of Shevchenko, no more fitting environment of freedom and liberty can accommodate Shevchenko's statue than the spiritually rich soil of Washington.

As an everlasting symbol of world freedom, the Shevchenko monument is thus properly and compatibly situated. In this free environment it will constantly emphasize the universal spirit and substance of Shevchenko's thoughts in behalf of freedom in all of its dimensions. It will brilliantly reflect the true character and stature of the nationalist revolutionary and patriot himself. It will preserve without blemishes and distortions of any kind the majestic message of Shevchenko's writings toward the final liberation of all nations from the cancerous domination of imperialist Moscow. In short, the natural, spiritual habitat of Shevchenko today is Washington, which in every essential respect can and does claim him as its own. In colonialist Moscow, any fabricated tribute to him is sheer mockery; in captive Kiev, it is an exercise in national frustration and suppression.

Clearly, then, what does Shevchenko mean to us Americans? Why on this 150th anniversary of his birth do we pay national tribute to the poet's humanism and universal idealism? How does one perceptively assess the significance of this national hero and patriot of a distant land to the interests of the United States and the free world? What can we Americans look forward to in the long period beyond June 27?

These and other meaningful questions have been raised frequently as countless of our fellow citizens have become enamored with Shevchenko, his life, his writings, and his enduring message. To answer them succintly here, let us first look into the background of events leading to the Shevchenko status; then we can easily observe the meaning of Shevchenko to America; and lastly, Shevchenko as a promise for the future can be readily determined.

THE STORY OF THE MONUMENT

For a complete and detailed story of the legislation providing for the erection of the Shevchenko statue, the reader might well consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 1, pages 1174–1176, "Ukrainian Independence Day." It was quite appropriate for this story to be told on such an occasion. The legislative history of the monument will undoubtedly fascinate many researchers of the future. However, the highlights of this history should be recounted for any understanding of why America today meets Shevchenko.

The idea of a Shevchenko monument in Washington was often expressed in the decade of the fifties by numerous knowledgeable individuals and groups who sought to honor the poet with maximum effect. In many localities this had been concretely displayed in a variety of forms, including statues. In Canada, preparations had already been underway for a Shevchenko monument, which was unveiled in Winnipeg in July 1961, the year of the Shevchenko centennial. On the national level in the United States this idea of a statue had to be integrated into a broader idea of national recognition and purpose that would poignantly project the universal stature and functional symbolism of Shevchenko.

It was with this comprehensive idea in mind that this writer authored a laconic and yet elastic resolution providing for the erection of the poet's statue in the Nation's Capital. On March 17, 1959, the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, sponsored the resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives, and the measure became known as House Joint Resolution 311. Soon, thereafter, the entire project for its successful passage was initiated by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a nationwide organization representing 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

Action on the joint resolution was not really taken until a year later. Soon after its introduction, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman of the House Administration Committee, indicated the desirability of holding hearings on the measure and referred it to the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, chairman of the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials. The procedure of receiving reports and recommendations from the Department of the Interior and the Commission of Fine Arts consumed so much time that the hearing was necessarily delayed until the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

On March 31, 1960, the hearing took place, and testimonies were submitted by representatives of various interested organizations. As pointed out in an article by this writer on "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" (the Ukrainian Quarterly, autumn, 1960, New York) the testimonies presented all the essential arguments in favor of the resolution, and their convincing character laid the grounds for speedy committee approval. Shevchenko's affinity to our own George Washington, the cultural and political prowess of his poetry and prose, his historical position as a powerful advocate of freedom in the very period of our own Abraham Lincoln, Poland's Mickiewicz, Hungary's Kossuth, Italy's Mazzini, and other freedom fighters, the idolization of Shevchenko by every patriotic Ukrainian down to this day, the tradition of freedom he represents in Eastern Europe and central Asia, the crucial importance of his works for the eventual liberation of all the captive nations in the present Soviet Russian Empire, the need to throw Moscow off balance in its calculated attempt to distort and disfigure the Ukrainian national hero—these and many other substantial arguments were advanced for the passage of House Joint Resolution 311.

As a matter of fact, this writer viewed the passage of this measure as the first implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed the preceding year; and we all know, the ideologic contents of that resolution frightened the Russian Dictator Khrushchev. So deeply impressed were the legislators by the data and reasons given that the publication of a short biographical documentary on Shevchenko was strongly recommended. With the aim of benefiting as many citizens as possible, the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, introduced House Resolution 524, calling for the official publication of the documentary.

Two months later, on June 1, the House Administration Committee approved both House Joint Resolution 311 and House Resolution 524 and ordered favorable reports on both to the House of Representatives. The authorization for the biography was passed first, and on June 24 the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 without any objection. In the foreword of the documentary biography "Europe's Freedom Fighter, Taras Shevchenko 1814–61" (House of Representatives, Doc. No. 445, 1960), the names of all legislators who were instrumental in this important legislation are listed. Among them are the present Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts and also President Lyndon B. Johnson, then Senator from Texas and the majority leader.

It took another 2 months before the Senate passed the measure. The national conventions of the two parties necessitated a recess in Congress, and time was gained for a thorough staff examination of the approved House resolution by the Senate Rules Committee. In the meantime, popular reaction to the documentary biography was salutary and beneficial. When Congress reconvened, the stage was set for a favorable reception

of the measure. Thus, on August 29 the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 311, and 2 days later, on August 31, the Senate voted for it without objection.

President Eisenhower signed the resolution into law on September 13, 1960. On the basis of this law the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America immediately proceeded to establish the Shevchenko Memorial Committee which would devote itself exclusively to plans and operations aimed at the erection of the statue. Furthermore, the law precipitated considerable discussion here and abroad. Although there were various press reports on the legislation in the course of its passage through Congress, the law now became an object of deep and curious interest to our press. Lengthly articles of a favorable nature soon appeared in the Washington Evening Star, the New York Herald Tribune, the Chicago Sunday Tribune, the Pittsburgh Family Magazine, and numerous other organs in the country. The Shevchenko symbolism had caught on.

The reaction from the Soviet Union was what we had anticipated. This act by our Government spoiled the propaganda plans of colonialist Moscow and captive Kiev, who were intent upon disfiguring Shevchenko as a mere social reformer, a democratic revoluntionary, and a precursor of the October Russian Revolution. The purity of a national symbol and spiritual force was to be polluted with familiar contaminative elements of Russian propaganda; the national heroism of Shevchenko was to be prostituted by the objectives of these detractors. Congress' action was like a bombshell in the Soviet Russian Empire. One need only read the vituperative absurdities about the work of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, real American business cynicism and a host of other mythical entities in the Sovietskaya Kultura, Kommunist, Literaturna Gazeta, and many other publications. Taking both the Captive Nations Week resolution and the Shevchenko Memorial resolution, the evidence on how to pulverize Soviet Russian psychopolitical maneuvers is indeed overwhelming.

Once the law came into being, the rest was a technical implementation of the intent and spirit of Public Law 86-749. The Shevchenko Memorial Committee, under the able administration of its executive director, Mr. Joseph Lesawyer, launched plans for the building of the statue speedily and smoothly. In the span of a year and a half, over a quarter of a million dollars were collected for the purpose. Also, a jury of prominent American sculptors, architects, and artists was established to select the proposed statue plan, which was that submitted by the Canadian Sculptor Leo Mol. Another Canadian, the Architect Radoslav Zuk, was selected to produce the architecture for the site at P and 22d Streets, NW., Washington, D.C. By the end of 1962, both the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission substantially approved the project as recommended by the Department of the Interior and the Shevchenko Memorial Committee.

Uppermost in the minds of the statue's sponsors has been the community about the Shevchenko site. From the very start, priority was given to criteria of beauty, restfulness, and utility. The statue and its surrounding architecture may well be viewed as an enhancement of the already existing qualities of the immediate environment. The Shevchenko Park is, in truth, a park of freedom and culture.

THE MEANING OF SHEVCHENKO TO AMERICA

In a way it is no accident that the Shevchenko statue stands in close proximity to the Church of the Pilgrims. One truly reinforces the other to give the entire area an atmosphere of value and sanctity to man's most precious right and God-given endowment—freedom. We all know and treasure the history of our early pilgrims and their courageous search for liberty, freedom, and genuine human happiness. With greatness of soul, rectitude of will, and intellectual certitude they laid the earliest foundations of this powerful Nation of ours. Significantly, and as though by act of providence, Shevchenko stands side by side with the Church of the Pilgrims, both symbolically radiating these ultimate and highest attributes of our temporal existence.

This fact in itself concretely conveys the meaning of Shevchenko to America. This crowning fact represents a complete circuit in modern history. The Pilgrims came to these shores to find freedom from the then oppressive institutions of Western Europe; they planted the seeds of liberal free existence here, the very existence we breathe and cherish today. To delve into this rich history is to look inward and to count our blessings. The symbol of Shevchenko, however, causes us Americans to look outward in this divided contemporary world toward the tremendous and challenging work that remains in bringing freedom to the nations of Eastern Europe, Asia, and elsewhere.

In short, the Shevchenko statue is a living symbol of our national determination to share the fruits of freedom with the captive nation of Ukraine and, in the universalist spirit of Shevchenko's historic message, with the peoples of all the captive nations. No other statue in the Capital of the free world bears this specific meaning and purpose. The Shevchenko statue is, of course, intimately related to the Washington Monument inasmuch as the poet revered the Founding Father of our Nation. With unique compatibility it is also related to our Declaration of Independence and our great tradition of national freedom and personal liberty. Over a hundred years ago this tradition rubbed off on Shevchenko and through him on all generations of Ukrainians and other subjugated peoples down to the very present. It is this supreme truth that Moscow and its colonial puppets seek to submerge. It is this supreme truth that the Shevchenko statue monumentalizes for eternity.

Without exaggeration, we are today the global pilgrims of freedom. Our men and women are scattered around the globe in defense of freedom and in search for its expansion. Shevchenko in America is a key to the success of this ceaseless search. He symbolizes the global pilgrim, sowing the seeds of liberation and permanent freedom in Eastern Europe and nurturing infinite hope and faith in the souls of millions who are held captive under Soviet Russian domination. His statuary presence here is a fixed reminder to millions of our own citizens that we have a moral and political responsibility toward the captive people of Ukraine and all other captive nations both within and outside the U.S.S.R. As the Statue of Liberty in New York bids all migrants welcome into the land of liberty, so the Shevchenko statue in Washington inspires faith in all captives in their destiny with freedom.

There are many other aspects of the meaning of Shevchenko to America. The unprecedented ground-breaking ceremonies on the Shevchenko site in September 1963 brought out in elaborate form the many fertile dimensions of the poet's life and works for American interests. These can be found in the book titled "Shevchenko, a Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of All Captive Nations" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 1964). In our country, as elsewhere, there will always be pockets of blind ignorance and even cesspools of prejudice for Moscow and its puppets to wallow in. This widely distributed book was published to fumigate these few cesspools, and the results have been exceedingly beneficial to the interests of our country. The reader will find this book quite illuminating and instructive.

A BRIDGE TO THE FUTURE

In his address on May 24, 1964, at the dedication of the George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Va., President Johnson declared: "We will continue to build bridges across the gulf which has divided us from eastern Europe. They will be bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors, and of humanitarian aid." It will require more than these bridges to defeat and eliminate the menace of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. However, as an idea and a dynamic symbolism, Shevchenko fits the President's prescription perfectly as a bridge into eastern Europe, truly as a bridge to our own future relations with the Soviet Russian Empire, which in its primary form masquerades today as the U.S.S.R.

Contrary to popular impressions, the erection of Shevchenko's statue in Washington is not the end, the omega, of American effort to broaden and deepen our outlook toward the Soviet Russian Empire. It is only the beginning, the alpha, of such concentrated effort. The monument does not point to the past, to a hundred and more years ago; it points primarily and exclusively to the future.

The whole significance of the Shevchenko statue is futural. Through all that it symbolizes—the continuum of freedom, longstanding spiritual affinity with our own revolutionary tradition, a humanism that rebelled against anti-Semitism, serfdom, Russian institutional barbarism, and the degradation of women, and the powerful ideas of national independence and self-determination of peoples—the statue will be a beacon for further free world enlightenment regarding the Soviet Russian prison house of nations, which is called the U.S.S.R.. Through Shevchenko, millions will deepen their knowledge about the largest captive non-Russian nation in Europe, Ukraine itself, and by this knowledge their appreciative awareness of all other captive nations in the U.S.S.R. will be intensified.

Not only will this bridge to the future serve this prime educational purpose, it will also guide us functionally in an unwavering concentration on the root cause of all the major problems bearing on war and peace in the world. And that cause is Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, operating and interminably functioning behind the deceptive mask of world communism. Those who grasp and understand the revolutionary patriotism of Shevchenko—which partakes of the same spiritual substance as our American patriotic idealism—are under no illusions about peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Russian empire. The heavy price of our myopic policy with its omissions and errors today in not asserting this idealism throughout the captive world will most assuredly be borne tomorrow. The list of captive nations beginning in 1918 is a long one, and an evergrowing one. It is to reverse this disastrous trend that the dynamic idealism and real symbolism of Shevchenko point to the most powerful force for freedom in Eastern Europe and Asia, that of patriotic nationalism.

The summit of cynicism was reached in the Kremlin this past March when the Russian dictator Khrushchev received a Shevchenko award. The supreme irony, not to say mockery, of this event can be gaged by Khrushchev's indelible reputation as the hangman of Ukraine. It is like conferring a medal of Washington on Hitler. One need only read "The Crimes of Khrushchev," part 2 (Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. Congress, 1959) to realize the depths the Soviet Russian totalitarians and their colonial puppets will go to distort the character and image of history's great personages. The names of Lincoln, Jefferson and scores of others have also been twisted to suit their propaganda purposes.

Shevchenko's statue in Washington mirrors with resplendent effect such lies and distortions on the part of colonialist Moscow and its colonial puppets. It stands as a monument of truth and a beacon of strength and enlightenment for American cold war victory over the reactionary forces of traditional Russian imperialism, which today seeks to legitimize itself under the ideologic cover of communism and under the pretense of monolithic Soviet power.

My colleague Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University, has written a fascinating book "Shevchenko Meets America" (Milwaukee, Wis., 1964). For background material it should be read by all. It goes a long way to explain why on June 27, 1964, finally, America meets Shevchenko, And beyond this date the two will never part as the global pilgrims diffuse the power of freedom in the remaining empires in the world.

UKRAINE: HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS

IN BRIEF

Area: 289,000 square miles (larger than Poland and Yugoslavia combined).

Population: Over 42 million.

Location: A Republic in the U.S.S.R., bordering on Hungary, Rumania, Poland, the Black and Azov Seas, Byelorussia and Russia.

Periods of Independence: 9th to 13th century; 17th century up to 1654; 1917–21. Ukraine today is nominally an independent nation with its own representative in the United Nations.

Resources: Ukraine is one of Europe's richest countries. It is a great producer of wheat, and has been referred to as the "granary of Europe." Equally important are Ukraine's machine building, its heavy and light industry, its giant hydroelectrical powerplants on the Dnieper River, and the oilfields in western Ukraine.

HISTORY

Historically speaking, Ukraine has had three distinct periods of statehood and national independence:

1. From the 9th century when its history began under the name "Rus" until the 13th century when the country was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tartar successors.

The original name of Ukraine was "Rus." The name of the lands ruled by Moscow had been known as the Grand Duchy of Moscow or Muscovy. Peter the Great, the Muscovite empire builder, took over the name "Rus" and called his domain Russia. Ukrainians adopted the name Ukraine, whose origin derives from the Ukrainian word krai, or country. Since the end of the 17th century Ukraine has been divided between Poland and Russia and later between Russia and Austria until the outbreak of World War I and the establishment in 1917 of the free and independent state of the Ukrainian people.

2. During the 17th century the Ukrainian people overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tartars were defeated. Independence began to wane in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky made a treaty with Moscow, on condition that Moscow would guarantee the autonomy of Ukraine. Muscovite troops settled in Ukraine ostensibly to protect Ukraine from the Poles but actually as occupation forces. During the occupation period the dream of an independent Ukraine was kept alive in literature. A leader in the revival of the spirit of Ukrainian national independence was Taras Shevchenko.

3. In March of 1917 the Ukrainians rose to freedom and established their own independent state by organizing the Ukrainian Central Rada, which became the nucleus of the Ukrainian sovereign State in modern times. On January 22, 1918, Ukraine declared its full independence and, as the Ukrainian National Republic, was recognized by a number of European states, including Soviet Russia. But immediately upon the recognition of Ukraine as an independent state of the Ukranian people, the Soviet Government dispatched powerful armies against Ukraine, and after more than 3 years of valiant opposition on the part of the Ukrainian nation, the Bolsheviks succeeded in destroying the Ukrainian national government and its armies and imposed a Communist puppet regime upon the country. In 1923, Ukraine was made an unwilling member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But control over foreign affairs and most domestic matters was taken over by the Soviet Government in Moscow, which was, in effect, the government of Russia.

PRESENT STATUS OF UKRAINE

The present status of Ukraine is that of a Soviet Socialist Republic; namely, the Ukrainian S.S.R. It is one of 16 constituent republics of the Soviet Union, and also a charter member of the United Nations. Theoretically, Ukraine is an independent country, with a separate Ukrainian government in Kiev. The separate Ukrainian Constitution assures the country the right of secession from the U.S.S.R. as does also the Soviet Constitution.

On April 11, 1963, the government of the Ukrainian S.S.R. was reorganized by the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, a pseudoparliament. The following ministries were designated: Higher and Secondary Education, Power and Electrification, Foreign Affairs, Communications, Culture, Public Health, Agriculture, Finance, Automotive Transport and Highways, Construction, Communal Enterprises, Assembly and Special Construction, Education, Public Security, Social Security, Commerce.

Only the defense ministry and internal security affairs (Soviet police) are in the hands of the central Soviet (Russian) Government. Although Ukraine has a ministry of finance, there is no separate Ukrainian national currency, just as there is no separate Ukrainian army or police.

The legislative power of Ukraine is concentrated in the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine in Kiev, which is a replica of the central Soviet in Moscow. There is only one legal party, the Communist Party of Ukraine. This latter is a branch of the All-Union Communist Party of the Soviet Union. All candidates to the Supreme Soviet must have the endorsement of the Communist Party, which in turn takes orders from the Russian Communist Party and its emissaries in Ukraine.

The strength and numbers of the Communist Party of Ukraine is not well known, especially since the weeding out of inactive or insufficiently committed members. However, the number is estimated as close to 900,000. From the time of the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1923 all top level Communist leadership in Ukraine has been non-Ukrainian. After the death of Stalin in 1953 and the rise to power of Khrushchev, a more "liberal" course was introduced in Ukraine to the extent that the secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine was now a Ukrainian, Alexander Kirichenko. He in turn was succeeded by another Ukrainian, Mykola Podhorny, and the latter was replaced by a third Ukrainian, Petro Y. Shelest.

Despite these outward Ukrainian trappings, the Soviet power in Ukraine is in essence a Russian power, bent on domination of the Ukrainian people.

In general, the Soviet power in Ukraine, including also the post-Stalin period, is characterized by the following:

1. Russification: Aimed at Russifying the Ukrainian people and, at the very minimum, creating a "common Soviet man and language";

2. Drive against Ukrainian nationalism: This has included periodic attacks on Ukrainian independent culture, and on other manifestations which are in consonance with the Ukrainian national aspirations for freedom and independent statehood;

3. Religious persecution: Both the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church have been the objects of persecution as well as other church bodies with constituencies in Ukraine;

4. Economic exploitation: Ukrainian natural resources, such as wheat, and the products of farms and mines, as well as of the machine-building industries, have been taken from Ukraine. Much has been sent to Cuba, and to countries of Africa and Asia, which the Kremlin is wooing to bring them to its side by promises of "help in their national liberation";

5. Genocide: Ukrainians have been victimized by every Soviet regime. The methods employed include manmade famine, forcible deportations to Asia, perennial "purges" and "liquidation of enemies of the people." Thus, the Ukrainian people have over the years lost many millions of their sons and daughters.

The sensitivity of Kremlin leaders over Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Communist Russia was well demonstrated in July 1959 on the occasion of enactment of the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" by the U.S. Congress. Thereupon, Khrushchev and his aids in Ukraine hastily proclaimed that Ukraine was a "free and sovereign country" and needed no helping hand from "American imperialists."

Ukraine is the largest of the non-Russian captive nations in the slave empire of Moscow. Without Ukraine, with its geopolitical position and tremendous wealth, Communist Russia could not have become a threat to the free world. Without Ukraine, Communist Russia would not be the threat to the free world that it is today.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEMORIAL STATUE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO, BARD OF UKRAINE AND FIGHTER FOR HUMAN LIBERTY

Taras Shevchenko embodied in his poetry the "holy ideas" of Ukraine, just as the American Declaration of Independence, and the words of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln embody the highest principles and aspirations of America.

The ideals of Ukraine were human liberty and national independence. Shevchenko expressed the close tie between America and Ukraine over 100 years ago by calling for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington "to promulgate his new and righteous law."

The Statue of Liberty in New York harbor stands as a symbol of freedom for everyone entering the United States. The statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., will stand as a constant reminder of man's struggle for freedom in east-central Europe and around the world.

THE WORLD STRUGGLE OF FREEDOM VERSUS TYRANNY

Today, the United States and Soviet Russia are waging a serious struggle over the memory of Taras Shevchenko, whose 150th birthday anniversay is being celebrated around the world in 1964.

Communist propagandists claim that Shevchenko, having fought against serfdom, was a Bolshevik who died before his time.

In the United States and elsewhere, those who oppose tyranny of any kind emphasize that Shevchenko was a leader in man's struggle against tyranny and for human liberty, and that he specifically sought Ukrainian independence from Russian rule.

Shevchenko was a true revolutionary for human liberty who, were he alive today, would be a leader in the struggle against the totalitarianism and the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

ACTION OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

In commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Shevchenko's death, the U.S. Congress

held hearings on Shevchenko's life and works. These resulted in production of House Document 445—Taras Shevchenko, Europe's Freedom Fighter—in 1960, and passage of a bill authorizing erection of a memorial statue of Shevchenko in Washington, D.C., without expense to the United States. Americans of Ukrainian descent and origin raised over one-third of a million dollars to cover the cost of the statue.

A competition was held to determine the statue design. This was won by Leo Mol, who had been born in Ukraine in 1915, had studied in Vienna, Berlin, and Holland, and was vice president of the Sculptors Society of Canada.

The erection of the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko perpetuates the memory of his fight for national independence and freedom of all peoples, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. It also is an expression of American devotion to the cause of independence and freedom everywhere in the world.

In the words of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America: "The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

AMERICAN LEADERS COMMENT ON SHEVCHENKO

American leaders of both political parties have praised Taras Shevchenko as a poet and as a champion of liberty. A few comments follow:

The late President John F. Kennedy: "I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut: "Taras Shevchenko belongs in the first instance to the Ukrainian people. But, in a larger sense, he belongs to all mankind * * * We honor him as a fighter for freedom and as a champion of the persecuted and oppressed. We honor him as a universal hero and as one of the towering moral personalities of all time."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota: "His [Shevchenko's] life and writings have played a great role in shaping the Ukrainian national spirit and culture. The ideals to which Shevchenko stubbornly clung—national self-determination and democratic rule—remain a guiding light today for Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe."

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York: "Taras Shevchenko was a bard of freedom * * * It is fitting that the statue of such a national hero, who taught the American ideals of patriotism and service to man, should stand in the Capital of the United States."

Former Congressman Alvin Bentley, Republican, of Michigan: "In authorizing the erection of this memorial to Taras Shevchenko * * * Congress was paying tribute which was both well deserved and long overdue to a recognized champion of human liberty and freedom. We are all familiar with the inspiration which Shevchenko, a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln and an admirer of George Washington, has given the people of his native Ukraine and freedom-loving peoples everywhere."

Congressman EDWARD DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois: "The Ukraine represents the largest single anti-Communist nationalistic force within the present boundaries of the Soviet Union, and congressional support of the monument to Shevchenko represents a psychopolitical blow against the Soviet Union and its insidious propaganda operation."

Congressman THADDEUS DULSKI, Democrat, of New York: "The coming Shevchenko statue will in every respect be a statue symbolizing world freedom. This is the most important aspect of the Shevchenko project. Shevchenko keynotes world freedom, especially for the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself."

Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio: "Taras Shevchenko was a unique champion of freedom for all men and independence for all nations, just as he was the avowed enemy of tyranny, despotism, and imperialism."

Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania: "When Shevchenko's monument to world freedom will be unveiled next June, it will also be a monumental tribute to all Americans who, like the late President, have with knowledge and perception understood the universal symbol of Shevchenko for world freedom. Indeed, the statue will honor the understanding and vision of our late President."

Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan: "Taras Shevchenko * * * was distinguished as a man of letters, an eminent poet, and a fervent patriot of unblemished character. But more than that, he was a voice crying for freedom from the dark depths of slavery and serfdom. During his lifetime, the Ukrainian people were almost as severely oppressed by the czarist Russian regime as they are today under the Russian Communists in the Kremlin. Today, as 45 million Ukrainians enslaved by the Russian Communists work unceasingly to obtain their freedom, they look to Taras Shevchenko as the symbol of true liberty and take inspiration and incentive from his life and works."

FROM UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

(By Neil A. Martin)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Controversy can take many strange shapes. Next week, for example, it will stand 14 feet high, weigh 3 tons, and be composed of pure bronze.

The controversy in this instance is a statue—a sculptured replica of Taras Grigoriyevich Shevchenko, 19th century hero and poet laureate of Ukraine. It is scheduled to be unveiled here next Saturday, with possible complications.

The bard is hailed by his American anti-Communist sponsors as "Europe's freedom fighter." Ironically, however, he receives equal commendation in the Soviet Union as a forerunner of modern bolshevism. And with both groups claiming Shevchenko as their hero, a tug of war has developed between Moscow and Washington.

The Soviet press is expected to react bitterly to the unveiling ceremonies. There will be reaction of a different type here between pro and anti-Shevchenko factions.

Led by the influential Washington Post, opponents have questioned the significance of a Shevchenko statue in Washington and have sought to persuade Congress to rescind its authorization of the memorial on varied grounds, including alleged anti-Semitism in the poet's writings.

Nevertheless, all efforts to stop the unveiling have thus far failed. The Shevchenko sponsors also have been able to muster influential supporters including two past U.S. Presidents, many Congressmen, and thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent.

In 1961 the late President John F. Kennedy praised Shevchenko for his "rich contribution to the culture, not only of Ukraine which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage."

Also, former President Harry S. Truman has agreed to act as honorary chairman of the memorial's sponsoring committee, which includes former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

The United Nation's Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has dedicated this year to the observance of the 150th anniversary of the poet's birth.

If everybody loves Shevchenko, then why all the fuss?

The controversy began in 1960 when Congress authorized the memorial and donated a small triangular park in the center of the city for its erection.

The event was intended to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the poet's death the following year, but it also coincided with similar festivities scheduled in the Soviet Union where there are many Shevchenko memorials.

The Soviets have always considered Shevchenko as their own. They have tied his name to more than 160 institutes, libraries, and theaters, 340 collective farms, 15 industrial plants, 190 towns and villages, 140 memorials, and 775 streets and boulevards.

Through the efforts of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Scientific Society more than $250,000 was collected for the memorial here. Ukrainian sculptor Leo Mol was hired to create the statue, and ground-breaking ceremonies took place in September 1963.

Then diplomatic fireworks began exploding.

The Soviet Embassy protested the appearance of an Interior Department official at the ceremonies, as well as a proposed Shevchenko memorial stamp. Later, L. Y. Kizya, chief of Soviet Ukraine's United Nation's delegation, charged the memorial was intended to "fan up animosity toward the Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggrevate the cold war."

Then the Soviet Union's strategy changed abruptly from harsh criticism to praise for the project. A delegation of leading Ukrainian scholars proposed to come here for the unveiling and even bring an urn of earth from the poet's grave.

Sensing subtle implications in the proposal the statue's sponsors declared they would have no part in such a deal.

Nevertheless, the U.S.S.R., Moscow's English-language publication distributed in this country, began running monthly articles on Shevchenko's legacy to the modern Soviet Ukraine. And Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was given the Shevchenko award from the Ukrainian Government for his outstanding social-political contributions to Ukraine.

As the date for the statue's unveiling drew near unexpected opposition arose in the Capital. The Washington Post printed a series of editorials questioning Shevchenko's literary merits and his importance to Americans.

The National Capital Planning Commission, which must approve planned statue sites, was urged by the Interior Department to restudy plans for the memorial. But a review of the project produced no grounds for delaying the unveiling.

One of the more humorous offshoots of the controversy centered recently on a proposal in Trenton, New Jersey's Hamilton Township to change the name of a suburban street to Shevchenko Boulevard. The suggested rechristening was beat down by angry residents who complained they could not spell or pronounce "Shevchenko."

Just who was Shevchenko? Was he a Bolshevik or a Ukrainian George Washington? Actually he was a serf, a poet, a painter, a humanist, a contemporary and admirer of Abraham Lincoln, a friend of the noted American Negro actor, Ira Aldridge, and an ardent nationalist.

During the past 50 years, his many volumes have been translated some 400 times into 41 languages. About 12 million copies of his works, in foreign languages, have been distributed, while Ukrainian copies of his poems exceed 7 million.

Born a serf in 1814, Shevchenko's freedom was purchased by a St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) painter in 1838. His paintings and poems soon gained prominence. By the time of his death, the 47-year-old poet had

become Ukraine's most outstanding literary figure.

Typical of Russia's fermenting 19th century intelligentsia, Shevchenko was enthusiastic about western democracy, abolition of serfdom, and an end to the czars. As a stanch nationalist, he also supported Ukraine independence.

For his activities in a secret Ukrainian nationalist society at Kiev in 1846, Shevchenko was arrested and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and exile. Pardoned in 1857, he managed to make a brief visit to his native Ukraine before dying in 1861.

Of his 47 years, he lived 24 in serfdom, 10 in exile, 3 under Russian police supervision, and only 9 as a freeman.

He is best remembered for these lines from his poem "God's Fool":

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man."

AMERICA MEETS SHEVCHENKO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

June 27, 1964, the day of the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko statue in Washington, can truly be accepted as the day America meets Shevchenko. In response to an act of Congress, this towering symbol of freedom now stands permanently in the Capital of our Nation, reminding all Americans that there are countries and nations in the U.S.S.R. which look to the United States for understanding and support of their supreme goals of national independence and freedom. America meets Shevchenko and through him will progressively come to know the greatest weakness and potential vulnerability of our chief adversary, imperialist Soviet Russia.

Up to the recent period, the direction of events and developments pointed only to Shevchenko meeting America. In the middle of the last century the poet laureate of Ukraine himself met America. By word and in an ardent spirit of common ideals and aspirations Shevchenko turned to our Washington for just laws to prevail eventually in his Ukraine and, indeed, in all of the captive nations of the Russian Empire. Those who over the past 70 years and more wrote in this country about Shevchenko gave further expression to the tendency of the European freedom fighter meeting America.

In this century, groups of Americans of Ukrainian background who established statues and other remembrances of Shevchenko in various localities in this country also represented Shevchenko meeting America. As this tendency progressed, the idea of a Shevchenko monument in Washington was widely discussed during the fifties. Numerous groups and individuals properly felt that a statue in Cleveland or volumes in English about this heroic Ukrainian nationalist or organizations, such as the Shevchenko Scientific Society, bearing the name of this universal figure did not spell in the aggregate the condition of America meeting Shevchenko and profiting by his works, meaning, and vision. For many years, in the Ukrainian Congress Committee and elsewhere, this idea of a Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital was being prepared in anticipation of the Shevchenko anniversaries in the sixties, awaiting the proper time and circumstances. In Canada, the same idea took hold, and although it fell short of realization in the Canadian capital, a Shevchenko monument was unvieled in Winnipeg in July 1961. But, today, there is no question about Amercia meeting Shevchenko.

FROM DENIAL TO ACCEPTANCE

One would suffer from extreme delusion if he were to believe that the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America to America meeting Shevchenko was a smooth and easy one. An honest and objective recognition of the obstacles, hurdles, and also intrusions of nuisance value provides one with a solid perspective of the immense work that lies beyond June 27. The Shevchenko statue is just a part of a greater whole, and if the bard were alive today to witness all this, he would be the first to decry any insular idolatry and blindness to the universal issue of freedom and totalitarian slavery. Also, as one recrosses this bridge, he will observe that in a real and complete sense America met Shevchenko in 1960, when Congress legislated House Joint Resolution 311, the Bentley measure, providing for the erection of Shevchenko's statue in this Capital of the free world.

A detailed story of how this bridge was crossed appears in the article on "Public Law 86–749 and the Shevchenko Centennial" in the autumn 1960, issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Taking some of the pertinent highlights from this story, it should be pointed out that in March 1960, the Department of Interior rejected the simple idea of having another statue in Washington. When this writer met with the Department's officials to discuss this decision, he argued for favorable reconsideration on the basis of the leading points found in House Joint Resolution 311, which the Congress committee primarily advanced, rather than Senate Joint Resolution 54, an inept standardized memorial resolution that arose in an unfortunate episode of self-seeking ambition. It was the height of political naivete to believe that Congress would pass a measure for the Shevchenko statue when at that time few even knew about Shevchenko. The death of Senate Joint Resolution 54 in the Senate Rules Committee in June 1960, almost caused further embarrassment when in that same month the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 311.

The generally held idea of a Shevchenko statue in Washington actually demanded a broader idea of national purpose, and this was afforded in the House resolution. It was the aim of this writer to have the component ideas of Shevchenko's cosmopolitanism, affinity to the American tradition, championship of liberty, and a binding spirituality between America and Ukraine lay the groundwork for meaningful argumentation in terms of the successful Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passed only a year before. The strategy worked and the Department of Interior reversed its original decision. The proposed statue had now a broader, functional significance and national purpose. Without this more comprehensive idea, placing the simple idea of a statue in the context of the contemporary struggle, there certainly would be no Shevchenko statue in Washington today; the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America to America meeting Shevchenko would never have been crossed.

Thus, the Shevchenko statue in Washington today is the prime result solely and exclusively of the initiative, effort, planning and operations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. We began to cross the bridge to America meeting Shevchenko when the Department of the Interior finally approved the broader idea. In the months following, we made rapid strides across the bridge as the House Administration Committee, on the basis of hearings on House Joint Resolution 311, passed the measure, as the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 524, which called for the publication of an official documentary biography of Shevchenko, and as the House passed House Joint Resolution 311 by June 24.

However, by this day only half of the bridge was crossed, and, as mentioned above, in turning to the Senate we were confronted by the embarrassing situation where only a few days before, the Senate Rules Committee killed the amorphous Senate Joint Resolution 54, which again threatened the success of the entire project. Happily, as though by providential design, Congress went into recess to accommodate the two political conventions, and time was gained to convince the members of the Senate Rules Committee on the merits of House Joint Resolution 311. The documentary biography, prepared by this writer, had in the meantime been published and proved to be a valuable and instructive medium. On August 29, the Senate Rules Committee reported out favorably House Joint Resolution 311, and on August 31 the full Senate passed the measure.

With the signing of House Joint Resolution 311 into law by President Eisenhower on September 13, 1960, the bridge from Shevchenko meeting America was completely crossed to America meeting Shevchenko. Soon thereafter, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America established the Shevchenko Memorial Committee to implement the act of Congress and to bring the statue itself into concrete reality. Later attacks against the statue by two well-situated individuals were successfully met largely by the leadership of the Congress Committee. Briefly, then, in formal glory America meets Shevchenko on June 27, 1964, but in reality America met Shevchenko as far back as 1960.

DEDICATION TO THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

In full conformity with the theme and character of this short history of the monument, the statue is rightly dedicated to the liberation, freedom, and independence of all the captive nations. In the larger framework of contemporary issues and for the long future, the success of this UCCA-sponsored project is actually the first implementation of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. The basic argumentation for the statue was in terms of this resolution, and the very contents of the resolution are the ideas and ideals which Shevchenko as a freedom fighter fought for and died for.

The prime meaning of Shevchenko and his works in our time is the liberation and national freedom not only of Ukraine but of all the captive non-Russian nations both inside and outside the Soviet Union. And this means against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the communist conspiracy, and all other Russian negations of freedom. Is it any wonder that America, the home of the free, has met and warmly embraced Shevchenko?

MEMORIAL TO A GREAT FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

A memorial statue will be unveiled and dedicated in Washington, D.C., on June 27 to perpetuate the memory of a powerful fighter for freedom and stand as a constant reminder of captive peoples' struggle for freedom.

Former President Harry S. Truman is honorary chairman for the event. The National Sponsorship Committee includes such outstanding national leaders as His Excellency Patrick O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington; Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of Christian Herald; Edmund Gulewitz, national commander, AMVETS; former Vice President Richard M. Nixon; Dr. Peter Lejins, president of the American Latvian Association; and 100 others.

The memorial statue will honor a 19th century Ukrainian poet and fighter for freedom, Taras Shevchenko. Shevchenko was born in serfdom in Ukraine, gained his freedom, and championed the cause of freedom and national independence for all peoples. He called for independence for Ukraine as the Founding Fathers of the United States called for independence for the colonies. Knowing of the American Revolution, he called for the coming to Ukraine of a Washington with "his new and righteous law."

INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF EVENT

The unveiling and dedication is an international event of great importance. This is

the 150th anniversary year of Shevchenko's birth, and is being celebrated around the world. Russian Communists are trying to claim that Shevchenko—a national hero of Ukraine—was really a Bolshevik who died before his time.

The truth of his life and of his poetry is that he sought Ukrainian independence from Russian rule, and championed the rights of all men to be free. He is known as a champion of freedom to all who live in or trace their origin throughout east-central Europe.

From 40,000 to 60,000 or more people from all over the Western Hemisphere—from Canada in the north to the Argentine in the south—are expected to attend the dedication June 27. The new statue will strengthen the ties between people of the United States and all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain who yearn for and struggle for their freedom and independence.

Erection of the statue is predicated upon a resolution of Congress passed in 1961 and signed by then President Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is sponsored by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, Inc., and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a participating organization in the All-American Conference.

UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO AMERICA

There is evidence that some Ukrainians were in America during the colonial period and that some fought in the American Revolution.

The bulk of immigration, however, came between the years of 1890 and 1914, the period of the last great influx of European migration.

Approximately 75 percent of the over 1 million immigrants at that time came from western Ukraine—Galicia, Carpatho-Ukraine and Bukovina—which were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire prior to 1914.

Another 100,000, approximately, entered the United States from displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II.

Today, more than 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent or origin are embraced by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

LOCATION OF UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS

Ukrainians who came to the United States in 1890–1914 settled in industrial areas—the coal mining areas of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Illinois; the iron ore regions of Minnesota and Michigan; the gold and silver districts of Montana and Colorado; the farm States of Nebraska and the Dakotas.

Some settled in metropolitan areas of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Chicago. Some went west to California, Oregon, and Washington. A few went to Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

The incoming Ukrainians formed a number of fraternal organizations to provide protection in the event of sickness or death. In 1894 appeared the first and largest of these, the Ukrainian National Association. Others followed, including the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics, and the Ukrainian National Aid Association.

Each publishes a Ukrainian-language newspaper. The earliest is Svodoba, established in 1893 and published by the Ukrainian National Association. The daily America is published by the Providence Association while the Workingmen's and National Aid Associations publish weeklies, Narodna Volya and Ukrainske Narodne Slovo, respectively. For the American-born generation there is the Ukrainian Weekly, published by the Ukrainian National Association, as well as English-language supplements of Narodna Volya, America, and Ukrainske Narodne Slovo.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

The absorption by Soviet Russia of western Ukraine at the time of the outbreak of World War II consolidated the Ukrainian immigration and its progeny in America. American-Ukrainians clamored for an assemblage which would speak out for ominously threatened Ukraine and for the menaced free world.

The first Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Congress was held in Washington, D.C., May 24, 1940. Delegates supported U.S. foreign policy, denounced totalitarian aggression, and appealed for help toward Ukrainian liberation from Russian Communist rule.

In succeeding years, UCCA instituted the publication, the Ukrainian Quarterly, urged Western support for the Ukrainian insurgent army which was waging underground war against Soviet Russia, and appealed for universal application of the four freedoms and Atlantic Charter principles to Ukraine and all enslaved nations.

The fourth UCCA Congress, Washington, D.C., November 1949, was warmly greeted by President Harry S. Truman. At this time the Voice of America announced that it would begin a Ukrainian language program in its oversea broadcasts. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, was elected president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

President Truman sent a message to the Fifth UCCA congress in July 1952 urging Americans of Ukrainian descent and origin to tell their kinsmen abroad the "true story of democracy" and to appeal to them not to despair in their fight for freedom.

Following UCCA congresses urged the United States to follow an enlightened liberation policy for the captive nations, and to appeal to the Soviet Government to cease its persecution of religion in the U.S.S.R. At the seventh congress in February 1959, the erection of a memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko was discussed.

ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA

The statue now has become a reality. It will stand as a constant reminder of the struggle of people of Ukraine, of East-Central Europe, and of all other nations for national independence and human liberty.

Organizations participating in the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America are:

1. Fraternal benefit associations

(1) Ukrainian National Association; (2) Ukrainian Workingmen's Association; (3) Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics; (4) Ukrainian National Aid Association.

2. Political organizations

(5) Ukrainian American National Democratic Association; (6) Association of Ukrainians of Revolutionary Democratic Convictions; (7) Association of Friends of the Liberation Movement of Ukraine; (8) Organizations for the Defense of Four Freedoms of Ukraine; (9) Organization of the Rebirth of Ukraine; (10) Ukrainian National State Union; (11) Ukrainian Hetman Organization; (12) Ukrainian Free Society in the U.S.A.; (13) Friends of the OUN Abroad; (14) Association for the Liberation of Ukraine; (15) Association of Friends of the Ukrainian National Republic; (16) DOBRUS, Democratic Association of Ukrainians Formerly Oppressed in the U.S.S.R.

3. Scientific associations

(17) Shevchenko Scientific Society; (18) Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.A.

4. Cultural and relief organizations

(18) Self-reliance; (19) United Ukrainian American Relief Committee; (20) Catholic Academic Union of Ukrainian Intellectuals "Obnova"; (21) Ukrainian Golden Cross; (22) Carpathian Association; (23) Ukrainian Evangelical Association; (24) Organization for the Defense of Lemkivshchyna; (25) Ukrainian Orthodox League of America; (26) Alliance of Ukrainians from Bukovina; (27) Ukrainian Association of Former Political Prisoners; (28) Prolog Research and Publishing Association;

5. Women's organizations

(29) Ukrainian National Women's League of America; (30) Ukrainian American Women's Relief Association of Olga Basarab;

6. Veterans' organizations

(31) United Ukrainian Veterans in the U.S.A.; (32) Ukrainian American War Veterans; (33) Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army; (34) Brotherhoods of Veterans—First Ukrainian Division, Ukrainian National Army; (35) Former Members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army; (36) Association Former Soldiers "Brody-Lev";

7. Foundations

(37) Scholarship Fund of O. Olzhych; (38) Ukrainian Student Fund; (39) Ukrainian Academy of Arts & Sciences Foundation.

8. Professional organizations

(39) Alliance of Ukrainian Artists in America; (40) Associations of Ukrainian Cooperatives; (41) Union of Ukrainian Cooperative Workers; (42) Association of Ukrainian Engineers in America; (43) Ukrainian-American Lawyers Association; (44) Association of Ukrainian Merchants and Industrialists; (45) Association of Ukrainian Veterinarians in America; (46) Ukrainian Professional Society of America; (47) Ukrainian American Medical Society; (48) Ukrainian Lawyers Association in America.

9. Youth organizations

(49) Federation of Ukrainian Student Associations of America (SUSTA); (50) Ukrainian Youth Organization "Piast"; (51) Ukrainian Youth Association of America (SUMA); (52) Ukrainian Youth League of North America (UYL-NA); (53) Ukrainian Student Association "Zarevo"; (54) Association of Ukrainian Democratic Youth (ODUM); (55) Ukrainian Youth Federation of America (MUN); (6) Ukrainian Student Association of M. Michnovsky (TUSM).

TARAS SHEVCHENKO: BOTH AMERICA AND RUSSIA CLAIM UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST AS HERO

(One of the most complex propaganda wars in years has been raging over a statue to be erected June 27 in Washington, D.C., to Taras Shevchenko, the great 19th century poet and freedom fighter who is the Ukrainian national hero. Russia is spending millions of rubles this year building up Shevchenko as a Communist before his time, while, paradoxically, some Americans are attacking Shevchenko as a nationalistic reactionary. Russian Communists insist Shevchenko was pro-Russian, while Ukrainians in America—and most historians—know that Shevchenko's dream was to liberate Ukraine from Russian rule and set up a democratic republic. The statue has been paid for by contributions from Ukrainians throughout America.)

(By Philip Love)

WASHINGTON, June 13.—It's a confused and confusing age we're living in. Alice could come back through the looking glass and—unless somebody like the walrus should tell her—never know that she'd left Wonderland.

What we know to be dictatorship Communists describe as "democracy." When Reds take over a country they say they're "liberating" it, and any nation that opposes them is an "aggressor." Although the Soviet Union maintains the largest military establishment on earth, any other country that tries to remain strong enough to defend itself is "militaristic." Any nation that re-

fuses to give the Communists their way is "imperialistic," and protection of a country they covet is "colonialism."

Even more confusing, perhaps, is the Soviet claim that an American working class family, with its comfortable home, automobile, good clothes and well-rounded diet, is "exploited by capitalists," while its Red counterparts, with far less of everything, are better off in every way.

"The facts of the matter are," as President Kennedy reported after his Vienna meeting with Premier Khrushchev, "That the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: War, peace, democracy, and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong."

NEW SOVIET "HERO"

Now, for reasons that only the upside-down jargon of communism can explain, the Soviets are hailing as a hero a 19th-century genius who would have been their natural enemy and are lambasting the United States for recognizing his greatness as a poet, an artist, and a fighter for human liberty.

Taras Shevchenko lived only 9 of his 47 years as a freeman. From his birth in 1814 until he was 24 years old, he was a serf. Even after his freedom had been bought, he spent 10 years in exile, and 3½ years under Russian police supervision. But in the brief time given to him he wrote so effectively and struggled so valiantly against serfdom that he is still acclaimed, 103 years after his death, not only as the greatest of Ukrainian poets but as "Europe's Freedom Fighter."

In 1961, Canadians of Ukrainian descent erected a statue of Shevchenko in Winnipeg, Ontario. And next Staturday (June 27) another statue of him will be unveiled (at 22d and P Sts. NW.) in Washington. It is the work of the Ukrainian-born Canadian sculptor, Leo Mol, and it stands on land made available by Congress for "A Monument to the Liberation, Freedom, and Independence of all Captive Nations."

To appreciate Shevchenko's greatness, one must know something of the history of his native Ukraine. Because Nikita Khruchchev boasts of being a Ukrainian, and Ukraine so long has been one of the "Republics" of the U.S.S.R., most Americans assume that its 45 million inhabitants are Russians. They are not.

HISTORY

Ukraine has had three periods of independence: (1) From the ninth century, when its history began under the name of "Rus," until the 13th century, when it was plundered and occupied by the forces of Genghis Khan and his Mongol-Tartar successors, (2) during the 17th century, when the Ukrainians overthrew the Polish rulers who had gained control of the country after the Mongol-Tartars were defeated; and (3) from 1917 to 1918 when they ousted their Russian overlords and established the Ukrainian National Republic (U.N.R.).

The second period of independence ended in 1654 when Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (CQ) made a treaty with Moscow under which Muscovite troops occupied Ukraine to "protect" it from the Poles. They never left.

From the end of the 17th century until World War I, Ukraine was divided between Russia and Poland, and Russia and Austria.

Because it was the border and between the Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, and Austrian Empires for so long, the area came to be called Ukraine (from "krai," meaning "border").

RUSSIAN REOCCUPATION

When Ukraine finally won its independence in 1917, the newly established Soviet Government was quick to recognize it. But it was quick, also, to dispatch powerful armies to suppress the new government. This took more than 3 years of bitter fighting, but in the end the Russians imposed a puppet Communist regime on the Ukrainians.

Throughout the long years of their enslavement, the Ukrainian people's longing for independence and freedom was fanned by the writings of their patriots. But Shevchenko, more than any other, expressed the yearnings of the people and their utter contempt for their oppressors.

Shevchenko had every reason to be bitter. He was born into serfdom on the estate of Baron Vasily Vasilyevich Engelhardt, and his mother died when he was 9, and his father when he was 12. To be either an orphan or a serf was bad, but to be both was almost unbearable.

After pasturing cattle and working in the bakery, for neither of which he showed any talent, he was assigned to the baronial mansion as a page. This at least provided an opportunity to study the many beautiful paintings that it contained, but when he was caught trying to copy them, he was flogged.

FREEDOM BOUGHT

When the beatings failed to kill his love of art, his master apprenticed him to a painter in St. Petersburg. There he met Karl Petrovich Bryulov, the most fashionable painter of the day. Bryulov bought Shevchenko's freedom from Engelhardt for 2,500 rubles, raised by raffling off a portrait of the Russian poet Zhukovsky.

Shevchenko had been writing poetry for some time, but his poems did not begin to attract attention until he was set free. Then they attracted so much attention that, when he was arrested with other organizers of a movement to create a republican government for all the slavic peoples, Czar Nicholas I added a special dictum to his sentence.

The sentence made Shevchenko a private in the army serving on the distant Asian border, and the czar added that the young artist-poet be kept "under the strictest supervision with the prohibition of writing and drawing."

After the death of Nicholas I, Count and Countess Feodor Petrovich Tolstoy persuaded the new czar, Alexander II to pardon Shevchenko. He continued writing and working in the cause of freedom, but he did not live to see his dreams come true. On February 26, 1861, the day after his 47th birthday and on the eve of Czar Alexander II's liberation of the serfs, he died.

Yet he lives on today, more than a century later. His beloved Ukraine is still enslaved by the Russians, but they have claimed him as their own. The Soviet Government removed the huge iron cross from his grave at Kaniv, on the bank of the Dnieper River, and replaced it with a tall obelisk monument—thus, as Roman Smal-Stocki has pointed out in his "Shevchenko meets America," "directing its propaganda to a systematic falsification to Shevchenko's works and the ideals which burned within them."

ADMIRED AMERICA

To the free world, Shevchenko was a leader in the struggle for human liberty against all forms of tyranny and sought national Ukrainian independence from Russian despotism. He expressed his yearning for Ukrainian independence and for the American form of government in these lines:

"Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man."

But in Moscow and Kiev, Soviet propagandists have been trying to prove that Shevchenko, having been a leader in the fight against serfdom, was thus a Bolshevik born before his time.

They have carried on a bitter and incessant attack against the Washington memorial to Shevchenko because it promotes the independence of Ukraine from Russian overlordship.

Says Georgetown University's Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

"The Communists cannot afford freedom, or even strong publicity about freedom. We in America cannot afford to be without freedom."

But, according to the Soviet propaganda, we are already without freedom. In a typical example of Red doubletalk, the Kiev newspaper, Komunist Ukraniv, quotes Shevchenko's fervent lines about Washington and says:

"In these words, Shevchenko contrasted the reactionary, rotten, autocratic order of serfdom with the political order defended by George Washington. Today all the 'righteous laws' in the United States of America have been buried; there exists a reign of the most high-handed reactionary social forces, a ruthless enslavement of the workers, and racial and national discrimination. The American reactionaries and their hirelings, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, will never succeed in turning the poet-revolutionary into a partisan of the American bourgeois order.

Yes, it's a confused and confusing age we're living in. Alice would find some of its language just as mixed up as any she heard in Wonderland.

NATIONAL SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL HONORARY SPONSORING COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

U.S. Senators

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado.

Hon. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland.

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

Hon. HIRAM L. FONG, Republican, of Hawaii.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Hon. STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Hon. JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, Democrat, of North Dakota.

U.S. Representatives

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Hon. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. MARK ANDREWS, Republican, of North Dakota.

Hon. ROBERT R. BARRY, Republican, of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES, Republican, of New York.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York.

Hon. WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana.

Hon. HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana.

Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia.
Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. JAMES A. BYRNE, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.
Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsyvania.
Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida.
Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska.
Hon. PAUL B. DAGUE, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina.
Hon. T. J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland.
Hon. PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Democrat, of Maryland.
Hon. ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Democrat, of Connecticut.
Hon. FRANK HORTON, Republican, of New York.
Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
Hon. ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. JOSEPH M. MCDADE, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota.
Hon. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, Republican, of Illinois.
Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana.
Hon. JOHN O. MARSH, Jr., Democrat, of Virginia.
Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican, of New York.
Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California.
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan.
Hon. ANCHER NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota.
Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, Republican, of New York.
Hon. EDWARD J. PATTEN, Democrat, of New Jersey.
Hon. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican, of New York.
Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.
Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, of New York.
Hon. FRED B. ROONEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York.
Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
Hon. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
Hon. DON L. SHORT, Republican, of North Dakota.
Hon. BILL STINSON, Republican, of Washington.
Hon. ROBERT TAFT, JR., Republican, of Ohio.
Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey.
Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington.
Hon. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, Republican, of New Jersey.
Hon. BOB WILSON, Republican, of California.
Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER, Republican, of New York.
Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Noncongressional members

Hon. Hugh J. Addonizo, mayor, city of Newark, N.J.
Hon. Elmer L. Andersen, former Governor of Minnesota.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Balkunas, president, Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern European Descent.
Ralph Bellamy, Hollywood.
Hon. Alvin M. Bentley, former Congressman.
Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of Political Science, Le Moyne College.
Hon. Ted W. Brown, secretary of state of Ohio.
Hon. Farris Bryant, Governor of the State of Florida.
Charles Burke, Polish American Congress, Inc.
Dr. Milton Butariu, administrative officer, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Desiderio Cardenas, co-president, Committee for Abolition of Enslavement.
Hon. Jerome P. Cavanagh, mayor of the city of Detroit.
Luben Christov, president, American Bulgarian League.
Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of The Citadel, Charleston, S.C.
Gilmore D. Clarke, consulting engineer.
Arthur Prudden Coleman, Fordham University.
Marion Moore Coleman, author.
Brutus Coste, secretary general, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Hon. James W. Day, mayor of the city of Parma, Ohio.
Donald DeLue, sculptor.
Dr. George M. Dimitrov, president, Bulgarian National Committee.
His Excellency John J. Dougherty, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark and president of Seton Hall University.
Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of Captive Nations.
Feliks Gadomski, Assembly of Captive European Nations.
Martin W. Gallagher, Georgetown University.
Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College of the City College of New York.
Dr. W. G. Glaskow, chairman, Supreme Cossack Representation.
Chester C. Gorski, council president, city of Buffalo, N.Y.
Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers University, New Jersey.
Edmund Gulewicz, commander, AMVETS.
Hon. Blair F. Gunther, commissioner, Allegheny County, Pa.
Hon. William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota.
Robert W. Hansen, Fraternal Order of Eagles.
Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.
Loy W. Henderson, School of International Service, the American University.
Hon. Robert King High, mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.
Walter D. Hyle, Jr., commander, Catholic War Veterans.
Walter H. Judd, former Congressman.
Hon. Daniel H. Kane, New York University.
Rev. William F. Kelley, S.J., president, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
Watson Kirkconnell, translator of Shevchenko.
Rev. John A. Klekotka, O.S.A. president, Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.
John Kosiak, president, Byelorussian Congress Committee of America.
David E. Kucharsky, news editor, Christianity Today.
Hon. Richard C. Lee, mayor of the city of New Haven, Conn.
Gerald B. Leighbody, deputy superintendent, board of education, Buffalo, N.Y.
Dr. Peter P. Lejins, president, American Latvian Association.
Jozef Lettrich, Czechoslovak National Committee.
Marx Lewis, chairman, Council Against Communist Aggression.
Prof. Clarence A. Manning, Columbia University.
Henry Mayer, chairman, Cold War Council.
Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor, city of Baltimore, Md.
Hon. William H. McKeon, chairman, New York Democratic State Committee.
Hon. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Premier of Poland.
Edgar Ansel Mowrer, columnist.
Hon. Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau County executive, New York.
Hon. Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States.
His Excellency Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington.
Charles H. Percy, chairman, Bell & Howell Co.
Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, former U.S. Commissioner, Displaced Persons.
Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor, Christian Herald.
Dr. Herminio Portell-Vila, former Cuban diplomat and professor, University of Havana.
Francis J. Proch, Polish American Congress.
Prince S. A. Radziwill, London, England.
Ronald Reagan, Hollywood.
Vera Rich, poetess.
Pamfil A. Riposanu, Rumanian National Committee of U.S.A.
Hon. George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan.
Prof. Joseph S. Roucek, chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut.
Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Smith, U.S. Army, retired.
Hon. Frank R. Somers, mayor of the city of Dayton, Ohio.
Hon. James H. J. Tate, mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Pa.
Henry J. Taylor, columnist.
Hon. John A. Volpe, former Governor of Massachusetts.
Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, N.Y.
Francis J. Wazeter, president, Downstate New York Division, Polish-American Congress.
George L. Yaremenko, president, Cossack American National Alliance, Inc.
Walter Zachariasiewicz, All-American Council, Democratic National Committee.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—NEW STATUE OF LIBERTY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

For America and all the world, both slave and free, a new Statue of Liberty has been unveiled. The plaudits of thrilled thousands

still rend the air. The familiar and "Loved Lady with the Lamp" in New York Harbor salutes New World pilgrims in the form of a heroic figure symbolic of liberty enlightening the world. But the impressive sculptured monument now standing in a dedicated spot in Washington, capital of the free world, speaks of freedom from coercive shackles of the body and mind, in the physical likeness of one who, himself, was tortured by cruel tyranny and who, in Abraham Lincoln's time, yearned for an emancipator for his enslaved land like unto the Washington of the American Revolution. His name—Taras Shevchenko—who, in the depths of Russian serfdom and thraldom, cried out in desperate hope that some day the liberating principles made flesh in the Father of the American Republic would snap the imprisoning chains of his loved Ukraine.

This new and deeply significant Statue of Liberty has been fashioned by authority of Congress in an action signed by the then President Eisenhower, who has declared: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repression of human beings on a gigantic scale."

The new Statue of Liberty is vocal with righteous indignation that burned like fire in Shevchenko's bones and smoldered in his very soul during the years of his enforced exile by the Russian czar from under his Ukrainian skies. His angry protest flamed against the coercive Moscow sword which dripped with Ukrainian blood as it does today. The same sort of atrocities which Shevchenko denounced by the Russian autocracy were being perpetrated then by czardom as they are today by the ruthless policy of the Soviet regime. Who knows more than do the Ukrainians that in its contemporary colonizing aggression Red Russia is a ferocious leopard which has not changed its czarist spots. In accomplishing its foul objectives, as Secretary of State Rusk declares: "The very language of international intercourse has become distorted. Aggression is whatever stands in the way of their world order." That is what makes every one of their embassies and legations a nest bed of spying and infiltration.

It is no wonder that the Soviets, with their fixed manifest destiny complex of world domination, rant and rave at the achievement of this new statue of liberty. They claim with perverted upside-down logic that if living today this apostle of democracy, who they admit was a child of genius, would be found aiding and abetting the enslavers. To make Taras Shevchenko a partner of the Kremlin conspiracy is akin to saying that if Washington were living today he would follow the perfidious betrayals of Benedict Arnold. To the cruel billingsgate, which has been hurled at those in this free land who insist on telling the historic truth about Russia, and about Shevchenko, there has been a silence quite vocal in our American officialdom. Any refutation by stubborn facts, from history not rewritten, might tend to upset the applecart of brotherly coexistence, which peaceful-looking vehicle stripped of its camouflage is more than likely to turn out to be a totalitarian tank, crushing into dust all obstacles to world rule.

Before he went so tragically, President Kennedy had this to say regarding Shevchenko: "My congratulations on the anniversary of the Shevchenko Scientific Society. Among your numbers have been some of the great names in learning to whom the world owes an incalculable debt."

Our new statue of liberty is a sacred altar where the plight of all captive nations will be lifted by a never-ending procession to the author of liberty whose decree is, "Let my people go." It will be a mecca for representatives of the peoples held in the grip of this new colonialism who, at the feet of this great Ukrainian, will cry out, "Oh Lord, how long, how long?" Here it will be remembered that this poet was not a narrow nationalist. His concern was not only for the liberty of his people but also for the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Georgians, and the other ancient peoples subjected by Russian aggression.

The Ukranians who have fled from "the Utopia" on the other side of the Iron Curtain have plenty of company. From the captive nations the estimated number of refugees from communism since World War II is 13,083,000, plus other millions who have been liquidated. In terms of human misery and suffering this vast uprooted army speaks with deafening and terrifying voice that the hope of the common man is not Lenin but Lincoln.

And so, brave poet-prophet, even your deadening years in serfdom could not put out the fire in your soul but rather turned your eyes to the emancipating principles of the American Revolution. Tens of thousands acclaiming voices welcome you to America to stand near the glistening memorials of patriots whose principles and ideals fired your own heart—Washington and Jefferson. When 50 years has passed since he penned the Declaration, and at the very end of his mortal days, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs with the favored few booted and spurred to ride them."

Here—Shevchenko—you will watch and wait for the saddle on the back of the Ukraine which has never belonged to Russia (except by conquest) to be torn away and its booted and spurred riders dethroned in that sure "someday" of which you dreamed when, for your captive millions and for all the captive nations inside and outside the Soviet colonial empire will come "another Washington."

THE "CONTROVERSIAL" STATUE

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

If one were to place credence in certain newspaper accounts, the statue of Taras Shevchenko in our Nation's Capital would be under some shadow of doubt. Supposedly, it would be controversial. Presumptively, it would stand with certain reservations.

Actually, this supposition involves more humor than anything else. Among numerous circles in Washington, whether in the private clubs, on Capitol Hill, in several interested agencies or at the universities where this writer normally circulates, the supposition has become a standard piece of banter. "How are the two boisterous controversialists on Shevchenko faring nowadays—Wig and Louch?" is the customary introduction to a measure of amusing conversation.

Without exaggeration, it is generally recognized even among those who were scarcely familiar with Shevchenko in mid-1963 that the so-called controversy over the statue engendered in significant terms a ratio of something like a million for and two against. Aside from the unheeded protests of the Soviet Embassy, the great controversy was really precipitated by two persons: Mr. J. R. Wiggins, editor of the Washington Post, and Mr. Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., a member of the National Capital Planning Commission. Doubtless, there were a number of persons who gullibly absorbed their fiction, but by the same token, applying our well-founded and conservative ratio, there were scores of others who didn't. What a measure of controversy—a million to two.

THE NATURE OF CONTROVERSY

This episode in the development of the Shevchenko statue has been a most interesting and instructive one. First, it has shown how the very term controversy or controversial can be uncritically bandied about. On the basis of our effective ratio in this case, nothing in life is beyond controversy. In our society as well as others, you'll always find two or more creatures objecting to mothers, God, children, virtue, and what have you. If out of ignorance or base motivation, a pair objects and criticizes loudly, does then the object of their misguided utterances become controversial? Hardly. Logically, it is one thing to have just an opinion, it is quite another for that opinion to be grounded in fact, evidence, and rational support. Alone, the former is scarcely sufficient to warrant a genuine controversy for it is nothing more than a thoughtless gesture of tongue or pen. When an expression of opinion rests on grounds of fact and reason, then we can seriously entertain it as a contribution to wholesome controversy.

In this light, genuine controversy is a condition to be desired. By its very nature it is nothing more than an accented exchange of mature views, a sharp clash of more or less justified opinions. Controversy crystallizes issues and aspects of subjects in a way that no other process of intellectual encounter does.

With this rational view of controversy we have never had any fear about the outcome of the Shevchenko statue. And in the end we were proven right. The technique of dubbing something or someone as being controversial simply because a few ignorant or ill-motivated voices are raised is clearly an exercise in obscurantism which bears no constructive relationship to the development of a controversy in its true sense. Both Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Louchheim endeavored to exploit this technique in the extreme.

As to controversy being incited by Moscow and its puppets, the above criteria of rational controversy virtually predetermine the only sensible reply on this score. One of the paramount reasons for honoring Shevchenko in this country has been the need to maintain the purity of his stature and meaning. As was anticipated, Moscow and its puppets have disfigured Shevchenko, have painted him as a forerunner, a precursor of the Russian Bolshevik revolution; in short, they have perverted the patriotic and nationalist freedom fighter for their own psychopolitical ends. This, of course, is not new with the professional perverters in the Kremlin, Kiev, and elsewhere. The honored names of Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, Shakespeare and dozens of others have been blemished in like manner. From the very start, the motivation is a dishonest one, aimed at a calculated disfigurement through manipulation of a quarter or half truth.

THE POINTS OF "CONTROVERSY" ABOUT SHEVCHENKO

The entire and complete story of the so-called Shevchenko statue controversy is systematically laid out in the book "Shevchenko, a Monument to the Liberation, Freedom and Independence of All Captive Nations" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1964). It is, of course, impossible to treat here every specious argument and accusation that was raised in the period of September 1963 to February 1964, nor is it necessary. Although every conceivable argument was concocted against the statue and its sponsors, some being of the basest and most vicious sort, the two controversialists relied ultimately on two main contentions that have been repeated over and over again. Apparently, by sheer repetition they have hoped to render these contentions plausible and rationally acceptable. The extreme to which Wiggins has gone in abusing the facilities of the Washington Post can be seen from the editorialized announcement of the placement of Shevchenko's statue ("Shevchenko Statue Ready for Pedestal," the Washington Post, May 30, 1964) and a report of its realization a week later ("Controversial Statue Placed on Its Pedestal," the Washington Post, June 4, 1964). The pattern of editorial comments

is the same: "controversial," "anti-Semitic," and "the idol of the Communist Party."

Last fall and early winter, this pattern emerged and was used repeatedly, not only in the Post's editorials but also in what was supposed to be objectively reported events. The validity of the first contention, that the statue is "controversial," obviously rests on that of the other two. Merely to repeat that the statue is controversial is no support of its alleged character; and as we've seen above, the conservative ratio of a million for and two against is not an unimpressive fact. Also, if one were to analyze carefully the comedy of journalistic error and bias as portrayed in the work quoted above, he would be even more impressed by the apparition of controversy surrounding the statue. In short, the technique of crying "controversial" is too obvious.

Before considering the allegations of anti-Semitism and Communist adoration, we should first take note of the way Wiggins developed his almost hysterial assault. This is important because his self-contradictory maneuvers patently represent a full confession of ignorance—worse, ignorance mixed with bold arrogance. In his first editorial on "Poetic Injustice" (September 23, 1963) he claimed that he stands second to none in his esteem for Shevchenko and for Ukraine, but since the city of Washington "found precious space for the Ukraine's national poet," he laments why space cannot be found for Shakespeare. Although Britain's great has been honored in multiple, substantial ways, our reaction was simply "why not." Of course if Wiggins were terribly impassioned by his own proposal, he would have been laboring for it since. Obtaining legislation for a national statue entails heavy toil and hard work, and there is no evidence to present date that the sedentary editory of the Post has embarked on it.

It was quite evident from this first editorial that Wiggins didn't know what the Shevchenko statue was all about. He actually admitted as much. The second editorial on October 18 confirmed all this, and the subsequent ones of November 1 and 12 demonstrated not only his fundamental deficiency in knowledge and understanding of the subject but also his base motivations regarding Shevchenko. The editorials contained every trick in the trade of journalistic smearing, even going so far as to degrading Shevchenko and alleging him to be offensive to numerous American groups. It is especially noteworthy that no self-respecting group fell for this smear technique. It backfired and added another self-inflicted blemish on the integrity of the newspaper. The comedy was also featured by the distinct contradiction of these editorials to Stephen S. Rosenfeld's article on "A Ukrainian Poet Gets Statue Billing" in the September 29 issue of the Post, particularly on the matter of Shevchenko's alleged anti-Semitism. As shown in the quoted source, the editorials even contradicted themselves in a most erratic fashion.

Rather amusing, too, was the sight of a Shakespearean devotee accusing Shevchenko of being anti-Semitic because of a passage or two in his poems about hated Jewish tax collectors. As a poet and a perceptive observer of reality, Shevchenko recorded in these few passages the feelings of people who despised those whom they regarded as their exploiters; and in the tyrannical system of serfdom it was not difficult to find a scapegoat, particularly a Jewish collector. Shakespeare bore the same poetic responsibility.

Both Wiggins and Louchheim have committed a grave injustice to the poet laureate by concocting this anti-Semitic slander. Nowhere did they dare quote Shevchenko out of context. The slander was perched merely on vague verbal generality. We were waiting for them to commit this additional error. For the fact is that in the preface to his realistic work the poet himself morally repudiates this irrational attitude and calls for rectitude of judgment. Most important of all, he placed his very life in jeopardy by signing a public protest against the officially sponsored oppression of the Jews. Those who know the history of anti-Semitism in the Russian empire, both czarist and Soviet, can well appreciate the service rendered to it by this ignorant accusation heard on these shores. Moscow couldn't have done better itself.

Another feature of this comedy is the spurious claim that Shevchenko is the idol of the Communist Party. When this writer first appeared before the National Capital Planning Commission in the fall of 1962, Mr. Louchheim, who admitted knowing nothing about Shevchenko, quickly reached the rigid conclusion that a statue here would serve Russian interests. Indeed, after a concise briefing was given on Shevchenko, he still dreaded the thought of having a statue in honor of a "Russian poet." Later, when Wiggins came into the act, the Washington Post amusingly transformed itself into a rabid anti-Communist organ, protesting Shevchenko as an idol of the Communist Party.

Enough had been said earlier on the disfigurement of national heroes by Moscow and its puppets to indicate the pathetic character of this contention. Moreover, if Wiggins were at all familiar with the literature on this battle since 1960, he would learn that our effort has unmasked the hypocrisy and cynicism involved in Moscow's manipulation of this Ukrainian hero. Furthermore, to inform the reader that thousands of collective farms, factories, streets, and what have you bear the Shevchenko name in the U.S.S.R. and that this fact proves he's a Communist idol is one of the worst forms of twisted reasoning. One would perhaps expect too much of this editor to grasp the meaning of this fact. The vast majority of these places are in Ukraine, where naturally they should be, and the Shevchenko nomer has served conspicuously to preserve the national identity of 45 million people, who even today are being subjected to Russification. For this great anti-Communist organ to overlook these essentials is scarcely cause for wonderment.

SOME LESSONS FROM THE CONTROVERSY

With the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue on June 27, 1964, and turning our eyes to the future, we might ever so often remind ourselves of the many lessons to be drawn from this so-called controversy over the statue. Some of them really constitute guidelines for the future.

One lesson is that although the experience was not one of genuine controversy, the "controversial" pair contributed heavily to popular familiarization with Shevchenko. This writer, for one, was quite eleated over the salutary results of this familiarization process. Despite its unsavory aspects, the "controversy" managed to absorb the interest of countless citizens in Washington and beyond. An evil begot much good.

Second, our freedom of the press came into play to offset the irresponsible and unfounded contentions of one man. Happily, Mr. Robert J. Lewis, writer for the Washington Star, sensed early the malicious character of the Post's editorials and articles, and in the November 10 issue of his paper presented an accurate account of "The Status of a Statue." A month later, the editor of the Washington Star came out with a pungent editorial on the tactics of the "controversialists," appropriately titled in the December 15, 1963 issue as "Association Again." In a democracy forces of reason and justice are always present to combat their negators.

The third lesson is the extent to which arrogant ignorance in our midst can serve as ready fodder for Moscow and its puppets. When Wiggins foolishly began to write about askewed nationalism and the like, the perverters saw their chance of horning in on the Shevchenko project. The Ukrainian puppet in the U.N. spoke his piece and a group in Ukraine sought to intervene in the final festivities of the project. The prevalence of arrogant ignorance in positions of public responsibility is always a tool for our cold war enemies.

Supplementing this is the fourth lesson, namely that the erection of Shevchenko's statute is only a phase in the battle of knowledge and understanding in America with regard to Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The controversy lucidly revealed the nature and character of this battle. The statue is a fixed monument calling for victory in this battle, which in every respect would be our victory in behalf of the basic interests of our Nation. One flays the meaning and significance of the statue if he interprets it harrowly as an end in itself. On June 10, 1964, Nikita S. Khrushchev, "the Hangman of Ukraine," did not unveil Shevchenko's statue in Moscow out of any cultural attachment. The timing itself is suggestive.

No, the Shevchenko statue in Washington is the free world's bridge to an understanding and support of the aspirations of the 45 million Ukrainian nation for freedom and independence. The "controversialists" failed to destroy this bridge. But, rest assured, their head will reemerge. Do not be suprised to read more editorialized comments on the unveiling and in the long period ahead. In tune with our treasured institutions, let us hope for genuine controversy.

UNVEILING RITES SET TODAY FOR STATUE OF SHEVCHENKO

The controversial statue of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and national hero, will be unveiled here today. Approximately 100,000 persons from all over the world are expected to attend the ceremonies, and some 32,000 Ukranians and descendants of Ukrarians will march in a parade preceding the unveiling.

The parade will leave the Ellipse at 10 a.m., head north on 15th Street NW., to New York Avenue, west on Pennsylvania Avenue to 23d Street and north to the triangle formed by 23d, 22d and P Streets, where the 14-foot bronze statue will be unveiled.

Controversy developed over the statue because of differing views over the Ukranian's philosophy. To Americans, Shevchenko was a champion of freedom; to Soviets, a disciple of what is now communism. He died 103 years ago.

Former President Eisenhower will unveil the statue at ceremonies set for 2 p.m. Former President Truman, who is not expected at attend, is honorary chairman of the program and nominee for one of five special "Schevchenko Freedom Awards."

A dozen bands and groups dressed in Ukranian costumes will participate in the 3-hour parade.

Vehicles authorized to use reserved Government parking facilities in the area and motorists who want to use private parking spaces along the parade route and disbanding area will be permitted to cross police lines if they indicate their intentions by turning on their headlights. Once the parade route is closed to traffic, however, no vehicles will be permitted on or across it.

Shevchenko was born a serf, gained his freedom at the age of 24 and went on to become his country's greatest poet. He died in 1861 at the age of 47. Moscow represents him as a forerunner of modern communism,

while his anti-Communist sponsors here insist he was an original "European freedom fighter."

PARADE AND DEDICATION HERE TO HONOR UKRAINIAN POET

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Today is Taras Shevchenko Day in Washington, and representatives of the Nation's 2 million liberty-loving Americans of Ukrainian origin have arranged an impressive show of pride in their 19th century poet-hero.

An estimated 50,000 Ukrainian Americans and others from Canada and countries abroad converged on the city last night and today for a parade and dedication of the Shevchenko statue authorized by Congress 4 years ago.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is scheduled to deliver the principal address and unveil the $250,000 monument to the Ukrainian people's foremost prohphet of freedom.

LAW SIGNED IN 1960

The law authorizing construction of the statue was signed by President Eisenhower on Septembr 13, 1960.

It is located on a triangular site at 23d and P Streets, just south of Massachusetts Avenue NW.

The parade started at 10 a.m. from the Ellipse while buses still were unloading persons who expected to participate.

A crowd gathered early this morning at the monument site to be sure of having a place to see the dedication ceremonies.

Many thousands of khaki-clad youngsters who arrived with Ukrainian youth groups were in the parade's line of march. Among musical groups and bands were the Royal Sabers of Washington. Officials said eight bands were to be in the parade.

SEVERAL TREATED

By parade time, a Red Cross first aid station at the south end of the Ellipse reported a few persons had been treated for blisters and fainting.

The influx of participants and spectators for the ceremonies was arranged for by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the Ukrainian National Association, and other groups.

The 14-foot-high sculptured figure of the poet surmounts a 7-foot polished granite base in the quarter-acre landscaped park adjacent to the Episcopal Church of the Pilgrims.

The site authorized by Congress was selected by the Interior Department and approved by the National Capital Planning Commission. All funds for the monument were raised in voluntary contributions by Ukrainian-American groups.

Opening event of the gala celebration, formally marking official recognition of the Ukrainian poet laureate in the Nation's capital, was a Constitution Hall concert last night. More than 1,800 persons from delegations arriving early, as well as others, were present for the program by Ukrainian instrumentalists conducted by John Zadorozny.

Besides the parade and dedication, today was to be crowded with other events, ending with a banquet for an estimated 3,500 persons at the District National Guard Armory at 8:30 p.m. Among events was to be the placing of wreaths on the grave of the late President John F. Kennedy and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery by the Ukrainian-American veterans' organization.

Principal speaker at tonight's armory banquet, at which five Shevchenko Freedom Awards are to be presented, will be Senator MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky. Honorary chairman of the sponsoring committee for today's celebration is former President Harry S. Truman, who has been chosen to receive one of the Freedom Awards.

OPENING ADDRESS, TARAS SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT UNVEILING CEREMONY, JUNE 27, 1964

(By Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, chairman, Shevchenko Memorial Committee)

The Shevchenko Memorial Committee extends to all of you, our fellow Americans, fellow Ukrainians, and delegates from near and far, our warmest welcome and cordial thanks for honoring us with your presence at this historic event in our Nation's Capital.

To the great soldier, President Dwight Eisenhower, who signed into law the House joint resolution on the Shevchenko Memorial, we offer our special welcome and tribute—a tribute born of our deep gratitude and respect to a man who is a symbol of our country, beloved by the whole free world.

We also extend a cordial welcome to their excellencies, the most reverend metropolitans, bishops, monsignors, clergy, and venerable sisters; to our honorable Senators and Congressmen; to the large delegation from Canada, headed by the Senators of Canada; to the delegations from Latin America, Australia, Europe, and especially to all delegates from the captive nations.

With God's help we are establishing a historical landmark in our Capitol. From the far corners of the globe we have gathered here to dedicate this monument to Taras Shevchenko—to a fighter for the freedom of serfs and enserfed peoples by Russian imperialism. We have come here to dedicate this monument to an apostle of true Christianity in the dark age of tsarist absolutism, to a teacher of the ways of peace, justice, and friendship among all neighbors. We have come here to pay tribute to the memory of a man who gave Eastern Europe and the world a vision of brotherhood among free nations under, as Shevchenko called it, "Washington's just and new law," under the ideas of the American Declaration of Independence—a freedom under God. Thus Shevchenko belongs not only to Ukraine, he belongs to America, to all captive nations, and to the whole free world as a symbol of freedom, human dignity, and good will toward all men. It is in that deep sense that this monument to Shevchenko is more properly a monument to the glory of God—to the God who granted us the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To carry out this noble ceremony of dedication may I now call upon the honorable Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to act as master of ceremonies for this historic event.

SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT: A CHALLENGE TO MOSCOW

(By Walter Dushnyck)

For almost 4 years, specifically from the observances of the centennial of Shevchenko's death in 1861 and the decision of the Ukrainian community in the United States to the Soviet press both in Russia and Ukraine, has been waging a systematic and scathing campaign against the Shevchenko project, which was undertaken by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the specially established body, the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America.

As we approach the final stage of this greatest and historic manifestation ever undertaken by the Ukrainian emigration in this country, let us review briefly the underlying reasons for this indiscriminate campaign by the Communists against our honoring and venerating Taras Shevchenko.

The Soviet Russians, unlike their predecessors, the Russian czars, have fully grasped and undertaken the powerful meaning and significance of Taras Shevchenko among the Ukrainian people. They could neither denigrate nor suppress the widespread cult and reverence which Shevchenko enjoyed and still enjoys among the Ukrainian people everywhere. What they tried to do, however, was to espouse him as their own precursor and prophet of their bloody and inhuman regime imposed in Ukraine and elsewhere in the U.S.S.R., which they euphemistically call the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

When the Ukrainian community in the United States undertook the project for the erection of a Shevchenko statue in Washington, the center of the free world, the Russian totalitarians and their puppets in Kiev howled with rage and indignation. No one, they contended, has a right to the heritage of Shevchenko, except his true heirs, the Ukrainian people, which in the Communist lexicon is equated with the Soviet regime.

Ukrainians in the United States were scathingly berated and labeled as "lackeys of American imperialists" and "unworthy" to build a statue to the Ukrainian poet, Shevchenko, and symbol of man's eternal search for freedom, justice, and equality, something entirely alien to the Communist ideology and Soviet totalitarian doctrine.

One of the alleged Soviet experts on Shevchenko, Eugeni Kiriliuk (his name would seem to indicate his Ukrainian origin—W.D.), for instance, wrote in the U.S.S.R. magazine (January 1961):

"The peoples of the Soviet Union, and with them all progressive mankind, are getting ready for a worthy observance of the immortal memory of the genius lover of freedom * * *. But our enemies are not asleep. The American imperialists, relying on those docile servants * * * the Ukrainian nationalists * * * are planning to take advantage of the 100th anniversary for the monstrous, disgusting, and provocative purpose of slandering the homeland of Shevchenko, Soviet Ukraine, and our people, with a flood of anti-Soviet insults, provocations, muck, lies and distortions. * * * The nationalist scribes, of the breed of Zaitsev, Dontsov, and Dobriansky, are displaying an extraordinary adroitness in the matter of falsifying Shevchenko and the blasphemous distortions of his works, attempting to present our great poet as some kind of advocate of the modern 'American way of life * * *.'"

Only a few weeks ago Literaturna Ukraina, which is the official organ of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, had printed a series of articles attacking the Ukrainians in this country for erecting the Shevchenko monument in Washington. For instance: one Dmytro Pavlychko even wrote a verse, in which he derided those "who sold out their Ukraine in the mire of lies, but who at the same time had erected a monument in Washington." In the same vein wrote another Soviet "expert" on Shevchenko, Mykhailo Novikov, who assailed Prof. Clarence A. Manning for his article on "Religion of Shevchenko," which appeared in House Document 445, "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61" (cf. Literaturna Ukraina, May 27, 1964, Kiev). The same organ earlier (March 9, 1964) had assailed a number of Americans for sponsoring the Shevchenko monument. The writer Mykola Tarnavsky (incidentially, Mykola Tarnavsky was compelled to leave the United States as an undesirable alien in the late 1940's, and now has become a Soviet "expert" on Ukrainians in the United States) castigated Congressman John Lesinski, Paul Jones, Senator Jacob K. Javits, and former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, of Michigan, for their contribution to the project of the Shevchenko statute in Washington. Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky and all others who are helping in the realization of the great plan, are called "inhuman scum," while at the same time the "progressive Ukrainians" are being praised by this traitor to America and Ukraine.

Taking all this into consideration, one is puzzled at the new outburst of the Washington Post, which, it is recalled, last fall began a rather mysterious campaign against the Shevchenko monument in Washington and against the Ukrainians as a whole. When the Shevchenko statue was brought to Washington and placed on its pedestal in Washington on June 2, 1964, the Post again demonstrated its unfairness and anti-Ukrainian bias, when under the two photographs of the Shevchenko monument it printed a caption, stating that the "controversial statue" was already set up, and that the project was assailed on the basis that Shevchenko was "an idol of Communists and anti-Semitic."

One is prone to wonder, who are the "experts," who feed the editors of the Washington Post such utter nonsense?

In any event, the overwhelming majority of the American people, and their leaders were not and are not now of the opinion that Shevchenko was not worthy of the honor bestowed on him by the erection of a monument in his memory and honor. Moreover, in connection with the forthcoming unveiling of the monument, a special Shevchenko Monument Honorary Sponsoring Committee was established under the honorary chairmanship of the Honorable Harry S. Truman, 33d President of the United States, with some 180 prominent American political, cultural, and civic leaders as members. Would they really join such a committee, had they a shred of doubt that Shevchenko was not worthy of their moral support?

There was another honorary committee established, of which all Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs in the free world became honorary members, as well as many representatives of Ukrainian scientific, political, cultural, and other organizations in the free world.

The Shevchenko monument in Washington is not only a great undertaking of the Ukrainian American community, but an act of tremendous international significance. Moscow and its puppets in Kiev tried in every way to belittle the project, or if possible, nix it before it is successfully terminated. When all these nefarious efforts of Moscow failed then a new tactic was adopted. Some 34 Ukrainian cultural leaders from Soviet Ukraine issued a public appeal, whereby they invited themselves to come to the unveiling ceremonies, on June 27, 1964 and to bring a "fistful of sacred Ukrainian earth" from the Shevchenko grave in Kaniv. This "appeal" was another ruse of Moscow to hitch itself to a project which they thought was important enough to be associated with, even though it was organized by the "despicable Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists." But this, too, was promptly rejected by the Ukrainian community, specifically, by the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, inasmuch as the hand of Moscow was too clearly evident in the gesture, and the Shevchenko monument project is the work of the American citizenry of Ukrainian origin, without any support or assistance of the Soviet masters and enslavers of Ukraine.

Thus, with the successful conclusion of the Shevchenko monument in Washington, the Ukrainians in the United States have completed a gigantic project; they have brought Taras Shevchenko, a symbol of human freedom, and the eloquent spokesman of the persecuted, to the center of the free world—Washington, D.C.

Heretofore Moscow had not been challenged and was left to distort and interpret Shevchenko to suit its own political objectives.

Ukrainians in the United States have ably brought the meaning of Taras Shevchenko to the focus of world opinion, and presented Shevchenko in a true historic light: Shevchenko was neither a Russian poet, nor an apologist for Moscow's imperialist policies in the past; he was a stanch Ukrainian poet, patriot and nationalist, and an intrepid fighter for the freedom of all races, colors and creeds, and he envisioned a free Ukraine with a "new and righteous law" of George Washington, which obviously had no parallel in Russian or any other literature of Central and Eastern Europe.

It is for this that we went a long way forward to establish a lasting monument to Shevchenko in Washington—the center of the free world today.

SHEVCHENKO STATUE HERE UNVEILED BY EISENHOWER

(By Robert Lewis)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower yesterday unveiled Washington's Taras Shevchenko statue as nearly 100,000 anti-Communist Ukrainian Americans and Canadians cheered and applauded.

The ceremony climaxed a colorful 2¾-hour parade that traveled a 16-block-long route. Police estimate about 35,000 persons participated.

The 73-year-old former Chief Executive flew by helicopter from his Gettysburg home to officiate at the dedication.

Despite a cruelly scorching sun, he stayed to the very end of the hour and 40-minute exercise at the base of the $250,000 statue at 23d and P Streets NW.

DEDICATED TO FREEDOM

Standing beneath an umbrella put up to protect him from the sun, the former President said he hoped erection of the monument in the Nation's Capital would help "kindle a new world movement in the hearts, minds, words, and actions of men."

Such a movement, he said, should be a never-ending one whose aim should be dedicated freedom of peoples of all captive nations of the entire world.

Speaking vigorously, Mr. Eisenhower said the "outpouring of lovers of freedom to salute a Ukrainian hero far exceeds my expectations."

In what appeared to be an obvious warning to Soviet Russian and Chinese leaders, the former President said, "We can be sure that this Nation will, with its valued allies, sustain the strength—spiritual, economic, and military—to foil any ill-advised attempt by dictators to seize any area that is independent and where the love of freedom lives and blazes."

The former President was surrounded by Ukrainian-American officials, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress and Ukrainian church dignitaries on a platform in front of the 14-foot bronze statue.

AUTHORIZED IN 1960

The monument and its quarter-acre park were authorized in a 1960 bill enacted by Congress and signed by Mr. Eisenhower while he was President.

All funds for erection of the statue and its surrounding park and fountain were raised voluntarily by Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian origin.

Taras Shevchenko, who died more than 100 years ago, is revered as the Ukrainian nation's foremost hero-poet and symbol of freedom.

Ukrainian spectators and participants in the parade and dedication poured into Washington last night and early today by a special train, hundreds of chartered buses, planes, and private cars.

WORE NATIVE GARB

Many wore the colorful Ukrainian national costume and others, including youngsters, were khaki-clad in uniforms of Ukrainian organizations.

Dozens of cities in the United States and Canada were represented. Many persons said they had traveled all night to arrive in time for the parade. Many were being unloaded along Independence Avenue, at the south edge of the Ellipse, after the parade had started, but succeeded in joining the line of march.

Deputy Chief of Police W. J. Liverman, who was in charge of traffic, estimated about 35,000 were in the parade and 100,000 jammed the 22d, 23d, and P Streets area, just south of Massachusetts Avenue, during the dedication.

DR. DOBRIANSKY PRESIDES

Presiding at the dedication was Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a Georgetown University professor and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The welcoming address and introduction of former President Eisenhower was delivered by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University, president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, which sponsored the ceremonies.

Other speakers at the dedication included Representative DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois; Representative DULSKI, Democrat, of New York; Representative FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio; and Representative FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DULSKI, said Shevchenko stands as a "symbol of freedom, and against tyranny, for all mankind."

UKRAINIANS MAKE EISENHOWER FEEL "LIKE I WERE BACK IN POLITICS"

(By Phil Casey)

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower received an ovation when he spoke at ceremonies for the unveiling of the bronze statue of the 19th century Ukrainian poet Taras Grigoriyevich Shevchenko at 22d and P Streets NW. yesterday afternoon.

Thanking the crowd of about 36,000 Ukrainians from this country, Canada, Latin America, and Europe for its warm welcome, Mr. Eisenhower said: "You make me feel almost like I were back in politics."

The parade began at 10 a.m. at the Ellipse and ended shortly after noon at 22d and P Streets NW., after a march up 15th Street, Pennsylvania Avenue, and 23d Street NW.

The former President praised Shevchenko's poetry and his fight for freedom, saying the poet "expressed eloquently man's undying determination to fight for freedom and his unquenchable faith in ultimate victory."

He said the statue, a 14-foot figure on a 10-foot base, speaks to "millions of oppressed persons" in Eastern Europe and "gives them constant encouragement to struggle forever against Communist tyranny, until, one day, final victory is achieved, as it most surely will be."

He warned: "The touchstone of any free society is limited government, which does only those things which the people need and which they cannot do for themselves at all, or cannot do as well."

The parade and ceremonies were a demonstration against communism as well as a tribute to Shevchenko.

Nevertheless, the poet is beloved by Communists as well. The Soviet Union hails him as a fighter for the ideals of communism and the Ukrainians idolize him as a fighter for freedom from tyranny and the oppression of Communist states.

A high point of the celebration, aside from the former President's appearance, was the non-Ukrainian Royal Sabres drum and bugle corps, which swings. There were few spectators for the parade, but those who did turn out applauded that band all along the parade route.

Shevchenko became a Ukrainian hero when he wrote revolutionary verse and worked actively for a free union of Slavonic peoples under a republican form of government. A serf, he won freedom for himself and his family.

A Ukrainian from Canada was found in the hot crowd, wilting in the 90-degree temperature. But he was glad to be there.

Peter Besko, who is well acquainted with the works of Shevchenko, said, "I work in the streets for the city of Toronto. I am a laborer, but I know Shevchenko. Maybe half of these people have never read him, but they know him as a fighter for freedom, and that is enough."

Another man, down from New York, explained the Ukrainians' love for and knowledge of Shevchenko.

"In the Ukraine," he said, "even the poor people know of him. When I was young, even the very poor had two books: the Bible and the poems of Shevchenko."

UKRAINIANS HAVE HISTORY OF FREEDOM SEEKING

The Ukrainian-born Americans and Americans of Ukrainian descent who came to Washington yesterday brought with them freedom-seeking traditions inherited from Cossacks and peasants.

Although the Ukraine has been a Soviet Social Republic since 1920, the Ukrainian-Americans retain a distinctive language, music, and dress—all of which were in abundant evidence yesterday around the statue of Taras Shevchenko at 22d and P Streets.

According to Orest Horodyskyj, a native of the Ukraine and writer for the weekly newspaper Ukrainian Life in Chicago, about a million Ukrainian-Americans now live in the United States, and some 40,000 were in Washington yesterday for the statue-unveiling ceremonies.

Horodyskyj said the main immigration of these people to America was about 90 years ago, and that most initially took jobs as farmers and laborers.

They now are concentrated in the urban centers of New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. About 80 percent of them speak Ukrainian, a Slavic tongue, and youngsters could be heard talking in Slavic sounds around the statue.

Standing beside his Scout-uniformed, 15-year-old son under a glaring sun, Horodyskyj, 45, gave this account of Taras Shevchenko and his meaning to Ukrainian-Americans:

Shevchenko lived from 1814 to 1861 in a time when landlords owned not only large pieces of land, but also their peasants. Shevchenko, though a peasant, was a very able painter, so friends bought him from his landlord and sent him to St. Petersburg in Russia to an art academy, from which he was graduated with a gold medal.

He began writing poems about the hard life of the Ukrainian peasant and political oppression under the czar. For these poems, and for membership in the inter-Slavic Cyrylo-Methodius Brotherhood, Shevchenko was put in the czarist army for 10 years.

Freed, he wrote anti-czarist poems and became one of the first strong voices in his time against the persecution and oppression of his people.

The poems were translated into other Slavic languages and marked Shevchenko as a champion of liberty whose works are still held up as models of the independent spirit.

PARADE CAUSES TRAFFIC JAM: 36,000 UKRAINIAN-AMERICANS MARCH IN HEAT TO UNVEILING OF POET'S STATUE

A Ukrainian poet, dead a little more than a century now, precipitated here yesterday a traffic jam of dimensions unsurpassed by those attending the occasional visits to this city of live foreign dignitaries.

Some 36,000 Ukrainian-Americans paraded in tribute to the man whose statue they unveiled at 22d and P Streets NW. Non-Ukrainian motorists found themselves hard put to go about their normal vehicular ways during the festivities.

Coping with the various traffic impasses downtown and in the Georgetown area were 700 policemen, a number of whom were themselves casualties in the searing 91-degree midday heat.

One motorist said he required an hour for his usual 15-minute trip; another said he was detoured around the crush, achieving a normal 4-mile drive over an 11-mile route.

But, police reported, the massed march from the Ellipse past the White House to the Taras Shevchenko statue site was accomplished without untoward incident and by midafternoon the traffic situation had dissolved to normal.

At St. Matthew's Cathedral guests arrived for the 10 o'clock wedding of Geneve Suzanne Murnane and Photographer Fred J. Maroon and waited. And waited. The wedding got off 25 minutes late and another wedding that followed was delayed also.

Inspector Charles L. Wright said 100 cars had to be towed away from temporary no-parking zones.

The Ukrainian-Americans came from as far as Michigan. After their long march from the Ellipse to the statue, they broke ranks to look for refreshment.

A restaurant across 22d Street from the statue did a land-office business and stores along P Street also tried to keep up with the unaccustomed rush on beer, soft drinks, ice cream, and sandwiches. One place was reported to be getting $1 a beer.

Down Connecticut Avenue a few blocks from the ceremony, a record shop quickly adjusted to the opportunity by prominently displaying records of Ukrainian music.

At one point enough persons were feeling faint from the heat for police to start calling taxis to carry away the indisposed.

Police Pvt. Charles J. Rusinak was half-dragged and half ran for 150 feet when his arm was caught in a car which he had tried to stop from entering the parade zone. A bus diver then tried to chase the determined driver but lost him.

The 700 policemen were supplied with box lunches of chicken, which this time did not spoil as some had during the civil rights march on Washington last August.

Once yesterday, the police braced for what looked like trouble. After the statue-unveiling ceremony, about 2,000 men started marching again, this time along P Street toward their buses and hotels. They looked determined.

However, they dispersed agreeably when told their parade permit had expired:

Inspector Wright called all of the marchers "a well-behaved group."

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN LESINSKI AT THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BANQUET ON SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1964, AT 8:30 P.M., IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY

Ladies and gentlemen, I deeply and sincerely regret that I will not be able to join you in person for this celebration, honoring the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko; but I am with you in spirit.

I was honored and privileged to have been able to play a significant role as the sponsor of the resolution to publish House Document No. 445, 86th Congress which tells of Shevchenko's contributions to the ideals of freedom and democracy. I was also glad to give a helping hand in having enacted the bill which provided for the erection of the Shevchenko statue in Washington which was dedicated this afternoon.

The enemies of freedom in other countries are trying to embrace Shevchenko as their own; but his words and his works stand in direct contradiction to them.

Shevchenko stands as a monument to freedom not only for the Ukrainians who suffer under Communist Russian rule but also to their descendants in this country, and to the people and descendants of all those other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. Together, we of the various ethnic groups, who know only too well what loss of liberty and freedom can mean, must work against any force that would deprive us of the freedom which we enjoy in this country. Freedom can be lost step by step, so we must all cooperate both at the national and the local levels to protect our individual rights and privileges.

Let us then join hands and strive for a better and a stronger America with all of its blessings and look forward to the day when the people of all nations will be able to share a life of freedom from oppression.

MESSAGE FROM SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL BANQUET, JUNE 27, 1964

I am gratified that so many of you are paying tribute to a man who in action and in verse proved himself inextricably bound up with the cause of freedom. The life of Taras Shevchenko has very properly become symbolic of a basic wish in all men—the desire to be their own masters.

As a recipient of the inspiring Shevchenko Memorial Award, I am particularly happy to greet all of you this evening. I also want to extend a special word of appreciation to the President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee—Dr. Lev Dobriansky—whose excellent advice and wise example I have always found rewarding in my work with the committee.

Exhilarating though this occasion may be, we must continue to pray in our hearts for those millions still saddled with philosophies not in their national tradition and governments not of their free choice. We have succeeded in raising a statue to Taras Shevchenko, and I share with all of you a natural sense of accomplishment. But much remains to be done in freedom's behalf, and I know that we will never rest until the chains of all captives are broken and the last enslaving wall crumbles away.

COMMEMORATIVE SCROLL

Be it known to all future generations that on this 27th day of June in the year of our Lord 1964, of the independence of the United States of America the 188th, and of the reestablishment of the independent, united, and sovereign Ukrainian National Republic the 46th,

When the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson was the 36th President of the United States of America,

When the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O.S.B.M., was archbishop-metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the United States,

When the Most Reverend Ioan Theodorovich was archbishop-metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States,

When Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky was president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America,

When Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki was president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society,

When Dr. Alexander Archimovich was president of the Ukrainian Academy of Art and Sciences in the United States,

When all freedom-loving peoples, led by the United States of America, having defeated the imperialist and genocidal forces of nazism and fascism, were engaged in a bitter cold war, pursued relentlessly in spite of temporary periods of seeming relaxation, against an equally evil and menacing threat of Russo-Communist imperialism,

On this day the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America, unveiled this monument in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the bard of Ukraine and universal champion of freedom, on the 150th anniversary of his birth, in the presence of a solemn gathering of thousands of people, including representatives of the American political, civic, and cultural life, representatives of Ukrainian

central and national organizations from many countries of the free world.

This monument is dedicated to all nations and peoples who, like the Ukrainian people, are engaged in a relentless and uncompromising struggle against Russian communism and all other forms of tyranny and despotism and who are constantly striving toward the attainment of the highest ideals propounded by Taras Shevchenko—liberty and national independence with freedom and justice for all.

This monument was authorized by U.S. Public Law 86–749, passed by the 86th Congress and signed by Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America, on the 13th day of September 1960.

This monument, created by Sculptor Molodozhanyn, was erected with funds donated by over 50,000 American citizens, mostly of Ukrainian origin and descent, and the implementation of the law authorizing the erection was carried out by the special Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America, representing 2 million Ukrainian Americans.

Given on this 27th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1964 and the 150th anniversary year of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, in Washington, D.C., the National Capital of the United States of America.

In witness thereof, we, the undersigned members of the executive board of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee of America hereunder affix our signatures to this scroll prior to its encasement in the base of the monument.

BIOGRAPHY OF LEO MOL, SCULPTOR FOR THE SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL

Mr. Leo Mol, sculptor for the Taras Shevchenko memorial in Washington, D.C., was born in Ukraine in 1915, and studied modeling in Vienna, in Berlin, and at the Academy of Fine Arts at The Hague. He has lived in Winnipeg, Canada, since 1948.

Mr. Mol has exhibited his sculpture with the Royal Canadian Academy, the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Hamilton Gallery, and the Toronto Art Gallery. He is a vice president of the Sculptors Society of Canada and a past president of the Manitoba Society of Artists. In 1960, Mr. Mol received a gold medal from the Canadian Society of Architects for his achievement in sculpture and stained glass.

Mr. Mol works in clay, plastics, stone, concrete, sheet and cut bronze, wrought iron, and welded steel. He also has done work in stained glass and in oils. His works are found in permanent collections of Hamilton, Toronto and Winnipeg Art Galleries and in numerous private collections throughout Canada and the United States.

PHYSICAL DETAILS OF THE TARAS SHEVCHENKO MEMORIAL STATUE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Total height, 24 feet.

Polished granite base for the figure of Shevchenko, height, 7 feet; width, 4½ feet; thickness, 4½ feet; weight, 12 tons.

Bronze figure of Shevchenko (three times life size), height, 14 feet; weight, 3 tons.

"Prometheus" unit (concave granite wall), height, 10 feet; width, 13 feet; thickness, 2 feet; weight, 30 tons.

The bronze figure of Shevchenko was cast at Bedy & Rassy Art Foundry, 229–31 India Street, Greenpoint, Brooklyn, N.Y.

The granite base and "Prometheus" wall is from Jones Brothers Co., Barre, Vt.

Light gray granite from Barre, Vt., is used for the memorial, including polished park benches and the granite for the fountain.

INSCRIPTION ON SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT IN WASHINGTON—DEDICATED TO THE LIBERATION, FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF ALL CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Submitted by L. S. Dobriansky)

This monument of Taras Shevchenko, 19th-century Ukrainian poet and fighter for the independence of Ukraine and the freedom of all mankind, who under foreign Russian imperialist tyranny and colonial rule appealed for "the new and righteous law of Washington," was unveiled on June 27, 1964. This historic event commemorated the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth.

The memorial was authorized by the 86th Congress of the United States of America on August 31, 1960, and signed into Public Law 86–749 by Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States of America, on September 13, 1960. This statue was erected by Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and friends.

APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES—EDITORIAL COMMENT CONCERNING U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. MOSHER. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke in support of House Joint Resolution 1100. I introduced this resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit a State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. With many others, it is my hope that before we adjourn this year, my resolution—or one similar to it—will be approved by this House.

Many thoughtful citizens share my concern that the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court requiring that both houses of a State legislature be apportioned on the basis of population was not wise. Many thoughtful and concerned citizens feel that the decision represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States to conduct their own affairs—within the framework of the U.S. Constitution.

The Keene Evening Sentinel, published in Keene, N.H., in my congressional district, comments on the recent Supreme Court decision in a recent editorial. I commend to my colleagues' attention the measured and perceptive observation of this editorial. The criticism expressed in this editorial is powerful and persuasive. It is especially so because of the fact that this excellent, independent paper has forcefully defended the U.S. Supreme Court in connection with some of its recent controversial rulings. I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial to which I refer:

UNWISE INTERVENTION

As we have made clear on a number of occasions, we believe seats in both houses of the New Hampshire Legislature should be apportioned on the basis of population.

But we do not believe it is either healthy or wise for this result to be achieved at the direction of the U.S. Supreme Court—which is now, apparently, about to happen.

A majority of the Court, with vigorous dissents by three Justices, has in effect ruled that in every State seats in both legislative houses must be apportioned strictly on the basis of population.

Since the Court has thus adopted the same principle that we, as a newspaper, have urged, why do we think the Court's decision is so unfortunate?

The reason is very simple: We feel it represents an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the rights of the several States and, to a degree, the rights of the Nation's voters.

Basically, the Court's majority argued that unless every citizen's vote for a State representative and State senator is given weight equal to the vote of every other citizen, then some citizens have been denied "equal protection of the laws," contrary to the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Presumably the same principle would apply to all local selections, and thus the Court's ruling, if it stands, would require that representation in every law-making body in the land be determined strictly according to population.

We shall leave to others arguments about the fine points of the law and turn, instead to what Walter Lippmann in his Monday column on this page said was the "crucial question."

"It is," he said, "whether the United States (courts) should intervene" in cases of apportionment, especially of State legislatures.

Lippman believes the Court should intervene in this situation, or in any others, "where there is a major ill for which there is no other remedy" except Federal Court intervention.

Regardless of whether Lippmann is right in this premise, we think it can be argued that in most States there are other remedies available to correct the injustices of unequal legislative apportionment.

He points out, correctly, that in many States (and New Hampshire is one of them) legislative seats have been apportioned so as to favor a minority of rural voters over a majority of urban voters. This is, we agree, unjust and is a major ill.

But we believe that, in New Hampshire and elsewhere, it can be corrected when and if a majority of voters become sufficiently aroused to insist through constitutional amendment or legislative action that the injustice be remedied. This might take a long time in a given State, but if the partially disenfranchised majority cared enough, we feel sure it could find ways to make its views prevail.

The recent New Hampshire constitutional convention had an opportunity to direct that both houses of the legislature be apportioned on a population basis. But it did so only with respect to the senate. It refused to change the apportionment of the house—and in this action rural delegates were aided and abetted by a number of urban delegates.

Under these circumstances, it seems quite clear that a legal method of reapportioning both houses was available, and that it simply wasn't used.

But beyond all this, there is another cause for grave concern in the Court's decision. Ever since the founding of the Republic, the States and their people have been left free to decide for themselves how to apportion their State and local legislative bodies.

Undeniably, many of them have done so in weird ways; but many of them, too, have changed their ways over the years in response to popular pressure.

We cannot understand why, suddenly, the Supreme Court has decided it—and it alone—must determine precisely how all such bodies must be apportioned.

Though we have been sympathetic with many of the Court's controversial rulings in recent years, especially those dealing with individual rights, we find ourselves in complete disagreement with the wisdom of the apportionment ruling, even though we believe wholeheartedly in the principle it enunciates: one man, one vote.

However, unless and until it is modified, it is the law of the land and should be observed as such. The New Hampshire constitutional convention is being reconvened in this spirit.

DROP IN FARM PARITY PROGRESS IN REVERSE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the 1-percent drop in farm parity income reported by the Department of Agriculture yesterday shows more progress in reverse for the farmer and from all indications this progress will be remaining in reverse.

The parity ratio, as all Members of Congress know, shows the relationship between prices received and prices paid by the farmer and they fell to a 25-year low of 74 percent of parity last month.

When Secretary Freeman took office the parity ratio was 81 percent. Since then it has dropped each year and according to the July 1 report of the Department of Agriculture it hit the lowest point since August 1939.

For wheat farmers, Mr. Speaker, the news is even worse. The same Department announced wheat prices at only 56 percent of parity.

It should be pointed out that nothing is being attempted and nothing is being done to improve this situation. The President has threatened to veto a bill even if passed by Congress which would limit beef imports, and the administration forced through Congress a bill which would reduce the support price on wheat from $2 to $1.72 a bushel, and the $1.72 includes diversion payment. It seems the Department of Agriculture and the administration are fighting to reduce farm income.

VOTE AGAINST THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am voting against the civil rights bill today. In my 12 years in Congress, I have voted for every civil rights measure brought to the floor, but I cannot support the final version.

Earlier this year, I voted with the majority of our colleagues to send the civil rights bill to the Senate in the belief that the Senate would be able to modify the most troublesome sections, including public accommodations. I had supported proposed amendments in the House that would improve this bill and which would be more apt to solve rather than compound the racial tensions that have built up because of the very real deprivation of the rights of Negroes.

Rather than improve the bill and make it more workable, the Senate added over 80 amendments that further compound and restrict orderly enforcement of the bill. For example, the Senate amendments in substance increase the powers of the Attorney General, who is a political appointee, not necessarily responsive to the people.

The Senate version is being brought out today under a gag rule that prohibits any opportunity to debate or modify the Senate's additional provisions.

Under these circumstances, I must reluctantly vote against the measure.

RESOLUTION BY THE FISH AND CANNERY WORKERS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this time a resolution adopted by the fish and cannery workers special legislative conference held by the Seafarers International Union of North America.

I introduce this resolution to emphasize to my colleagues the importance of the fisheries industry to this Nation. As more is learned about the sea, harvest of its fish food resources will increase.

The resolution asks that the well-being of the American worker be considered when decisions are made, when treaties are talked, when actions are taken that could affect American fisheries. The fisheries workers want a voice in consideration of fisheries agreements. I introduced legislation which Congress has passed to protect our own fishermen within the 3-mile limit. The pressure of foreign fisheries is increasing. Huge trawlers lurk off our shores. We in Congress, and those in the executive branch, owe it to the fisheries industry and its workers, to see that their rights to harvest seafood resources off our shores are protected and that no nation be allowed to arbitrarily foreclose them from the open seas beyond traditional limits due each sovereign country.

Text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF FISH AND CANNERY WORKERS SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, JUNE 23, 1964

Whereas:

1. The world fishery is a vastly expanding industry as to activity, number of nations engaged, and scientific development; and

2. United States consumption of fishery products has more than doubled in recent years and will continue to increase; but

3. United States import of fishery products has increased 900 percent in quantity (over 4½ billion pounds in 1962) and 1,000 percent in value since 1940; but

4. U.S. production has remained static, and U.S. fishing fleet and employment in the industry has drastically declined; and

5. Increasing consumption of fishery products in the United States has benefited only foreign fisheries at the expense of American workmen and their employers; and

6. Executive and administrative action of the various departments of the executive branch of the U.S. Government could do much to alleviate this distressing situation and reverse this disastrous trend; and

7. Workmen in the industry have not been adequately represented in the policymaking processes of the executive department of the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference adopt as policy, and attempt to prevail upon the President of the United States to adopt as policy the following:

In all actions of the executive department, and all its branches, special attention and care shall be given that no action shall be taken which is detrimental to the American fishing industry, especially to those actions which are detrimental to American fisheries to the benefit of foreign fisheries, and that every effort shall be made wherever possible in administration and executive actions to foster, expand, and improve American fisheries, and that representatives of those employed in the industry should be adequately represented in all decision-making processes wherein consultation with the industry is indulged.

RETIREMENT OF DR. JAMES H. WAKELIN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the June 30 retirement of a distinguished American, Dr. James H. Wakelin, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development.

Dr. Wakelin was appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on July 8, 1959. His career has been characterized by dedication to public service and leadership in industrial research. He has participated in many of the scientific breakthroughs which have helped keep our Navy tops in tactical facilities.

Dr. Wakelin attended Cambridge, England University, and Yale. He worked for the B. F. Goodrich Co. in the early 1940's, then became ordnance staff officer to the Coordinator of Research and Development of the Navy Department from 1943 to 1945. As a lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy Reserves, he was head of the chemistry, mathematics, and mechanics and materials sections of the Planning Division, Office of Research and Inventions. Following World War II, Dr. Wakelin joined a group of former Navy research scientists in the establishment of Engineering Research Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C. After serving as director of research for Princeton University for 3 years from 1951 to 1954, Dr. Wakelin established his own consulting business, where he served several industries and was instrumental in founding Chesapeake Instrument Corp., of Shadyside, Md.

Dr. Wakelin is an example of the restless, creative mind which has helped the United States advance scientifically into world leadership. His was the blending of the discoverer with the producer. He is a coauthor with C. B. Tompkins and W. W. Stifler, Jr., of "High-Speed Computing Devices," published in 1950.

I know that I join my colleagues in wishing Dr. Wakelin many happy, productive years of well-earned retirement.

May I express my appreciation on behalf of our fellow citizens for the extraordinary record of achievement and public service compiled by Dr. Wakelin during the past three decades.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE'S POWER OF DESIGNATION IN ARA

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Administration law is so broadly drawn that it makes the Secretary of Commerce—or the ARA Administrator—a veritable satrap or czar when it comes to designating areas for eligibility. Last July Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., told the House that the Administrator already had the authority to group contiguous counties which were not hard up with counties which were. This was so that special, particular counties could be tied into a single neat redevelopment area. The ARA calls this "rounding out" an economic area. The truth of the matter is, however, that after the ARA got through with its first frenzy of designation, it turned out that some counties failed to qualify even under the loose criteria ARA was using. This put some Congressmen, who had voted for the legislation and promised their constituents lavish benefits, "on the spot." So, the new "rounding out" technique was concocted. Under this scheme, the ARA claimed the right to "depress" a county, or series of counties, if it touched counties already eligible under the rationale that the group of counties constitute a single economic unit and ARA assistance to a "rounded out" county would benefit the unemployment and underemployment in the contiguous areas. By this scheme, 24 more counties were added to the dole.

But, like the little boy with jam on his face and a guilty conscience, ARA went back to Congress and asked the legislation to give it authority which it claimed it already had. The change in the law, said F.D.R. Jr., "merely makes more explicit the authority and discretion the Administrator already has." For once, thank heaven, Congress had the courage and foresight to say "No." But the ARA still carries those 24 counties on the dole.

Congress should investigate these techniques before it permits the Area Redevelopment Administration to continue.

CALIFORNIA FARMERS ARE TRYING DESPERATELY TO FIND SUBSTITUTE FOR BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress served notice upon the fresh fruit and row-crop vegetable growers that they could not supplement the domestic farm labor supply with braceros, the farmers in my district in California have been trying every idea ever proposed. In order to prevent wholesale spoilage of crops, in order to provide jobs for workers in allied industries, in order to save their businesses and land, the farmers are experimenting and testing every conceivable proposal.

I want to share these various experiments with Members, so they can better evaluate the comparative values of the bracero program.

The Garin Co., at great cost and expense, and after much planning and preparation, recruited 46 experienced field workers from Mississippi and transported them all the way to the Salinas Valley of California.

High school students from San Francisco are being employed to pick strawberries by the Merrill Farms Co. near Salinas. Puerto Ricans have been contracted by the Santa Maria Association. Texas Mexicans have been recruited by the Yuma (Ariz.) Association.

The Carl Maggio Co., of King City, Calif., is working directly with and at the direction of the California State Department of Employment to obtain domestics. This company was willing to contract for 350 year-round workers at $1.12 per hour, plus fringe benefits.

The Farmers Cooperative, of Salinas—Ted Gottlieb, president—has attempted to use "green carders"—legally admitted Mexican nationals.

Mexican nationals earn $1.50, and more, per hour during the harvest seasons. Other workers could earn more. Living conditions are as good as any. Working conditions are unsurpassed. In spite of these favorable conditions, the experiments are not progressing well. As the results are documented, I shall make them available to Congress so that Members can know better how to solve the farm laborers' plight.

UNITED STATES REJECTS $4 MILLION GRANT FOR FOURTH STADIUM IN PHILADELPHIA—HOUSE SPECIAL HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE URGED TO TAKE NOTE OF HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate developments in the Federal urban renewal program has been the stretching of the intent of the Congress past the breaking point. Local officials, encouraged by Federal Urban Renewal Administration decisions in the recent past, have tried to shove every conceivable project under the urban renewal tent. I have been calling attention to this fact for some time now, and I am happy to report that, at least in one case, the intent of the Congress is being observed.

Plans to use $4 million of Federal urban renewal funds to build a fourth sports stadium in Philadelphia over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks has been rejected by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner. The rejection was based on the very logical and reasonable grounds that the air space over a thriving freight yard can hardly be called a blighted slum area. This rejection followed by 1 week my own condemnation on June 22 of the proposed grant of Federal funds—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 22, 1964, pages 14669–14671.

It is my hope that this decision by the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner will be read by other regional directors of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration and reread many times in the future by Federal URA Commissioner William L. Slayton. If this is done conscientiously we may hope to return to the original intent of the national housing policy and of the Housing Act of 1949, which was to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for people, not to provide it for athletic teams and stock exchanges.

I have in the past called attention to the pioneering work being done by Philadelphia in the housing code enforcement area—daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 15, 1964, page A3218—and I hope that Philadelphia will continue its leadership in the housing and urban renewal field not only as it relates to the enforcement of housing codes but in reforming and humanizing the Federal urban renewal program.

One final note: I would like to call the attention of my Democratic colleagues on the House Special Housing Subcommittee to the fact that the rejection of this stadium project in Philadelphia was made after Federal URA Commissioner Slayton made a personal investigation of it in the field. I would suggest that the House Special Housing Subcommittee could become equally well informed on a national basis through the same techniques of personal investigation. This would be the logical, and, in fact, it is the only way of preventing further mistakes in solving the problems present in the housing field when we act on the extension of the housing and urban renewal laws.

I include as part of my remarks several newspaper articles which shed further light on the action by the Federal Government in rejecting the application by the city of Philadelphia for a $4 million Federal urban renewal grant to help finance a local sports stadium:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 29, 1964]

U.S. RULING BARS AID TO STADIUM

(By C. Allen Keith)

An informal application for $4 million in Federal and city funds to purchase the air rights for the proposed 60,000-seat stadium over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at

30th and Arch Streets was turned down Tuesday by the Urban Renewal Administration.

URA Commissioner William L. Slayton said he was forced to refuse the subsidy on the ground that "it is clear that the rail yard area does not meet the requirements of law."

His announcement was released through Jason R. Nason, regional URA director here. Slayton's decision, which was not unexpected, came just 7 days after he inspected the west Philadelphia site.

TATE STILL HOPEFUL

Mayor James H. J. Tate, while expressing "disappointment in the ruling," said the program would go forward without U.S. aid.

David C. Bevan, PRR's chairman of finance, said "we cannot comment on the Urban Renewal Administration ruling until we have an opportunity to examine the details of the announcement and confer with our urban renewal consultants and city officials."

At the same time, the Philadelphia Real Estate Board voted to go on record as favoring the 30th and Arch Streets site, and said "failure to carry through on this proposal can only do harm to present plans and the actual future redevelopment of center city."

Slayton's rejection of the stadium project was the second setback Mayor Tate has received within a week. Last Thursday Jerry Wolman, owner of the Philadelphia Eagles and Connie Mack Stadium, announced he would not become a tenant at the new stadium.

ASKS PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

Wolman said the stadium should be publicly owned.

Mayor Tate, angered by Wolman's refusal to have the Eagles play at the new stadium, offered to buy the Mack Stadium from Wolman for 50 cents. Wolman had previously offered to sell Mack Stadium to the city for that sum, provided the city would redevelop the 21st Street and Lehigh Avenue property as a modern stadium with adequate parking.

In rejecting the application for URA funds for the stadium project, Slayton said his "decision is certainly no reflection on the urban renewal program being carried out by the city of Philadelphia, which we consider one of the finest in the Nation."

DICTATED BY LAW

"Rather, it is a decision dictated by the terms and the purpose of the Housing Act passed by the Congress," Slayton said. "The only question we have before us is the legal eligibility of the proposal under the Housing Act. No other aspect of the stadium proposal is involved in any way.

"The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate 'blighted areas.' It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the rail yards adjacent 30th Street Station.

AREA NOT ELIGIBLE

"This area is one which does not contain 'slum or blighted structures,'" Slayton continued. "On the contrary it is an area which is in active, heavy use by a thriving, well-managed industry, and it will continue to be used.

"To find that this area is 'blighted' would not be in keeping with the law passed by Congress. If we considered this to be a blighted area, then we must inevitably conclude that virtually every sizable railroad area in the Nation is also eligible as an urban renewal project. This is clearly not what Congress intended."

If the URA had approved the project, the Federal Government would have contributed $2.7 million and the city $1.3 million toward the purchase of the air rights from the railroad.

TOTAL COST $25 MILLION

The city would be required to put up an additional $6 million for service streets. The total cost in construction has been estimated at $25 million, $13 million of which would be financed by Stadium Corp., comprised of the railroad, Madison Square Garden Corp., and McCloskey & Co., building contractors.

Mayor Tate, in commenting on Slayton's rejection, which is considered final, said:

"Naturally, I am disappointed in the ruling but it should not discourage us from following through on our parallel proposal for building the stadium without Federal funds. This will evidently satisfy the dissenters who are concerned over the use of Federal money for this purpose.

"The importance of building this modern sports stadium is unquestioned," Mayor Tate added. "However, we will continue our negotiations with the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Madison Square Garden Corp."

The mayor said he thought the new stadium could be supported by the Phillies alone, although he welcomed the Eagles as tenants.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1964]

UNITED STATES REJECTS $4 MILLION GRANT FOR STADIUM—RENEWAL UNIT DECREES SITE IS NOT SLUM—CITY SOUGHT AID FOR PROJECT AT 30TH AND ARCH STREETS

The Federal Government today rejected the city's application for a $4 million urban renewal grant to help finance the proposed stadium on stilts over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets.

The rejection was announced here by Jason R. Nathan, regional director of the Urban Renewal Administration, on behalf of William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner. Slayton inspected the proposed site last Tuesday.

The URA decision was the second setback in less than a week for the stadium project.

Last Thursday, Jerry Wolman, owner of the football Eagles, said his team wouldn't play in the proposed stadium under arrangements presented to him thus far. At the same time, George Harrison, treasurer of the baseball Phillies, said the terms offered were "very stiff" and must be negotiated further.

NOT QUALIFIED

Nathan said the rail yard area could not qualify either as a blighted or as a slum area under the Federal urban renewal law.

"As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this matter is a closed book," Nathan said. "The decision is final."

Mayor Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the 60,000-seat stadium estimated to cost $25 million.

"This program will go forward," he said.

Nathan, in explanation of the turndown, said that the only question involved was whether "this was a blighted or slum area."

The city, he recalled, has described the area as a "blighting influence" on the surrounding area.

"An application must stand or fall on its own merit, without consideration to the contiguous area," Nathan said.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 30, 1964]

MAYOR SAYS HE'LL PRESS FOR STADIUM

Mayor Tate said this afternoon the city will continue to press for a sport stadium at 30th and Arch Streets despite loss of a $4 million Federal grant to help finance it.

He said that he had not seen the Urban Renewal Administration's ruling but that he understands it is based on legal grounds, not on the merits of the project.

"Naturally, I am disappointed in the ruling," he said. "But it should not discourage us from following through on our parallel plan for building a stadium without Federal funds.

"Needless to say, this program will go forward on this basis," he said.

SIXTY THOUSAND SEATS

The mayor observed that the rejection evidently will satisfy dissenters who objected to use of Federal money for the proposed $25 million, 60,000-seat stadium-on-stilts over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks.

"The importance of building this modern sports stadium is unquestioned, however, and we will continue our negotiations with the PRR and the Madison Square Garden Corp.," he continued.

"The prospects are still excellent to develop the 30th Street area in the same manner as the Penn Center was developed through the last decade. The proposed stadium would spark an entire development program of this type.

SPARK RENAISSANCE

"Such forward-looking plans have sparked the city's renaissance—and we must continually look to the future."

Tate expressed his appreciation to the URA and its commissioner, William L. Slayton, for the attention they gave the stadium proposal.

"We can note with pride their recognition of the outstanding urban renewal program that keeps Philadelphia in the forefront of progress," he said.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., July 1, 1964]

REJECTION LIKELY TO SPEED STADIUM, MCCLOSKEY SAYS

(By John F. Morrison)

Thomas D. McCloskey, president of McCloskey & Co., said today that rejection of the city's request for a $4-million urban renewal grant to help finance the proposed sports stadium might prove to be a blessing in disguise.

"It may actually speed up construction of the stadium," said McCloskey, whose construction company is a partner in the project.

McCloskey said the way is now cleared for Mayor Tate's proposal of earlier last month that the stadium be built through the redevelopment authority—without Federal funds.

MOVE A LOT QUICKER

"The redevelopment authority will move a lot quicker than the Federal Government," McCloskey said.

"But," he said, "the Federal application had to be made and acted on before other steps could be taken."

Awaiting a decision by the Urban Renewal Administration has kept the project largely in abeyance since last fall.

McCloskey & Co. is in partnership with the Pennsylvania Railroad and Madison Square Garden Corp., of New York City, in the plan to build a stadium on stilts over the Pennsy's tracks at 30th and Arch Streets.

Ned Irish, president of Madison Square Garden, refused to comment on the rejection.

DETAILS OF TATE PLAN

Mayor Tate's finance plan called for the redevelopment authority to put $16 million in bonds and for the Pennsy and its partners to put up $13 million.

Of the $16 million, $4 million would be used to buy air rights over the tracks from the Pennsy. This was to have been the purpose of the $4 million Federal grant.

The redevelopment authority would own the stadium, under Tate's plan, and the bonds would be retired by rentals.

The rejection of the urban renewal grant was announced here yesterday by Jason R. Nathan, regional URA director, on behalf of William L. Slayton, URA Commissioner.

DECISION IS FINAL

Nathan said the rail yard area could not qualify either as a blighted or as a slum area under the Federal urban renewal law.

"As far as the Urban Renewal Administration is concerned, this matter is a closed book," Nathan said. "The decision is final."

Nathan said the only question was whether this was a blighted or slum area.

The city, he recalled had described the area as a blighting influence on the surrounding redevelopment areas.

"An application must stand or fall on its own merit without consideration to the contiguous area," Nathan said.

NO BLIGHTED BUILDINGS

"The law states that Federal urban renewal funds shall be used for assisting cities to eliminate 'blighted areas.'

"It is not possible to interpret these words in any reasonable way as applicable to the rail yard adjacent to the 30th Street Station.

"This area is one which does not contain slum or blighted structures which will be eliminated. On the contrary, it is an area which is in active, heavy use by a thriving, well-managed industry, and it will continue to be so used."

Tate said he was disappointed but not discouraged by the ruling and that he will continue to push for the stadium.

"This program will go forward," Tate added.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Daily News, June 29, 1964]

PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD TO REVISE STADIUM TERMS, WOLMAN TO LISTEN

(By Lou Schienfeld)

The Pennsylvania Railroad is willing to meet Jerry Wolman across the bargaining table—and Wolman is willing to listen. So, maybe the $25 million stadium on stilts at 30th Street still has a prop or two to stand on.

Pennsylvania Railroad officials aren't about to forget the whole project just because the young Eagles' owner walked out on their take-it-or-leave-it terms.

The word is that Pennsylvania Railroad Financial Chief David C. Bevan and Ned Irish, the Madison Square Garden Corp. president, will ease their stiff terms and come up with a lease that won't double over Wolman with laughter.

The rejected terms confused Wolman. He couldn't figure whether Irish wanted to be one of his landlords or his partner.

It's no secret that Irish's manner caused the Eagles to make up their minds in a hurry. One high Eagles' aid said that if Irish had handled things less brusquely, the team would have been willing to sit down and seek a compromise.

Terms dictated by the developers, Pennsylvania Railroad, McCloskey & Co., and the Garden, reportedly included a whopping 20 percent of box office admissions, control of parking, and a cut of concessions.

There would be no charge, of course, for air to fill the pigskins.

Anyway, Wolman can just sit back and wait for the phone to jangle.

He may not have to wait long.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 23, 1964]

EARLY OPINION DUE ON GRANT FOR STADIUM—RENEWAL HEAD TOURS PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD SITE AND TALKS WITH CITY OFFICIALS

William L. Slayton, head of the Urban Renewal Administration, said yesterday that there is legal precedent for Federal grants for air rights in renewal projects.

But Slayton said the precedent is in cases where more than air rights was involved.

He said, however, there is nothing to preclude payments for such air rights, and that the requirement is to prove it a deteriorating or deteriorated area.

OPINION DUE IN 2 WEEKS

Slayton came here from Washington at the city's request to give an informal opinion on whether the proposed stadium site over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets could be called blighted.

The Administrator said he expected to decide within 2 weeks.

Slayton was careful to point out that if the proposed 17-acre stadium area is declared blighted, the entire 85-acre railroad yard would have to be considered blighted. He said the city wants to know if the entire 85 acres is eligible for redevelopment grants.

The city proposes to buy air rights over the tracks from the railroad for $4 million, then built the stadium on stilts over the tracks.

If Slayton rules informally that the area is blighted, the city will follow with a formal application for a renewal grant.

ANOTHER POSSIBILITY

The Administrator also said the city advanced the possibility of making the proposed stadium site part of the University of Pennsylvania redevelopment project.

Slayton began his tour here at Mayor Tate's office where he looked over at Pennsylvania Railroad's model for redevelopment of the entire 85-acre track site.

The model consisted of a number of office buildings and an arena on stilts over the tracks.

Slayton referred to the model as "a rather exciting project" with many good points.

The Administrator then toured the area. Later, he attended a conference at the redevelopment authority's offices at Broad and Walnut Streets with city, authority, and Pennsylvania Railroad officials.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, June 23, 1964]

JERSEY LEGISLATOR OPPOSES STADIUM AID

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, said yesterday that Federal urban renewal funds should not be given to Philadelphia for construction of a sports stadium.

WIDNALL said the stadium should be "a function of private enterprise since the probable users will be highly profitable athletic teams."

The north Jersey Republican, ranking minority member of the House Housing Subcommittee, said that if Federal funds are approved for the stadium, he will demand an investigation.

He said that "millions of Americans have a desperate need of good housing." Philadelphia already has three sports stadiums, WIDNALL pointed out.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, June 23, 1964]

UNITED STATES NEAR DECISION ON STADIUM OK—RENEWAL CHIEF PROMISES ACTION WITHIN 2 WEEKS

(By Daniel Langan)

William L. Slayton, Federal Urban Renewal Administrator, said Monday he would decide within the next 2 weeks whether a plan to build a stadium atop the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at 30th and Arch Streets would qualify for Federal aid.

Slayton made the statement after a 3-hour visit here, during which he conferred with Mayor James H. J. Tate, toured an 84-acre west Philadelphia redevelopment area and heard a 1-hour "pitch" by top railroad officials, concerning the proposed stadium.

UNIVERSITY PROJECTS

Slayton said the entire acreage, which includes the university 4 and 5 projects the city wants redeveloped, will be approved or rejected by his Department "maybe in a week or two."

During his meeting with Tate and other city officials at the mayor's reception room, Slayton declared Federal urban renewal payments for "air rights" in renewal projects are possible.

Viewing a table-top model of the west Philadelphia stadium projects, Slayton said it also would be possible under urban renewal laws for redevelopment authorities to own or lease stadiums.

STADIUM OWNER

Under the Philadelphia proposal for the stadium, the redevelopment authority would own the stadium and lease it to the Pennsylvania Railroad and its associates.

The proposal by the city seeks to have the Federal Government put up the $4 million to pay for the "air rights" over the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at the site.

The stadium would occupy 17 of the 84 acres for development in the project. Mayor Tate has proposed a $16 million bond issue to help finance the 60,000-seat arena.

Following the conference with Tate, Slayton toured Society Hill, which he called "a quite exciting development," and the proposed stadium site and West Philadelphia projects.

Then he went to the Urban Renewal Authority office, where he met with Pennsylvania Railroad treasurer William R. Gerstnecker; David C. Brown, chairman of the railroad's finance committee; Fred N. Sass, economic analysis department manager, and several legal, architectural, and engineering consultants.

OFFICIAL SEES SLIDES

Slayton was shown filmslides as the Pennsy officials explained their plans for the stadium.

After the conference he said, "I got their pitch, you might say." He and the railroad officials were noncommittal, but the Administrator said his decision would be forthcoming within 2 weeks.

He then said the purpose of his trip here from Washington was "to determine the eligibility" of the proposed project for "air rights" payments.

"The basic question," he said, "is whether this project meets the criteria for redevelopment funds under Federal and State laws."

CITES PRECEDENT

He said also there is a "precedent" for Federal payments for "air rights." But, he added, "air right" payments would not be made solely because railroad tracks might be called a slum or blighted area.

The local plan calls for having the tracks declared a slum area in order to clear eligibility for the Federal money.

At city hall, Tate said the city must show good faith in the railroad because it had done a good job in the development of Penn Center.

Slayton pointed out that no Federal urban renewal funds were involved in the Penn Center project.

Also present at the conference with Slayton were Managing Director Fred T. Corleto, City Finance Director Edward J. Martin, City Representative Fredric R. Mann and City Development Coordinator John Shea.

Meanwhile, in Washington, Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, delivered another slashing attack on the stadium as an unjustified diversion of urban renewal funds.

WIDNALL blasted the stadium proposal again, saying Congress never intended the urban renewal program to be used "to provide new homes for profitable ball clubs."

He said Philadelphia already has three stadiums and asked what "possible connection does such a project have with the national housing policy?"

JANE JACOBS' WHITE HOUSE SPEECH ON THE NEEDS OF OUR CITIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 Mrs. Robert H. Jacobs, Jr., famous author of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," was guest speaker at Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's fifth monthly Women Doers luncheon at the White House. President Johnson dropped by to shake hands with each of the guests and to "give a special greeting" to Mrs. Jacobs, according to a report in the Washington (D.C.) Post of June 17, 1964.

Mrs. Jacobs said, according to the Washington Post, that the Federal-aid urban renewal programs which shunt poor people and Negroes out of their accustomed neighborhoods "are cause for worry."

I was much interested in this talk by Jane Jacobs, which she was kind enough to send me. I believe this Congress should carefully consider what she has to say in light of the new substantive programs being proposed by this administration for our cities.

One of the main points of Mrs. Jacobs' significant speech, which has not received the attention and study it deserves, is that "a great unbalance has developed in cities between money for building things and money for running things."

The explanation given by Mrs. Jacobs is that there is money available for capital grants to build new parks and new buildings and new highways, but the cities do not have the financial resources to maintain and improve existing facilities. Federal grants which encourage making capital outlays often result, says Mrs. Jacobs, in "capital expenditures that are unnecessary and even inane."

I wonder if the much heralded open space program, for example, does not help to starve existing parks and recreational areas. When I see city after city competing for ever more urban renewal funds to start new projects when old ones lie incompleted and housing codes lie unenforced I am forced to the conclusion that we in Congress have not been fully aware of the true needs of our urban centers. As Mrs. Jacobs puts it:

> Already, it has become easier for cities to let things disintegrate awaiting a big capital expenditure of some kind, and at that point sweep away the good with the bad, the beautiful with the ugly, and the productive with the unproductive. We see the paradox of cities actually impoverishing themselves by capital improvements. This unbalance is approaching a point of economic and social crisis.

I believe that we in Congress, as well as the administration, must bear the responsibility for much of the unbalance which Mrs. Jacobs complains of. Congress as well as the administration, therefore, has a responsibility to explore the problems created by this unbalance and seek a solution in cooperation with State and local governments.

I am pleased to include a letter from Mrs. Jacobs and the text of her White House speech for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Thank you very much indeed for the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 17, with your very generous remarks about my efforts. I was also most interested to read the United Steelworkers' pamphlet material which you quoted, as I had not known of it.

I noticed from your remarks that you had asked at the White House for a text of my luncheon remarks. As they said, I did not speak from a text; but the fact is that I had previously worked out for myself a text and so knew what I would be saying. I am very pleased to enclose a copy for you, since I know you are interested. It is not long, as I was asked to confine my remarks to 7 minutes. I would be interested to know what you think about this problem of the relatively decreasing running expense money and relatively increasing capital funds. I do not think that aid to cities can much longer ignore the one and so much exaggerate the other.

Your work for the mass transit bill is greatly appreciated by many other citizens besides myself, I am sure. Highways versus transit is of course another field that has gotten wildly out of balance; many many thanks for your work on a start toward redressing it.

Again, may I say how much I appreciate your very kind remarks.

Sincerely,

JANE JACOBS,
Mrs. R. H. Jacobs, Jr.

REMARKS OF MRS. ROBERT H. (JANE) JACOBS, JR. AT THE FIFTH MONTHLY WOMEN DOERS LUNCHEON, SPONSORED BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE WHITE HOUSE, JUNE 16, 1964

This is an age when we talk more and more about city amenity and produce it less and less. Many outrages are committed in its name. Poor people, Negroes and businesses on which many livelihoods depend are tossed out of their neighborhoods in the name of somebody's idea of amenity. Here and there our cities are given a slick, artificial mask. But neither that aberration, nor the drabness, dirt, and dispiritedness in other places answers the profound need we have for character, convenience, visual pleasure and vitality—all those things we lump together as amenity and cherish in cities.

The attractiveness of cities is not gotten by subtraction. It builds up from lots and lots of different bits and details, lots of different bits of money, lots of different notions, all coming out of the concern, the affection, and the ideas of lots and lots of different people. The amenity of cities cannot possibly be planned or bought wholesale. It is so much more complicated and quicksilver than a choice between wall-to-wall pavement and wall-to-wall grass.

From my observation, there is deep concern about city amenity on the part of great numbers of ordinary people, and no dearth of ideas and effort too. The serious problem is that all the concern and the efforts are consistently coming to so little.

Numerous obstacles prevent the thousands of improvements and differences that add up to attractiveness and amenity. I am going to speak about only one obstacle, not because others are unimportant but because this one is probably the most serious and far reaching.

Almost unnoticed and unremarked, a great unbalance has developed in cities between money for building things and money for running things. Let me give a current example from my own neighborhood. For years we have been begging for repair and restoration of our park. For years the park has been running down. Last month the city offered to destroy the park and build a new one. Why not use that money, the citizens asked, to restore and maintain the park, and several others besides? The parks commissioner candidly explained that his department is starved for maintenance funds but is relatively well off for capital funds. He has money to build an unwanted new park for $750,000 but is hard put to find money for repairing benches, planting flowers, and picking up papers.

The consequences of such unbalance go far beyond dirt and disrepair. The certainty of not having enough money to run things automatically rules out wide ranges of potential recreation in cities, and many forms of potential beauty—not so much because of what these cost to develop but because they take more than routine care. Even the devastating ugliness of parking lots is insured when the hospital director or housing manager or auditorium chairman knows in advance that his budget cannot possibly support maintenance of more than hot, unrelieved asphalt and chain link fence. And how can we make headway combating private devastation of this kind when everyone can plainly see that the public standards are as low or lower?

Variety and character in parks and in the total city scene will steadily become less and less possible, no matter how lavish our lip service to amenity, unless we get many, many more cleanup people, repair people, painters, gardeners, and so on, working for the public. Many of these jobs, incidentally, require little training.

The wild unbalance between capital funds and running expenses is typical of many municipal services, and of all cities. This unbalance is compounded by the present forms of the subsidies for highways, institutions, public housing, most instances of urban renewal, and by the devices of public authorities with their own borrowing power. Most of these cases of aid to cities, especially nowadays the grants for highways, remove great territories from the local tax rolls, while they simultaneously increase welfare, policing and social work burdens. Yet the subsidies themselves provide only for construction. They do not provide the equivalent of tax funds, nor even funds for the public share of their own subsequent maintenance costs. The cities' matching grants to projects can be in the form of capital improvements; this provision frequently stimulates capital expenditures that are unnecessary and even inane. The local borrowing power can be called on to finance these, but the interest comes out of the same pot as running expenses.

Theoretically, all these forms of aid are supposed either to cut running costs or bolster the local tax base; but they are not working out that way at all. The unbalance automatically feeds on itself and increases, because the harder it is to get maintenance funds, the greater the scramble for capital funds instead. Already, it has become easier for cities to let things disintegrate awaiting a big capital expenditure of some kind, and at that point sweep away the good with the bad, the beautiful with the ugly, and the productive with the unproductive. We see the paradox of cities actually impoverishing themselves by capital improvements.

This unbalance is approaching a point of economic and social crisis. The disappointing appearance of things is only one of many symptoms. Perhaps we can do nothing until

this crisis is upon us full force. I am an optimist, and prefer to think we can.

I am sorry if I sound too serious, but you know there is no point in setting a course, toward attractiveness or anything else, without knowing where the boobytraps lie. Of course there are other boobytraps—weird thickets of deadening, obsolete and absurd regulations for instance. But one of the great things about public efforts in this country is that when we do find the traps, and enough people make enough noise about them, we can be wonderfully ingenious at dealing with them.

THE FOLKS AT HOME EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my feeling that too many times the opinions of the people have been overlooked or disregarded by their elected representatives. Too often, I fear, we are inclined to let those immediately surrounding us—the professional pollsters, the news writers, interpreters, columnists, and the bureaucrats—have more influence on our decisions than the folks back home. With this thought in mind and with the help of hundreds of volunteer workers, I recently mailed out my second annual legislative questionnaire to the citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Texas, inviting them, individually, to advise me of their views and opinions on some of the major issues facing Congress and the Nation.

The response to this questionnaire was tremendous. It far exceeded the number of replies to my first questionnaire. Over 35,000 answers have already been received, and almost 10,000 of them had additional comments attached. Answers came from every single community and all of the 19 counties in my district—from people in all walks of life—from Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike. Because of this diversified and widespread response, I believe that this poll is a reasonably accurate expression of public opinion. I am pleased to report the results of these replies for the information and review of my colleagues.

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Should the U.S. Government guarantee credit for the Soviet Union's purchase of wheat or other commodities?	3.2	96.8
2. Do you favor the creation of a Domestic Peace Corps or a National Youth Corps financed by Federal tax funds?	12.8	87.2
3. Do you favor Federal medicare for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	14.3	85.7
4. Do you favor the administration's proposal of more new Federal welfare programs to end poverty?	15.7	84.3
5. Do you favor the provisions proposed in the civil rights bill now before Congress?	15.4	84.6
6. Do you favor a reduction of Federal controls and regulations of agriculture?	89.1	10.9
7. Do you favor a constitutional amendment permitting voluntary prayer and Bible reading in our public schools?	79.2	20.8
8. Do you think we should make some large reductions in our foreign aid expenditures?	94.0	6.0
9. Do you feel that our prestige abroad is lower now than when Eisenhower was President?	80.1	19.9
10. Who do you believe would make the best President of the United States, 1964–68?		
	Percent	
President Lyndon Johnson	30.1	
Senator Goldwater	53.5	
Governor Rockefeller	1.0	
Governor Scranton	2.2	
Senator Smith	.4	
Ambassador Lodge	3.2	
Richard Nixon	7.6	
Others or no opinion	2.0	

Mr. Speaker, these views and results speak strongly and forcefully for a concerned American people—God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who believe in the free enterprise system and in the preservation of our representative form of government. They are the kind of people who believe two and two still make four, and that all that glitters is not necessarily gold.

They are honest Americans who still believe in the good, old-fashioned principles of fiscal and personal responsibility, individual liberty and freedom, integrity, patriotism, loyalty, and hard work—people who are not afraid to tell the truth and look the world straight in the eye—people who are not too lazy to work, not too proud to be poor—people who are willing to live on what they have earned, and wear what they have paid for—people who are not ashamed to say "no" to socialism and communism with emphasis, and who are not ashamed to say, "I can't afford it."

From the results of this questionnaire, it is evident that the people of west Texas fully realize that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and paid for later by their children or grandchildren, with interest added. They know, too, that Government has no money or income that it does not first take from the people. Most of these folks feel that they are getting more government than they need, and more government than they want. One nice little lady was very expressive in her reply to me by penciling in the margin of the questionnaire, "Thank goodness we don't get all the government we pay for."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these people are solid, sincere Americans, who are still puritanical enough to believe that a man and government should pay its debts and not continuously spend more than it takes in. They still refuse to find shame in our power or our creed. They still believe that the American story of individual freedom, responsibility, and dignity is worth telling. They are dedicated, devoted people who put their country ahead of petty partisan considerations. They just want to see America win every time. I share their viewpoint, and I am proud to represent them in this great, lawmaking body.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up on a farm. We did not have very much money and my folks were not able to give me much in the way of material things, but they gave me something even more valuable—they taught me about individual responsibility and hard work, and, in a way, about capitalism. They taught me that if I wanted to have more material things in my life, I would have to work for them. They taught me that the world pays for the right answers, efficiently delivered—and that the No. 1 question in life is not, "How many storms did you ride out?" or "Did you have a rough time?" but, "Did you shoot square, did you bring the ship in safely?" They taught me the virtues of honesty and self-respect—and they taught me that when my problems were too great for me, I could always drop down on my knees and ask for, and get, help from our God above.

I hope Americans never forget, or stray away from these fundamental, basic principles that made us what we are today. West Texans have not, and I do not think the American people have, or will, but we could fail if we ever stopped relying on ourselves and started looking to Government to solve all our problems and make all our decisions for us. Yes, America could go down, but if we ever do, it will not be because the world developed a hydrogen bomb—it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct.

It was American freedom, and that alone, which first made it possible for our country and the world to dream of a day when poverty might be abolished. It is American freedom, and that alone, which is the only really new idea, the only genuine bold new program in all history for the production of wealth for all. Socialism is the latest form of an age-old fraud, that something can be created out of nothing, that we can get wealth by merely wishing for it or claiming it as a right, that government can plan a man's life for him better than he can. Socialism is a fraud because it creates poverty while constantly promising to abolish it, and so by a vicious circle, maintains itself in power.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the Congress and our national leaders, regardless of their political party affiliations, to give heed to these opinions, this feeling, this voice of the American people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving our freedom, our heritage, our constitutional rights and principles, and our great Nation "under God." Let us stop our continually increasing Government spending programs, let us initiate some tough, tightfisted management over our wasteful, irresponsible foreign aid giveaway programs; let us get back in balance

again, economically and spiritually, and let us place the welfare of this great country ahead of political considerations. All my life I have lived and worked and fought for these truths and ideals. During the past 2 years, as a Member of this Congress, my position has been clearly, plainly, and irrevocably spelled out—on the record. These are the principles I have believed in and worked for—for my Democrat and Republican friends alike. This, gentlemen, is a nonpartisan question, a nonpartisan challenge. It is our country and our freedom that are at stake. This is far more important than the success or failure of a political party. Indeed, it is the success or failure of the preservation of freedom for our children and for all mankind.

EUROPEANS SPEND OVER $1½ BILLION IN LOTTERIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we refuse to recognize the tremendous advantages of a Government-run lottery, 81 foreign countries enjoy the revenues derived from such harmless activities. All of these 81 foreign nations utilize government lotteries not only as a compromise with their gambling problems but as revenue-raising devices as well.

All of these 81 foreign countries have found that restraining rather than prohibitive measures are best not only for their people but for their governments as well.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, the tremendous success of the European lotteries. Twenty-eight countries in Europe have found that government-run lotteries not only yield substantial revenues but also help eliminate underworld problems.

I am happy to list 28 countries in Europe which recognize and accept the fact that gambling is a normal fact of life and should be treated as such.

In 1963, 28 countries in Europe, listed below, took in gross receipts of over $1,532,384,000 from its government-run lotteries. The net income to the governments of these countries came to over $631,372,000 which was used for social welfare programs, hospitals, culture, housing, arts, youths, schools, charity, sports, transportation, veterans and other worthwhile projects.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we be as smart as our European friends? Why cannot we have the courage to capitalize on our own people's thirst for gambling? What is wrong with us when we ignore and close our eyes to a possible additional revenue of $10 billion a year?

A national lottery in the United States will not only strike a lethal blow at organized crime but it will pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt. Is it not time that we stopped pussyfooting and become realistic on this issue? What is wrong with us?

Country	Gross receipts	Net income	Purposes used
1. Austria	$16,800,000	$7,200,000	General purposes.
2. Belgium	10,713,162	6,200,000	Social welfare programs.
3. Bulgaria	3,517,600	1,005,025	General purposes.
4. Czechoslovakia	11,157,600	5,000,000	Hospitals, sports, and culture.
5. Denmark	7,076,000	638,000	General fund.
6. England [1]	212,000,000	125,000,000	Central government expenses.
7. Finland	5,773,346	1,951,306	Science and fine arts, opera.
8. France	140,000,000	44,000,000	General purposes.
9. Germany	433,000,000	175,000,000	Youth, sports activities, and health.
10. Gibraltar	1,832,600	434,000	Housing, education, and social services.
11. Greece	26,994,000	6,145,000	Welfare agencies.
12. Hungary	84,333,990	33,730,845	Housing and sports facilities.
13. Iceland	960,000	310,000	Housing for elderly and research.
14. Ireland	43,229,849	10,586,334	Hospitals.
15. Italy	97,450,000	52,565,600	Hospital, orphanages, and education.
16. Liechtenstein [2]		$4,350	Sport activities and welfare.
17. Luxembourg	$1,562,300	624,920	Charity, welfare, and medicare.
18. Malta	1,273,314	209,000	General purposes.
19. Netherlands	9,893,000	1,083,000	General revenue.
20. Norway	18,700,000	5,800,000	General funds.
21. Poland [3]	53,378,000	18,138,000	Housing and culture.
22. Portugal	23,118,200	6,290,604	Public assistance.
23. Rumania [4]			50 percent of income used for sports.
24. Russia [5]	113,220,000	56,610,000	Unknown.
25. Spain	134,000,000	37,000,000	General budget and Red Cross.
26. Sweden	58,228,000	32,343,124	Culture and artistic purposes.
27. Switzerland	6,350,000	1,706,480	Public building and transportation.
28. Yugoslavia	8,824,000	1,786,666	Veterans, deaf and blind, Red Cross.
Total	1,532,384,861	631,372,254	

[1] Premium savings bond lottery used.
[2] Principality of Liechtenstein has a population of 17,000 and participates in Swiss lotteries.
[3] 1962 figures are used.
[4] Rumania is a Communist country: information not available.
[5] Information considered confidential. Figures are estimates.

POLITICS AND POVERTY

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD, at this time, two articles which discuss some of the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The two articles reveal that there is genuine bipartisan concern over the intents and the powers inherent in this act. The first is an article compiled by J. R. Anderson, an employee of the Republican congressional committee. The second is a newsletter issued by Representative E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, Democrat of Arkansas.

Many have the attitude that Congress is remiss in its duties if it does not spew forth a stream of legislation. This attitude of "don't just stand there, do something" may be fine in some instances. However, if one is standing on the edge of a cliff, impulsive action may be more conclusive than desirable. I feel we are standing on the edge of a legislative abyss when we consider legislation with such widesweeping powers centralized in a very few.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will read these articles carefully, and give some constructive thought as to the serious nature of the course of action we are being asked to take in the name of fighting poverty.

Text of the articles is as follows:

PRICE OF "POVERTY" PROGRAM

There are a few in the Congress of the United States who would differ with the concept that it can serve no nobler purpose than to afford the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity to all citizens of this land.

The provision of these related opportunities is the stated aim of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Achieving this aim is fundamental to the well-being of this Nation and to the labors of those of us who serve in its legislature.

And yet, in striving for opportunities of this kind through legislation, we must always bear in mind the warning of the First Baron Acton, when he declared "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

We must never permit ourselves, in drafting and acting upon legislation, to rationalize that our ultimate purpose is so noble in its intent that the end justifies the means. If the means of achieving opportunity for all our citizens tends to concentrate unlimited discretionary power in the hands of an individual then the specter of corruption lurks within a moment's journey and the principle of checks and balances must inevitably be haunted by the fear of destruction.

The American people, and those of us delegated the power to serve their interests, have consistently rejected the concept of czarism. Concentration of unlimited power within the grasp of a single individual is anathema to us all, and properly so.

And yet, despite our tradition of separation of powers, despite our characteristic caution in vesting unlimited discretionary power in the hands of one man, other than the President in time of national emergency, the Congress has before it a bill which does violence to these concepts. While acting to relieve the suffering of those of our citizens

who experience the hardship of poverty, unemployment, and despair, we must, at the same time, safeguard the basic philosophy of our Nation and protect against the surrender of our Federal Union to the threat of statism or dictatorship.

There may be those who will say that this warning establishes a strawman as a convenient target for launching opposition to a worthy bill. There may be others who will hold that control of funds by the Congress will effectively limit the growth of power in the person of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Some there may be who will view this opposition as a political lever, designed to alarm the people and thus damage the acceptance by them of administration programs.

Believe me when I say that none of these objections is valid. Believe me when I say that my concern with the language and methodology of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 stems from a knowledge of history and a determination that "It can happen here."

The destruction of a nation may be brought about through legal means whenever legislators and the people relax their vigilance. The rise of Hitler, not so long ago that we should have forgotten the warning, demonstrates the precedent * * * the ultimate outcome of that rise dramatizes the insidious nature of a legal approach to dictatorship.

In 1933, the Reichstag passed an "enabling act" which formally was known as the "Law for removing the distress of people and the Reich." Hitler asked for powers which would enable him to overcome a number of serious problems, one of which, according to William L. Shirer in his book, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," was "getting the country out of its economic morass and finding jobs for the 6 million unemployed."

That purpose, I am sure, strikes a familiar chord, since the purpose stated in H.R. 10443, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, is "to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States."

It is true that the legislation before this body does not contemplate, as did the Reich's "enabling act," removal of the power of legislation, control of the budget, approval of treaties with foreign states, and the initiation of constitutional amendments, from the hands of the legislature. However, by vesting unlimited specific powers in the hands of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, it does tend to fulfill the shift of control which Hitler later achieved in his "Law for Reconstruction of the Reich," which was passed 1 year after he came to power.

Let us look at this second German takeover law and relate it to the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964." The 1934 act transferred the sovereign powers of the states to the Reich, all state governments were placed under the Reich government, and the state governors put under the administration of the Reich Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick, who explained this latter move, "The state governments from now on are merely administrative bodies of the Reich."

Within 1 year, Hitler had effectively destroyed the age old Federal character of Germany. Does not a similar threat lurk within the provisions of the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964"?

Look at the powers of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity with respect to the "Job Corps":

He is authorized to "enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed to carry out the purposes" * * * he is authorized to "prescribe such rules and regulations and make such arrangements as he deems necessary," * * * he may enroll male individuals "who have attained the age 16 but have not attained age 22 at the time of enrollment, and who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director" * * * he has the right to extend service beyond 2 years "as the Director may determine in special cases."

In fiscal management, the allowances and maintenance of enrollees are determined, not by the law, but "as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs."

Throughout the bill there is constant reference to determinations, judgments, allocations, and decisions by the Director, with the net result that the will of the Congress, the States, local governments, and cooperating private organizations are neither implied nor specified in a wide range of issues which normally fall within their purview.

Elimination of the Federal character of our country lies within the language of the bill related to "work-training programs," since it is inevitable that the hand which controls the purse strings establishes the tenor and extent of State functions. Section 113, for instance, says: "The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines" that it meets criteria subject to his own interpretation.

The enrollment of youth, meritorious as it appears to be to achieve their ultimate economic independence in maturity, gives pause when viewed in the perspective of history. In 1932, the last year of the German Republic, the Hitler Youth enrollment totaled only 107,956. Six years later it numbered 7,728,259. Most significantly, Baldur von Schirach who was named "Youth Leader of the German Reich" in June 1933, served under the Ministry of Education until December 1, 1936, when he was made responsible directly to Hitler. The youth enrollment program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 eliminates the waiting period and begins with the Director reporting solely to the President.

Shirer, commenting upon the influence of the Hitler Youth movement in Germany, said: "The young in the Third Reich were growing up to have strong and healthy bodies, faith in the future of their country and in themselves and a sense of fellowship and comaraderie that shattered all class and economic and social barriers."

Although we remain confident that "it can't happen here," is there not a grave danger when the National Government is put in a position to control the indoctrination, the feeding, the clothing, the shelter, and the economic philosophy of youth?

Is there not cause for apprehension to be abroad in the land when the provisions of a loosely drawn bill afford the Director of any Federal program the right to acquire and maintain, in direct violation of existing law, a personally controlled, uniformed military force?

You say this bill provides no such thing? Listen—section 106(e) says "Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strengths under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein."

In effect, that section authorizes the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to draw upon the Armed Forces of the United States for any number of personnel he requires, to promote them as he sees fit, regardless of limitations imposed on the numbers of military personnel in each grade, and the military leaders of the Nation would then be enabled to fill the holes in their forces, thus created, although ceilings have heretofore been imposed on military strength by Congress. Does this not constitute a private army? Does this not balk the will of Congress in its determination of the number of Americans to serve under arms? Is there not danger in such a move?

There are infinite other examples of the peril inherent in this proposed act. That they exist by design as a means to establish a dictatorship, I seriously doubt. That they could, however, achieve this end in the hands of the wrong men, I do not doubt.

Hitler, at a meeting of state governors in the Chancellery on June 6, 1933, declared: "In the long run our political power will be all the more secure, the more we succeed in underpinning it economically."

The economy of the United States is a matter of paramount concern to every one of us; it is of critical concern to those Americans who suffer the deprivation of poverty. And yet, I venture to say that even those who suffer hunger and cold and discomfort and despair as a result of poverty would not surrender their freedom for a crust of bread, a pair of shoes, or a roof over their heads. I believe that Americans want to remain free and independent and I am convinced that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as presently drawn, could effectively deny freedom and independence to every American if it were to become law.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and the Congress of the United States must serve as the first watchman against the forces which could destroy us from within. I submit that the dangers inherent in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 must be clearly recognized and eliminated if we are to provide Americans enduring freedom as well as bread.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BILL OF 1964

(By Representative E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS)

The bill to aid the Nation's impoverished people is a reckless departure from commonsense and prudence. It is wasteful, extravagant, and ill advised. The legislation comes along at a time when belt tightening and retrenchment could very well aid in the absorption of a part of the $11½ billion tax cut recently enacted.

A look at some of the provisions of this so-called economic opportunity bill of 1964 is most revealing. Title III embraces "special programs to combat poverty in rural areas." The statement of purpose says this: "It is the purpose of this title to meet some of the special problems of rural poverty and thereby to raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families." In order to carry out such policy or purpose the Director of such an agency is authorized to make grants not to exceed $1,500 to low-income rural families where in his judgment such grants have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to:

1. Acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon.

2. Operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized.

3. Participate in cooperative associations.

4. Finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

Also, loans to such families, having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not exceeding $2,500 in the aggregate to any family at any one time are provided.

The House Committee on Agriculture heard testimony from Agriculture Department officials. The testimony stated that 1 million families are "boxed in" because of age, education, or physical disability. Of these, 400,000 would be outside the scope of the present authority of the Farmers Home Administration.

The $1,500 in grants would be made to farm families for fundamental improve-

ments, such as to buy livestock, feed, seed, fertilizer, farm equipment, or land. The bill provides for family farm development corporations and authorizes the Director to cooperate with such organization which would have the power to acquire real property or any interest therein in rural areas to divide up large tracts into units not larger than family farms. Necessary fences, farm buildings, land and water development, and related facilities are included. The farms so developed or reconstituted would be sold to low-income farm families. Under the present Farmers Home Act, a borrower could contract for say 80 acres of land for $250 an acre, but he would not be loaned more than the normal value of the land which the Farmers Home Administration may set at about $200 an acre. Such applicant would have to pay the $50 an acre himself. Under the new proposal contained in the antipoverty bill, the $50 an acre downpayment would be paid by the Government, then a loan made to him in the amount of $16,000 for the 80 acres of land. In addition, the Government would build him a house, a barn, and other improvements which would cost in the neighborhood of $10,000, making a total outlay of $26,000 with regard to the land transaction. At this time the Farmers Home Administration loses less than 1 percent on its land insured loan program. The losses would be astronomical if the recommendations carried in the antipoverty bill were to be enacted.

The $1,500 grant to eligible individuals could be made by itself or in connection with a loan of up to $2,500 which could be used for some other line of activity outside of farming, such as the establishment of a machinery repair shop, welding, or some other form of endeavor or trade which the applicant may wish to enter.

Other provisions of the 47-page bill would make loans to companies which will agree to put more men to work. It would lend up to the sum of $10,000 for each new job that is produced. The bill says in this respect, "Persons not already employed by the borrower, a majority of whom will be recruited from among the longtime unemployed." This would mean that should a company desire to build a $50,000 new plant or an addition to an existing one, he could hire three men who need a job and two men who are already employed elsewhere. The bill calls for an authorization of $962,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums as are necessary to carry out this act. This is quite an ambitious program which needs to be studied most carefully across the country as well as by the Members of both branches of the Congress. There is a lot more to this legislation than the catchy phrase of bringing "war on poverty."

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION VERSUS THE SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest that the Johnson administration is in the process of carrying out a policy which, if allowed to run its sure course, would effectively undermine the last citadel of local self-government in this country—the school board control of public education. Whether this policy is deliberate, Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to say. I do not know. I prefer always to credit my political opponents with the highest of motives. In this case I am confident that the President and his educational policymakers want to bring about what in their opinion would be the best possible education for American youth. And these Federal educational policymakers give every indication of feeling that they know best how to get the best.

I too want the best education possible for American youth, but I believe—and I believe it strongly—that the local school boards—made up of community leaders, and so forth—know best. They know better than the education policymakers here in Washington what sort of an education they want for their children. I believe that once the school board's education decisionmaking has been sufficiently weakened and the control of curriculums centered in Washington, not only will we have to submit to an authoritarian type of educational system but to an authoritarian type government in other fields as well. What will it avail us if we be the first to reach the moon if we lose our own liberties?

Mr. Speaker, I have documentary evidence to show that this is the direction the Johnson administration is leading us; first, through action being taken by the executive branch, particularly through HEW's Office of Education; and second, through administration bills now before the Congress, including the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

POVERTY PACKAGE

First let us consider the Economic Opportunity Act now before us. This package of poverty programs include principally, first educational programs; second, job training programs; third, job experience programs; and fourth, aid to individuals and groups which will aid others in these three fields to wage "war on poverty."

On May 27, the ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said of this so-called Economic Opportunity Act, H.R. 11377:

> The pending proposal bypasses established State and local governments. It requires no outlay of State and local funds. It accords them no recognition. It places no responsibility on them. And it permits them no meaningful participation in the administration and development of the various activities envisioned in the bill.
>
> This undermining of traditional State-Federal relationships and this resort to direct Federal intervention in local affairs is, in our opinion, unnecessary and unwise. It would constitute a monumental error in judgment and pose a real danger to proven receipts of American governmental practices.

The minority report on the poverty package, signed by all the Republican members of the committee also stresses that:

> This bill is marked by an administrative philosophy completely at war with the proven precepts of American government and society—a philosophy which accords no meaningful recognition, role, or purpose to established State and local governments or to local planning bodies, and looks only to Federal action directly upon citizens and private groups to carry out programs of Federal design.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to spell out exactly how this bill bypasses the school boards and relieves them of their traditional responsibilities.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE JOB CORPS

Title I, part A, of H.R. 11377 establishes a Job Corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity, for young men and young women, 16 through 21, who have dropped out of school. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is authorized to "enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation, in rural and urban areas, of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed."

He is authorized to provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience; and "arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollers in the corps, provided, that, where practicable, such programs may be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational, educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures"—section 103(b).

Please note that the local public educational agencies would not be in control of the education of the boys and girls of the proposed Corps. "Where practicable," in the opinion of the Poverty Director, educational programs for the Corps "may" be provided through local public educational agencies. The word "may" is most significant.

Apparently, however, the local public school agencies in order to qualify at all would have to set up special programs because under section 104(a):

> Only in exceptional cases shall enrollees in the Corps be graduates of an accredited high school, and no person shall be accepted for enrollment in the Corps unless the local school authorities have concluded that further school attendance by such person in any regular academic, vocational, or training program, is not practicable.

Who does this language make eligible for enrollment in the Job Corps? Who else but the mentally retarded though teachable teenager and the incorrigible school dropout whose further attendance "in any regular academic, vocational, or training program" would not be "practicable?" Surely not many bright students whose only reason for dropping out of the regular public school system is to get a job to help support their younger brothers and sisters would choose the Job Corps. A boy who did not want his mother to have to accept aid to dependent children on his account would do better both financially and academically to take a daytime unskilled job—of which there are many going begging—and go to night school than enroll in the Job Corps.

What the administration warriors against poverty have in mind may be deduced from a pamphlet entitled "The War on Poverty—A Congressional Presentation, March 17, 1964" prepared by Mr. Schriver's staff.

Explaining the difference between the Job Corps conservation camps and its training centers, the pamphlet says:

In conservation camps, young men with problems of attitude and resistance to learning will be given basic skills training, as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic. The training centers will offer more intensive and advanced education and training to young men who are ready for this experience. In the long run, it is anticipated that many youths will be coming to the training centers as conservation camp "graduates."

Speaking of "the education component" of the conservation camps, the pamphlet says:

The education program in conservation camps will be designed to meet the needs of young men who are so lacking in basic academic skills that they cannot undertake vocational training. (A fifth to sixth grade literacy equivalency is considered necessary to profit from vocational training. An analysis of Selective Service System rejectees indicates that over half of those who fail to meet mental achievement requirements will be below this level.) Reading, writing, arithmetic, and speech will be taught, and minimum levels to be obtained are as follows:

Reading: An ability to read and comprehend at mean seventh-grade level,

Writing: An ability to complete, clearly and legibly, application and other employment, forms, to write simple letters of inquiry, and to make out orders,

Arithmetic: An understanding and mastery of the four basic skills (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division), common and decimal fractions, reading of scales, units of measurement,

Speaking: An ability to be understood in employment and other conventional situations, and to understand directions.

To reach these goals, new instructional materials designed especially for the purpose will be developed. But the education component of the program cannot wait. The availability of current materials will be reviewed by the Office of Education and those determined to be best suited will be used. Continuing evaluation of the camps' programs will provide guidance for the development of new materials.

Revealing that "for every 100 young men, there will be an educational and counseling staff of 4, responsible to the Deputy Director for the Job Corps through the camp director." The pamphlet informs us:

The 800 education and counseling staff members required the first year will be recruited from many sources, including college placement offices, retired people, and volunteers throughout the country. These teachers will undergo a special intensive training course, currently planned to take about 4 weeks, which will prepare them for their work in the camps.

As to the training centers, the pamphlet tells us:

The major emphasis of the training centers will be on vocational training and basic educational improvement in preparation for permanent employment. Vocational training and basic education will consume most of the day in a training center.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the extensive Job Corps educational programs in basic academic skills and vocational training will be beyond the control of the school boards. The Office of Education will choose the "instructional materials" to be used while "new instructural materials designed especially for the purpose" are being developed. Teachers "will undergo a special intensive training course—which will prepare them for their work in the camps." The Federal Government will be in control.

For this reason, at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I will introduce an amendment to bring the Job Corps on a grants-in-aid basis under the administration of the States and local governments.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS

Title I, part B, of H.R. 11377, authorizes the Poverty Director to "assist and cooperate with State and local agencies and private nonprofit organizations in developing programs for the employment of young people in State and community activities which whenever appropriate shall be coordinated with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies"—section 112. "The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all the cost of a State or local program submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that," among other things:

First. "Enrollees in the program will be employed either (a) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (b) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations, other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of any facility used or to be used solely for sectarian instruction or a place of religious worship"—section 113(a)(1)

Second. "To the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies: *Provided, however,* That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."—section 113(a)(6) and

Third. "The program includes standards and procedure for the selection of applicants, including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with local and other authorities to encourage students to resume or maintain school attendance"—section 113(a)(7).

Despite the legal lipservice to the effect that these work-training programs shall be coordinated whenever appropriate "with programs of training and education provided by local public educational agencies," Mr. Speaker, this part B of title I undermines school board authority in three ways.

First, it permits, under section 113(a)(B) Federal aid to parochial schools other than those used solely for sectarian instruction.

Second, where, in the opinion of the Poverty Director, the vocational training and educational services sponsored by the State or local educational agencies, are not adapted to the special needs of the enrollees in the work-training program, where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the Poverty Director "may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of/or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Third. The Poverty Director has discretionary power over the coordination "whenever appropriate" of the poverty work-training programs and the training and educational programs provided by the local public educational agencies.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government in the person of the Poverty Director may, under this part, find a local public school system "inadequate and make provision for its enlargement, improvement, development" and so forth.

There is no language permitting the local school board to decline the Federal dollars thus dangled before their noses to follow the Federal lead—even though the school board might be wholly opposed to the so-called "improvements" proposed. Under the part, the Federal Government would in effect be able eventually to take over all school board functions relating to vocational education and the education of working students and potential school dropouts.

For this reason at the proper time, I will introduce an amendment to bring the work-training programs, on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of the States and local governments so that the school boards' decisionmaking prerogatives in this field will not be threatened.

SCHOOL BOARDS AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

Title I, part C, Mr. Speaker, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist in the operation of "work-study programs" to promote the part-time employment of students of low-income families in work either for the institution itself or for a public or private nonprofit organization.

Although institutions of higher education are not under the control of the local school boards, nevertheless under this part, parochial as well as public schools may receive Federal aid in the form of work service—section 124(a)(2)(B).

Since neither the consent nor the advice of the State and local governments is requested under this part, I will, at the proper time introduce an amendment to bring the work-study program, on a grant-in-aid basis, under the administration of State and local governments.

SCHOOL BOARDS AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to a massive, multiple attack—not on poverty because the amounts involved are not enough and the means proposed could never win a "war on poverty." No, this is a massive multiple attack on the prerogatives of local self-government. It is a subtle, devious undermining of public education by reducing it to the status of "welfare."

Title II, part A has as its purpose "to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs"—section 201.

The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs (sec. 204).

The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families (sec. 205(a)).

The original bill, H.R. 10620, defined "community action program" as meaning a program "which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency * * * which is broadly representative of the community"—section 202(a)(4)).

The words "which is broadly representative of the community" were cut in committee, Mr. Speaker, meaning that under the bill as it is before us any "public or nonprofit agency" which fights poverty even by providing extra jobs—any such group the Director sees fit may receive Federal aid. Federal aid conceivably could go to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Communist Party, the John Birch Society, the NAACP, or CORE.

The orginal bill also included the language under section 204(b):

Any elementary or secondary school education program assisted under this section shall be administered by the public educational agency or agencies principally responsible for providing public elementary and secondary education in the area involved. No child shall be denied the benefit of such a program because he is not regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Without such language, the highly controversial church-state issue would have come to the fore again. Without this language, the administration could not have hoped for the support of the NEA, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and other organizations particularly devoted to the public schools and the separation of church and state. Indeed, Dr. Adron Doran, president, Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky., representing the NEA, said in his testimony before the committee:

We note with approval that section 204(b) provides for public control of any elementary and secondary school education programs which may develop under this title and that such programs must be made available to all children whether or not they are regularly enrolled in the public schools.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, this whole section 204(b) was deleted in committee thus permitting not only Federal aid to parochial schools but to any agency the Poverty Director sees fit to conduct "special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families."

The fact that section 205(b) states that "No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system" is irrelevant. It does not prohibit any categorical aid the Poverty Director thinks would help to fight poverty.

It is not surprising that the opposing sides in the Federal aid to parochial schools controversy hold different views on the language of section 204.

A key to the Roman Catholic position to the reason section 204(b) was deleted and to the formula used in an attempt to make Federal aid to parochial schools constitutional as a welfare measure rather than an educational program may be found in a column by Msgr. George G. Higgins published in the Catholic Standard, May 15, 1964. Reporting on his testimony before the committee Monsignor Higgins said in part:

The members of the subcommittee neither agreed nor disagreed without line of reasoning, but, in any event, they clearly gave the impression, during a 45-minute colloquy, that they were at least open to suggestions as to how the bill as a whole might be improved, and, more specifically, how the exclusively public-school language of section 204 might be amended.

DELICATE PROBLEM

The members of the subcommittee recognized, and so did we, of course, that this is a rather delicate problem given the lack of consensus in and out of the Congress on the meaning of the first amendment and its applicability in the case of legislative proposals aimed at providing educational or related services to parochial schoolchildren.

Nevertheless, they were willing to discuss the matter on its merits—not in the doctrinaire terms in which it has too often been debated in the past, but realistically in terms of the particular bill in question, which is essentially an antipoverty bill and not a general aid-to-education bill.

It was only after the social action department had testified in support of the antipoverty bill that the Reporter published an article by William Lee Miller of the Yale Divinity School, entitled "Aid to Education: A Better Deal."

In the words of this perceptive article, Mr. Miller says, among other things, that President Johnson's antipoverty program:

May give a new focus that will allow people to rearrange their old positions (on the question of aid to education) or make them do it, and may open new possibilities.

Let us have an all-out war against poverty, he says. If eliminating poverty requires aid to schools, fine. Who can object if aid to schools to eliminate poverty includes some participation by religious organizations and schools?

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, has this to say about H.R. 11377:

This bill (H.R. 11377) makes an effort in changing "education" to "supplementary educational services" to avoid the constitutional issue by making what is education by any name appear to be welfare in a constitutional sense instead of education.

To authorize the use of Federal tax funds for discretionary allocation to parochial schools by a Federal official, violates the Federal Constitution and constitutes vicious Federal control of/and interference with local education throughout the United States.

At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, in order to prevent the downgrading of American education to the status of welfare, as well as the undermining of the dignity and integrity of the school boards, I shall offer an amendment striking part A of title II from the bill.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Title II, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to make grants to the States which have approved State plans for adult basic education.

To be sure this part does not totally bypass the State and local governments as do title I parts A and B and title II part A. It provides a Federal grant to the States for one more kind of categorical aid to education. It has Federal strings attached to make sure that the money goes where the Federal Government wishes it to go. It thus would tighten the Federal grip on the local school systems in a way which, since we already have passed adult basic education under the Manpower Training Act, would seem to be an unnecessary duplication.

At the proper time, therefore, I will introduce an amendment striking this part from the bill.

THE SCHOOL BOARDS AND MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL FAMILIES

Title III, part B, authorizes the Poverty Director to:

Develop and implement as soon as practicable a program to assist the States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations or individuals in establishing and operating programs of assistance for migrant agricultural employees and their families which programs shall be limited to housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children. Institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals shall be limited to direct loans. (Pages 42–43.)

Since this language makes it possible for the Poverty Director to make direct loans to individuals and organizations thus bypassing State and local governments and school boards, I shall at the proper time introduce an amendment to strike part B of title III from the bill.

URBAN EXTENSION SERVICE

Another front upon which the President and his administration are busily at work undermining the rights of the school boards to control American education is what is being called an urban extension service.

On Sunday, June 21, 1964, the Washington Post reported:

At Irvine (Calif.), Mr. Johnson said he foresaw the day when an urban extension service operated by universities will do for urban America what Agriculture Extension Service has done for rural America.

The President said he had directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to meet with educators "to see how that can come to pass."

Just as our colleges and universities changed the future of our farms a century ago, so they can help change the future of our cities, he said.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that a century ago 80 percent of the American people lived on farms while today 70 percent live in urban areas.

Hailing California's educational gains, he made it clear he does not regard education as only a State problem. And he spoke with pride of the three education bills he has signed into law.

Offhand this idea of an "urban extension service" patterned after the Agricultural Extension Service gives the impression of a service to adult city dwellers in their diverse occupations as the Agricultural Extension Service is a service to farmers in their occupation of farming. But this is only partly true. What the administration has in mind—and we have their own words for it—is a complex of federally financed "research and development centers" in the universities where, according to U.S. Commissioner of Education Dr. Francis Keppel:

Behavioral and social scientists, subject matter scholars, educational specialists, administrators, and teachers will not only conduct research but also translate the results into new materials and methods that can be evaluated in school settings.

The purpose is not only to bring about curricular changes but also changes in the local control-structure of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

I quote, first, pertinent parts from the House Appropriations Committee hearings, U.S. Office of Education request for funds for fiscal 1965 under the Cooperative Research Act:

Mr. KEPPEL. A new element in the 1964 program which will continue in 1965 would be the initiation of research and development centers which will focus on a wide band of research activities in such crucial problem areas as school dropouts, disadvantaged children, talent development, and arts and humanities. (Pages 447–448.)

Dr. IANNI. These centers are very similar to the agricultural research centers that did so much for agricultural research. (Page 460.)

Mr. FLYNT. May I say a word, Mr. Chairman? It took agriculture almost a century to cover the span from basic research in the laboratory to application in the field. The land-grant colleges were begun in 1862 but it was not until 1887 that the Hatch Act was enacted and a cooperative research program was created.

Even that still fell short of translating research from the laboratory to the operating farm, because the farmer felt the Government could always try again if it failed, but that he could not. He would go bankrupt if he tried a new breed of chicken that did not lay the amount of eggs expected. The Smith-Lever Act of 1913 brought another element in it, a middleman between the experimental research man at the agricultural experiment station and the farmer. And this man is backed up by an enormous paraphernalia of research people and specialists in the colleges and experiment stations.

It is the scientific miracle of our age that we can produce more things than we can eat, more food and fiber than we can use, for less and less labor force.

When the land-grant colleges were established in 1862 it required 56 percent of our labor force to provide the requisite food and fiber; today it requires only 8 percent of our labor force. This surpasses atomic energy or anything else. All of these other things are puny compared to this.

It seems to me that we ought not to sit around and wait for this long span of time to pass in education. If we can build centers in which basic research, experimentation in the laboratory situation, field testing and evaluation, and finally tryout, can take place, through the cooperation of a university, a State department and school systems we might create an institution which will shorten the lag to 5 or 10 years. You cannot expect basic research to become immediately operative—people want to see it tested out and proved.

When we are dealing with a farmer, we were dealing with his very livelihood. In education we are dealing with the minds of men, and there is a deep moral question involved.

I think if there is any one great contribution we can make to educational research, it is to get these centers going. (Pages 460–461.)

The Cooperative Research Program Newsletter of November 1963, listing completed projects indicates the sort of project so far undertaken. Here are just a few:

"A Study of the Structure of Attitudes of Parents of Educable Mentally Retarded Children, and a Study of Change in Attitude Structure." Volumes I, II.

"A Comparative Investigation of the Learning and Adjustment of Trainable Children in Public School Facilities, Segregated Community Centers, and State Residential Centers."

"Motivational and Personality Factors in the Selection of Elementary and Secondary School Teaching as a Career."

"Career Development in the Public School Teaching Profession With Special Reference to Changing Motivations, Pressures, Satisfactions, and Dissatisfactions."

"Effects of Children's Social Power and Intelligence on Their Interpersonal Relations."

"Social Structures and Social Climates in High Schools."

"The Quality Measurement Project."

"Restricted Generalization, Bias, and Loss of Power That May Result from Matching Groups."

"A Sociopsychological Study of School Vandalism."

"Relationship of School Experiences to Delinquency."

"The Identification and Measurement of Secondary School Homemaking Teachers' Attitudes and Other Characteristics Associated With Their Ability To Maintain Desirable Learning Situations."

"Evolution of American Educational Theory."

"Psychological Characteristics Underlying the Educability of the Mentally Retarded Child. I. Concept Formation and Transposition in Young Mentally Retarded and Normal Children."

THE USOE AND "NEW CURRICULA"

A more detailed description of the goals of the "Curriculum Research and Development Program of the U.S. Office of Education: Project English, Project Social Studies and Beyond" is given in a chapter under that title by Francis A. J. Ianni, and Lois S. Josephs of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in a book entitled "New Curricula" edited by Robert W. Heath published by Harper & Row, 1964.

According to a footnote, page 161:

Dr. Ianni contributed to this chapter in his private capacity and no official support or endorsement by the Office of Education is intended or should be inferred.

However, Dr. Ianni is Director of the Cooperative Research Branch of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development USOE and should know what he is talking about. I quote from the text in part:

The role of the U.S. Office of Education in the development of the new educational curriculums is one of relatively recent origin. While it is certainly a valid assumption that the major Federal agency charged with responsibility for education should have been actively engaged in curriculum revision programs, until the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Office's role was primarily a consultative one. And most often this consultation took the form of the preparation of descriptive studies of curriculum materials prepared by other organizations rather than any direct involvement in curriculum revision programs or research into new curriculum methods.

Actually, however, the interest of the national government in both research and education has a respectable antiquity (p. 161).

The cooperative research program of the Office of Education is a relatively recent addition to the growing number of Federal funding programs. The post-World War II period ushered in some awarenesses of the great need for adequate research in education and related areas as a basis for sound educational practices. The growing recognition of this need led to the passage of Public Law 531 by the 83d Congress. This law, which was signed by the President on July 26, 1954, authorized the Commissioner of Education "to enter into contracts and jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education." Although the law was passed in 1954, funds were not appropriated for its implementation until fiscal year 1957. For the first year of operation, approximately $1 million was appropriated; for the second year it was increased to $2.3 million. Since that time, the budgetary appropriations have continued to grow; and in fiscal year 1963, the budget for the program, exclusive of some special foreign currency items, is $7 million. The budget requested for 1964 is $17 million.

In the early years, the program was focused on 10 areas of research interest which the Office of Education considered particularly important, although projects in other areas of education were also supported. In recent years, however, the program has encouraged and received applications from the wide spectrum of research interests relevant to education. As a result, the research areas serviced by the program have expanded rapidly; and today research is being supported in many fields of basic knowledge—fields which hold promise of important contributions to educational knowledge. This diversification has led to the involvement of growing numbers of scholars, behavioral and social scientists, who have joined with education researchers in addressing themselves to the problems of education (pp. 163–164).

It soon became obvious that research alone will not bring about educational innovation (p. 165).

The trend in most fields of research has been to move from the project approach to the next stage of research mobilization—program research—where preplanned, continuous attention, through all steps in the research process is focused on persistent problem areas until solutions are found and translated into practice. Thus, one group of researchers follows a research program from development through demonstration. The intermediate steps of basic research, curriculum development and field testing are also a part of the program. Under ideal conditions, the same team of scholars, research scientists, teachers, and school administra-

tors work continuously on all phases of the program. This is not a new idea and we do not suggest that it is the only course for curriculum revision programs; we simply insist that joint efforts by each of the interested parties to the program will help implement the results of research as soon as they are available.

The first steps in this movement within the Office of Education took place in 1962, with the introduction of "programed research" activities in the areas of English and talent development as a means of focusing major attention on these particular problem areas of education. In 1963, a similar programatic approach is being taken to the area of the social studies and in 1964 the same approach in the arts, in teacher education, and the learning disorders. In each of these programed areas, funds are or will be available for planning and development programs, basic, and applied research, curriculum development, field testing, and demonstration, and dissemination. Under the present operational plan, each phase of the research program must be applied for separately; but we are encouraging applications for total programmatic support in 1963 (pp. 166–167).

The heart of the new plan, however, would be the establishment of a series of curriculum study centers designed to (1) examine existing curricula in English; (2) design and develop new curricula where needed; (3) test and refine the curricula in actual school situations; and (4) produce and make available on a wide scale new curricula materials. Once the materials are developed they would be demonstrated to teachers through a series of demonstration centers established throughout the country (p. 169).

In our experience with the first 2 years of Project English we feel reasonable assurance that this approach has met with great success in both establishing a programmatic approach to the development of new curriculums in English and in establishing a model for future programmatic approaches to other subject areas as well (p. 169).

After a lengthy analysis of the U.S. Office of Education's Project English and Project Social Studies, Ianni and Josephs tell us:

The hub of the proposed new Office of Education curriculum research and development program would be the Curriculum Program Center and its associated demonstration schools established by university, groups of universities and colleges, or some parauniversity enterprise in association with a State department of education. Each Center would, with long-term Federal financing, conduct research, develop and test new curriculums, establish demonstration and training programs, and generally perform all of the functions now scattered among various institutions. Centers would be established in each of the major curriculum areas and would be associated with a nationwide network of model demonstration schools where new curriculum materials developed at various centers would be tested, evaluated, and made available to local school systems (p. 209).

Now all that remains is to assure the more suspicious among educators that Federal aid is not synonymous with Federal control and that the time has come for bold, new steps in the improvement of education. Such steps will not come about without some positive articulation between the Federal concern for excellence in education and the reality of new curricular revision programs.

And even this will not create the absolute reality. Perhaps in education there is no absolute, no final being since "the process of education" is a continuous becoming, a constant flux. To be even more specific, no curriculum can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and the society. The Aristotelian notion of change and reality and Bergson's observation that "we change without ceasing and * * * the state itself is nothing but change" are peculiarly true of education today. Certainly, the reality of education is a changing process; therefore it is the role of the U.S. Office of Education to foster the demands of that reality as it exists in an ever moving and fluid society" (p. 212).

I would like to ask two questions, Mr. Speaker:

First. What exactly is the degree of difference between Federal-aiding the school boards into rubberstamping a federally financed curriculum-change and "control of education"? Certainly the net result is calculated, probably by computer, to be the same.

Second. In reference to the statement by Ianni and Josephs that "no curriculum can ever be in final form because as societies change so do the needs of both the individual and society." During the last 30 years has any one person or group consciously, deliberately tried to fashion a curriculum to bring about social change?

In 1932, Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Counts, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a follower of Prof. John Dewey, philosophical "father of progressive education," and research director of a Carnegie Foundation-financed, 17-volume study of American education, published a pamphlet entitled "Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?" in which he said:

That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation (pp. 28–29).

Today, 32 years later, not only are certain educators deliberately reaching for power but they are being permitted to fashion the curriculum backed by the Federal funds and at the behest of the Johnson administration. Some of them are even playing interchangeable roles in Government and the universities. Their immediate target: the circumvention and "reform" of the school boards. This facet of the problem was cited in my speech of June 25, 1963, entitled "NEA Versus the School Boards."

INNOVATION AND EXPERIMENT IN EDUCATION

Further evidence of the Johnson administration's war on the school boards may be found, Mr. Speaker, in a pamphlet published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in March 1964:

Innovation and Experiment in Education.—A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

Although this panel report was not written exclusively by USOE staff, it is a natural sequel to the "Federal Education Agency of the Future—Report of the Committee on Organization and Mission of the U.S. Office of Education." Indeed, the new report outdoes the earlier report in its frankness in regard to local control of education.

In the table of contents of this remarkable panel report, we find among the panel's "leading ideas":

"Inductive Teaching": (Education in which children induce generalities for themselves brings about more effective learning but requires new instructional materials and new teaching practices.)

"Education in a Changing Society": (Social and technological change mean that youngsters must be prepared to cope with, and help shape, new developments.)

"Aims of the Panel": (The chief aim is to suggest possible lines of action for Government offices and agencies involved in education.)

Before going on to quote from the panel report itself, I will let the panel identify itself. The panel, we are told on page 59:

Was established in 1961 to operate under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Like other such panels, it reports to the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, who is also chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee; but the panel is unusual in that it also reports to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and to the Director of the National Science Foundation.

The panel conducts business, and works to persuade other groups to conduct business, in several ways. There are, first, the regular meetings of the panel. Guests are frequently invited to these meetings to expand the range of competence in the room and to present special views. Growing out of such panel discussions are a variety of 1- and 2-day meetings to develop points of particular interest to the panel; 5 to 15 people take part in these meetings, a few of them chosen from the panel but most of them expert in appropriate fields. These meetings have been held on such topics as teacher education and nongraded schools. The meetings develop new ideas but serve mainly as ways to explore the feasibility of making larger studies, and in some cases to develop possible plans of approach for such studies. Finally, there are the larger studies, or seminars, lasting approximately 2 weeks and consisting of 30 to 50 people; against including a few people from the panel. The seminars have been held on such topics as learning about learning, music education, and education for the deprived and segregated.

The seminars, and the other meetings too, serve as means of attracting new people to educational reform. The reports of the seminars serve both as guidelines for future action and as mandates for that action (p. 59).

Funds for the meetings of the panel and for some of the special 1- and 2-day meetings come from the Office of Science and Technology, which was established in 1962 in the Executive Office of the President. The Office of Science and Technology supplies staff and other support for the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee. Funds for certain of these special meetings and for the seminars come from other agencies of the Government. These other agencies have included the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. The seminars are supported by the usual procedures of grants or contracts to sponsoring universities, and such projects, of course, must pass an agency's usual reviewing procedures (p. 60).

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a federally financed undertaking which has been passed by the usual reviewing procedures of the agencies concerned.

Panel members and associates, we are told on pages 61 and 62, are as follows:

Jerrold R. Zacharias, chairman, professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education, State education department, Albany, N.Y.

B. Frank Brown, principal, Melbourne High School, 1050 Babcock Street, Melbourne, Fla.

Jerome S. Bruner, Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

Bowen C. Dees, associate director (scientific personnel and education), National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Charles A. Ferguson, director, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

John H. Fischer, president, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Sister M. Jacqueline Grennan, S.L., vice president, Webster College, St. Louis, Mo.

Martin Mayer, 33 East End Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Sterling M. McMurrin, Department of Philosophy, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

S. M. Nabrit, president, Texas Southern University, Houston, Tex.

Marcus G. Raskin, codirector, Institute for Policy Studies, 1900 Florida Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

Patrick Suppes, Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Ventura Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Ralph W. Tyler, director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 202 Junipero Serra Boulevard, Stanford, Calif.

Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools, Board of Education, City of Chicago, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Consultants: Evelyn F. Carlson, associate superintendent, Board of Education, City of Chicago, 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Robert N. Kreidler, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Stephen White, Assistant to the President, Educational Services, Inc., Watertown, Mass.

Principals: Leland Haworth, Director, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, The White House, Washington, D.C.; Francis Keppek, Commissioner of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Staff Assistant: Joseph Turner, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that Jerrold R. Zacharias of the MIT, is chairman of the Panel on Education Research and Development, which wrote the panel report, and which is under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development, USOE, was one of the committee responsible for a Federal Education Agency of the Future.

Sterling M. McMurrin, department of philosophy, University of Utah, was U.S. Commissioner of Education when the Federal Education Agency for the Future was published by the Office of Education.

Francis Keppel, now U.S. Officer of Education, chaired a special panel meeting on Teacher Education in Chicago, November 9, 1962—as dean of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University—page 68.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Francis A. J. Ianni, Cooperative Research Branch, USOE, from whose chapter in the New Curricula I have quoted, took part in some six special panel meetings.

According to the Chairman's foreword:

The panel was established, and this report was essentially completed, during the tenure of Jerome B. Wiesner, now of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and as Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee. We have benefited greatly from his advice and encouragement, and we look forward to working with his successor Donald F. Hornig, as we have been working, and will continue to work, with Francis Keppel and Leland Haworth—page x.

The Innovation and Experiment in Education Panel has, "taken as its domain all of education inside schools and outside schools, for children and youth and for adults"—page 3—a not inconsiderable ambition. But in this first project report the panel touches only on the problems of "learning about learning," "music," "teacher education," and "the deprived and the segregated." It also covers much the same territory as does Dr. Ianni in regard to the USOE's Project English and Project Social Studies. I quote:

Reforms as a continuing effort: The effort to improve education—to develop better curricular materials, better programs of teacher education, better schools, and school systems—is not a one-shot affair. This activity should be carried on continuously. At the heart of the current effort lies the assumption that nobody knows the ideal system. Meeting immediate needs can prepare the way for longer range reform, and new results in fundamental research will open up new possibilities. Changes in the schools will make possible changes in colleges, and changes in the colleges will make possible changes in the schools.

If reform is to be a continuing effort, then a substantial research and development activity should be built into the educational system—page 5.

A current effort to develop a built-in research component, which the Panel wishes to commend, is found in the newly enacted National Vocational Education Act of 1963. The act authorizes the use of 10 percent of all appropriated funds for research and development.

Pedagogy is an experimental science, and to prefer one teaching method over another is to risk being dogmatic. But the experimenters must choose the places to begin research and the ways to proceed. In this sense the panel can be said to favor a particular approach to teaching, an approach called inductive teaching or the discovery method—pages 5–6.

Learning about learning: There is much still to be learned about these three factors—reward, pleasure, and identification through learning—but several lines of school experimentation seems advisable. With respect to the anticipated rewards of learning, more is needed in our schools to illustrate realistically the manner in which schooling plays a role in life—to show what learning is for. The success story of young Abe Lincoln has limited relevance to the modern child, and particularly to the culturally deprived modern child from a background in which school is regarded as an interim in life (pp. 11–12).

Music: The music education publishing business was found comparable to the automotive industry. A small number of companies are in intensive competition, with very little variation in product (p. 17).

A number of ideas for improving music education were developed at the seminar. One idea was to produce a really new, and really musical, music series for the school curriculum (p. 18).

Teacher education: One implication is that a teacher (sometimes referred to in this report as "he," sometimes as "she") must be better educated than he now is in the subjects that he teaches (p. 23).

A second implication is that prospective teachers must study a number of things that a person seeking only competence in the subject need not study—pedagogy and related matters (p. 23).

At various times in the series of meetings on teacher education, consideration was given to the development of educational complexes in appropriate geographical areas. A complex would include a graduate school of education, several colleges and universities, institutions devoted principally to teacher training, a large number of public school systems, and institutions devoted to educational research and development.

Besides giving prospective teachers experience teaching in public schools and bringing them into contact with the problems of curriculum development, such a complex would provide an augmented flow of scholarship from the colleges and universities into the graduate school of education, where it might contribute to the formation of educational policies and practices (p. 27).

The deprived and the segregated: The panel decided to urge an appropriate group to organize a special project on education for what it initially called "the difficult 30 percent" and now calls "the deprived and segregated." These are youngsters suffering from one or more handicaps, handicaps predisposing them to other handicaps—youngsters on the hardship end of such scales as family income, home atmosphere, skin color, scores on IQ tests, location of the home in the community, location of the community in the Nation, and motivation. They are mostly the children of the poor, usually the children of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, mountain people who have migrated to midwestern cities, workers in service jobs, people in depressed rural areas (p. 29).

The seminar was conducted by the Bank Street College of Education, under a joint contract with the Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (p. 29).

The seminar brought together approximately 60 people from a wide range of occupations and with a wide range of interests. The participants included teachers, principals, superintendents, professors of education, physicists, biologists, mathematicians, sociologists, social psychologists, philosophers, psychiatrists, novelists, criminologists, judges, lawyers, curriculum reformers, people from foundations, and people from the Federal Government. The seminar was interdisciplinary; it was also interracial (p. 29–30).

By all known criteria, the majority of urban and rural slum schools are failures. In neighborhood after neighborhood across the country, more than half of each age group fails to complete high school, and 5 percent or fewer go on to some form of higher education (p. 30).

The schools are in competition with another educational system, the streets. Staffed by people proud of their professionalism and supervised by boards of education drawn almost exclusively from the upper-middle and upper classes, school systems are often crippled by social parochialism in dealing

with deprived and segregated children (p. 31).

The panel believes that assistance to the schools is not a matter simply of providing additional funds for more classrooms and for increasing the ratio of teachers to pupils; it is also a matter of experimentation. Schools must learn to make such services more efficient and more effective. The panel believes that special research programs are necessary for deprived and for segregated children. These efforts will require certain familiar forms of research—curriculum development and teacher education—and certain new forms.

A special program in curriculum development does not mean production of watered-down material or any implication that these children are incapable of possessing the world of imagination, from literature to electronics, or that they do not possess their own world of imagination. But the children come to school with experiences different from those of other children and take what they have learned back to different homes. Their teachers must understand what these children know and value and must teach in a way that builds on that foundation. These special materials might also prove useful in improving the education of the more fortunate members of the school population.

The children of the deprived and segregated do not get much help from a standard reading program. Special programs are needed (p. 31–32).

For example, the slum child might read a story in which a child has his own bed in his own room and then return to a home where the entire family sleeps in one small room. The answer may be to let children themselves fill in the details of a story. A child in a story can sleep, but the pupils can say (and write) how and when he sleeps. To give children freedom to shape the manner of their learning is possible in other areas, too. In some schools the visitor will hear kindergarten children reciting nursery rhymes to a jazz beat.

Some subjects, such as arithmetic and science, can readily be taught in an intuitive, nonbookish way. Learning arithmetic—or, more broadly, mathematics—need not depend on the student's ability to read (p. 32).

Also necessary is innovation in the institutions of education—classroom practices, recruitment and utilization of teachers, use of the school building, relationship of the school to the community (p. 34).

Model systems: To develop fully these lines of innovation, still another form of experimentation must be added: the establishment of model school systems—or, within a big-city system, subsystems comprising about 20,000 pupils and 30 principals (p. 37).

The management of the system itself will also be the subject of experiment. The school "system" is a natural unit for reform. The system is an organic, semiautonomous unit of education, with pension plans and supervisors, principals, promotion and hiring procedures, specification of jobs, adoption committees. It has electoral responsibilities, public-relations problems, budgetary experience. World War II measured armies by divisions because the division was the smallest military unit that included all services—Infantry, Artillery, Tanks, and Air. The school system is the "division" of education.

Within a big-city system, a model subsystem would report directly to the superintendent of schools. The subsystem would have its own lay advisory council or "board," including members of the school staff, members of academic faculties of universities, and artists, musicians, writers, lawyers and other interested people from the community. The subsystem could be developed cooperatively by a university, an association of universities, or a special nonprofit organization and the school staff. Selection of the "board" would be made with a view to its task, the cooperative direction of a comprehensive experiment.

The subsystem should be of such superlative quality that it would draw children from middle-class as well as deprived neighborhoods. Such subsystems could be started in the Nation's 10 largest cities and could be staffed partly by people already working in the schools of these cities, partly by newcomers, partly by outsiders. Support could come from sources not usually available directly to the cities—from the large foundations and the Federal Government—and could build up to around $10 million a year for each system.

Model systems are needed as testing and demonstration grounds for new programs. Novelty in one area may require changes in other areas. If a program is really to be tested, freedom to make those other changes is also necessary. To offer one example, new curricular materials require that children play a more active role in their own education. This has implications for the relationships between pupil and teacher, but it also has implications for the relationship between teacher and school principal. If the pupil is to exercise more initiative, the teacher must also exercise more initiative, and this means he must be given a freer hand by the principal. The lesson plans that teachers now generally prepare for their principals should not work against an approach to education that requires teachers to exercise more initiative.

The lines of innovation sketched in the previous section can be pursued separately, but when they are pursued together, many new possibilities open up. To offer a more extended example, such structures as nongraded schools and team teaching have been combined before, but they might now be combined additionally with new procedures for recruiting teachers (persons can be hired who are not yet certified); with use of the school as a teacher-training institute (in cooperation with local colleges and universities); with introduction of new curricular materials (new teachers can be trained immediately in their use); and with use of other professional people outside the schools (persons who helped develop the new curricular materials can help train teachers in their use).

The idea of an autonomous subsystem within a big city school system is not new, nor are the specific programs discussed above. What is new is the notion that such a subsystem would be an experimental system, with freedom to experiment across the board—curriculum, recruitment of teachers, utilization of teachers, the management of the system itself (p. 38–39).

This was the blueprint for Dr. Hansen's model system the school board here in our Nation's Capital has been persuaded to accept.

The panel, on page 5 of its report claims:

Thus, models can indicate new paths in education without interfering with traditional local responsibilities [sic]. The development of new educational programs provides the Nation's school system with more and better things to choose from. But the school administrator or school board continues to exercise the same responsibilities (p. 5).

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the rubber stamping of a plan inspired by a central planning group offering dollars for its acceptance falls far short of School Board responsibilities to think and decide what sort of education is best for the children in its care. On June 16, I inserted in the RECORD, at page 13983, a report from the Washington Post on the District of Columbia model system. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a followup Post article on the subject by Eve Edstrom.

AGENCIES FORGET THEIR SNIPING, FOCUS ON CARDOZO AREA SCHOOLS

(By Eve Edstrom)

Until last week when School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen pushed a plan to turn 18 schools into model educational laboratories, Washington's effort to lift slum children out of poverty appeared to be in a state of crisis.

This was because community agencies were more concerned over who was going to do what instead of what was going to be done.

But now, with some help from White House advisers, the roles of key agencies have been clarified and they are moving ahead with ambitious plans for the 18 schools in the Cardozo High School area.

The educational innovations, which are crucial to widening the horizons of deprived children, will emanate from Hansen and the School Board.

LOOK TO PRESIDENTIAL PANEL

But school officials will rely heavily on the advice of the Presidential Panel on Educational Research and Development which has recommended that big cities operate a cluster of schools as model laboratories for bringing across-the-board services to slum children.

The Chairman of the Panel, Jerrold Zacharias, who helped to initiate the curriculum reform movement in science, and other top-notch educational innovators, will be available to aid the District in establishing its model system.

Also working closely with the schools will be the United Planning Organization which already has $336,000 in private foundation funds and expects to be the funnel for any money the District receives from President Johnson's antipoverty effort.

The role of the United Planning Organization is that of a catalyst to help all community agencies fight against poverty, unemployment, inadequate educational opportunity, and slum housing. As such, it could grant money to the schools to carry out parts of its model plan.

FINANCE MANY SERVICES

It also will help finance many of the new services which Washington Action for Youth (WAY) has designed to improve health, recreation, and family living in the Cardozo area.

That plan, calling for an expenditure of $7 million to bring a saturation of services to disadvantaged children, is expected to be completed by the end of this month. WAY then will be absorbed by the United Planning Organization, which will move ahead to put the plan in action.

WAY had selected the Cardozo area, known as the inner city target area, for the focal point of its plan and had proposed drastic revisions in the educational programs of the area's 18 schools.

HANSEN COOL TO PLAN

But School Superintendent Hansen and his staff showed little enthusiasm for WAY's proposals. Hansen said they duplicated much of what is being done by the schools and that many of the proposals were too broad.

However, Hansen's opposition also stemmed from the fact that he resented noneducators telling him how to run the schools. And he and the school board feared that WAY might be usurping their powers. Antagonism was especially pronounced between Hansen and WAY's director Jack R. Goldberg, who last month returned to his former post as a camping director in New York because the WAY effort was almost completed.

Eventually, the school board adopted a watered-down version of WAY's proposals. Paul P. Cooke was appointed a temporary director of the program but Hansen stressed that Cooke would not institute programs or issue orders.

Consequently, some persons who worked closely on developing the WAY program felt it would come to naught because the schools would not be a central instrument for effecting changes in the lives of deprived children.

But Hansen, in revealing on Thursday that he fully intended to use the 18 schools for wide-ranging educational experimentation, has put the schools at the hub of the effort to salvage the talents of slum children.

THE USOE V. THE SCHOOL BOARDS

You may recall that at the time of the publication of the "Federal Education Agency for the Future—Report of the Committee on Organization and Mission of the U.S. Office of Education" I analysed it and here on the floor denounced it as "a blueprint for complete domination and direction of our schools from Washington." I revealed the reorganization of the Office of Education according to the plans drawn in the mission report for the admitted purpose of attaining the mission goal of OE "leadership" in education. I showed that OE staff members responsible for the mission report had themselves appointed to positions of power in the new structure. And I brought this information up to date in a speech entitled "U.S. Office of Education Versus the School Boards," October 23, 1964.

I can now reveal that a refinement of the OE reorganization has recently taken place, Mr. Speaker, to bring it into better focus on the problem of sociological change. The new reorganization of the Bureau of Educational Research and Development was announced by Commissioner Keppel, April 27, 1964. According to the USOE press release:

Reorganization of the Bureau of Education Research and Development within the U.S. Office of Education was announced today by Commissioner Francis Keppel.

As a result, the Bureau will operate with five divisions instead of six, under the supervision of Associate Commissioner Ralph C. M. Flynt.

Enlarged and given significant new responsibility was the Division of Educational Research, a division with a name similar to the Bureau's. It now contains four branches: Basic Research and Media Research and two new branches—Curriculum and Demonstration, and Arts and Humanities. The latter formerly was the Cultural Affairs Branch.

To the Curriculum and Demonstration Branch were added the specialists in English, the social sciences, mathematics and science, and talent development. Formerly the specialists were assigned to the Divisions of Higher Education, and Elementary and Secondary Education. Francis A. J. Ianni, former director of the Cooperative Research Branch, will head the Division.

The emphasis on social change is evident from Dr. Ianni's background, Mr. Speaker, not as an educator, but as a sociologist and anthoropoligst. According to a biographical sketch supplied to me by his office:

Born: Wilmington, Del., March 29, 1926, Married, 3 children.

Education: B.S. (psychology, the Pennsylvania State University, 1949), M.A. (Sociology and anthropology) ibid, 1950. Additional graduate work in anthoropology at Pennsylvania State and at Yale and University of Pennsylvania, Ph. D. (sociology and anthropology) 1952.

Fellowships: Stipend Fellow, The Pennsylvania State University (1950–52) Ford Foundation Fellow, Behavioral Research Council, University of Pennsylvania (1951–52), Carnegie Corporation Fellow, Yale University (1956–57), resident fellow, Berkeley College, Yale University (1956–57), awarded Fulbright Research grant (Italy) 1955, grantee, Bureau of Specialists and Leaders in Education, U.S. Department of State, Ethiopia, 1958, awarded Fulbright Research grant, University of Rome (1959), Smith-Mundt grantee, U.S. Department of State, University, College of Addis Abba, Ethiopia (1959–61).

His professional experience includes:

In 1950–52: Graduate assistant, Pennsylvania State University. Taught courses in introductory sociology and social problems.

In 1951–52: Fellow, Behavioral Research Council (Ford Foundation).

In 1952–58: Instructor to associate professor, anthropology and psychology, Russell Sage College.

In 1955: Awarded Fulbright research grant for study of Italian ethnological materials on Ethiopia and Eritrea. Visiting assistant professor of sociology, State University of New York (summer sessions).

In 1956–57: Carnegie Corp. teaching fellowship to develop behavioral science course at Yale.

In 1959–61: Awarded Fulbright research grant (University of Rome) and Smith-Mundt grant (Ethiopia) for additional field work among Danakil. Served as professor of anthropology, University College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Established social science research program. Lecture tour in East and Central Africa and in Israel for U.S. Information Service.

In 1961: Research coordinator-acting director, cooperative research program, U.S. Office of Education.

In 1962: Director, Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education.

In addition to his contribution to the book "New Curricula" from which I quoted earlier, Dr. Ianni has written:

"The Norristown Study: Technological Change and Social Adjustment," Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959. Sidney Goldstein, senior editor.

"Adolescent Culture," New York, Dorsey Press, 1964 (with David Gottlieb).

"World Minority Group Relations" manuscripts, in preparation under contract to Harper & Bros.

"The Negro Student," manuscripts, in preparation under contract with Prentice-Hall, "Time and Place as Variables in Acculturation Research," "American Anthropologist," volume No. XIV, February, 1958; "Social Class Position and Child Rearing and Child Bearing," "American Journal of Public Health," June 1958; "Psychological Determinants of Danakil Social Structure," "Bulletin of the Ethnological Society," Addis Ababa, July, 1939; "The Federal Concern for Educational Research," "Harvard-Ford Foundation Seminar on Education and Public Policy" (forthcoming); "Inhibition and Curiosity," School Life, September 1962; "The Contribution of Behavioral Science to Research in Teacher Education," Research in Teacher Education, Bulletin No. 20.

On page 3 of "Innovation and Experimentation in Education—A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development," Mr. Speaker, this pamphlet to which Dr. Ianni made at least an indirect contribution as his superior Dr. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for Educational Research and Development—a panel member—made a direct contribution, we find the statement:

Education for the deprived and the segregated is an important facet of the attack on poverty.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called attack on poverty is an important facet of the administration's war on the school boards. It is part of a master strategy which also includes the USOE's reorganization for the attainment of its "mission"; the USOE research and development centers for curriculum innovation and the establishment of an urban extension service; the panel report on innovation and experimentation education; and the model school system School Superintendent Dr. Hansen has been persuaded to set up here in Washington.

ROAD TO SERFDOM

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, of all of these facets to the administration's master strategy for its war on the school boards, the so-called Economic Opportunities Act is by all odds the most serious—and this for three principal reasons:

First. It would create a precedent for the bypassing of State and local governments and particularly the school boards.

Second. It would give to Mr. Shriver and to Federal educational bureaucrats under the guise of "welfare" immediate control of the education of the "deprived and the segregated."

Third. The direct federally controlled Federal aid that it would pour into the communities might well act as a narcotic to local initiative and responsibility so that pulling out of it again would require a second American Revolution.

The so-called Economic Opportunities Act, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is not a "war on poverty," it is a power grab. It cruelly plays politics with promises to the poor and unfortunate while maneuvering to wrench control of education and poverty-relief programs from the State and local governments. I do not mean merely to hurl epithets. I am simply saying this: the problems of education and training, of school dropouts, of juvenile delinquency and crime and related matters are local responsibilities and when the Federal Government takes over these responsibilities, however well-meaning its officials, we are on our way to losing our liberties, we are on what Professor von Hayek calls in his brilliant monograph "the road to serfdom."

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I will offer my amendments to this power grab bill and make an effort to restore some semblance of local control which will preserve local autonomy.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT THE PEOPLE OF ANY STATE FROM APPORTIONING THE MEMBERSHIP OF ONE HOUSE OF LEGISLATURE BASED ON POPULATION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a constitutional amendment which states that nothing shall prohibit the people of any State from apportioning the membership of one house of their legislature on factors other than population, if the citizens of the State shall have the opportunity to vote on such an apportionment. That the need for any amendment should arise is a sad testiment of the regrettable usurpation by the Supreme Court of powers reserved to the States and their citizens under the Constitution.

Recent decisions strike hard at our time-honored system of limited government with checks and balances. The latest edict further attempts to interpret the 14th amendment to mean that a State's own legislature, duly elected by the people of that State, is in violation of the U.S. Constitution if both houses do not strictly adhere to a new formula based solely on population. The Court's slogan, "one man—one vote" has a ringing appeal to all who believe in fairplay. However, whether it is politically expedient to challenge such a popular slogan or not, we must in all fairness question where they derive the authority for the assumption of this jurisdiction.

Our historic doctrine of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people was rendered asunder by the decision—specifically in the State of Colorado.

Only weeks before the Supreme Court decision, the people of the State of Colorado voted to apportion their two houses, one on the basis of population and the other on the basis of other factors. The constitutional change was approved by the voters of every county, including the most metropolitan areas, with majorities ranging from 2 to 1, to 3 to 1 and greater. In the most unbelievable abridgement of the rights of the voters of Colorado, the Supreme Court threw out the results and said, in effect, that no longer shall the people of Colorado have the right to govern themselves in such a manner.

The Constitution with its amendments is clear in its intention—each State was meant to be sovereign in matters such as local and State elections. In fact, the U.S. Senate is apportioned on a State line basis rather than in accordance with population.

This constitutional compromise insured that smaller States had the protection of some representation in our National Government. The larger States were to have more voice in the House of Representatives which were apportioned by population. In this way, each has a voice. In this way, even the smallest group was given the constitutional guarantee of at least receiving fair and adequate hearings in the councils of our Nation.

Thus it is with a sincere regret that I felt it incumbent upon me to introduce this constitutional amendment, one which simply spells out again a principle which I believe to be so basic to our American way of life that I find it difficult to understand how any court could violate it; the principle that the people of the United States have the right and must maintain the right to govern themselves.

THE SIXTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 12–16, 1964

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in observing the sixth anniversary of our national recognition of the captive nations of Europe.

On the eve of our own celebration of Independence Day, which had its birth on July 4, 1776, it is fitting that we keep in mind the nations of Europe today in physical captivity to the Soviet Union.

That these nations, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Bulgaria, Armenia, mainland China, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and Cuba—long for freedom from their state of captivity—is self-evident.

That there is a continuing effort on the part of the U.S.S.R. and her sister Communist nation, Red China, to complete the subjugation of Europe, is also self-evident. This desire for subjugation of other nations is not even confined to the European continent—it has clearly extended to our own hemisphere, and we had a sharp reminder of this in recent years when we discovered Russian missiles and troops on an island only 90 miles off our own shores—Cuba. We will not soon forget that lesson, nor will we overlook the attempts to extend the Communist empire to South America. It almost seems that wherever we look in the world today we find no peace. Yet, we hear daily protestations of peaceful intentions from the Soviet Union, just as did the present captive nations in Europe before their takeover was completed.

We know in this country the value of a dynamic democracy. For those foreign countries who view our national campaigns every 4 years with wonder, we quote words from the writings of one of our American sociologists, Saul D. Alinsky, who said:

> There can be no democracy unless it is a dynamic democracy. When our people cease to participate—to have a place in the sun—then all of us will wither in the darkness of decadence. All of us will become mute, demoralized souls.

This cannot happen in our country as long as we are aware of the value of our freedoms, and the need to be active in the affairs of our Government. The time to become worried is when the people can no longer become aroused over presidential candidates, and candidates for the House of Representatives or the Senate, or the State legislatures, on down to the local offices.

The only way to make the mass of any people see the beauty of justice, and of a government founded on principles of justice, is to show them in plain terms the consequences of injustice. For this reason, it would seem important for us to press for creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. In this way we will be able to study the results or consequences of what happened to those people of the captive nations when they were taken under the pseudoprotecting wing of the Soviet Union. These people live in twilight zones of the spirit. They cannot freely speak citicism of their government; they cannot publish critical observations of those in power; they cannot travel freely; they cannot take part in free elections—with a choice of candidates—but instead are handed a sop by supposedly casting their votes for one candidate and told this is freedom. When news is beamed their way, through the Voice of America, or Radio Free Europe, the broadcasts are jammed with a few rare exceptions. When they get news of our country's affairs, it is news of the kind their captors feel they should hear—in other words, the frailties and the weak spots here and there in our Government and daily life. The isolated cases of injustice or wrong are played up as though these are acceptable, daily occurrences which our type of government stands powerless to control. Even our open and public disagreements with one another are used as examples of disorder in a weak people and weak government.

I believe, however, that these people cannot help but realize that if we are able to voice our feelings so freely, we surely have freedom of a unique quality which they obviously are not able to enjoy. The one thing which the Communist dictatorships are not able to do is make captive the minds and hearts of these people, unless they are willing to let them do so.

Our fine and respected former President, Herbert Hoover once said:

> The spark of liberty in the mind and spirit of man cannot be long extinguished; it will break into flames that will destroy every coercion which seems to limit it.

The spark of liberty is indeed flickering in the minds of many of the peoples of these captive nations. We can see the results of this spark from time to time in news from Poland; news from Cuba; news from many other parts of the world. We hear reports of the stirrings in these countries and we know the history of the world proves beyond all doubt that those who desire freedom will not forever be denied.

We cannot forget our own heritage. Our desire for freedom overcame the natural reluctance of many to break away from a mother state.

We must be diligent to remind the people in these nations to nurture carefully the spark of freedom. We know

the pretensions of the Communists of a policy of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" for the falsehood it is. We have free access to information and we have seen clearly the results of the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. since the beginning of its own revolution when it overthrew the rule of the czars, only to have forced upon them the rule of a Communist dictatorship.

Only half a century ago, the world was largely made up of empires. These have gone their way, with but a few exceptions where the ruler is only a figurehead without power to affect the true government of their people.

In its place, however, we have seen the supposedly "peaceful means" whereby the Communist dictatorship has swept into its protective embrace 23 nations on the European continent, and will sweep even more unless they become aware of the falsity of their surface friendship.

Indeed, our own Nation was in danger during the thirties, when in the midst of a depression we found the false ideology of communism had become attractive to many discouraged American citizens. To a large extent, these same American citizens—once they became aware of the falsity of communism—returned to American principles of government. For those who still remain captive in mind to the Communist ideology we have deep pity, but not the kind of pity that will allow them to freely subvert our Nation without even a word of protest from those of us who truly value our American republican form of government.

We in this country know what it means to earn liberty. Beginning with the first small group of courageous men and women who sought not only civil, but religious, liberty as well, this grew from a small whisper to a shout on July 4, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence came into being. An English clergyman, Caleb C. Colton, once wrote:

> Liberty will not descend to a people; a people must raise themselves to liberty; it is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed.

To me this truth was voiced in some of the finest words of our history as a nation, and I offer them to each of the captive nations, to ponder and cherish in their hearts until the day they can let the spark become a flame of liberty for their country:

> When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to this separation.
>
> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.
>
> Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right—it is their duty—to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security.

These are the words which lighted the torch of liberty for this Nation. These are the principles which, if nurtured, will one day cause the captive nations we honor here today, to throw off their government and provide new guards for their future security.

As long as only a half-dozen people in each captive nation subscribe to these principles, the spark will be kept alive—and one day it will take form and substance and the nations under captivity will throw off their bonds and become free. With this freedom, God grant that they cherish their added knowledge, born of their suffering under captivity, to truly provide themselves with the new guards which will provide protection for their future security.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON APPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there have already been expressions of great concern in this House over the decision on the 15th of June by the Supreme Court that both branches of State legislative bodies must be apportioned on the basis of population. I would like to add my voice to those who have proposed that something must be done to erase this action. I, therefore, introduce a House joint resolution as an amendment to the Constitution to read as follows:

> The Judiciary powers of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity concerning the apportionment of representation in a State legislature if either or both Houses of that State legislature are apportioned on the basis of approximately equal population, and the citizens of the State have approved by vote in referendum the composition of representation of its legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this amendment would not only protect our form of government but assure that the interests of minorities and majorities, too, would be guaranteed their rightful protection.

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely feel that if we do not act in such a manner as to reverse this momentous decision, minority groups in the United States will be stripped of their most singular voice in Government. May I say, that the legislative bodies of our Government, are unique in the representation they give to the will and desires of the majority, while affording, at the same time, protection for the rights of minorities. I would not like to see this changed. I would not like to think that by a 6 to 3 vote the Supreme Court could usurp the legislative prerogatives of the Congress of the United States. I would not like to think that this House would permit such a thing to happen without protest.

Chief Justice Earl Warren has stated that legislators represent people, and not trees, or acres—that legislators are elected by voters and not farms or cities or economic interests. But it is a fact of our way of life that trees, and acres, and farms, and cities, and economic interests are vital to the welfare of our people. I know what these things mean to the people of Maine and I know what they mean to the peoples of other States. But if the people of the United States had wanted to change their form of government, this could have been done by petition and legislative action through their duly elected representatives. Justice John Harlan has hit the nail on the head in his dissenting opinion. He says:

> What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible. I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform.

Right at the heart of the matter is Justice Harlan's comment that the Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for its citizens. He states that the Court exceeds its authority and has added something to the Constitution which was deliberately excluded from it. Justice Potter Stewart stated that he considered the Supreme Court's decision a long step backward and Justice Tom Clark also disagreed with the majority opinion. Yet, unless we do something about it, six men have changed the direction of the Nation and altered the historic strength we have found in the Constitution.

I agree with Chief Justice Earl Warren who once held an entirely different view on the matter of apportionment as reported in the July 6 issue of U.S. News & World Report. In a speech at Merced, Calif., on October 29, 1948, he said:

> Many California counties are far more important in the life of the State than their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I have never been in favor of restricting the representation in the Senate to a strictly population basis.
>
> It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representations to the States of the Union—equal representation in one House and proportionate representation based on population in the other.
>
> Moves have been made to upset the balanced representation in our State, even though it has served us well and is strictly

in accord with American tradition and the pattern of our National Government.

There was a time when California was completely dominated by boss rule. The liberal election laws and legislative apportionment of the system have liberated us from such domination. Any weakening of the laws would invite a return to boss rule which we are now happily rid of.

Our State has made almost unbelievable progress under our present system of legislative representation. I believe we should keep it.

Mr. Speaker, the present form of our National Legislature has set the pattern for good government throughout the free world. The legislative bodies of our States have confirmed the rightness of the system, in fact, some were well established before the Federal body came into being. The States of the Union and the citizens of the United States must look upon June 15 as the day upon which the delicate balance, which protected all people from the absolute control of the majority, was upset. The Congress of the United States must look upon this day as another day when its exclusive right to make the law of the land was abrogated. And I am sure that history will note this day as that upon which we departed from the wise path which the founders of our country clearly marked with their genius when they prepared the Constitution. I say that this must not happen. It is the duty of this House to act decisively and repair the damage before it is too late.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT—A POLITICAL GIMMICK

Mr. MOSHER. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, about 7 weeks ago the President of the United States, with great fanfare, submitted to the Congress his proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964. Almost before the ink was dry on the 45-page printed bill, H.R. 11065, an ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was appointed, and public hearings commenced.

MISSING—CAREFUL THOUGHT AND STUDY

Hearings on the bills have continued through 17 separate sessions over a period of 5 weeks, and one fact has been made embarassingly clear: the bill, as prepared by the executive branch and recommended by the President, is a prime example of fuzzy thinking and poor legislative drafting. It is vague and ambiguous, it can be interpreted in almost any way one wishes, and it contains provisions which would have the Congress abdicate many of its most basic responsibilities.

Witness after witness—including spokesmen for the executive branch who necessarily favor the bill and will assist in its administration if it is enacted—proposed or conceded the necessity for amendments, clarifications, and revisions of the bill. Perhaps the nadir was reached during the testimony of Secretary of the Interior Udall, who appeared before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on which I serve, on May 6. Secretary Udall's testimony did not seem to bear much relationship to the bill recommended by the President. It developed that the Secretary's testimony was based upon the erroneous assumption that a number of specific administration-sponsored amendments to the bill dealing with mining areas had been submitted to the subcommittee. They had not been—and at the end of the hearings on June 11, some 5 weeks later, still had not been—submitted to the subcommittee. In fact, they have not yet been submitted.

When the President of the United States recommends legislation to the Congress, the Members should be able to devote their attention to the merits of the proposal on the assumption that the bill is properly drawn and clearly and precisely reflects the President's views as to the methods and details of accomplishing his objectives. The proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 is so in need of major revision that a serious question is presented as to whether the proposal is the product of careful thought and study, as it is publicized to be, or a spur-of-the-moment gimmick mainly with political gain in mind. The administration has spotlighted the plight of some of our allegedly less fortunate neighbors, in one part of the country, often to their great embarrassment, and then raced about madly in all directions ballyhooing a hastily drawn, poorly conceived, ineffective, and inadequately developed Federal plan for their assistance.

A proposal to extend massive Federal aid to assist, what is termed, a poverty stricken area is an attractive objective from a humane as well as a political viewpoint. But, in the interests of the people of Appalachia, as well as the millions of taxpayers throughout the Nation, the details of such a proposal must be closely examined to assure that it will actually be beneficial to the people who need help, rather than merely aiding politicians in Washington, D.C.

UNLIMITED SPENDING FOR THE SAKE OF SPENDING

The mere spending of great sums of money by the Federal Government will not necessarily assure permanent economic improvement of the Appalachian area. It, alone, will not guarantee new jobs and a continuing higher standard of living for the people of Appalachia. Government spending which is unlimited in this bill, merely for the sake of spending, historically has proved to be of little lasting benefit to the economic well-being of people. Even the Public Works Acceleration Act, which was enacted in 1962 as a highly publicized solution to the nationwide unemployment problem, has proved to be a failure. Almost $900 million has been obligated under this program, and the Area Redevelopment Administration has been unable to show any substantial reduction in unemployment actually attributable to the program. They have made glowing reports of the number of jobs to be created by projects, as distinguished from the number of unemployed persons actually put to work, but even these figures have been ballooned out of all reason, apparently in an effort to secure congressional authorization of additional funds. The Comptroller General of the United States, in a report to the Congress in May of this year, advised that the ARA has overstated the on-site man-months actually worked on projects by from 83 to 128 percent. Furthermore, the on-site man-year project cost has been exorbitantly high, frequently exceeding $50,000, and in at least one instance exceeding $1 million. The expenditure of almost $900 million under the PWA program may have helped someone, but it has been of little demonstrated assistance to unemployed persons.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDS WAIVE STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

We find this same type of PWA program included in the President's proposed Appalachian legislation, only bigger—and better—insofar as the expenditure of public funds is concerned. Section 216 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce—who is in charge of the ARA and PWA programs—to allocate unlimited Federal funds for 100 percent of the cost of such existing and future Federal grant-in-aid programs as he may designate, except for construction of highways. This 100 percent Federal financing would be available until the beginning of the third full fiscal year after enactment of the bill, and thereafter the Federal share of the cost would not exceed 80 percent.

The PWA Act provided for a maximum of only 75 percent Federal contribution to the cost of projects, whenever the State or local government cannot pay all of its usual 50-percent share of the cost. It would appear that all existing grant-in-aid programs, including PWA and ARA, and all grant-in-aid programs to be enacted by Congress in the future, which provide assistance for the construction or operation of facilities, would be eligible for this increased Federal financing. Irrespective of what Congress may have prescribed as State and local matching funds requirements, for whatever good and valid reason, under the proposed legislation such requirements can be waived by the Secretary of Commerce for all or parts of those portions of the 10 States within the designated Appalachian region.

There is clearly no justification for an expanded and 100-percent financed PWA program in Appalachia, particularly when its nationwide application has not proved to be effective in securing the desired results. Furthermore, there is neither any time limit nor any dollar limit on this Appalachian WPA portion of the bill.

A BLANK CHECK PROGRAM

In fact, there is no dollar limit on any portions of the legislation proposed by the President, except for the construction of highways at $976 million, health facilities at $26 million, and the purchase of stock in the Appalachian Development Corporation at $550 million. Section 501 is an open-end, blanket authorization for

the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary, without any limitation whatsoever, to carry out all of the remaining programs contained in the bill. No administration witness who appeared before the ad hoc subcommittee would even hazard a guess as to how much the entire Appalachian program would ultimately cost the American taxpayers, although the figure of $4.6 billion has been rumored for a 3-year period. Furthermore, the bill imposes no time limit on the many programs it encompasses, except to place a 5-year limit on grants of Federal funds for the operation of health facilities.

COMPLETE VETO POWER IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Title I of the bill establishes the Appalachian Regional Commission, which is composed of a representative of each of the 10 States involved, and one Federal member, who has complete veto power over the decisions and plans of the Commission. This is in addition to the authority of the Secretary of Commerce or other designated Federal officials to approve or disapprove proposals submitted by the Commission.

The Commission apparently is not a Federal agency—although this is as subject to doubt as other parts of the bill—and its officers and employees are not considered Federal employees. Yet, the Federal Government will pay, under section 105, all of the expenses of the Commission for 2 to 3 fiscal years, and half of such expenses thereafter.

Who would submit a budget for such expenses, to whom would the funds be appropriated, and who, if anyone, would audit the books, is not stated. There seems to be no real Federal control over the amount of such expenses, which, considering the functions of the Commission, could be substantial.

Also, sections 106(c) and 107(b) of the bill authorize Federal agencies to make available to the Appalachian Regional Commission information and personnel "on a reimbursable or, where appropriate, nonreimbursable basis." The bill contains no indication as to when or why it would be "appropriate" to decide whether these aids would be on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis. Nor do they indicate who would make the decision.

A NEW GOVERNMENT BUREAU?

Of really deep concern is the question of who will administer the various programs provided for in the bill. Will it be the existing agencies—State or Federal—or will it be the Appalachian Regional Commission acting as a superbureaucracy for the Appalachian region? The bill requires that all programs it authorizes—which include supplementations and modifications of existing programs as well as new programs—must be carried out under plans and recommendations of the Commission. If the Commission is to administer these programs instead of existing, fully staffed agencies, it will be a ridiculous and wasteful duplication. And there seems to be nothing in the bill to preclude this.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PAVE PRIVATE DRIVEWAYS?

Section 201 of the bill, relating to highways, is a morass of uncertainties, ambiguities, and unwarranted abandonment of established principles. The bill authorizes the appropriation of a total of $645 million for the construction of 2,350 miles of development highways and also 500 miles of local access roads to serve "specific recreational, residential, industrial, or other like facilities or will facilitate a school consolidation program."

Under this provision, for the first time in history, Federal participation in the cost of private driveways would be legally possible. Furthermore, an entirely new classification of highways would be grafted upon the Federal aid highway program, and it would only be a matter of time before this new classification would be proposed for financing out of the highway trust fund.

The development highway and local access road program would be undertaken pursuant to recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission. There is no requirement in the bill that the State highway departments be consulted. The Commission could deal with counties, municipalities, or local improvement districts, without even advising the highway department of its highway plans and activities.

The highway aspects of the bill are to be conducted "in accordance with those provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to Federal-aid highways and are not inconsistent with the purposes of this act or the provisions of this section." The "purposes of this Act" are set forth in one short sentence of section 2 of the bill, and are so vague and indefinite as to make it completely impossible to determine which of the provisions of title 23 would or would not be applicable.

Section 201 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to increase the Federal share of the cost of constructing developmental highways and access roads from 50 percent to a maximum of 80 percent, and authorizes the appropriation of $185 million for this purpose. The bill contains no real guidelines, limitation, or criteria concerning the increase in the Federal share. Furthermore, under the bill, the Secretary would have authority to increase the Federal share in one State while denying such increase to others—all without control by the Congress.

CABINET MEMBERS EMPOWERED TO DELEGATE POWERS

Section 303 of the bill states:

> The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to delegate his functions under this Act, to the extent he deems appropriate, to the Administrator of the Appalachian Development Corporation appointed pursuant to section 402. The authority hereby granted shall be in addition to, and not in limitation of, any authority now existing or otherwise granted by this Act.

The Appalachian Development Corporation would be basically a financing organization. Its main function would be to provide funds to "local development districts" through loans and purchase of obligations.

The functions of the Secretary of Commerce, under the bill, include administering the development highway and access road program—section 201—the authority to waive or modify fund-matching requirements established by the Congress in all existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs except those dealing with highways—section 216; providing funds for research and demonstration projects and making grants for administrative expenses to "local development districts"—section 301; and appointing an "independent committee" to review the effectiveness of the programs authorized by the bill.

There is no apparent reason why these functions should be delegated to the Administrator of the Appalachian Development Corporation. There are many obvious reason why they should not, particularly in the case of the highway and road program which can be handled by the existing Bureau of Public Roads.

SUPERMONSTROSITY—APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Title IV of the bill, which would provide for the creation of the "Appalachian Development Corporation" is patently absurd. It creates an unprecedented, hybrid supermonstrosity.

The Corporation, a Federal agency, would be authorized to make project loans to "local development districts" in Appalachia. As defined in the bill, the term "local development district" would include private corporations organized for profit. And the projects for which loans could be made could include the construction of golf courses, swimming pools, and the like, if a finding is made that such projects would contribute to the "economic growth" of the area by promoting tourist trade.

The initial capital of the Corporation would be advanced entirely by the Federal Government, and to this end the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase preferred stock of the Corporation having an aggregate par value of $50 million. The bill authorizes appropriation of $50 million for this purpose. In addition, the Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury or the public, up to 10 times the sum of the Corporation's capital and retained earnings; namely, $550 million.

The Corporation could make loans to "local development districts" to help defray the costs of projects. Such loans, among other things, could be used to meet the requirement of local matching funds on Federal-aid projects, so that even if the Secretary of Commerce does not waive the laws requiring local matching funds (under sec. 216 of the bill) the result could be projects financed 100 percent with Federal funds.

A PRESIDENTIALLY APPOINTED CZAR

The Corporation is to be headed by an Administrator, a presidential appointee. By granting or withholding financial assistance, the Administrator could exercise an effective veto over

projects in areas where financing is a problem. And this veto power of the Federal member of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and power of approval or disapproval of the Secretary of Commerce or other official designated by the President under section 223 of the bill.

The Congress would not have an opportunity to review projects to be given financial assistance by the Administrator of the Corporation. The Administrator would have full discretion to grant or withhold financial assistance. In view of this and the authority of the Corporation to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury, it is obvious that the President's proposal is a blatant case of back-door spending: taking funds from the Treasury without specific appropriation control.

Section 222 reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be interpreted as requiring any State or political subdivision of a State to engage in or accept any program without its consent.

Since a substantial part of the programs provided for in the bill can be extended directly to individuals, private organizations, and local development districts, this provision is utterly meaningless.

TESTS TO QUALIFY ARE WITHOUT MERIT

The President's proposal defines the Appalachian region by listing the 340 counties in 10 States. As of April 15, 1964, 59 of those 340 counties—about 17 percent—could not meet the eligibility requirements—high rate of unemployment—for assistance under either the area redevelopment program or the Public Works Acceleration Act. One of the primary reasons for designating the area as in need of special treatment is the comparatively high percentage of families having an income of less than $3,000 annually—the assumed poverty level. But this ignores many factors, such as the price indexes in the area, or the above-national-average incidence of homeownership, car ownership, washing machine ownership, and so forth, in West Virginia, which is presumably fairly typical of the Appalachian region, since it is the only State wholly included therein. It also ignores the widespread Government-financed poverty—if $3,000 annual income is to be the test—under the social security program. As of December 31, 1962, some 193,000 families—including a worker, spouse, and 1 or more children—were receiving social security benefits. The average family benefit ranged from a high of $1,891.20 annually to a low of $1,339.20 annually. It includes areas with no chronic unemployment and no widespread poverty.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC POWER SEEN

It is particularly significant that the Appalachian region—as defined in the bill—includes one-half or more of the region supposedly developed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Two Federal agencies would have jurisdiction over the same area. Nearly one-third of the counties listed as being in Appalachia are in the Tennessee Valley or are within the TVA service region. The expenditure of vast sums of money by the TVA since its inception in the 1930's evidently has not solved the problem. It is questionable whether additional expenditures of tax dollars on the proposed programs would do more. And the creation of an additional bureaucracy having duplicatory and overlapping functions and powers would be inexcusable.

The danger of such overlapping was made apparent in the testimony of Mr. Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association. Mr. Radin quoted President Lyndon Johnson as saying that:

Everything I saw justified our speeding up action on the poverty bill, yesterday. There is need for careful scrutiny of the development of power resources looking toward action. That would mean specifically the possibility of steamplants, TVA, in some of that area.

Mr. Radin also quoted from a letter of Secretary of the Interior Udall to Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt, as follows:

It is my view that an effort should be made to undertake the studies recommended by the Commission immediately. These studies should include preparation of engineering plans and economic analyses for specific installation of large thermal plants of 1,000 to 2,000 megawatts together with suitable peaking hydroelectric capacity.

Concurrently, various organizational and financial arrangements for making such development possible should be studied, including the possible establishment of a public-nonprofit corporation that could borrow capital on the open market. The studies should also give consideration to new industrial development that can be attached to the region by low-cost power and to marketing arrangements that will reduce power costs to industry.

These quoted statements may well reveal the real purpose of this bill. Under the vague sweeping language of the bill, it might well be possible to construct public power facilities throughout the region. The statements of President Johnson and Secretary Udall indicate the extreme danger that an attempt to do this will be made, and all without specific authorization, or even consideration, by the Congress.

OTHER REGIONS COMING

One of the most serious objections to this bill is the regional approach taken. Certainly there are many people throughout the United States making less than the $3,000 a year poverty level set by the administration who might equally be said to be held down by their impoverished environments.

I consider any Federal program that selects certain areas of the Nation for Federal aid while overlooking other areas, to be discriminatory in its conception and susceptible to vote buying in its application.

The best indication of the future prospects for this type of legislation was revealed by Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who in testimony before the committee in behalf of the bill, said that he could see other regional areas that one day might qualify for similar redevelopment programs. He listed two prospective poverty areas as the Ozarks and the upper Great Lakes iron-ore areas.

The ramifications of this program are readily apparent. By selecting certain "pockets of poverty" and by eliminating other parts of the country, the program can be used in a discriminatory manner for political expediency, Executive favoritism, and vote buying on a grand scale.

The regional Federal Government dominated antipoverty gimmick cuts across State borders, subverts State authority, and would give birth to a hybrid TVA-type approach to the national poverty problem—with the Federal control covering every conceivable public endeavor in addition to power development.

WOMEN OF AMERICA, FOR GOD'S SAKE, AWAKE

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the above-entitled article written by a great-grandmother, Mrs. Phil Regan, in Palm Springs, Calif.

I believe this is a wonderful expression by a very good lady, and there is little doubt of the truth and wisdom of her statement.

I commend the reading of this article to all Members:

WOMEN OF AMERICA, FOR GOD'S SAKE, AWAKE

The torch is passed to the women of America. It is our moral responsibility to restore Bible reading and prayer in our schools.

Many wonderful things have been twisted into instruments of destruction. In amendment 1 of the Constitution, what law has been broken by Bible reading and prayer in schools?

There is no doubt that the U.S. Supreme Court is comprised of fine men who acted upon the letter of the law when they ruled 8 to 1 on cases from Maryland and Pennsylvania that State laws providing for a religious exercise or prayer recital are unconstitutional under the doctrine of separation of church and state.

What Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson said in 1948 still stands:

"One can hardly respect a system of education which would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move the world society * * * for a part in which he is being prepared."

One persistent atheistic woman never stopped until she had reached the Supreme Court and through the technicality of the interpretation of the letter of the law succeeded in banning Bible reading and prayers in our schools while we women—mothers, grandmothers, and great-grandmothers (the writer is in the latter category)—looked on, too lethargic to prevent this audacious woman who was speaking for her own child.

What has happened to the women in this country to take this lying down? We are paying taxes for all children to enjoy an American education.

Who is financing her? Who are the unseen insidious forces behind her atheistic move? Are we going to let one godless woman succeed without setting out to reverse this decision? Do you realize what will happen if we take God out of our schools?

A LESSON FROM THE NAZIS

During the postwar trials of Nazis in Germany in 1946, a former high official of the Third Reich confessed that he had taken part in the coldblooded murders of 2½ million persons by Nazis. One American investigator, astounded by the casual manner in which the defendant admitted these atrocities, asked: "Do you believe in God?"

"Most emphatically not," the Fuhrer's disciple replied.

In countries the world over where God has been deliberately rejected by atheistic rulers, the value of human life is soon belittled.

We of this generation have no excuse not to learn from a terrible experiment which has taken place in our own times.

This know-it-all claims, "Religious people are weak." Under the Hitler regime kindness was considered weakness; brutality became a virtue.

Those who would enslave man concentrate first on schools as the most effective place to deform and debase impressionable minds. Thus they quickly eliminate all teaching that reminds the human being that he is made in God's image and that his rights come from his Creator.

The edicts of the Supreme Court shall pass. The laws of God shall never pass.

No child ever became a delinquent or a traitor by applying the inspired words of the Bible and prayer to his daily living.

Milton said: "There are no songs comparable to songs of Zion; no orations equal to those of the prophets; and no politics like those which the Scriptures teach."

Horace Greeley said: "It is impossible to mentally or socially enslave a Bible reading people. The principles of the Bible are the groundwork of human freedom."

Francis Bacon said: "They that deny God destroy man's nobility; for clearly man is kin to the beasts by his body and if he is not kin to God by his spirit; he is a base and ignoble creature."

Young said: "A foe to God was never a true friend of man."

Unless a man's spirit be free, he is imprisoned.

This amendment has interfered and prevented our freedom of spiritual speech. For when we pray we speak to God and when God answers, He speaks to us, His children on earth—black, white, yellow, Jew, Protestant, Catholic—through the Bible.

Nothing in the Constitution prohibits Bible reading and prayer in our schools. Why change and play into the hands of atheistic Communists. The Supreme Court has gone beyond its power in amending the Constitution.

Article I: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press or of the right of the people."

Women, why not take a popular vote?

The atheistic aim is clear. Without God the consciousness of man is lowered. With this accomplished, man will be unable to discern evil if it has a legal dress. Without God in our schools, we shall perish.

The Old Testament teaches wisdom. The New Testament teaches love and peace. Combine these three, they equal power for good.

All of our Presidents from George Washington up to and including Lyndon B. Johnson were consistent in recognizing the dependence of this Nation on God. This is clearly revealed in the inaugural address of each President. Every President invoked God's help and recognized dependence of this Nation on God. These are excerpts from three of their inaugural addresses:

Abraham Lincoln: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

Dwight D. Eisenhower: "This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God."

John F. Kennedy: "Asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Our Founding Fathers repeatedly referred to the duty in our Declaration of Independence. We are one nation under God. Would they today try to make us "One nation under Khrushchev"?

The first amendment has been interpreted in the light of man's limited thinking, therefore, the letter has been construed.

The whole of our State constitutions are miniature declarations of independence. Some of them use the very words of the Declaration itself, recognizing God and practically all call attention to the fact that our rights and liberties stem from God.

Do you realize that only 3 out of 100 Americans actually deny the existence of God? The convictions of a small minority should not result in the imposition of a godless philosophy on the other 97 percent.

In conclusion, I would like to draw your attention to an interview given to the Realist by this godless woman:

"If I can't come through this case the same offensive, unlovable, bullheaded, defiant, aggressive slob (she said this, I didn't) that I was when I started it, then I'll give up now. My own identity is more important to me. They can keep their g--damn prayers in the public schools, in public outhouses, in public H-bomb shelters, and in public whorehouses."

Those are the words of the woman who brought the case to the Supreme Court; the woman who doesn't want her child exposed to prayer.

Every night I shall ask Almighty God to spark each and every woman in America to act now. Do something—a popular vote on our National and State ballots, not at some future date, but now and in the meantime write your Congressman as follows:

"In order to insure our freedom of speech and religion, we, the women of America, demand that some legally effective measure be adopted forthwith to allow Bible reading and prayer in every school throughout our Nation, the United States of America."

Sign your name and address clearly.

Do it now and may Almighty God speak through you.

Permission is granted to print this article.

JO B. REGAN,
A Great-grandmother Who Is Very Concerned About the Lethargy of Our Women of Today.

RICE ANSWERS NCWC

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter Charles E. Rice, professor of constitutional law at Fordham University, has written to the editor of the Tablet in reply to the statement issued by the National Catholic Welfare Council.

I feel his answer is worthy of the attention of all the Members of the House, for I believe he does his usual superb analysis in this letter.

The letter follows:

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., July 1, 1964.

The EDITOR OF THE TABLET,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has urged the American hierarchy to be cautious toward proposals to amend the Constitution to rectify the Supreme Court decisions on school prayer. The department's statement noted that the great variety of the various amendment proposals, together with the haste with which they were formulated, displayed more eagerness than profound constitutional deliberation. Moreover, the statement noted, the House Judiciary Committee hearings have contributed to the uncertainty and confusion.

At the risk of disturbing the olympian detachment of the learned gentlemen of the department, I venture to observe that their talents should have been put to use in aid of the constructive efforts of others who have sought, and are seeking, to draft an appropriate amendment. To the best of my knowledge, the department has not acted to help surmount the drafting problem during the past 2 years. Nevertheless, even at this late hour, the department, instead of carping, could render a public service by making concrete suggestions on the legal problems involved in drafting an amendment.

The department has not been timid in the past about taking a stand when the matter at issue was a Federal subsidy to parochial schools rather than merely the question of whether the Government can constitutionally recognize the existence of God. It should be remembered that no general program of nondiscriminatory aid to education, including parochial schools, can realistically be enacted except in an atmosphere of governmental hospitality toward theistic religion. The logic of the school prayer decisions, however, unless the Court is checked by amendment, will predictably usher in a period of governmental hostility to such religion. Moreover, I hardly expect that those vocal pressure groups which oppose both Federal aid to parochial schools and a prayer amendment will lend their support to the former merely because some Catholics, who ought to know better, oppose the latter.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. RICE.

MY VOTE ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the year and a half that I have been in Congress I have never cast a more difficult vote than was demanded of me today.

I abhor discrimination in any form and strongly believe in equal rights for all. However, after spending hours in concentrated study of the changes made by the Senate, delving into my conscience, and, I might add, spending sleepless nights, I came to the conclusion that I would be derelict in my constitutional duties as a Member of Congress if I voted

for this bill. This is purely my own decision. It is with regret that I break with the leadership of my party—but I came here to vote my convictions and not to take the easy way out.

When the House first considered this bill in February, I worked for enactment of amendments that would have improved the bill so as to provide for equal rights for all without the erosion of individual liberties. Most of the suggested improvements were rejected. Nevertheless, I voted for passage of the House version of the civil rights bill with the hope and belief that the Senate would be able to improve the worst features of the bill. Instead, it appears to me that many of the amendments adopted by the Senate confuse rather than clarify the real intent of the Congress. Furthermore, many of the Senate changes grant even greater discretionary power and authority to one man—the Attorney General of the United States. No matter how able and highly motivated an individual Attorney General may be, he is—after all—a political appointee. Vesting such great power in the hands of one individual not responsible to the electorate is fraught with dangers to the basic structure of our constitutional system.

The greatest tragedy of all is that there is no legislative history to guide this one man in the implementation of the law. Observance of the traditional procedures of orderly legislation would have provided the guidance which assures a government of laws rather than of men. Without committee reports on the final bill, without a conference, and with a gag rule which gave the House only 1 hour to consider some 80 amendments, I had no alternative but to vote against passage.

IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written concerning the racial disturbances which have been stirred up in the South, but which are exploding with equal violence without urging in the North. I believe the most succinct examination of the present-day dilemma I have ever read is contained in an editorial, "In the Name of Christianity," in a recent Shreveport, La., Times.

I commend it to the attention of all my fellow Members and do so without the necessity of further comment:

IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY

Between May 20, 1963, and mid-March of this year, there were 2,229 racial demonstrations in 338 cities and 40 States of the United States. This is an average of more than seven—almost eight—per day, winter and summer, rain or shine.

The period of time covered has no especial significance. It simply happens that the Times asked a Federal Cabinet Department last April for this information and the data given was the latest available at that time—and is the latest quickly available at this moment.

The Department cannot be identified because it does not officially publicize such information. But the statistics are gathered by its own employees, who happen to be stationed in many cities all over the country, and from newspaper and press association reports. The figures indicate the constant prodding that is being carried out all over the Nation in behalf of Negro demands for desegration of something or other, or for more desegration than has been granted under law or voluntarily, and for self-asserted privileges which are described as rights but may have no connection whatever with Federal or State constitutions or with Federal or State laws.

The rate of demonstrations per day probably has increased since the period covered in the above figures—increased with spring and summer weather and the ending of school, which has released tens of thousands of young Negroes of the type belonging to the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the two organizations whose activities most frequently lead to violence.

All of the prodding in the world cannot justify what seems to have happened in Mississippi in the disappearance of persons making up part of a huge vacation period invasion of Mississippi for "rights" purposes. Two were whites from Brooklyn and the third a Negro professional worker for CORE, all men. The fact that their car has been found in a burned condition and that they have not been heard of since they started driving along a highway after paying a fine for speeding several days ago, indicates the worst.

And "the worst" is revolting and repulsive to all decency in a manner that is beyond words to describe.

It could be said that the two from Brooklyn should have stayed there and joined the Maccabees, an organization formed by Jews to carry out unarmed night patrols because of the increasing number of crimes of violence, especially biracial criminality, that obviously has become beyond control of the police; the attempted rape of a Rabbi's wife was an incident merely symbolic of daily and nightly events that caused the Jews to move into action in that part of Brooklyn.

It could be said that the New Yorkers moving into Mississippi might do well to think of their own city where 38 persons recently stood by and watched a man murder a woman without even calling the police; and that another group stood quietly as a naked woman who had been raped tried to escape her attacker by running out into the street but was caught by him and dragged back into a building. In another case, people in the street shouted "Chicken. Yellow Coward. Jump—go on and jump," at a mentally deranged person standing on a building ledge seven stories high.

But one act of horrible repulsiveness does not justify another; much less many others. Some way, some time, people of all areas must courageously face the fact that repulsive crimes and horrible racial incidents of violence are not confined to any one area or any one group of citizenry. Nor are they common to all groups. What has happened in New York and elsewhere does not justify what seems to have happened now in Mississippi. But to assume that such things happen, or can happen, only in Mississippi may merely encourage more incidents of the same type in many places.

The white who murders a Negro for racial reasons in Mississippi is in no way better or worse than the Negro who shoots promiscuously into groups of whites and kills in the Carolinas or elsewhere.

The Negro who hides in the ambush of a building and shoots whites is no better or worse—simply because his bullets did not happen to be fatal—than a white man who shoots a Negro in the back in the dark from ambush, regardless of the geographical location of either incident.

The Negro or the white, whether uneducated and illiterate or a college student or graduate, or a member of the ministry or engaged in any other profession, who deliberately violates the public peace and commits trespass in full knowledge that the end result may be violence and death and even mutilation and murder, cannot plead innocence through professing lack of intent. He is just as guilty of the violence that comes from his action as the person who puts no mask over his intent to cause violence.

The individuals, ministers and churches, and denominations which directly or indirectly make up the National Council of Churches of Christ in America must judge themselves and their organization, as well as be judged by others. The NCC is sponsoring and paying the costs of a training school in Ohio, conducted with a faculty of members of CORE and the SNCC—both organizations of Negro youths often moving in a manner to bring violence.

The first 200 graduates have been sent into Mississippi and 400 more are scheduled to go through the school and then go to Mississippi for their own school vacation periods. Other training schools similarly conducted are expected to bring the total forces—mostly college youths—invading Mississippi to at least 1,000 and perhaps 2,000 this summer. Many of the students are from the Eastern Ivy colleges or big State or tuition colleges and universities elsewhere. About 80 percent are white. A strong portion of the girls and women at the first NCC training school were from fashionable Eastern women's colleges.

The National Observer and other publications give eyewitness accounts of training at the National Council of Churches, Ohio school. One television network has presented action films of the training. The National Observer mentions, without comment, that one of the subjects of discussion in the school among the young college girl students is which choice they would make in Mississippi if arrested: to be horsewhipped, or "yield to the (sexual) desires of a jailer." The inference seems to be assumption that the choice would have to be made.

In a school skit acted by CORE professionals, the college boys and girls witnessed supposed Mississippi people cursing the white northerner with vile and filth that could not possibly be published or put on the air. The impression was given that this is common in Mississippi; one might gain the impression that there is no such thing as a decent human being in that State.

The National Observer reporter said that many of the white training school students, who thought they were merely signing up for a sort of summer domestic Peace Corps lark, have become imbued with fear of going to Mississippi, but are more afraid of the jeers and sneers that would come if they backed down after entering the NCC school. The NCC training school students supposedly go into Mississippi simply to assist Negroes in voter registration. But they are trained also how to act in street violence, how to protect themselves, and they are told that they must live with Negroes of the lowest educational, economic and physical hygiene brackets; that white Mississippians won't even talk to them. Frequently they work in teams of three—two rookie students and a trained CORE or SNCC member in charge; often two men and one girl.

These things are presented herewith dispassionately, simply as facts. They are facts that do not have to exist and certainly should not exist. Surely, the fear created in the NCC Ohio training school and the nature of some of the training is of a type to provide seedbeds for human hatred—hatred by the training school students of the whole people of a State; and hatred from others in return; all of this as supposedly the Christian way to cure the evils of mankind.

There is no excuse, no justification, for what has happened in Mississippi in the case of the missing or in some other racial incidents.

But what justification or excuse can be offered, in the name of Christianity, for using Negro organizations (with some white members) to train young college boys and girls to invade areas of which they have no firsthand knowledge and where their presence and immature conduct brings constant danger of inciting both Negroes and whites to violence and bloodshed?

THE U.S. AIR FORCE: A POCKET OF POVERTY

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, what would be the reaction of the people of this Nation if they knew that 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receive annual military cash pay and benefits at less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that approximately 60,000 airmen are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits, including low-cost housing, free food, dollar grants, and clothing? What would be the reaction of the people if they knew that over 5,000 airmen are actually receiving relief benefits, and that this figure does not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Air Force Aid Society? What would their reaction be if they knew that far more personnel would qualify for benefits if identical relief programs were made available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges?

In my opinion the initial reaction would be one of surprise, followed by strong urgings to do something about this pocket of poverty in the U.S. Air Force. Yet, the facts I have suggested are true. There are 8,012 of the active duty personnel in the U.S. Air Force receiving annual military pay and benefits at less than the poverty level established in connection with the war on poverty. There are 60,000 airmen considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. There are more than 5,000 airmen actually receiving relief benefits in addition to those receiving loans and grants and other benefits from the Air Force Aid Society. It is true that more personnel would qualify for these benefits if identical relief programs were available to all active duty personnel, and if the Air Force did not resolve some of the problems by granting hardship discharges.

These sad statistics are facts, not rumors. They may be seen in a study recently completed by the Air Force entitled "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel." This disturbing document reveals not only the figures that I have cited but the following as well:

Another reason there are not more military personnel on relief is because there are over 71,000 heads of families who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. That is, we pay our Air Force personnel so poorly that a substantial number of them are forced to moonlight. For example, in the Strategic Air Command—SAC—our major deterrent force, 11 percent or one airman in nine is a family man working after hours to support his family. Further, more would work if shift work or alert duty permitted.

In some metropolitan areas more than one-fourth of the married junior officers and airmen have supplemental employment, that is, they moonlight, and up to 70 percent of their wives are working.

The highest percentage of moonlighting occurs not at the lowest grades, but in the middle grades where families are beginning to develop and where career decisions are being made. Over 10 percent of the Air Force staff sergeants and 9 percent of airmen first class are moonlighters.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that if these facts were fully known by the American people they would rise up and demand that we stop shortchanging our military personnel. For if we paid our men and women in the Air Force adequately they would not have to go on relief, they would not have to obtain public assistance, they would not have to borrow extensively and go heavily into debt, they would not have to moonlight and the men would not have to send their wives to work in order to supplement their military incomes, and they would not have to obtain hardship discharges to extricate them from the mess that one gets into when there is not enough income to support the family.

Last Monday, June 29, I introduced H.R. 11819 to increase the subsistence allowance for members of the uniformed services to $75 per month. Surely this is a modest increase from the $30.90 to $47.88 per month that is presently allowed for subsistence. As you know, the subsistence allowance is intended to be used by military personnel who do not eat in the base messhalls for the purchase of food off the base. But you cannot buy enough food with $30.90 or even $47.88 for an adequate diet. And that partly explains why these people have to go on relief, and moonlight, and send their wives to work, and obtain hardship discharges.

By the unanimous consent of this House, I include in the RECORD the "Survey of Economic Status of Certain Air Force Personnel":

SURVEY OF ECONOMIC STATUS OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

This briefing is the result of a survey of all major Air Force commands taken by the Directorate of Personnel Plans. The survey was taken as a result of a discussion of the Federal war on poverty.

One definition of poverty given by the President's Council on Economic Advisors, as a rough rule of thumb, is an annual income of $1,500 for a single person, up to $3,000 for a family of four. This chart shows the number of lower grade airmen by these annual cash income brackets. When the so-called poverty criteria are applied to the Air Force, there are 169,000 airmen receiving an annual military cash pay at less than the theoretical poverty level for the United States. Taken without further clarification, this would be 23 percent of our enlisted force.

"Poverty" formula—Total annual cash income

	Single, $1,500	1 dependent, $2,000	2 dependents, $2,500	3 dependents, $3,000
Airman, 2d class (E-3)	45,759	1,734	660	772
Airman, 3d class (E-2)	87,691	4,422	4,568	1,912
Airman, basic (E-1)	20,068	605	449	360
Total		169,000		

However, this large figure is misleading because most airmen are furnished their room and board which most civilians must procure for themselves. When the equivalent value of military rations and quarters furnished in kind are included, we find that 8,012 of our active duty personnel meet the poverty criteria. We feel this is a more accurate measure. In each case these are lower grade airmen with under 2 years of service and with two or more dependents.

Total effective income

	Single, $1,500	1 dependent, $2,000	2 dependents, $2,500	3 dependents, $3,000
Airman, 2d class (E-3)				772
Airman, 3d class (E-2)			4,568	1,912
Airman, basic (E-1)			449	360
Total		8,012		

In our survey we asked all major air commands for the number of personnel who are eligible for various relief benefits. They report approximately 60,000 airmen who are considered to be eligible for various State and civic relief benefits. The four major benefits are: Housing, food, dollar grants, and clothing. This table shows eligibility as reported Air Force-wide. By far, most of these people are merely technically eligible for low cost public housing regardless of whether or not it is available:

Various relief benefits

Low cost public housing	53,811
Food	4,000
Grants	1,900
Clothing	273
Eligible	60,000

But over 5,000 airmen are actually reported to be receiving relief benefits. These are indicated on this chart. These figures do not include various medical benefits nor the loans and grants made by the Air Force Aid Society. Our 5,000 personnel drawing relief benefits include airmen from all ranks but the commands report that it is in the airman first class to staff sergeant level where the highest incidence takes place—personnel whom we consider to be career airmen. The availability of State and civic relief benefits varies widely by geographical area. For ex-

ample, many recipients of clothing are clients of a religious organization in San Antonio. The low-cost housing may be available anywhere in the United States. Overseas, relief benefits are almost nonexistent, but many areas have a station allowance to offset cost-of-living expenses. We can assume that far more personnel would qualify for benefits if identical relief programs were made available to all active duty personnel, and if we did not resolve some of these problems by granting hardship discharges:

Various relief benefits

Low-cost public housing	4,698
Food	280
Grants	45
Clothing	24
Receiving	5,000

Another reason there are not more people on relief is because there are over 71,000 heads of families who work after hours to supplement their military incomes. This figure includes 952 officers. This practice is called moonlighting and varies widely by geographic and economic factors. The number of moonlighters reported by certain commands are shown on this chart. Note that 11 percent of SAC—or 1 airman in 9 in SAC, our major deterrent force—is a family man working after hours to support his family. More would work if shift work or alert duty permitted. In favorable metropolitan areas more than one-fourth of the married junior officers and airmen may have supplemental employment and up to 70 percent of their wives may be working:

Moonlighting to supplement the head of family's income

SAC, 11 percent	26,464
ADC, 12 percent	11,347
ATC, 11 percent	6,487
MATS, 7 percent	5,117
TAC, 6 percent	3,732
Others, 5 percent	17,888
Total	71,005

Moonlighters by grades are shown on this chart. Note that the highest incidence of moonlighting occurs not at the very lowest grades, but in the middle grade brackets where families are beginning to develop and where career decisions are being made. Over 10 percent of staff sergeants (and 9 percent of airmen, first class) are moonlighters. The subject of moonlighting will be further explored in the May Sample Survey which will be available at a later date, where we will go into the extra hours worked per week, the total amounts earned, and the number of dependents who work. The results of the survey will be available by July. We hope that this information can be used to promote improvement in personnel programs to provide a better personnel image. Information properly handled should be useful as a factor in pushing for better pay, better housing, and extended collateral entitlements:

Moonlighting by grades

952 officers:	
O6	14
O5	78
O4	136
O3	297
O2	268
O1	115
CWO	44
70,053 airmen:	
E–9	253
E–8	622
E–7	3,033
E–6	7,507
E–5	19,476
E–4	19,168
E–3	14,713
E–2	5,172
E–1	149

COMMENTS ON THE INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the magazine Banking reprints a letter to the editor from the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. This letter replies to an article that appeared in an earlier issue of that magazine, which was critical of the investigation into the Federal Reserve System being conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee under the able leadership of Chairman PATMAN. The chairman's letter defends the investigation of the Fed, the first comprehensive study of the hard core of our entire financial structure, and explains some of the reasons behind it. Because of the light this letter sheds on the investigation and its critics, and because it constitutes part of the continuing public dialog on the Federal Reserve System, under unanimous consent, I insert at this point in the RECORD the letter to the editor of Banking by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN:

MAY 2, 1964.

DEAR EDITOR: Were it not an election year, I might be puzzled, even offended, by the remarks of my erudite and distinguished colleague, BILL WIDNALL, which appeared in the May issue of your magazine. In such a year, some ordinarily responsible Congressmen become at least slightly toxic with the political war virus. Such is the case, I suspect, with Mr. WIDNALL, and the article in question is the result.

Since January 21, our Subcommittee on Domestic Finance has been hearing testimony from leading members of the Federal Reserve Board, the 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, the Secretary of the Treasury, leading academicians from our most advanced economic departments in our foremost universities, law deans, representatives of the banking fraternity, labor, and others properly interested in and concerned with money and credit.

I am pleased to report that the Honorable WILLIAM WIDNALL participated frequently in our many hearings, and he invariably asked responsible and astute questions.

I think that it is unfortunate, but this I allow to politics, that the gentleman from New Jersey would write so disparagingly in Banking magazine against the work being done by the committee, especially since he has not seen fit to do so either in committee or in open hearings, or even to the chairman. It is possible that Mr. WIDNALL, and his minority colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee, have not approved of many of the facts that have been brought out in much of the testimony thus far presented before our committee.

It is noteworthy that minority members of the committee took an antagonistic position on the five bills mentioned by Mr. WIDNALL in the article and which were authored by the chairman, even before the testimony, pro and con, was in. As the May 4 issue of the U.S. News & World Report states, "the five Republican members have shown Mr. PATMAN and his plan nothing but hostility." Perhaps this is the "hippodrome" atmosphere that Congressman WIDNALL referred to.

It is unhealthy, as has been pointed out time and again, for a few people, responsible to no one, to have so much financial power as now exists in the present Federal Reserve setup. Several witnesses have testified that the chronic tight money bias of the Fed—free of any outside checks or balances—has led to serious recessions in 1953–54, 1957–58, and in 1960–61.

The American people are just now, thanks to our hearings, learning about such matters. This knowledge is not forthcoming because of an "inquisition" by the committee or its chairman. On this point, I will quote Mr. T. H. Milner, Jr., representing the Independent Bankers Association, who stated, "I might say, personally, that I have learned more about the Federal Reserve System than I ever knew before. * * * It has been an interesting and revealing study."

The article Congressman WIDNALL wrote is in the great Republican tradition. The GOP members invariably act as apologists for big banks and big banking institutions such as the Federal Reserve. The Fed, a Government agency, is operated for the profit of big banks, rather than for the benefit of the people of the United States. What BILL WIDNALL is asking for is maintenance of the status quo insofar as the Federal Reserve is concerned. "God's in His Heaven, all's right with the world"—so long as interest rates are high and money is hard to get for the average citizen.

"SHOCKING" ASPERSIONS

I do not wish to "nit pick" Congressman WIDNALL'S opus, but there is a point he raises that surprises, even shocks me. I refer to the aspersions he cast upon the distinguished panel of witnesses which have appeared during the past 3 months before our committee. As he himself says, "23 university professors * * * have given testimony based on their analysis of past events, and their theories as to how the central bank of the United States should be organized and monetary policy formulated." He continues, and here is the shocking part, "Some of these presentations could be characterized as free-wheeling, for their exponents had no responsibility for the results their brain children could have produced."

Was he referring to Dr. Milton Friedman, world-renowned economist of the University of Chicago, and part-time adviser to Senator GOLDWATER? Did he have in mind Dr. Harold Barger, chairman of the Department of Economics of Columbia University? Did he really mean Prof. G. L. Bach, of Stanford University and Carnegie Institute of Technology and a member of the board of directors of the Pittsburgh Federal Reserve Branch Bank? Or was he thinking of Dr. Paul A. Samuelson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—respected by several Presidents of the United States and business leaders all over the country—and author of the world's most widely read textbook on economics?

GROSSLY UNFAIR

I think it grossly unfair that Mr. WIDNALL impugn the integrity or the ability of a single witness. Neither the committee chairman nor the majority members have done any such thing, even when they have disagreed completely with some of the witnesses.

Then the author finds fault with the cost of printing the voluminous report that the committee I chair has printed, and will continue to print as the record unfolds. Is it not rather picayune to complain about such small matters when one considers that the Federal Reserve System, the hard core of our entire financial structure, is having the first comprehensive study made of it in its first half century of existence? Is it right to quarrel about the price of printing committee reports when we are looking into an institution which, at this very minute, holds

more than $30 billion worth of Federal securities in its vaults, and which has within itself the power to increase interest rates and tighten money which affects every man, woman, and child in America?

THE BANKERS' FRIEND

Despite the apparent "stand-patism" of the author, who along with his Republican minority colleagues seems unmoved by the testimony, the great bulk of the evidence rejects the present separate existence of the Federal Reserve as incompatible with the requirements of a modern society. Good, sound, Republican banking policy is what comes naturally for most Republican Members of Congress. They think in those terms; they act in those terms. I honestly believe they think they are right. It does not disturb them that they are the bankers' friend, particularly the big bankers' best friend. That they have blinders over their eyes is the fault of no one but themselves.

The American people—I speak of the grassroots American people—the farmers, the small businessmen, the war veterans, the factory workers, and the youth of America—are slowly perceiving that the world was not set up for the prime benefit of those who own bank stock. I am for the free enterprise system, which certainly requires that banking be a legitimate business like any other. But, when enormous profits are not enough for the banking community, then I say we must not let bankers kill the goose that laid the golden egg by tightening money and increasing interest rates to the detriment of our business community, and 190 million Americans to boot.

We cannot permit a totally independent Federal Reserve System, unreceptive at times to the common good, to retain forever power which the Congress of the United States never intended for it to have—the sole power to govern our money and credit structure. Bankers all know that the control of the money supply is exercised by the Open Market Committee that meets in secret every 3 weeks in Washington, and nobody, not even the President of the United States, nor the committees of Congress, knows what goes on at these meetings. To me this is secret and nonrepresentative government, which runs counter to our American tradition.

BANKING APOLOGISTS

What I have been trying to get across in this letter is that apologists, such as Mr. WIDNALL, never are able to perceive of the human effect money and interest policy contains. The concern of big banking apologists is always with how money and credit affects banking institutions per se. I do not apologize for the consistent position I have taken over a period of 35 years, which shows a bias on the side of human beings.

Mr. WIDNALL makes a particular point that there will not be any remedial legislation coming out of the Banking and Currency Committee this session. He is quite correct insofar as the Fed is concerned. However, a far greater volume of important legislation has been processed by the committee this session than ever before, such as the silver bill, continuation of the Export-Import Bank, important small business amendments, credit union amendments, a comprehensive savings and loan bill, area rehabilitation, mass transit, the increase in deposit insurance, and housing legislation, to name some. Before Congress goes home, most of these bills will have become the law of the land; many have already.

Concerning the Federal Reserve study, we intended the current hearings on all facets of the Federal Reserve to serve as an intensive educational program on money and credit for both the Congress and the people. The problems involved are exceedingly complex.

We would never attempt to railroad through any legislation. It has been my purpose to see that the need for remedial legislation be registered, not alone in the Congress, but in the grassroots itself. Despite a continuous propaganda smokescreen such as the Widnall article exemplifies, which ignores the basic issues involved, the story of the cost of maintaining an independent Fed outside of the American system of checks and balances, is getting across to the Congress and the people. I am confident there will be some changes made within the next year or two or three. These will not merely be good for the American people as a whole—they will prove sound for all legitimate banking interests; that is, bankers who are satisfied to make a reasonable profit rather than those who would gouge the lender and bring banking back to the period of the great depression, when a banker had the lowest prestige in the community.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

P.S.—For the benefit of the Honorable BILL WIDNALL and some fellow Republicans who agree with him concerning the Federal Reserve System, let me quote from President Hoover's memoirs, page 212: The Federal Reserve "was indeed a weak reed for the Nation to lean on in time of trouble."

W. P.

STATEMENT ON H.R. 1794

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, last week the conferees appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives met again to discuss H.R. 1794, a bill providing for the relief and relocation of the Seneca Indians in New York following the taking by the Federal Government of a major portion of their Allegany Reservation in connection with the Kinzua Dam and Reservoir project.

I shall not here attempt to review the unhappy chapter in our Nation's history which precedes this legislation. As the members of the House well know, construction of the Kinzua Dam is being accomplished only at the expense of violating a solemn treaty by which the United States promised to maintain these very Seneca lands inviolate. The time has long since passed, however, for reversing such action. Within a few months, the Senecas will be forced to abandon the reservation communities which they and their ancestors have inhabited for centuries and to find new homes in a new environment.

Though the Kinzua project is fast becoming a fait accompli, there remains an issue of honor, and it is this issue that is being resolved in conference. The issue is whether the United States, having prevented the Seneca people from continuing their chosen way of life and having unilaterally broken its own pledge, will now, by providing adequate assistance, make it possible for the Senecas to begin anew. H.R. 1794, as unanimously passed by the House of Representatives, went a long way toward achieving this goal, and carried the endorsement of the executive agencies involved, as well as the Seneca Nation. Specifically, section 4 of the bill would authorize the appropriation of $16,931,000 in rehabilitation funds to aid the Seneca Indians in relocating their homes and establishing a new and self-sufficient way of life.

The fund provided in section 4, however, was reduced by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to $6,116,000, a cut of almost 65 percent. Moreover, though the reduced appropriation is clearly inadequate to enable these depressed people suddenly to enter our culture, the Senate committee added a new section 18 to the bill, calling for the termination of the special relationship between the Seneca Nation and the United States.

The volume of mail and telegrams which I have received from my constituents, and the attention focused upon the Seneca legislation in the press evidence a keen public awareness of the moral question presented to the Congress, as well as a genuine sympathy for the plight of these Indians. In order that justice may be done to the Seneca Nation, and in order that the reputation of the United States for fair dealing may be preserved, I believe that agreement by the conferees upon the full amount of the rehabilitation funds authorized by the House and deletion of the termination amendment added by the Senate are required. On behalf of the Indians and other concerned citizens in New Mexico, I am also submitting these views in letters to the House conferees and to Senator FRANK CHURCH, chairman of the Senate conferees.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for the sixth time since 1959, we are observing Captive Nations Week.

President Johnson, in accordance with Public Law 86–90, has proclaimed that the period of July 12–18, 1964, be observed as Captive Nations Week.

The observance of Captive Nations Week points up to the tragedy of the people enslaved by the Communists. It focuses attention on the tragic truth that although the Allies won the war, the defeated enemy countries are recognized as free and sovereign while nations that fought on the side of the victorious allies are subjugated satellites of Soviet Russia, one of the perpetrators of World War II.

To us, living in a free world, the observance of Captive Nations Week should be a time for both prayerful reflection and renewed determination. During this week we as Americans can reflect on the liberties and freedoms which we often take for granted. We can once again voice hope and determination that those captive nations will once again regain their freedom which is their inherent right to enjoy.

More than 90 million people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania were free and independent. In their homelands they lived and were content with their lot under their national and democratic governments. The war changed all this. These nations were fighting to continue to live in freedom, but the U.S.S.R. had different views on their status after World War II. Now nearly two decades later these nations are still under the yoke of Soviet Russia. Not only the people of these nations are under Communist domination, but nearly 17 million Germans in East Germany suffer a similar fate.

The Communist leaders know that if we keep alive the opposition to the Communist tyranny in the captive nations we can move toward their liberation from Communist rule. Hope of freedom lives in the hearts of these people and this spark can be intensified and become a blaze if we can deter Communist ambitions of world domination and eventually bring about its defeat.

In 1959, the House of Representatives and the Senate adopted a resolution for the designation of Captive Nations Week for appropriate observance throughout the country. The month of July was selected as the most appropriate month for these festivities.

After the designation of the first Captive Nations Week in July 1959, it was apparent that this declaration was a thorn in the side of the Russian leaders. At that time Khrushchev denounced the Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week because he knew the Soviet Russian treachery and consistent betrayal made her the undying enemy of the captive nations and a foe of Christianity and democracy forever. He realized that he had to retain enough pawns like the captive nations to perpetuate more heinous crimes in the future.

He has publicly stated that he will bury us for he believes that the Godless communism, which Soviet Russia has foisted upon her Christian, God-fearing neighbors, and that the Iron Curtain will be a deathknell of Christianity, democracy, and civilization.

We in Congress, our public leaders, and all citizens, not for only 1 week but throughout the year, should take positive action to halt, control, and eliminate this international conspiracy. We should be fearless and forthright in determining a policy and future course of action that will lead to the restoration of full sovereignty to all the nations that are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and the liberation of the millions of Europeans now held captive by the Communists.

During this Captive Nations Week we can reaffirm our sympathy for those people now living under Communist domination. We can assure them that we have not forgotten them and give them assurance that we will continue our efforts for the return of freedom and liberty to them.

Let us strengthen our vows to keep alive the knowledge of the injustice to those subjugated nations and the oppression of human beings. We should do this in the hope that the ensuing years will see these Communist-dominated countries once again as members of a free world community.

What appears to be hopeless today may become a reality tomorrow if we can continue our efforts toward forcing these unfortunate nations from the yoke of Communist oppression. Given the opportunity, these enslaved people will rise up and fight their captors. The free nations must keep this hope alive so that this freedom may soon be attained.

SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE BOB SIKES OF FLORIDA

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Florida Times-Union on Saturday, June 27, and which praises our able colleague, and the dean of the Florida delegation, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES.

I particularly agree with this editorial when they praised the choice of Congressman SIKES as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard recently held at Camp Blanding, Fla., which is in my congressional district.

As an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, and as an outstanding authority on the requirements of military defense in this country, Congressman SIKES has rendered a great service to our Nation. All of us in Florida who know him appreciate the fact that despite his high position of importance here in Congress, he is never too busy to advise his colleagues and to help us with the many problems that we have.

I salute this great American, and I am pleased that one of his experience and ability is so prominently connected with the military affairs of this Nation. The editorial from the Florida Times-Union follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union, June 27, 1964]

GUARD EXERCISES HALLOW A GREAT TRADITION

The choice of U.S. Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES of Florida's First Congressional District as principal speaker for the officer candidate graduation exercises of the Florida National Guard tomorrow at Camp Blanding is entirely fitting and proper.

In addition to serving the people of northwest Florida in the lower House, the Congressman is also a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve, a rank to which he climbed all of the way from the bottom rung on the ladder.

The civilian components of the Army of the United States have a great tradition both in war and in peace. General SIKES was among those Reservists who at the outset of World War II provided a nucleus of young commissioned leaders around whom Uncle Sam could expand the Defense Establishment. It was within the framework of the National Guard and the Reserve officer contingent that the immense emergency wartime growth became possible.

The Federal activation of the Guard units was not without its problems. One of the most difficult of these was facing up to the fact that there was a danger in sending units, made up largely of young men who were all from one locality, into combat together. An untoward fortune of war could wipe out all of the youth in one area at one fell blow. The ultimate solution to that problem was using Guardsmen, after a certain period of training, as cadres for new divisions. Thus an entirely new Army was built on the Reserve and National Guard.

Of the many National Guard major generals who were federally activated at the inception of hostilities, only several finished commanding their units. The Regular Establishment saw to it that the men who wore the ring of the U.S. Military Academy were moved into these positions, after relieving the original commanders. It was held that the Guard commanders, in some instances, were not militarily qualified for their jobs, that they were in their positions by virtue of political pull, a charge that still rankles in the bosoms of the men who received such treatment.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for all its intrinsic merit, the historic legislation which Congress has concluded passage of today is less an end than a beginning. It is less the whole than a small part of the total effort and struggle to secure full civil rights and equal justice under law for all Americans.

It can hardly be denied that the grievance of this country's Negro minority is longstanding and eminently legitimate. But it is also clear that other Americans are experiencing discomfort in the face of the unprecedented push by the Negro in this decade for immediate improvement of his civil rights and status.

The expansion of public means for combating private discrimination as contained within the civil rights bill is our Nation's response to the urgency and righteousness of Negro demands. Resistance to Negro pressure for full civil rights probably does not stem from a denial that such demands are legitimate. Most Americans admit that the Negro has and still does suffer from grave discrimination. Rather, resistance arises because Americans are disconcerted by the increasing vehemence with which those demands are being expressed, and by the greatly stepped-up pace of change in general.

We must recognize, furthermore, that Negro leaders are not prepared to relent on their drive or modify their demands.

We must realize, finally, that stubborn refusal to accommodate Negro demands can only serve to drive more and more Negroes to seek relief under the auspices of more and more radical and militant leaders.

If all these things are true—that the Negro grievance is legitimate, that civil rights leaders will not relent on their

drive, and that failure to accommodate Negro demands will drive Negroes into the arms of more and more irresponsible groups—then is it not our clear obligation to make every effort to redress the long-standing and admittedly legitimate Negro grievances of which I have spoken?

Passage of a strong civil rights bill is a first step and small part of such an effort. Provision for adequate Federal protection of students and citizens in Mississippi should be another. This week, 29 eminent attorneys and legal scholars expressed their considered opinion that sufficient legal foundation exists for Federal intervention in areas where, according to section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code, the President "considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations or assemblages make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings."

The legal scholars stated:

> It is not lack of Presidential power to act, but the absence of a conviction that action is now called for that explains nonaction.

It has taken the disappearance of three students in Mississippi to dramatize the fact that "action is now called for."

I strongly urge upon the Members of this House support for these and other matters pertinent to the field of civil rights. There can be no conflict of interest when to accommodate Negro demands for full civil rights is also to act pursuant to America's finest ethical and moral principles.

BANKS SHOW GENERAL IMPROVEMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of today, I note from the midyear reports of some of America's largest banks that most banks show a general improvement in the 6-month net operating income compared with the 1963 first half. Among the banks reporting, I noted that all of them reported a substantial reduction in their holdings of U.S. Government securities as follows:

[In millions]

Bank	U.S. Government securities held June 30—	
	1964	1963
Manufacturers Hanover Trust	878,136	994,320
Chemical Bank New York Trust	531,504	646,050
Marine Midland Trust of New York	129,697	154,862
National City Bank of Cleveland	146,075	146,484
Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust	104,507	127,718
Irving Trust of New York	372,374	402,473
Girard Trust of Philadelphia	157,580	161,103
Harris Trust of Chicago	237,910	284,049
Provident Tradesmens Bank	70,398	76,126
United California Bank	376,144	405,160
Philadelphia National Bank	181,181	187,064
Bank of New York	77,345	100,977
State Street Bank of Boston	80,520	97,016

It thus appears that in spite of higher profits and higher commercial activities, the banks are reducing their liquidity which is reflected in the continuation of the trend toward the reduction in holdings of U.S. Government securities. In these times, it might well constitute a danger signal.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend existing law with reference to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of State legislatures.

In view of the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court it is imperative that corrective steps be taken by the Congress. Unless this is done promptly it would appear that there will be utter chaos in the several States of the Union. We must immediately consider some remedy to the ill created by the Court and take firm action to prevent further usurpation by the Court in this area.

The dissent of Justice Harlan in the reapportionment case points out in a very vivid manner the error of the majority of the Court. He has expressed the views of many Americans when he states that the Supreme Court is wandering far afield of its intended jurisdiction when it undertakes to usurp the constitutional authority of the States to determine the composition of their legislative bodies.

My bill would get at the heart of the problem. It simply provides that no U.S. district court shall have jurisdiction to entertain a petition or complaint seeking to apportion or reapportion a State legislative body, nor shall the Supreme Court have the right to review the action of a Federal or State court in such cases. This is a direct and proper legislative manner in which we in the Congress can undo the damage done by the power-hungry U.S. Supreme Court.

I urge all of our colleagues to join with us in this effort to bring order out of the chaos created by the unfortunate action of the Supreme Court.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—FOR MEN, TOO—IN THE NURSE CORPS AND MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us who have worked long and hard over the years to secure and maintain equal employment opportunities for women are sensitive to unequal opportunities in employment wherever and however they exist. So it is with regret that I learn that the press of other legislation will prevent the Armed Services Committee this year from considering H.R. 1034, sponsored by Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio, to permit the Army and the Air Force to commission men for service in the Nurse Corps and the Medical Specialist Corps. Mrs. BOLTON is the author of much of our legislation to upgrade the careers and increase the supply of our country's nurses.

Truly, in the nursing field, perhaps more than in any other profession, women are a "little more equal" than men. Men comprise just about 2 percent of the Nation's professional nurses, and many men among that small percentage are holding administrative rather than nursing assignments. Nursing has been considered a "woman's" profession for so long that it has always been difficult to attract men into the field. Yet many men have made excellent nurses and medical specialists, particularly in the armed forces, and many more could be—both in the services and in the private health field. I have received a strong endorsement of Mrs. BOLTON's bill from Sister Wilma Marie of the St. Louis University School of Medicine in her capacity as president of the Eastern Missouri Chapter of the American Physical Therapy Association. This organization believes passage of H.R. 1034 would be most helpful in increasing the number of male physical therapists by opening up important new career opportunities in the commissioned ranks of the armed services for men interested in this field.

In 1954 legislation sponsored by Mrs. BOLTON enabled men to receive reserve commissions in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps. But men still cannot be regular officers in those corps. The Air Force has statutory authority to appoint men as regular officers in those fields, but since the law uses such designations as "she" and "her," the Air Force would like the United States Code to spell out in clear language that men are as "equal" as women for consideration for such appointments. H.R. 1034 would amend this law to refer to "persons" rather than to "women" and to eliminate the word "she" in reference to officers in these categories.

Women have a special stake in supporting Mrs. BOLTON's bill. Here we can show by example that we really do believe in equality of opportunity for all who, by training and experience, qualify for the job.

THE GLASS INDUSTRY OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry of America is disturbed over

the possibility of a reduction in present tariff levels.

Current hearings being conducted before the Tariff Commission could spell the end of the glass industry in America.

Testimony is being given by persons representing both industry and labor. I would like to read to the House some examples of this testimony for the benefit of all who are interested in this critical situation.

STATEMENT OF ENOCH R. RUST

Mr. Chairman and members of the U.S. Tariff Commission, my name is Enoch R. Rust, international second vice president of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL–CIO.

I make this appearance on behalf of the membership of this international union and especially so in regard to those engaged in the manufacturing of crown, cylinder, and sheet glass. I also appear here as chairman of the stone, glass, and clay coordinating subcommittee on tariffs and trade, a group consisting of 7 international unions with a membership of 250,000.

For the past several years workers in the glass industry have had the displeasure of working under a cloud of uncertainty and doubt. They could only stand by and watch the flood of imports of window glass grow and grow. Their pleas for relief often fell on deaf ears. Many of the melting furnaces within the window glass industry were filled with finished, boxed, and ready-for-sale window glass instead of being in operation (running hot, molten glass down its lehrs toward the American marketplace).

Workers in this industry were becoming despondent and depressed. There was no chance, nor reason, to plan ahead because all that faced them was a future filled with uncertainty.

After an extensive investigation, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Expansion Act of 1951, as amended, the Tariff Commission found that serious injury to this industry had been caused by excessive imports and by Presidential proclamation, an increase in duties was levied in order to save the industry.

As a result of this long overdue consideration by the Tariff Commission and the President of these United States the worker in this industry accepted this as a new ray of hope and began to plan accordingly.

Now, when things began to look a bit brighter for these people President Johnson has ordered an investigation of the industry's standing as of now. This, of course, again raises the mantle of fear and has thrown some members of management into a mood of near panic. In fact under present conditions a true picture of the actual health of the industry cannot be evaluated.

While there has been a lot of squawking by crown, cylinder, and sheet importing nations, the record will show that their ability to trade in the U.S. marketplace has not been hampered. Imports of this item have held at or near the 400-million-square-foot mark. Gentlemen, this is a lot of glass.

At Clarksburg and Charleston, W. Va., the center of Appalachia where jobs are still as scarce as hens teeth, is where we find the major part of the window glass producing industry located. We came here to Washington in 1960 and consumed the major part of 3 years showing facts and figures which clearly demonstrate the serious plight of this industry and the workers there involved.

We came to seek relief for the people and an industry which had become seriously depressed. We were even granted this relief. Industry, the workers and small business people in these towns all rejoiced in unison. This proclamation by the late President Kennedy served as a large measure of security for us all.

We came pleading for protection for this industry and jobs for our laid-off members. We were granted this protection through a duty increase. Laid-off workers were called back to work, now, gentlemen, is there a danger that the rug will again be jerked from beneath us? We pray not. We believe that there is every cause to continue the present protection and hope that Tariff Commission will so find. We feel the following information and statistics will support our position.

Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. at Charleston, W. Va., has two furnaces that are down and not producing window glass. At the present time 161 men are still laid off. We have 475,000 boxes of glass in warehouses and 200,000 boxes of uncut glass in stock. If all Charleston facilities were in operation we would increase our work force there by 600 workers.

To demonstrate the ability of the foreign importer to enjoy the American market under present duty levels, we will give you a rundown on import figures for the first quarter of the years 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964. 1961—1,306,000 50-foot boxes; 1962—2,289,000; 1963—1,218,000; and 1964—1,895,000. Gentlemen, there is no sign of any abatement of the pressure from imports in these figures.

Gentlemen, the weight of advantage in the trade situation weighs heavily in favor of the Belgians. I feel that it is very important to take into account here that when we speak of trade with member nations of the European economic community, we think in terms of creating jobs for the natives of those nations in order to create a healthy economic atmosphere, but now we find that after full employment was achieved industrialists of these nations did not stop there but instead are now, importing glassworkers from many distant parts of the world.

It is high time that we call upon our friends to give us a hand in helping to alleviate the unemployment of over 4 million Americans and to increase the minimal income of the 37 million other Americans who live in abject poverty.

Let us look at the window glass exporting situations as existing in both the United States and Belgium.

While Belgian exports during the 10-year period between 1953 and 1962 increased from 286 million pounds to 648 million for an actual increase of 362 million pounds, the American window glass exporters were not quite so fortunate. Instead of enjoying the healthy export growth as did the Belgians, our exports had dropped by 2 million pounds annually by 1962.

Sheet glass exports by Belgium and the United States, 1953–62

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Belgium	United States
1953	286	5.5
1954	318	3.4
1955	404	5.3
1956	474	3.9
1957	392	2.5
1958	455	3.0
1959	596	3.2
1960	515	4.3
1961	524	3.0
1962	648	3.5

Sources: Belgium—Bulletin Mensual du Commerce Exterieur de l'Union Economique Belgo-Luxembourgeoise. Institut National de Statistique Ministere des Affaires Economique et de Lenergie. United States—Table 3 of Tariff Commission publication.

As you may see, U.S. exports were merely a drop in the bucket compared to those of Belgian and even this drop is drying up. And furthermore, most of these American exports go to Canada and do not leave the North American Continent; in fact, most of those exports to Canada go primarily to an affiliate of one of America's window glass producing companies. Otherwise our export picture would now be practically nil.

Mr. Chairman, we have demonstrated here that: (1) The American window glass industry and workers are still not out of the woods in supplying job opportunity to laid-off workers; (2) the Belgian employment picture is at an alltime high and they are importing glassworkers from many parts of the world; and (3) the 1962 duty increase has not interfered with the foreign producers' ability to grab off the entire market expansion in the United States but merely checked their inclination to expand their market inordinately.

This ability on the part of the importers to supply all the increase in consumption in the American market is very dangerous to the American producers and their employees as it erases any and all chance of industrial expansion in this country.

Gentlemen, we rest our case in your hands and pray that you will carefully consider all elements of this situation. It is our strong belief that the facts presented at this hearing will clearly demonstrate that reduction in duties would lead to distress in the U.S. sheet glass industry and would greatly accentuate the plight of the U.S. glassworker.

I want to thank the Commission for this opportunity to appear here.

STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS AND FIBER GLASS GROUP, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, JUNE 30, 1964

Mr. Chairman and members of the Tariff Commission, my name is Robinson F. Barker. I am vice president, glass and fiber glass group, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and have been in the glass business for almost 30 years.

I have been privileged to appear before the Tariff Commission on two earlier occasions in connection with the Commission's investigations of sheet glass. My first appearance was on August 17, 1960, at the time of the Commission's peril point investigation. My later appearance was on March 15, 1961, in connection with the Commission's escape clause investigation.

The Tariff Commission is, of course, well versed in sheet glass matters. In addition to obtaining a wealth of information at the hearings referred to above, since the summer of 1960 my company and other members of the industry have completed several detailed questionnaires which the Commission propounded. During the 1960–64 period representatives of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. have also had several visits from the Tariff Commission staff and have given them additional information that they have requested from time to time.

I welcome the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the current status of the domestic sheet glass industry and the problems in that industry which confront my company.

As you will recall, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. owns and operates four sheet glass plants in the United States. They are located at Clarksburg, W. Va.; Mount Vernon, Ohio; Henryetta, Okla.; and Mount Zion, Ill. With the exception of the latter, the business of these plants is confined solely to the production of sheet glass. In the case of our Mount Zion plant, in addition to producing sheet glass, we also perform some fabricating work on sheet glass there.

Although Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is a diversified company, we maintain separate books and records respecting our sheet glass operations. This enables us to look at our sheet glass business independently from the other businesses in which the company is engaged.

PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

I am advised that your task in the current investigation is to advise the President of the probable economic effect on the domestic sheet glass industry were there to be a reduction or a termination of the duties applicable to sheet glass which became effective June 17, 1962. In so advising the President, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 states that "The Tariff Commission shall take into account all economic factors which it considers relevant, including idling of productive facilities, inability to operate at a level of reasonable profit, and unemployment and underemployment" (sec. 351(d)4).

Because the standard prescribed by the statute requires that all relevant economic factors be considered, this means that the standard is not necessarily met if some conditions in the domestic industry have merely improved since June 17, 1962.

I will state categorically that the facts respecting all relevant economic factors do not warrant the Tariff Commission's advising the President to reduce or terminate the June 17, 1962, increased rates of duty applicable to sheet glass.

I will support that conclusion, first, by reviewing briefly the situation confronting the domestic producers of sheet glass at the time the Commission conducted its escape clause investigation. I will then discuss the situation both today and into the foreseeable future, with particular emphasis on the problems of PPG.

REVIEW OF THE SHEET GLASS SITUATION

You will recall, I am sure, the report the Tariff Commission made to the President on May 17, 1961, at the conclusion of the Commission's escape clause investigation of sheet glass. In its findings the Commission stated in relevant part as follows:

"(a) That as a result, in part, of the duties reflecting the concessions granted thereon in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, cylinder, crown, and sheet glass * * * are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, both actual, and relative, as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry producing like products; and

"(b) that in order to remedy serious injury to the domestic industry concerned, it is necessary that the specific duties applicable to such glass under paragraph 219 be increased" (TC Publ. 17, pp. 2–3).

In order to analyze the sheet glass situation properly, it is necessary that the Commission take a broad look at the situation confronting the domestic industry. Thus, in arriving at the above findings, it is significant that the Commission looked at a period of over 10 years—the period from 1950 through 1960. We believe that in its present investigation the Commission should look at that period as well as at the post-1960 period.

It is not my purpose today to catalog or tabulate the many facts and figures which sustained the Commission's findings in the escape clause investigation of sheet glass. I do think it important, however, that you recall what happened in the U.S. sheet glass market during the period from 1950 to 1960. History teaches that "the past is prolog" and that teaching seems to be particularly applicable to all who are competing for the U.S. sheet glass market. The reason I say this is readily apparent from our first exhibit. With your permission, I will now hand up a chart entitled "Index of Sheet Glass Trends—U.S. Imports, Domestic Shipments by U.S. Producers, U.S. Exports (1950 equals 100)."

This chart records graphically information concerning the years 1950 to 1962, inclusive, derived from table 3, appended to the Tariff Commission's report to the President of September 27, 1963 (TC Publ. 110, p. 22).

In addition, the chart has been extended to include information for the full year 1963 and the first quarter of 1964 which has been published by the U.S. Department of Commerce. I should note parenthetically that the information for the first quarter 1964 has been annualized.

You will observe that this chart presents the rate of change, respecting the data portrayed, on an index basis with 1950 equals 100. The chart presents more eloquently than words the extent to which imported sheet glass has penetrated the U.S. market.

It also shows the relatively static shipment picture of the domestic producers during the 1950–64 period. You will note that the chart records separately domestic shipments by U.S. producers and U.S. exports.

The information recorded on our first exhibit becomes more significant when we look at the growth picture of the U.S. sheet glass market during the same period and see how the domestic and foreign sheet glass producers have participated in that growth. I now hand up PPG's second exhibit which is a chart entitled "U.S. Apparent Consumption of Sheet Glass as Supplied by U.S. Producers and Foreign Imports—Years 1950–1964." Here again I invite your attention to the fact that the data for the first quarter of 1964 have been annualized.

The data shown on this second chart are in absolute quantities, i.e., in billions of pounds, and in this respect the chart differs from the index portrayal utilized in our first exhibit.

This chart shows at a glance the total apparent U.S. consumption of sheet glass by year during the 1950–1964 period. In so doing, it also shows the growth in U.S. sheet glass consumption that has occurred during that period.

We have drawn on this chart a horizontal line which shows the absolute volume of domestic shipments by U.S. producers in the year 1950. We have labeled that line "1950 level." By continuing the line across the entire span of years portrayed, it is abundantly clear that the foreign producers are the prime beneficiaries of substantially all of the growth that has occurred in the U.S. sheet glass market. And, please observe that this was not only the case in the years immediately preceding the escape clause investigation but also such continues to be the case down to the present.

You will also note that the total domestic shipments of U.S. sheet glass producers have exceeded the total amount they shipped in 1950 in only 5 of the 15 years portrayed. This is a far cry from that which has taken place in this country since 1950 insofar as total U.S. industrial production is concerned. You will recall that table 5, appended to your report to the President of September 27, 1963, shows that in the period from 1950 to 1963 total U.S. industrial production increased 64 percent. Although total apparent U.S. consumption of sheet glass in 1964 is approximately 24 percent higher than it was in 1950, the unfortunate fact remains that the whole amount of that increase continues to be supplied by foreign producers.

It should be emphasized that in a vital, dynamic economy such as we have experienced in the United States during this period, no industry having a static, relatively inelastic market position can make the economic, technological, and even social contributions which naturally flow from a position of continued progress.

The post-war history of the domestic sheet glass industry is not a pretty picture. There are two principal factors which have created this situation. First, there is little doubt in my mind but that the successive reductions in rates of duty applicable to sheet glass that took place over the years were a substantial factor. Those reductions, as this Commission found in its report to the President of May 17, 1961, enabled sheet glass to be imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic sheet glass industry.

The second factor attributable to the continued plight of the domestic sheet glass industry lies in the simple fact that the foreign sheet glass producers enjoy substantially lower costs than we do. This statement is not a mere assertion on my part but rather it is based upon personal knowledge derived from my experience in administering our foreign glass investments.

There is great disparity between wage rates paid to sheet glass workers among the producing countries in the world. This is borne out by U.S. Department of Labor figures. For example, the average total hourly wage cost for PPG sheet glass production workers today is $3.80. Resolving all doubts in this area in favor of the foreigners, this is more than 3½ times the comparable cost for Belgian sheet glass production workers. The labor cost advantage held by the Belgians over us is even greater in the case of some of the other European sheet glass producing countries for the reason that the latter enjoy even lower labor costs than the Belgians. But that is not all. The labor cost advantage held by the Japanese is still greater than that enjoyed by the European sheet glass producers—at least six to seven times less than PPG.

This cost advantage is of real substance when it is realized that our labor cost alone accounts for nearly 50 percent of our total cost of producing sheet glass.

In addition to the substantial labor cost advantage held by the foreigners over us, it is important to note that foreign producers also enjoy a cost advantage in raw materials. Our studies show that our raw material batch costs are approximately 15 percent higher than those prevailing in the Common Market.

Another substantial advantage held by foreign producers over the domestic producers of sheet glass is that of income taxes. Although the tax rates vary as among the different foreign sheet glass producing countries, the significant fact is that all or virtually all of those countries have lower income taxes than those of the United States.

In this setting of foreign labor and raw material costs and tax advantages, it is no wonder that the domestic producers' exports of sheet glass are miniscule. During the past 15-year period sheet glass exports by U.S. producers have represented substantially less than 1 percent of their total domestic shipments. It should be emphasized that this pathetic situation is not caused by foreign tariff barriers. Indeed, if all the countries of the world were to abolish their tariffs on sheet glass, the U.S. producers would not be able to export any more sheet glass than they are now exporting. The simple reason for this rests in the substantial cost and tax advantages held by the foreign producers. Of course, it goes without saying that with the U.S. sheet glass producers being virtually foreclosed from all export markets, the foreign producers are supplying all of the sheet glass requirements of the other countries in addition to supplying 24 percent of the total apparent U.S. consumption.

EFFECT OF THE 1962 TARIFF INCREASE ON THE FOREIGNERS

It is appropriate at this point to determine what has been the effect on the foreign producers since the late President Kennedy issued his proclamation increasing the rates of duty on sheet glass.

In this connection, my first observation is that the increased rates of duty made effective June 17, 1962, have had no adverse effect on the foreign sheet glass producers' exports to this country. Not only is this clearly reflected in the two exhibits we have previously handed up, but also some of the foreign producers have themselves admitted the validity of my statement in their published reports. For example, the annual report of

the Societe Generale de Belgique (the company which controls the entire Belgian glass industry) for the year 1962 contains a number of interesting statements. Thus, at page 20, the report says:

"For flat glass products and chemicals, the volume of production showed increases of 20 and 16 percent respectively."

At page 74 the Societe Generale Annual Report has this to say:

"The flat glass industry in Belgium developed on very satisfactory lines during 1962.

"In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas. The exports, indeed, practically reached the 1960 levels, which were exceptionally high."

The Societe Generale Annual Report for the year 1963 also refers to business conditions during that year. In this respect, it stated:

"The year 1963 was marked by a material shrinkage in the demand for flat glass products and, more particularly, for window glass.

"This is explained in part by the severe winter conditions of 1962–63 and by the fact that consumers have been reducing their stocks. Moreover, the raising of the U.S. import duties in June 1962 was reflected only in the second half of that year, so that 1963 has been the first year to show the full effect.

"During the first half-year, production remained in excess of sales. Large quantities of window glass had to be taken into stock, despite the stoppage of several furnaces. In July, however, a recovery set in; and its continuation in the following months made it possible for the furnaces to be restarted. Conditions in the second half-year were thus once more on a satisfactory level, not only for window glass but also for plate glass and cast glass."

This admission on the part of Societe Generale is interesting but to put it in its proper context, some additional observations will be made.

Sheet glass imports declined during the last half of 1962 and the first half of 1963. Of course, the foreigners would have this Commission attribute the decline in imports to the increased rates of duty. That was simply not the case. The fact is that the abnormally heavy advance buying which occurred during the first 6 months of 1962 resulted in the accumulation of vast inventories by the foreigners' U.S. customers. Those swollen inventories needed an extended period of time in which to be consumed. And, that is precisely what took place during the last 6 months of 1962 and well into the year 1963. Therefore, the decline in imports during this period is attributable to this advance buying and not to the increase in the rates of duty.

I would also observe that the portion of the Societe Generale 1963 Annual Report which I quoted implies that business was sluggish for the Belgian sheet glass industry in the first half of 1963 but that in July a "recovery" set in. I cannot refrain from noting in this connection a curious coincidence. The increased rates of duty on sheet glass went into effect on June 17, 1962. Because a statutory provision requires the Tariff Commission to report to the President annually with respect to all escape clause matters, it was generally assumed that the Commission would release such a report on or about June 17, 1963. However, several days before this anticipated June 1963 release date, the Tariff Commission corrected this erroneous assumption by indicating that its report would not be forthcoming until September 1963. The curious coincidence I referred to above stems from the fact that foreign sheet glass imports into the United States jumped 29.1 percent in July 1963 over June of that year. This is to be contrasted with an increase in July 1961 imports over June 1961 of 8 percent and with a decrease in July 1960 imports below June of that year of 6 percent. The question thus emerges—did the foreigners intentionally hold back their shipments to this country during the first 6 months of 1963 for the purpose of artificially influencing the U.S. import figures for that period, with the hope that such action would result in a more favorable report from this Commission? In any event, we all know that imports returned to a very high level throughout the second half of 1963 and this continues to be the case through April of this year, the latest month for which data are available.

There are additional facts which clearly demonstrate that the June 17, 1962, increase in the rates of duty for sheet glass has not injured the foreign sheet glass producers. Many foreign producers are operating at such a high level of production that they cannot obtain enough employees to man their factories. In fact, the Belgians have such a shortage of sheet glass workers that they are importing workers, together with their families, from other foreign countries. The following additional quotation from the 1963 Societe Generale Annual Report states the Belgian labor situation in this fashion:

"Frontiers are now wide open to foreign manpower to bridge the gaps in the local supply. Belgium, after recruiting in Italy and Spain, has had to absorb labor from countries as far afield as Greece, Turkey, and Morocco, despite the high costs and the risks involved in these movements of populations, and the many settlement problems which arise.

"The insufficiency of manpower is the more notable in Belgium since the population of working age is growing less rapidly than in other countries. Various estimates have shown the shortage of workers in Belgium is likely to continue for a long time."

While Belgium was importing workers from various parts of the world in 1963 in order to fill their labor shortage, many U.S. sheet glass workers were jobless. Specifically, the number of U.S. sheet glass production workers has declined in recent years. For example, the most recent industry figures which the Tariff Commission has reported show that there were an average of 8,301 such workers in 1955 but only 7,597 in 1962.

In our own case PPG employed fewer sheet glass production workers in 1963 than it did in 1959 and 1962. I recognize that our practice of introducing more efficient methods of production, including automation, may account in some degree for this decline. Of course, with foreign imports accounting for one-fourth of all the sheet glass consumed in this country, I have no doubt that the domestic industry could employ more production workers in spite of our constantly improving technology, if the domestic industry had a larger participation in the U.S. market.

THE PROBLEM OF APPALACHIA

While on the general subject of employment in the sheet glass industry, I believe it appropriate to make reference to the Appalachian bill President Johnson sent to the Congress on April 28, 1964 (H.R. 11065). In his transmittal letter to Congress, President Johnson stated that this bill is "designed to make possible the economic development of the Appalachian region."

The bill itself declares "that the Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity."

According to the New York Times, the bill contemplates Federal expenditures of at least $1 billion and possibly $4 billion in order to help the economy of Appalachia.

The Appalachian region is located in a 10-State area. It encompasses all of West Virginia and substantial portions of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia.

Historically, the sheet glass industry has been closely associated with the Appalachian region. There are 14 sheet glass plants in the United States. Six of those plants are located in Appalachia, and two others are located in the Appalachian States of Tennessee and Ohio. The six plants situated directly in Appalachia presently employ approximately 4,300 employees. If the two other plants are added to these six, this brings the total number of employees to approximately 6,750.

It is interesting to note that even though only 6 of the Nation's 14 sheet glass plants are located in Appalachia, these 6 plants employ 45 percent of the Nation's sheet glass employees. This figure becomes 72 percent if the 8 plants in the Appalachian States are considered.

Needless to say, the payrolls that are earned by these residents of Appalachia help "to make possible the economic development of the Appalachian region." There is no doubt that more Appalachian people would be on the payrolls of these sheet glass plants if foreign glass was not accounting for one-fourth of the U.S. market. So too, it is highly probable that there will be fewer Appalachian people on these payrolls if the foreign sheet glass producers are permitted to gobble up an even greater percentage of the U.S. market.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the Appalachian sheet glass plants are particularly vulnerable to foreign imports because those plants normally serve large volume markets in the eastern and southern sections of the United States, where import competition has been exceedingly intense. Therefore, if sheet glass duties are lowered, that action would obviously result in increased imports into those markets with a concomitant adverse effect upon the Appalachian plants.

If the Appalachian bill is passed by the Congress, our Government will undoubtedly assist the economy of Appalachia by spending huge sums of money in that area. Although I am not an expert on political affairs, to me it would be highly inconsistent for this Government to do that on the one hand and on the other hand reduce the present duties on sheet glass so that foreign producers, in countries where overemployment already exists, can supply the glass that the Appalachian workers would otherwise have supplied. Certainly such inconsistent action would not help to assure that Appalachia's people share properly in the Nation's prosperity.

FOREIGN CARTEL

I have a few other observations to make concerning the foreign producers who are exporting sheet glass to this country. During the year 1963 sheet glass was imported into the United States from 32 foreign countries. Most of the foreign sheet glass companies who export to the United States are not small, independent or struggling business organizations. Quite to the contrary, a preponderance of those companies are large, well-financed, and well-organized corporations. I refer here particularly to the Japanese, Belgian, French, British, Italian, and German producers. In addition, many of the foreign sheet glass producers who export to the United States hold stock

interests in each other, and as a result, it is not uncommon for those companies to adopt and pursue identical business policies and practices. Whether or not any of those companies are members of an international sheet glass cartel would call for a legal conclusion on my part that I am not competent to make. However, the fact that many are interrelated by stock affiliation and interlocking directorates is widely known and this interrelation, in my judgment, is clearly relevant to the current investigation. Accordingly, the Commission may wish to explore this subject thoroughly as a part of its own investigation.

PPG'S SITUATION

Turning now to another subject, you will recall that when we appeared before the Commission on March 15, 1961, we submitted a chart entitled "Index of Sheet Glass Trends—U.S. Imports as a Percent of Domestic Shipments—PPG Gross Fixed Assets—PPG Sales—PPG Net Income (1955 equals 100)." That chart covered the years 1955 through 1960.

In order to analyze PPG's situation both before the June 17, 1962, increase in the rates of duty and after, we have brought that earlier chart up to date through the first quarter of 1964. Our updated chart is PPG exhibit 3 and with your permission I now hand up a copy.

This chart shows a number of things:

First, it shows that the tariff increase of June 17, 1962, has had no appreciable effect on the ratio of imports to domestic shipments. With 1955 equaling 100, U.S. imports as a percentage of domestic shipments stood at an index of nearly 220 during the first quarter of 1964. This is higher than any year prior to 1962, the year of the increased rates of duty, and it is only slightly lower than 1962 itself, which was the highest year on record, and the year in which the foreigners were exporting tremendous quantities of sheet glass into this country in anticipation of the duty increase.

Second, PPG's sheet glass gross fixed assets have been on a constantly ascending curve throughout the 1955–64 period. Those assets have gone up each year and today are at an index of 214. Manifestly this constant increase reflects a real and continuing determination on the part of PPG not only to stay in the sheet glass business but also to improve its competitive position. Later in my statement I will speak again about the improvements we have made that underlie the increase in the PPG gross fixed assets curve on this chart.

Third, you will observe that PPG's sheet glass sales rose slightly in 1956 over what they were in 1955. But, you will also observe that our sales dropped off drastically thereafter and remained below the 1955 level for the next 5 years. Thus, it was not until 1962 that PPG's sales surpassed the 1955 level and in that year they rose to an index of about 107. In 1963 our sales showed further improvement and moved up to an index of 122 and they continued at about that level during the first quarter of 1964. Needless to say, I am pleased with this development, but when it is observed that PPG increased its investment in gross fixed assets 114 percent and obtained an increase in sales of only 22 percent during the span of nearly 10 years, I cannot regard this improvement as completely satisfactory. In saying this, I am cognizant that during the same span of years, U.S. industrial production has gone up 33.6 percent and gross national product has increased 53 percent. It is quite evident to me that the improvement in PPG's sales made since 1962 is attributable largely to the tariff increase. I doubt that I could properly be accused of allowing my imagination to stray too far were I to speculate that if the 1962 tariff increase is terminated, it is likely that our sales will again drop below the 1955 level.

Fourth, you will note that PPG's sheet glass net income declined drastically after 1955, and that it reached its low point in 1958, dipping to an index of 20. Although 1958 was a recession year, from the viewpoint of total U.S. consumption as well as total shipments by U.S. producers, 1959 was a banner year. The fact remains, however, that in 1959 PPG's sheet glass net income reached an index of only 64.6, which still was more than 35 percent below PPG's 1955 net income. The chart also shows that our net income sharply declined again in 1960, 1961, and 1962 from what it was in 1959. It was not until 1963 that PPG's sheet glass net income started to rise again. During the first quarter of 1964 our sheet glass net income stands at approximately the same level as it did 7 years ago, in 1957. Even so, our net income is nearly 20 percent lower today than it was during the year 1955.

I submit that no clearer evidence could be offered to prove the fact that the June 17, 1962, increased rates of duty were vital to the domestic sheet glass industry. As I shall develop, those increased rates of duty were extremely helpful in enabling my company to achieve the modest improvement in the earnings picture I have just outlined.

In urging the Tariff Commission to reduce or terminate the increased rates of duty, the foreign producers point to the improvement in PPG's net income picture that has taken place within the past 15 months. To me, any argument based upon such a short period of time is simply unrealistic.

When this Commission found that the previous rates of duty had contributed in part to the increased quantities of imports into the United States so as to cause serious injury in the domestic industry, the Presidential proclamation made effective June 17, 1962, was obviously designed to remedy that cause of injury. It necessarily follows, therefore, that with all other factors being equal, the position of the domestic producers would thereafter improve. In a large sense, improvement was what the Presidential proclamation was designed to attain. Certainly the mere fact that PPG's sheet glass net earnings over the recent 15-month period have improved somewhat from the miserable position they were in during the previous 3 years does not justify the removal at this time of one of the principal causes of that improvement. I am referring, of course, to the 1962 tariff increase.

In my judgment, the fact that some improvement has been made in recent months is living proof of the wisdom underlying the Commission's findings in the escape clause matter and the relief which was instituted thereafter.

To go further, there is little doubt that the June 17, 1962, tariff relief was helpful in bringing about the recent improvement in our sheet glass earnings because that relief provided an economic setting for much-needed upward price adjustments.

Since 1960, we in PPG have had some extremely difficult decisions to make in the pricing of our sheet glass products. Throughout this period we have been on the horns of a dilemma whether, on the one hand, to try to recapture on the basis of price alone the large part of the U.S. market which we previously lost to the foreigners or, on the other hand, to try to get our economic house in order so that we would be in a position to compete effectively against the foreigners by improving our technology and developing more efficient production methods.

In resolving that dilemma, we first utilized a deep price reduction in the form of freight absorption as a competitive weapon in an attempt to recapture some of the lost domestic market. The results we experienced by that action proved to be nearly disastrous. The foreigners' instant retaliation made it abundantly clear that there was virtually no floor to their price levels, and in the spring and summer of 1960 they undercut the domestic prices by even greater amounts than had previously been the case. The Tariff Commission had this to say about prices in its Report to the President of May 17, 1961:

"The information in this investigation shows * * * that the sale of a large and growing volume of imported glass at prices significantly lower than prices for comparable domestic glass has seriously weakened the price structure in the U.S. market."

That, of course, does not tell the full story. In addition to our lack of success in recapturing the lost domestic business from the foreigners, the domestic industry suffered an aggregate net operating loss in 1960 equal to 1.3 percent of the aggregate net sales for the reporting companies. This fact also was reported by the Tariff Commission to the President on May 17, 1961 (Ibid, p. 36).

Accordingly, since that abortive experience, we realized that our principal hope for a succesful future lay in our ability to continue to introduce technological improvements and create operating efficiencies. And, this is what we have done and what we are continuing to strive to do. For example, since March 1962, when the late President Kennedy announced the tariff increase, my company has made capital expenditures for its domestic sheet glass manufacturing facilities in excess of $6 million. Because I do not wish to divulge confidential information that might aid our competitors, I shall not disclose on the record how we have spent that money. The Commision's staff, however, has been fully advised. Suffice it to say, the improvements which have resulted from those expenditures, as well as those made earlier, have increased the quality of our product and created improved operating efficiencies.

It is an economic fact of life that improvements and efficiencies of the kind I am talking about require the expenditure of large sums of money. In order to justify the expenditure of that kind of money, it is also an economic fact that the operations requiring such investments earn a competitively determined profit. Only by making money are we justified in continuing to reinvest in the sheet glass business.

At the time of the Presidential proclamation announcing a tariff increase in March 1962, PPG's net income position continued at approximately the same low level which it had obtained in 1960 and 1961. This is clearly reflected by PPG exhibit 3. Therefore, it was abundantly clear that PPG should attempt to solve its pricing dilemma by obtaining more money for its product. Only in this manner could the company stand to gain the necessary profits to develop better technology and more efficient production methods. Thereafter, on April 9, 1962, PPG increased its prices 5 percent on single, double, and heavy sheet thicknesses. However, this price action still left the company in a less favorable net income position than it was in prior to the time when it began absorbing freight in the spring of 1960. This is also borne out by PPG exhibit 3 where you will observe that PPG's 1962 net income increased only slightly over what it was in 1961, notwithstanding the fact that PPG's April 9, 1962, prices were in effect for nearly 9 months of 1962.

It was obvious to us in PPG that our net income picture did not reach a satisfactory level in 1962. Indeed, our studies showed that between 1960 and 1962 PPG's net realized price per unit (i.e., 50' SSE. box) increased 7.9 percent but our total costs and expenses per unit increased 9.1 percent. This amounted to a net deficit of 1.2 percent which occurred despite a substantial in-

crease in PPG's 1962 shipments. Although we had this information before us in early 1963, we were loath to attempt another price increase because we realized that such an increase might have the effect of diverting more business to the foreigners. However, in the summer of 1963 the foreign producers increased their prices. This gave us the opportunity to raise our prices and thereby provide a basis for an improved net income picture.

You will note from PPG exhibit 3 that even though our net income did improve in 1963, it was still approximately 30 percent below our 1955 level. Therefore, in March 1964 we increased our prices on single strength and thinner sheet glass and on "B" quality selected for silvering. For years our return on single strength and thinner sheet glass had been lower than the return we had obtained from our double strength and heavy sheet glass products and our price action of March 1964 endeavored to improve that situation. In addition, for some time we had been selecting "B" quality sheet glass for silvering without receiving any additional compensation for the added cost such double inspection entailed. Obviously this also required corrective action. Wtih the price changes I have referred to, PPG's net income in the first quarter of 1964 has shown additional improvement, but it is still 18 percent below the level we attained in 1955. We are hopeful that this 1964 price increase will assist us to come closer to the level that we achieved almost 10 years ago, in 1955.

Our recent price changes, whether viewed separately or collectively, were absolutely necessary in order for PPG to attain a healthy position in the highly competitive U.S. sheet glass market. I could speak at length about the economic justification we had for making these increases but I will merely refer to some of the more obvious ones. For example, in this connection you will recall table 8 which is appended to the Tariff Commission's Report to the President of September 27, 1963. Using the 1957–59 period as a base, this table depicts the domestic delivered prices to customers located in eight selected U.S. cities. We have brought that table up to date, and it shows that PPG's prices for single strength sheet glass delivered to factory buyers in those eight cities now stand at an index ranging from 104.8 (Miami) to 117.1 (Pittsburgh), or an average index of 111 for the eight cities. On the same basis, PPG's prices for double strength and heavy sheet have increased about 8 percent since the 1957–59 period.

It is interesting to contrast the price increases that I have just mentioned with some of our cost increases. For example, the total average hourly wages (including fringe benefits) paid by PPG to its sheet glass production and related workers increased 23 percent from 1957 to 1964. And, in the case of the five basic materials which comprise the batch in making sheet glass, PPG's costs for those materials have increased approximately 15 percent for that same period. With those substantial increases in labor and raw material costs, it is no wonder that we suffered the net deficit of 1.2 percent I referred to previously in comparing our 1962 sheet glass operations with those of 1960.

I could continue to talk about other aspects of cost, but if I were to do so, in a sense, I would be talking about individual trees rather than the forest. Cutting through this whole subject of price, the plain, simple fact of the matter is that our sheet glass operating results were dismal during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962 and it was mandatory that we take affirmative action in order to remedy this situation. Our first attempt at a solution involved a drastic price reduction and this method failed. Our second attempt involved getting our economic house in order by increasing our prices and introducing further improved operating methods.

Needless to say, our recent price increases, which were based upon an economic setting that was created in large part by the tariff increase of 1962, have contributed in a substantial manner to the improved operating results which we have recently attained. This is reflected by PPG exhibit 3.

CONCLUSION

We in PPG know that the cost advantage of the foreigners is still overwhelming. In view of this, we are continuing to make every effort to reduce the existing cost disparity by developing efficiencies and improving our technology.

As I have stated earlier, this means continued heavy investment on our part, but to warrant this kind of investment it is axiomatic that the investment earn a return commensurate with the risk. As PPG exhibit 3 certainly shows, we have not yet achieved that result. Therefore, we sincerely believe that the domestic industry needs to operate under the present tariff relief for an additional, reasonable period of time.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated, we earnestly request the Tariff Commission to advise the President of the United States that a consideration of all relevant economic factors respecting the sheet glass industry conclusively points to a continuation of the present rates of duty.

THE U.S. EXHIBIT AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most appropriate on this historic day in this Chamber for me, as an American and as the member of the New York congressional delegation in whose district the New York World's Fair is located, to raise my voice in defense of the exhibit of the U.S. Government at the fair.

Since this fair opened its doors to the public on April 22, I have heard and read a number of speeches presented by some of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives. As is so frequently the case, those who are satisfied and pleased with an exhibit or an issue, and proud of an accomplishment, will hold their tongues; but let there be the slightest difference of opinion or vague dissatisfaction, and we see the floodgates of criticism open wide.

As I analyze some of the unfavorable comments that have been made about the U.S. exhibit, I am struck by a certain thread of similarity running through them, in substance as well as in the terminology used. I hear it said that the exhibit is a national disgrace, that we have used the pavilion to downgrade America, that we should have advertised to the world that we are the greatest nation on earth and emphasized our accomplishments instead of identifying our aims.

Yet, is it not true that, great as our national achievements are, we still have a long way to go? Would we not be less than candid if we suggested that there is no unfinished business left to be done, no problems to be answered, and no aspects of our freedom yet to be resolved?

No doubt it was a realization of these facts which led John G. Rogers to write in the New York Herald Tribune that the "American exhibit—'The Challenge to Greatness'—is noteworthy because in an exposition replete with self-congratulation, it indulges in self-criticism and concedes openly that the United States still has hurdles to clear in such fields as civil rights and education."

I applaud the maturity of judgment displayed by a citizens' advisory committee which, early in 1962, was charged by the Secretary of Commerce to develop a theme and general concept for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair. This committee included among its members: Leonard Bernstein, composer-conductor; Dr. James M. Hester, president of New York University; C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc.; Paul M. Rudolph, head of department of architecture at Yale University; Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Corp.; and Sylvester L. Weaver, chairman of the board of McCann-Erickson Corp., International.

The committee's recommendations follow:

Within a World's Fair whose theme is "Man's Achievements in an Expanding Universe," there is a natural temptation, perhaps out of national pride, to offer up before the world a U.S. exhibit that reveals our socio-economic progress, displays the material rewards of our advanced technology, or hails our scientific and cultural achievements.

Yet it is this committee's belief that the very nature of the times requires a deeper reflection of the United States and a truer image of its free society. And we recommend that a Federal exhibit invite interest not merely in our progress, but in the challenges our progress holds up to us * * * not in our technology, but in the responsibilities our technology imposes upon us * * * not in our achievements but in the spirit which leads to our achievements.

Helping visitors to see and understand our challenges, our responsibilities, our dedication, would provide a more accurate and meaningful excursion into the character of a nation that serves as a model for freedom and bears the burden of proof that a democratic system succeeds.

We would have it known that our democracy does not assure progress and achievement—it merely offers the opportunity.

We would have it known that our democracy has problems—yet that same democracy demands of us that every wrong be righted, every ill combatted, every advantage given, every challenge met.

We would have it known that our democracy does not make us great—but does afford us the freedom to become great.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we suggest the Federal Government's exhibit in the World's Fair be created around the theme: "Challenge to Greatness."

We believe this theme allows the United States to show itself without boast to the world, and at the same time offer inspiration to its individual citizens.

Te recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee were accepted by President Kennedy who, in his message dated March 13, 1962, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, stated as follows:

The theme "Challenge to Greatness," proposed by a Citizens' Advisory Committee established by Secretary Hodges, will enable us

to present to the world not a boastful picture of our unparalleled progress, but a picture of democracy—its opportunities, its problems, its inspirations, and its freedoms.

During subsequent appropriation hearings both in the House and in the Senate, the Department of Commerce, which was assigned responsibility for Federal participation in the fair, stressed the fact that the basic theme proposed by the Citizens' Advisory Committee would form the basis for the Federal exhibit. Subsequently, in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1962, the Congress granted an appropriation of $17 million for this purpose. Thus, in the final analysis, the Congress itself gave its stamp of approval to the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

These recommendations are reflected in a truly imaginative manner in the exhibits which the Department of Commerce and, through it, the U.S. Commission for the New York World's Fair, created for the Federal Pavilion. I have seen this exhibit and I was proud of the fact that our Nation is humble enough to recognize its weaknesses and realize its responsibilities. At a time when so many of us evaluate greatness in terms of wealth, creature comforts, and destructive power to blow this universe to smithereens, it is refreshing to see our Federal Government emphasize the spirit and the human values which are truly the mark of greatness in a nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me take you, if I may, on an imaginary tour of the Federal Pavilion.

The fair visitor enters a 600-seat theater, where he views an introductory film entitled "Voyage to America." This film was produced and directed by John Houseman, cofounder with Orson Welles of the Mercury Theater; wartime Chief of the Overseas Radio Program Bureau in the Office of War Information; three-time Academy Award winner for "The Seven Lively Arts," in 1957, and "Playhouse 90," in 1958 and 1959; artistic director of the American Shakespeare Festival Theater in Stratford, Conn.; and artistic director of the Theater Group of the Adult Education Division of the University of California.

The musical score of the film was written by Virgil Thompson.

The film presents the great cultural legacy and heritage that 40 million immigrants contributed to America. It shows a story of motion and change and of greatness based on a migration that is unique in recorded history. It points out that aside from the American Indians, the rest of us—and this goes for every American who ever lived—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants. Starting with the Pilgrims who came to New England in search of religious freedom, and others—French, Germans, Swedes, Spanish, and Dutch—who founded settlements of their own, all hoping to find in the New World opportunities which the Old World had denied them, the film depicts the great waves of immigration: first the Irish, ravaged by famine, driven off their land, who came 4¼ million strong, to build our first chain of canals, railroads, the cities of the Middle West. From northern Europe, the English, Scotch and Welsh, the Scandinavians, Germans, Austrians and Swiss—15 million—seeking refuge in the New World, bringing with them their skills, education, and ways of life. From southern Europe, the Italians—6 millions; from impoverished countries of central and eastern Europe, Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians, Bohemians, Slovaks, Ruthenians—8 million; from the Balkans and Asia Minor, Greeks, Macedonians, Croatians, Albanians, Syrians and Armenians, came to work in the new land to which a $12 steerage ticket gave them entry. They helped to open what was left of the continent; they flowed as workers and consumers into the shops and mills and factories of the cities, the mines and logging camps and oilfields of the exploding West.

The film goes on to show that in times of crisis our doors are still open and newcomers continue to move in. The great migration is over; but this does not mean that the American journey is complete. To survive, we must face the challenges which are greater than other generations of Americans have faced in the past.

In pointing out that it is for us to extend the discoveries of the immigrants, whose past is our past, to continue their long and painful struggle for dignity and freedom, the film serves as an introduction to the next section of the exhibition.

As he emerges from the theater, the fairgoer enters an exhibition area entitled: "The Challenges: Today." Here an imaginative attempt is made to define and demonstrate through the use of three-dimensional objects some of the major challenges and issues which face the American people today. Divided into two major headings, "Challenges to Freedom" and "Challenges to Peace," the exhibits deal with such challenges as those of equal rights, democracy, learning, growth, social concern, creativity, discovery; and such international challenges as those of the free world, the population explosion, the developing nations, arms control, our world community, and the discovery of space.

Here are some of the exhibition items which were selected to portray these challenges:

Enlargements of letters to the President, some on permanent graphic display and others changed periodically, to symbolize the range of our system of self-government, from the citizen to the Chief Executive, and the opportunity for all Americans to exercise freedom of expression.

A programed audiovisual teaching and work station where young unskilled workers demonstrate how they may be upgraded through on-the-job vocational training; and three individual audiovisual electronic study booths which display the impact of technology on modern-day education.

A model expressing the sweeping scope of the Central Valley project of California to symbolize the challenge of growth in terms of greater utilization of our natural resources.

A life-sized design of a simulated blighted area, which not only points up the ugly side of some of our present day slum conditions, but includes an actual model of an urban redevelopment area in Philadelphia.

A large model of the human cardiovascular system and a display of new equipment and techniques and treatment of heart and circulatory diseases to illustrate both achievements in medicine, and to suggest the direction of future research.

An operating newsroom with three direct news printers and one photofax machine operated by the New York Times, which brings the world's news in words and pictures directly to the Federal pavilion and symbolizes our interdependence and the responsibilities of freemen throughout the world.

A fully equipped two-man submarine used for deep sea nutrition research, to show the challenge of food research and "aqua-culture"—farming the sea, which may become a source of food supply for the exploding populations of the world, virtually as important as agriculture.

A live presentation combined with audiovisual aids to tell the story of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the Alliance for Progress, as well as efforts by volunteer organizations and private business in assisting the development of underdeveloped countries.

Operating worldwide weather stations receiving signals directly from Tiros and other space objects, to illustrate the space program's contribution to vital areas of nonmilitary research.

A tracking system to detect, track, identify, and catalog all manmade objects orbiting our planet, be they giant satellites or slivers of metal no longer than a pencil. Employing an extensive network of radio operations, high frequency radio sensors, and cameras that can photograph space objects 20,000 miles away, it is manned by personnel of the North American Air Defense Command.

A symbolization of our challenge to secure equal rights for all and to show the Negro movement for equality. Placed in the context of similar historical U.S. drives of our past—in opportunity and in voting—this exhibit is intended to point out that such movements themselves are part of the rule of law in that they exercise both the right of petition and the right of assembly and that they are part of that democratic procedure by which men define justice, make laws, and agree to respect them.

It must be pointed out that at no time does the Federal Government attempt to propagandize or to recommend specific solutions to the burning issues with which it comes to grips in the exhibit. It merely points out that the problems exist and makes you aware that they represent major challenges which this generation of Americans must face and, in one form or another, attempt to solve.

The entire upper level of the Federal pavilion is devoted to a mechanized ride entitled "The Challenges: Tomorrow." This is a unique experience that no one should miss. Visitors enter specially de-

signed moving grandstands, carrying 55 persons apiece, to take a journey through a series of motion and still picture experiences. Produced by Cinerama, based on a script by Ray Bradbury, and using 130 screens and audio devices, this exhibit is intended to demonstrate that our past, characterized by ingenuity and restlessness and a yearning for self-realization has been merely prolog for the next phase of our journey; that these human qualities, nourished by our system of freedom and individual liberty, are the link between our explorers, patriots, inventors, artists, astronauts, and other heroes, and that the wilderness of the universe challenges Americans of this generation and future generations in the same way that the wilderness of the sea, the land, and the air have challenged American pioneers throughout our history.

My enthusiasm for this Cinerama production is shared by some of our well-known news writers. John G. Rogers, of the New York Herald Tribune, in a feature story entitled "A Hit Is Born at the World's Fair: American History at U.S. Pavilion," called it "the latest wonder to be unveiled at this World's Fair already replete with wonders," and refers to visitors emerging from the pavilion as "buzzing enthusiastically about 'the American journey.'"

And Bosley Crowther, writing for the New York Times, acclaims this ride through the centuries of American history as "the ultimate eye and ear excitement that the U.S. Pavilion provides in its 'Challenge to Greatness' exhibit," and quotes a viewer as saying, "There's nothing else like it at the fair."

Returning to the lower level, the fair-goer enters a special exhibit, sponsored by the American Library Association, entitled "Library USA: The Challenge of Information." Staffed with professional librarians, this area contains a modern computer information center, where visitors receive answers to any query that may be related to a subject matter viewed in the Federal Pavilion. A delightful children's area is also included.

This library exhibit is symbolic of the continuing challenge to increase each person's free access to sources of information and has found great popular appeal.

Mr. Speaker, obviously an exhibit which endeavors to deal forcefully with one of the great, unsettled issues of our time cannot be expected to meet with universal approval. But I would venture a guess that the favorable comments far exceed the critical ones.

In view of the fact that the fair is in my district I feel I have the responsibility to set the record straight, and to dispel any misconceptions about the Federal exhibit. I hope I have done so, and I would like to invite you all to come to the fair and see for yourselves just how wonderful it really is.

I have been particularly impressed with an article which appeared on May 20 in Ralph McGill's syndicated column in the Atlanta Constitution and other newspapers under the title of "A World's Fair Show Worth Seeing." Mr. McGill describes the Federal exhibit in some detail, and with permission I wish to extend my remarks to include his article, printed in its entirety. Perhaps it will shed some light on what this exhibit is all about, and will be instructive to those who have been misled by criticism couched in the vaguest of terms.

May I close by pointing to the last paragraph of Mr. McGill's column, which extols our U.S. pavilion as follows:

One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting 3-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe. But for Americans, the show in the Federal building is the one not to miss.

The full column by Ralph McGill follows:

AMERICA'S ITINERANT CAMERAMEN—A WORLD'S FAIR SHOW WORTH SEEING

NEW YORK.—Semidarkness came with the pressing of a button. The first half of the Federal building's show here at the New York World's Fair came on the screen, with the picturing of the people who constitute the world power we call America.

There were the beginnings shown in pen and ink sketches by artists of the time, portraying the small ships that came, the first settlements, the Indians, the men in armor, those in lace and pantaloons, and the slave ships.

The journeys were hard and dangerous. One of every three of those who started died on the way. One half of those who came were in some condition of servitude. Thousands were indentured servants, apprentices, or laborers, all bound to a master for a period of years. And, of course, some were slaves.

THE TIDE

There followed a series of old photographs. The immigrant tide were some 40 million persons—the Irish, Germans, Jews from many lands; Poles, Italians, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Ukrainians; Scandinavians, Bohemians, Rumanians, Croats, Serbs, and Bulgars. They came from many lands to join the first adventurers from England, France, and Spain.

For an absorbing while there flashed on the screen a long series of these old photographs. Here and there one heard an indrawn breath, a whispered comment, but mostly there was a tribute of silence. An audience of affluent Americans, able to attend the World's Fair were stilled by these pictures of their ancestors. These early products of the camera's art are magnificent and moving. The subjects are stiffly posed. They stand before sod-roofed houses in the Dakotas; they sit in groups on the decks of immigrant ships, the women shawled, their skirts gathered about their feet.

AMERICA AT WORK

There are pictures of men, women, and children before lonely cabins. Irish labor crews, digging the canals and tunnels, posed for some of these pictures, as did those immigrants who built the rail lines westward. There are pictures of Italians at labor, of men before coal mine pits, and of small boys, their faces and clothing dark with coal dust grime.

There is an occasional picture of men with heroic mustaches, sitting with beer mugs before them in some saloon. But mostly the pictures are of men and women at work building America, ripping its raw materials from the earth, laying steel westward, cutting down trees, putting the plow to the prairies, killing the buffalo wantonly and without reason.

The pictures are stark, with the austerity and hardship of the time. The faces of women look out, some young and pretty and dressed in the frilled blouses and long skirts; others, wrinkled and old at 35 from hard work and the bearing of children. The men peer at us, wearing mustaches and beards. There are dandies in tight trousers and derbies. There are others in patched and shapeless trousers, workers in mines and steel mills and of laborers digging ditches and canals.

MOBILE THEATER

Many of those who daily and nightly sit through these showings have pictures at home of grandfathers and grandmothers, perhaps daguerreotypes of immigrant grandparents like those shown on the screen.

Once this show is over the crowds move to a mobile seating arrangement. It moves in semidarkness, travelling a slow circular route. On each side and ahead, pictures of America flash on screens. The history of development from the first sea crossing to the time men are orbiting the earth and preparing to go to the moon appear on multiple screens. In the ears of those seated in the traveling theater is the story of it.

There is not much talk among those who come out. They are moved and humbled. America was not always so affluent, with pockets of poverty hidden in mountains and slums of large cities. The shining towers of the fair testify to what man has created, but not too long ago his creations were sod and log huts and implements pounded out on anvils by men called blacksmiths.

One can go to the Illinois exhibit and see a Disney-created Abraham Lincoln rise from his chair and talk about liberty and justice. Or one may go to the Johnson Co. building and see an enchanting three-dimensional film on the freedom and spirit of children over all parts of the globe.

But for Americans, the show in the Federal Building is the one not to miss.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. JOE W. KELLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Joe W. Kelly, commander of the Air Force's Military Air Transport Service, will retire July 18 after nearly 36 years of service. I say this with a feeling of sadness because General Kelly is a friend of many years standing, a dedicated public servant, a fine military officer and leader who will leave a lasting mark of his many achievements in the Air Force. For about 5 years, as you will recall, General Kelly was in charge of the Air Force Legislative Liaison Office. In this capacity he gained a wide acquaintance and many friends on Capitol Hill for his hard work, his unfailing courtesies, his sure touch, and his commonsense.

My regard for General Kelly not only is personal; in a professional capacity he has appeared before our committee from time to time and briefed us on developments in the Military Air Transport Service, usually called MATS, which is his present and last military command. The Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has studied military airlift problems, including procurement of civil airlift for the military, extensively; and I agree with Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert that General Kelly is

our "top expert on airlift." The loss of his services to the Air Force and to the country will be a heavy one.

General Kelly, now 54, took command of MATS on June 1, 1960, as a lieutenant general. Under his direction, and in accord with the recommendations made by our Subcommittee and Mr. Rivers' Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the command has been rapidly replacing obsolescent aircraft with a modern jet and turboprop airlift force.

If I may be pardoned a note of reminiscence—and I could recall many interesting incidents of our long association—General Kelly personally put MATS into the jet age in 1961 when he piloted the first jet transport assigned to MATS from the Boeing factory at Renton, Wash., to Eastern Transport Air Force Headquarters at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. I was standing on the field when General Kelly put the great jet plane down in a perfect landing, moved her to the assigned place, opened the plane door, and came down the ramp to say hello and shake hands with those of us who were there. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was there; also the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who serves on my subcommittee; and other members and staff who follow closely the MATS operation were in the group which welcomed General Kelly.

I might say that General Kelly's continuing development of the global airlift force won him a fourth star on June 6, 1963.

Airlift, as Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has said publicly, is an "essential instrument of national policy"; and MATS, as a major airlift arm of our national defense, must have the ability for quick and ready response by deploying American strike forces, as required, to any trouble spot in the world.

Outstanding examples of the Armed Forces' new dimension of mobility provided by MATS include the 118,000 hours flown by MATS during the buildup of forces in the 1962 Cuban crisis, and the deployment in 63 hours of the troops of an entire armored division—plus nearly a million pounds of equipment—from the United States to Germany in 1963 in Exercise Big Lift.

There is also a great humanitarian function that MATS performs, aiding areas stricken by drought and pestilence and flood and other ravages of nature. One of General Kelly's first tasks as MATS commander was the operation in 1960 of a massive mercy airlift to earthquake victims in Chile, where he had served 20 years earlier as a member of the U.S. military mission.

Under the MATS global command and control system, General Kelly is enabled to give direction to the entire airlift force—including the 70 MATS aircraft that are always en route somewhere at any hour of the day or night—and divert them immediately to meet any sudden and new requirement placed on MATS by defense authorities.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara reported to Congress recently that the Nation's military airlift capability had been increased by 75 percent over the past 3 years, and that capability still is being increased. The next addition to MATS' airlift force will come this fall with the assignment of the Lockheed C–141 Starlifter, the first jet transport ever designed specifically for troop and cargo operations. The Starlifter also was designed to meet commercial requirements, and orders for commercial versions of the aircraft already have been placed.

MATS modernization, under General Kelly's supervision, is an outgrowth of a recommendation which our committee made in a report to the Congress which we presented in 1958. And closely related to MATS modernization is the continuing orientation of the MATS airlift force to hard-core military missions. It was our general contention that MATS should not be a miscellany of obsolete aircraft competing with civil carriers. We said that rather than run a civil-type airline, MATS should acquire new, modern equipment and direct its activities to military missions which could not be readily performed by commercial carriers. Aircrew training for these military missions requires every crew to achieve a maximum of aircraft capability, including airdrop and assault landing of combat troops and equipment.

As executive agent for the Air Force single manager of military airlift, MATS handles contracts for about $200 million a year in commercial airlift augmentation. This is an important part of MATS work. Our committee was instrumental in encouraging the Defense Department and the Air Force to stabilize the civil airlift augmentation, so that there would be better working relationships between the military and the airline industry, longer term contracts, fair and economical pricing without cutthroat competition, and the buildup of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

The conduct of this commercial procurement, under the policies we recommended, has encouraged modernization of commercial air cargo operations. It also has resulted in new, more efficient procedures for activating the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, the organization of the commercial carriers doing business with MATS that would back up the military airlift force in various levels of emergencies.

There have been, and will continue to be some difficult problems of procurement of civil augmentation airlift. Our committee always has contended for broad participation by qualified carriers, with due regard to the needs of small business carriers and the all-cargo carriers, all of whom are struggling to survive in an environment of extensive Government regulation and competition from the large and more prosperous carriers.

I know that General Kelly always has been fair and square in his methods of doing business with the carriers, and I trust that his successor, who will be Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., will carry on in the same vein. It should be understood, of course, that the broad procurement policies are set at higher levels than the MATS command, although the command has the specific responsibility for purchase decisions and for allocating the procurement dollars to the various carriers.

The professionalism demonstrated by MATS under General Kelly's command has been widely recognized. Just this year the command was named outstanding in the Air Force for its flying safety record, its ground vehicle safety record, and its aircraft maintenance record.

Last year General Kelly accepted for MATS the Brig. Gen. Nelson S. Talbott trophy for procurement management efficiency, the first time the trophy had been won by a major air command. His command was cited by the American Public Relations Association in 1960 for having the best military public relations program in the Nation.

General Kelly's duties as MATS commander take him on many military exercise and inspection trips. Since he took command of MATS he has flown more than a half million miles visiting and supervising MATS operations in the United States, the Far East, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Antarctica. He has logged more than 10,000 hours—more than a calendar year in the air—since he entered flying school in 1932.

General Kelly was born in Waverly, Ind., on January 19, 1910. He attended DePauw University at Greencastle, Ind., for 1 year before entering the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., from which he was graduated in 1932.

He served as a pursuit pilot, an air mail pilot, and a flying instructor. During World War II he led a 9th Air Force B–26 bomber unit to the most outstanding record in the European theater.

He later served as director of aviation at West Point, commanded Strategic Air Command bomber units for more than 5 years, and won an Oak Leaf Cluster to his Distinguished Service Medal for his 5 years as director of legislative liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force.

His other decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with nine Oak Leaf Clusters, the Belgian and French Croix de Guerre, the British Distinguished Service Order, the Chilean Legion of Merit, and the Army Commendation Ribbon among others.

General Kelly and his wife, the former Virginia Johnson, of Paxton, Ill., have three children.

To my friend, General Kelly, and to his family, I extend my best wishes and express my great regard and affection.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of May several Members of this body introduced legislation to provide public works and eco-

nomic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Hearings were held on the bills, H.R. 11065 and H.R. 11066, known as the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964, by an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Appalachian Regional Development of the House Committee on Public Works. During these many days of hearings it became evident that the bill had extremely serious defects in legislative drafting and coordination with other existing Federal programs.

I would like to make some remarks today generally on the entire bill with some specific comments on the agricultural programs of the legislation. There are a number of aspects of the pasture improvement section which deserve special attention, but first it would be best to look at the entire bill.

In questioning the many witnesses on the two identical bills concern was evident over some of the questionable provisions such as:

First. Open-end spending authorizations.

Second. Duplication of existing programs and services.

Third. Discrimination against the rest of the Nation by establishing a regional approach.

Fourth. Estimated costs that range from $4 to $24 billion for the entire program.

Fifth. Absolute veto and therefore Federal control of all plans and projects by the Federal member of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Sixth. Back-door spending provisions which would allow upward of $550 million to be spent by such provisions.

Seventh. Nine-hundred and twenty million dollars for a 5-year development highway program.

Eighth. Lack of annual congressional review of the programs and projects.

Ninth. Two hundred and twenty-seven million dollars in 1965 spending would balloon into billions in later years.

Tenth. The accelerated public works program to meet unemployment with expenditures ranging to $960 million has been a failure.

I see no reason for the Federal Government, acting on behalf of 50 States and 180 million citizens, to give preferential treatment to one section of this Nation when there are other areas such as northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Utah which suffer from equally high levels of economic depression from closing of mines. Some people seem to have forgotten that West Virginia, a State which I am sure everyone would concede is a typical part of the region, has a higher percentage of homeownership, automobile ownership, and washing machine—unnecessary item—ownership than the national average. The proponents of this bill, who cite $3,000 per annum as being the cutoff point between poverty and nonpoverty, seem to forget that the maximum amount one can receive without being penalized for earning other moneys under the social security system is approximately $1,890 per annum. Is not this a form of government-instituted poverty?

Now let us turn to the agricultural aspects of the bill.

Section 203 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to assist in the improvement and development of pastureland for livestock in the region. Grants to any person under this particular section of the bill shall not exceed 80 percent of the costs of improving and developing 25 acres of pastureland utilized by such person. It is not clear as to whether this 25 acres are limited to a family, farm unit, or individual. If it is limited to an individual, then a farmer with 12 children in the family, could receive assistance for 300 acres. If it is assistance per farm unit, then the landowners could receive unlimited assistance if they owned a number of farms.

The Department of Agriculture reported that the importation of beef into this country was the highest on record in 1963, yet at the same time we are holding some land out of beef production in this country and also at the same time we are spending Federal funds for the stocking of surplus American beef. Now the farmers in the rest of this Nation are being discouraged from making any increases in the production of beef, supposedly because of the decrease in the average price per head for beef on the market, but yet the farmer in Appalachia is being encouraged to do so. This is incredibly inconsistent.

Now, some production—if limited to farm-produced-and-consumed foods—might be justified in terms of welfare and/or relief. But the program appears to be intended to provide cash incomes to potential producers, and it would only provide for the subsidization of livestock production on an uneconomic basis. Surely considering the technological problems now taken into account, the production of beef by the beef producers of the Nation, a 25-acre improvement per farm is unsound, uneconomically feasible, and actually of very little benefit to the farmer. Facts given to us by the Department of Agriculture already indicate that the beef industry now is in an unsatisfactory position as to prices and income. This is a direct consequence of Federal-aid programs intended to improve prices and incomes for grain producers, of a rapid increase in red-meat imports into the United States in the past decade, and of a bulge in beef production. Actually, the grants provided by this section would be a very substantial capital subsidy to competitors of the existing livestock industries.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a prepared statement filed with the ad hoc subcommittee, stated the best probable solution to the agricultural programs in Appalachia when they stated:

> If any assistance is warranted, especially in Appalachia, it should be by increased programs within the framework of the existing agricultural conservation payments programs, or—at most—by loans where funds are not otherwise obtainable and not by grants * * *. Section 203(a) provisions constitute an inequitable, unduly favored treatment not available to farmers who develop and improve pastures outside Appalachia.

Farmers in the Midwest keep asking me, "Why do farmers get special treatment in Appalachia? We are having it rough out here too." What can an adequate answer be? The only adequate answer can be that there is something involved here other than fighting poverty with the single purpose of eliminating poverty.

The passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act as presently written would only create an agency which would use in its administrative functions funds which could be going to aid the proverty-stricken of this Nation through other programs. Let's not establish another bureau to conduct programs which are already in existence. Instead let us aid all of the people of this Nation through sound programs to help themselves. The proper role of the Fedreal Government in this area should be to promote the general welfare, not to provide for it.

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. CRAMER. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the July issue of the New Guard, magazine of the Young Americans for Freedom, is a thought-provoking article by the president of the Young Republican National Federation, by D. E. (Buz) Lukens, on the subject, "The 1964 Republican Platform."

I include the article in the RECORD and commend it to the Members of the House—at least on the Republican side—and to the platform drafting committee for its consideration:

THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM—WHAT DO WE REALLY BELIEVE? NO MORE SHOPPING LISTS

(By D. E. (Buz) Lukens)

Besides nominating its standard-bearer in the fall presidential election, the Republican National Convention meeting in San Francisco this month has an equally grave responsibility. For the party must once again determine its policies in broad areas of political controversy, in a manner not only appealing to the American voter, but in a greater sense defining the positions upon which Republican candidates on all levels can stand.

Its importance, then, is in direct proportion to the importance of the continuation of the two-party system in the United States. While the GOP has for many years been a minority party, the principles for which it stands are in no sense held only by a minority of the American people.

The dedicated Republicans who have the primary responsibility for drafting the party's platform are the members of the committee on resolutions, headed by the respected Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin. The document they present to the convention, when adopted, will theoretically represent official party policy, rightly or wrongly, on all major issues from agriculture to statehood for Puerto Rico for the 1964 election and for the next 4 years.

PARTY GOSPEL

I believe that the platforms as we have come to know them in the past have had certain weaknesses, not the least of which is an undue lengthiness. Therefore, I don't believe I would be making an unpopular statement if I say that cutting down the platform for 1964 ought to be one of the primary considerations of the committee on resolutions. Such a concise document could, I believe, become a much more effective instrument of Republican policy than those voluminous booklets adopted in 1952, 1956, and 1960.

Delegates to the past few national conventions have been frankly bored by the singsong recital of thousands of words making up the proposed platform, read by the committee chairman. Not only are they impatient with the lengthy reading of the document, but they are naturally looking forward to the exciting balloting for the presidential and vice-presidential nominees. More importantly, a wordy platform tends to be subject to varying degrees of interpretation by GOP leaders, and leads to party schism rather than party unity. The platform is also subject to continuing interpretation and misinterpretation in the years following the election. At times, the party finds itself in the embarrassing position of attempting to live up to a 2-, 3-, or 4-year-old platform encompassing obsolete issues and failing to cover newer, more vital ones.

BACK TO PRINCIPLE

We are in this situation now. Though the 1960 platform was necessarily geared to the administration of President Eisenhower and the record and views of Vice President Nixon, it is now being cited as party gospel by some. Yet, Republicans have been given a far better guide in the 1962 declaration of Republican principle and policy, subscribed to by leading Republicans of almost every political viewpoint within the party.

Try to imagine a statement of policy which would satisfy men with admittedly divergent views such as Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont; Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah; Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York; Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas; Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., of New Jersey; and Representative JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa, to name a few. Yet those very Republicans endorsed the declaration of Republican principle and policy in June 1962.

This statement is more universal and acceptable than an election year platform. For few if any Republican leaders could quarrel with the five basic beliefs as espoused in this document: viz, individual liberty, limited government, diffusion of power, government with a heart, and government with a head.

POCKET-SIZE PLATFORM

The trend toward such concise statements of Republican belief is also seen in the platform adopted by the Young Republican National Federation, June 1963, here in San Francisco. The YRNF statement of principle fits on a 4-page insert the size of a business card. The Young Republicans, impatient with long windedness found too often in their elders, say that the statement is "a responsible guide for progress through individual freedom and liberty."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S home State of Arizona has long employed the brief statement of principles as its party platform. Republicans in Arizona, who find they must represent the naturally divergent views of those who have settled in Arizona from all geographical segments of the Nation, say that a consensus can be reached in such a set of principles, rather than a potpourri of policy stands on every issue from agriculture to county sewage systems. Arizona's 1-page declaration of principles has been endorsed by every Republican State convention since it was first introduced in 1956.

What, then, should a national platform have as its first aim? I believe that our party's platform must seek to serve as an inspiration to Republicans, and as an affirmation of unchanging principles so that the voters will understand just why there should be a Republican Party.

I also believe most fervently that such a platform, if drafted by the committee and presented to the convention, will cause a stampede of approval—not a unanimous "ho-hum."

For those who will undoubtedly argue that such a platform would fail to provide the 1964 voter with definitive stands on important national issues, let me say this: It is highly unlikely that the average, busy American will read another long-winded platform such as was adopted in 1960. He will look instead to the presidential candidate, and the Republicans running for State and national offices to spell out the party's positions—and the clear-cut alternatives to the nonpolicies of L.B.J.

GENERAL TO SPECIFIC

The question will also be raised as to the possibility that not every Republican officeholder could stand on such a platform. Yet I find it difficult to understand why any Republican, in or out of office, would refuse to subscribe to such a basic tenet of Republican belief as, for example, the principle of God-given dignity of the individual and the duty of the Government to serve that individual—not vice versa.

The important consideration is this: that once a set of general principles has been established and agreed upon, specific applications of those principles should be easily translatable into public policies. It is my feeling that the 1964 Republican platform should include some basic tenets included in the 1962 declaration of principle:

"We believe in the individual's right and capacity to govern himself without the restraints of dictatorship or paternalism.

"We believe that Government should do for the people only the things they cannot do for themselves.

"We believe that the Federal Government should act only when the people are not adequately served by State or local governments.

"We believe that Government must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help assure that no one is denied the requisites for a life of dignity.

"We believe that * * * the future will be built by those who work for it—not by those who only promise it."

From those inspiring principles Republicans can reason to more specific positions on major national issues. Not a discussion of whether to support or oppose a Senate or House bill constructing 80,000 hospital beds in the northeastern United States.

Foreign policy is an area where Republicans have an opportunity and a responsibility to expose Democratic blunders throughout the world. But, not, I suggest, in the form of long lists of charges and counterproposals written into a party platform. In foreign policy, more than any other field, events are susceptible to change daily. By stating broad principles rather than proposing specific solutions to specific problems, the Republican Party will be free to respond to Democratic mishaps as they occur.

Our foreign policy plank should be specific enough, however, so that Americans will understand just how important Republicans do regard the matter of foreign diplomacy. In short, I believe we should take a straightforward, fundamental approach to this subject.

Republicans do not merely dispute the administration's handling of crisis after crisis around the world. We should insist that the United States assume its traditional role as the responsible and mighty leader of the free world, and then outline the obligations of such leadership. For without doubt, the Johnson administration has been steadily denying the free world the real leadership it expects, causing retreat after retreat and loss after loss to place all freedom everywhere in jeopardy.

The Republican platform must point out the disintegration our free world alliance system, especially NATO, and propose immediate steps to restore the confidence of our allies, perhaps by limiting U.S. bilateral negotiation with the Soviet Union and assuring our allies that we will consult with them prior to major foreign policy decisions. It is no secret that the one-sided decision to scrap the Skybolt weapon system irked the British, and that all free world allies were miffed by our abrupt announcement of the establishment of a "hotline" from Washington to Moscow.

The party must point to the objectives for which the United Nations was meant to serve. The platform should cite the many instances wherein U.N. action has strayed from its ideal—as embodied in its own charter. It should propose resolution of unnecessary burdens now falling on the U.N., and demonstrate the real opportunity which exists for the U.N. to be used as an effective instrument of American foreign policy. The platform should make it clear, I believe, with no "ifs, ands or buts" that the term "peace-loving" nations which appears in the U.N. charter does not apply to Red China. In short, the platform is no place for wishy-washy, utopian thinking. In the year of decision—1964—it is appropriate for the Republican platform to state unequivocally: "Red China must not be admitted to the United Nations," and "The administration has allowed NATO to drift into disarray."

BE POSITIVE

Rather than argue over the pros and cons of tariffs and world trade, and in attempting to accommodate all views, wind up by saying nothing, I propose that the platform committee take a more positive stand on the subject of trade:

"The best way to achieve a favorable position in world trade is to increase our own ability to compete and to build better production into the free enterprise system."

From that general premise GOP candidates on all levels can argue the issue as it affects their own States and communities. They should point out the policies of the Democratic administration which militate against jobs for American workers and expansion for American business. The platform plank on this issue should be an "issue umbrella" under which Republicans can meet, consult, and then sally forth to do battle against the Democrats.

CALL TO LEADERSHIP

Again, in the issue of concerted action against past and current Communist drives in Latin America, the platform should contain a strong plank not only charging the administration with the failures of present policies, but declaring for once that America will provide the leadership necessary for other, smaller nations to follow in forestalling Communist aggression in the Caribbean and throughout Latin America.

Republicans have an important issue in the misuse of foreign economic aid. But the platform should affirm the necessity of foreign military aid in the overall mutual security program, and then cite the abuse of American dollars in the foreign aid program by the Johnson administration. It is a fact that economic aid has reached a low point in futility in which it is being used by the Democrats as a bribe to our enemies rather than a boost for our friends. The Republican Party historically has called for more cautious use

of such economic aid, and the 1964 platform should take a positive turn by calling upon other free nations who are economically capable to share this burden. True to its roots in free enterprise, the party should encourage expansion of private investment abroad, as a means of helping developing nations, rather than continuing to depend on U.S. handouts. And, most important, the platform must condemn aid to Communist nations.

In 1960, nearly everyone recalls the Democratic war cry about the alleged missile gap, which proved to be a hoax. It was charged that the Eisenhower administration had allowed American prestige abroad to sink to a new low. Today I believe the party platform must stress the steady trend toward unilateral disarmament which now passes for a defense policy. Important planks should include mentions of the administration's abandonment of our balanced defensive deterrent; their cancellation of manned bomber systems without introducing new strategic weapons systems; their concentration on "moon-doggling" while ignoring the military and strategic implications of inner space; and their failure in the vital area of research and development.

The Republican Party has a golden opportunity to put the issue squarely before the voters: A pledge that a Republican administration will do everything possible to provide the American people with a modern and adequate defense organization. "Peace through strength" should be the slogan of Republican defense policies.

CLEAR-CUT CHOICE

Domestically, the key to the party's platform should emphasize the differences between Republican and Democratic approaches to economy. The Johnson administration feels that only the Federal Government's experts know how to spend America's earnings wisely. Much is said about growth rates and gross national product. And what has been the result? Recession, followed by an unusually slow recovery, the highest unemployment rate since the thirties, and the greatest number of business failures in 25 years.

The Republican view has nearly always formed a perfect contrast to this tax and spend, spend and tax, policy. Republicans believe that government should encourage economic growth through creation of a favorable environment for fuller employment, higher production, and steadier prices. Our party feels that free enterprise can and will continue to make America grow while providing more jobs for the ever-increasing labor market. The Federal counterparts to this healthy business growth are a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, and a stable dollar.

This position is best expressed by standing firm for limited government and for individual responsibility. This means arguing against continued concentration of power and authority in Washington, as former President Eisenhower has so often done, and against regimentation of the population by Federal planners in Washington.

In the vital area of civil rights, the Republican Party's traditional stand can well be drawn into the 1964 platform in the form of a principle, rather than a lengthy piece of legislation. We should favor, for example, ways of redressing grievances which would preclude herding people into the streets. We should call for vigorous enforcement of the right to vote, to equal treatment before the law, to hold property, and to the protection of contracts—rights all guaranteed by existing laws. We should demand more detailed investigations of fraud at the polls, since the right to vote is denied just as easily by fraud as by physical exclusion from the voting booth.

THREE CHEERS

In summing up, let me say that besides avoiding longevity and the tendency to be too specific, the 1964 platform should not be a mere shopping list for the voters, wherein they are invited to compare the promises of both parties and choose the one which gives them more.

A punchy, hard-hitting, and enthusiastically presented platform can provide the Republican Party and its standard bearers with undreamed-of inspiration and drive during the 1964 election. But it must be brief, and it must contain a preamble spelling out just what Republicans really believe.

But allow me to make one suggestion. They could not do better than what was adopted in 1963 by the Young Republican National Convention, here in San Francisco:

"We are the custodians of a deep and abiding political, moral, and economic philosophy, which can best be summed up in the words 'individual freedom,' freedom must be fought for and won by every generation. We pledge to this fight our time, our energy, our resources, and ourselves until victory for freedom at home and abroad is achieved."

THE DECLARATION OF REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLE AND POLICY (JUNE 1962)

We believe in the individual's right and capacity to govern himself—to set his own goals—to make his way to them without the restraints of dictatorship or paternalism.

We believe that government should do for the people only the things they cannot do for themselves.

We believe that the Federal Government should act only when the people are not adequately served by State or local governments.

We believe that government must act to help establish conditions of equal opportunity for all people and to help assure that no one is denied the requisities for a life of dignity.

We believe that government must prudently weigh needs against resources, put first things first, rigorously tailor means to ends, and understand the differences between words and deeds. The future will be built by those who work for it—not by those who only promise it.

Republicans understand the workings of a free competitive economy. The present administration does not. We hold that American labor, business, industry, science, and agriculture get the jobs done, pay the wages, and create the rising standard of living.

Republicans believe that this Nation which has, under God, proclaimed liberty throughout the land, must now dedicate its strength to proclaiming freedom throughout the world.

In foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence. There can be no real peace short of it.

An active strategy aimed at victory does not increase the risk of nuclear war. Weakness and irresolution on the part of the United States—which could lead the Communists to underestimate the intensity of the devotion of free men to their freedom—are more likely to bring the world to hot war than are strength and firmness.

Republicans demand high-powered deeds, not high sounding words. We want and expect the cause of freedom to win.

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. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. DORN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAGEN of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. BRADEMAS

Mr. SICKLES.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7152. An act to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations; to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 321, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 321, the House adjourned until Monday, July 20, 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:

2257. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting a special report on U.S. participation in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, by the Board of Governors of the Bank at its fifth annual meeting in April 1964 at Panama City, Panama (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

2258. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting 25 reports covering 37 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 3679(1)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2259. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2260. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relating to overcharges for aircraft products liability insurance under various contracts awarded to Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., East Hartford, Conn., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2261. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to clarify the responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2262. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the relative cost of shipbuilding in the various coastal districts of the United States, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2263. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2264. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained therein was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9070. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 795. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 799. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3873, a bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10777. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8068. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of free transportation to guides or seeing-eye dogs accompanying totally blind persons; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9995. A bill to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to allow credit to certain members of the U.S. Secret Service Division for periods of prior police service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9752. A bill to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11622. A bill to permit the vessel U.S.S. *Alabama* to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 801. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6793, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. 11893. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 11894. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 11895. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 11896. A bill to provide for a national referendum with respect to the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 11897. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11898. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 11899. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of parts designed for use or chiefly used in agricultural or horticultural implements or in tractors suitable for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11900. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that stock and securities may be treated as replacement property for real property held for use in farming which is condemned by the United States in connection with the construction or enlargement of a reservoir; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 11901. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make the robbery of a cooperative bank which is a member of a Federal home loan bank a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 11902. A bill to provide assistance for students in higher education by increasing the amount authorized for loans under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 11903. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11904. A bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11905. A bill to provide Federal assistance for faculty exchange programs of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11906. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to

combat poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11907. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11908. A bill to establish the position of U.S. customs inspector (nonsupervisory) in the Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, to place such position in grade 10 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11909. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal building in Queens County, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11910. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Narcotics Division in order to improve the enforcement of the narcotics and other antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11911. A bill to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of certain organizations for the credit of a person's account, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 11912. A bill to authorize the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies of coins are available; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 11913. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11914. A bill to amend section 1202(a) of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 and the first section of the act of August 6, 1958, to delete, now that the additional House Office Building is nearly complete, their superfluous authority for the acquisition of real property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 11916. A bill to provide for a national referendum on the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11917. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 11918. A bill to prohibit profiteering in the initial distribution of U.S. coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11919. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11920. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to provide judicial review of certain determinations of the Tariff Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11921. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11922. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 11924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on table tennis balls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11925. A bill to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 11926. A bill defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 11927. A bill to prevent the Federal courts exercising jurisdiction in cases involving apportionment or reapportionment of the legislature of any State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11928. A bill to allow the State of Texas to use certain funds for the improvement of National Guard armories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.J. Res. 1107. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the apportionment of districts from which members of a State legislature are to be elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 1112. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 1113. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 11 of each year as German-American Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 800. Resolution authorizing expenditures incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures to be paid from the contingent fund of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11929. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 11930. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Engle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11931. A bill for the relief of Luigi Renzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11932. A bill for the relief of Gregoire Karalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11933. A bill for the relief of Constantin Papagiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 11934. A bill for the relief of Nasralla Aziz Barber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Turner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11936. A bill for the relief of Claire A. Zarur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 11937. A bill for the relief of Elda Bertolotti Lazzarone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hala Landa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11939. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jetta Barfod Greer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11940. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kanelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11941. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ibrahim Faruk Sarac, his wife, Fatma Nukhet Sarac, and their two daughters, Ayes Hulya Sarac and Fatma Nil Sarac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11942. A bill for the relief of Capt. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 11943. A bill for the relief of Miss Catherine Cariotaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:
H.R. 11944. A bill for the relief of Joao Pereira Morais and Maria da Gloria Morais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. BOB WILSON:
H.R. 11945. A bill for the relief of Jose DaSilva Da Luz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

951. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate legislation calling upon the TV industry to cease all its propaganda relating to warfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

952. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Pioneer Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the great State of Alaska have a particular reason to be concerned with any activity or ceremony affecting Pan American World Airways. That is why I take great pleasure and pride in joining with my other colleagues in commemorating the memorable and significant event in the history of Pan American World Airways, consisting of its successful inaugural flight across the Atlantic.

Residents of Alaska, Mr. Speaker, recall all too clearly the horror which struck our State last March. Well do we remember the immediate, enthusiastic, and unselfish response of Pan American in making available its equipment and extensive facilities to alleviate continued suffering in Alaska.

Commercial jet transportation played an important role in helping Alaska back to its feet after the Good Friday earthquake.

When the docks at Seward and Whittier were demolished, Pan American Airways' jet clippers began carrying average cargo loads of 6 to 9 tons every night to Fairbanks.

One passenger jet carried 23,826 pounds of badly needed supplies to Alaska—one of the heaviest cargo loads ever transported on a passenger aircraft.

Part of this record load was 9,000 pounds of fresh milk. Foods and other perishables make up a heavy proportion of each jet flight, augmented by drugs, clothing, and other necessities.

Passenger traffic for the weeks following the earthquake reflected the resurgence of the 49th State with a 41 percent gain for Pan American during April over the same month of 1963.

Destruction of the docks at Seward and Whittier posed a major threat to the entire State, even areas not directly affected by the earthquake. Port facilities at these two cities serve as important gateways to Alaska for surface cargo, shipped in bulk or containers.

From these points, cargo is transshipped aboard the Alaska Railroad for carriage into the interior. Following the earthquake, Alaska had the alternative of bringing in vitally needed goods via the long hard truck haul along the Alcan Highway or by a 3-hour nonstop jet Clipper flight.

Although cargo volume doubled almost overnight the capacity of Pan Am's Boeing 707 jet clippers was so great that no backlog of cargo developed except for the first few days immediately following the earthquake.

While the entire community was dependent on air transportation for fresh produce and dairy products, Pan Am's highly nonstop flights to Fairbanks provided a 1,520-mile aerial supply line.

During the emergency, Seattle and Fairbanks airport personnel referred to Pan Am's nightly jet flight 901 as the "flying milkwagon" because of the large amounts of fresh milk and dairy products that went aboard each evening.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that Pan American, who pioneered service to Alaska in 1931, will be serving our great State for an indefinite period of time. We certainly hope so and we anticipate that its services will be maintained, not solely for emergency purposes, but to bring to the great State of Alaska many thousands of our fellow Americans who have never been exposed to the magnificence and beauty of the northernmost State in this Union.

Let Freedom Ring: July 4, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the 188th Anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1964, the members of the American National Cowbelles—an auxiliary of the American National Cattlemen's Association—have sponsored the presentation of tiny cow bells to each Member of Congress to observe Independence Day by the ringing of bells across the Nation.

Since the initial effort to revive this American custom of ringing bells in celebration was started, it has grown steadily through the participation of patriotic citizens throughout the Nation. In Nebraska, the American Legion has sponsored a statewide program to enlist communities to ring school and church bells at a specified time. It has been enthusiastically received.

I can think of no better time than the present for each of us to reflect upon the freedoms we hold so dear and to renew our personal dedication to continue our American way-of-life in the face of growing threats from all sides.

We should rekindle in the hearts of all of our citizens a feeling of pride and patriotism such as that felt by our forebears when the first Independence Day was celebrated or when this young Nation withstood trials and emerged stronger and more prosperous than before.

I join with the members of the National Cowbelles and invite you to "ring out the bells on the 4th of July."

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountainside
Let freedom ring."
—*Samuel Francis Smith, 1808–95.*

National Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 2, 1964

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation's Capital and the Congressional County Club were host to one of the world's prime sporting events, the 64th Open Championship of the U.S. Golf Association.

Golf fans who witnessed the National Open this year, either on the scene at the Congressional Country Club or via television, were privileged to see the greatest chapter in the long history of this event. In every respect, from the hospitality given visitors by the community and the club to the thrilling climax of the tournament itself, this 64th National Open was the finest of them all.

For this success we can thank Frank J. Murphy, Jr., general chairman of the tournament. It was Mr. Murphy's initiative, planning, and dedication that brought the 64th Open to Washington and the Congressional Country Club, and assured its flawless operation during tournament week. Appreciation must also be expressed to A. E. (Lon) Martin, club manager, and to all the officials and employees of the Congressional who contributed so much to making the Open a success.

And, of course, no one will ever be able to mention the 64th National Open