

whose population was smaller than those which were already in the Union, we would still be a nation of 13 States strung along the Atlantic seaboard. I am happy to join in congratulations and best wishes to my colleagues from the Empire State and to applaud their statesmanship on the Alaska and Hawaii statehood issue and on other issues of national importance since that time.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think that one of the striking events which has occurred in this country in the last few days is the heart-warming support of the President evinced by his countrymen. The insertion in the RECORD a few moments ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] of the record of spying in this country by Russian spies, Stalin spies and Khrushchev spies, should make every American aware that we are not living in a world of fantasy. We are living in a world of realism, and we also have to engage in a program of realism if we are to protect ourselves.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of the Senate, as well as other Members of the Congress, who can possibly do so, will be present to welcome the President when he reaches home and to express the unity behind the President which the leaders of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have so well expressed. This is a serious time, but I believe the unity of the people of the United States has never come closer to being a oneness than it has today. I hope it will continue.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2131), Calendar No. 1267.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

THE B-70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, within recent days we have seen the hopes of the world for peace dashed by the impetuous and irresponsible tirades of Mr. Khrushchev at the Paris summit conference.

Instead of moving in the direction of disarmament and an easing of the tensions, we find to the distress and disappointment of the free world that we and the Russians are entering a period of even greater intensified cold war maneuvers in which the gravest consequences may be anticipated.

The question that seriously concerns me in that connection is, again, the adequacy and confidence that we can place in our Defense Establishment.

This body has heard prolonged and able debate by the junior Senator from

California [Mr. ENGLE], by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and others concerning the attributes and superiority of the B-70 bomber.

The Senate, Mr. President, has also heard that our danger point in our military security will occur in the next few years during which we are attempting desperately to close the missile gap.

I find it indefensible for the administration to have cut the \$365 million B-70 budget approved by Congress last year to a figure of only \$150 million this year. And I note with grave concern that the administration advocates an expenditure of only \$75 million for fiscal 1961, when the amount for the B-70 should have been \$463 million for fiscal 1961.

Where does this type of fiscal juggling of our military defenses place this country?

To me, it means that by the middle of this decade, we will have not a fleet of some 60 or more B-70 bombers capable of almost instantaneous arrival at a troubled area and capable of penetrating any known defense the Russians now have. But what we will have will be a mere prototype, an experimental model, which will not assure us that we can do what has to be done.

This will not, Mr. President, accomplish what many of our outstanding military leaders and congressional experts claim we should have at that critical time.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate and Americans everywhere who are concerned with national defense to reexamine our vulnerability, to reexamine the scuttling of the B-70 program, and I am sure they will come to the conclusion that this country cannot afford to risk placing all of our confidence in the B-47's and B-52's of the Strategic Air Command and fixed, above-ground ICBM bases, together with Polaris, which may, in fact, be inadequate to a task which may come to them within the next few years.

Without the B-70 in our free world arsenal, our security would be doubtful. We could not, for example, place utmost confidence in our ICBM's, and we could not forever rely on the Strategic Air Command's present inventory.

This airplane, if we provide for its production now, would be the only recallable weapon that would be in our inventory even after all of our missiles are in place. Flying overhead even as a diplomatic weapon, it could be incalculable visible evidence of the military strength of this country.

It offers for us a weapon which could be directed toward the Soviet Union within minutes, and would require the U.S.S.R. to divert untold resources in manpower and treasure in seeking to provide a defense against the B-70. It is the one weapon that I feel would be exclusive to our inventory and which the Russians would not be capable of matching for some time.

The B-70 program, in my opinion, should be speeded up and placed on a crash program basis if that is what it will take to deliver these excellent airplanes at the earliest possible moment.

To my mind, it represents an insurance policy which this country cannot afford to take lightly.

I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will weigh the evidence that has been presented in favor of the B-70 weapons system, and reexamine the contribution this system is ready to make to our defenses before unthinkingly subscribing to the administration policy that it is something we can do without.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 18, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernark Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake;

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements;

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin;

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Company, Inc., of Staunton, Va.;

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately-owned property adjacent thereto.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

II Timothy 4: 17: *The Lord stood with me, and strengthened me.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, who alone can make us equal to every untoward circumstance and every bitter calamity, wilt Thou give us a sense of security and strength as we walk a dim and shadowy way whose meaning our finite minds cannot comprehend.

Grant unto us the chivalry and courage of a strong faith which is confident that our anchor will hold no matter how fiercely the storms of adversity may rage and that out of the welter of world tragedy there will emerge a new and nobler era for all mankind.

Hear us as we daily pray that the nations of the earth may be drawn into a closer and deeper fellowship with one another, possessing the same passionate

strivings after peace and righteousness and inspired with the same earnest longings to be comrades in the doing of Thy will.

In the name of our blessed Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The **SPEAKER**. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. **McCORMACK** (after the Committee on the District of Columbia was called). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. The Committee on the District of Columbia was called. The next committee in order today or any future day when action is taken under Calendar Wednesday would be the Committee on Education and Labor.

The **SPEAKER**. That is correct.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

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

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the Committee on the District of Columbia been called and passed?

The **SPEAKER**. The committee has passed.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. **McCORMACK**]?

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY INVESTIGATION

Mr. **MUMMA**. 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. **MUMMA**. Mr. Speaker, the May 21 issue of Labor, a periodical put out by the railway labor organizations, devotes an article to the current highway investigation of the Roads Investigating Subcommittee.

It uses the words "shocking, biggest scandals, fantastic," and so forth, and borders on the overly enthusiastic use of the spectacular. The writer of that article further professes agony and attempts to malign all the railroaders against new highways despite the fact they might use them in their daily travels to and from work or just for the fun of Sunday driving.

However, for myself, speaking as a member of that subcommittee, I think the writer could not have been present at the hearings and heard all the testi-

mony. I have been in the supply and materials and contracting business and feel qualified to pass on this subject. You know, the parallel that comes to my mind about this situation in Oklahoma is something like a bank clerk being in collusion with the vice president of a bank—how long does it take the president or board of directors to find out something improper had been going on—perhaps until the Federal bank examiner comes around and uncovers the mess, if he is lucky and the bank clerk and board of directors do not attempt to conceal the dereliction from the examiner, which is the sort of thing which happened in the Oklahoma case.

To attribute the program as being full of corruption because of the Oklahoma incident is gross injustice to the rest of the highway construction program and untrue.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. **WILLIS**] I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **McCORMACK**. 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. 94]

Alexander	Durham	Murray
Allen	Forand	Pillion
Baring	Gavin	Powell
Blitch	Gilbert	Preston
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Jackson	Santangelo
Cannon	Johnson, Colo.	Scott
Celler	Kilburn	Short
Chelf	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Taylor
Dawson	Morris, Okla.	Walter
Diggs	Moulder	Williams

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. **ASPINALL**].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7155, with Mr. **THOMPSON** of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **CHAIRMAN**. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on line 21, page 3 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. **HEMPHILL**. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **HEMPHILL**: On page 3 at end of line 21 insert new paragraph to be known as paragraph (b) to read as follows:

"No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed and which will be in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security."

Then renumber the first paragraph as section 1(a) and renumber other sections accordingly.

Mr. **HEMPHILL**. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to keep within some reason this particular authorization bill. This is similar to the language which is contained in the Senate bill, although not identical. The language contained in the Senate bill, we find here, had some technicalities as to what marketing year would be involved. All this does is to say that we are not going to here authorize the use of water to promote further surpluses, and we take the basic crops, which are cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice—I believe corn has been included on a different formula—and say that the irrigation districts or the water districts cannot contract for the use of this water on this new land, if there is any new land irrigated—and I assume there will be—to provide more surplus crops.

Now, I might say to the gentleman from California, if he will give me his attention, that I would like for him to answer for me at this time a question about the cotton acreage production in this particular area. As I understood the gentleman from California yesterday in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from California

assured the gentleman from North Carolina that despite the fact that the committee report said that there were 132,000 acres of cotton, the result of this particular legislation, if enacted, would be to reduce the cotton acreage.

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

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

Mr. SISK. In answer to the question yesterday, I stated that rather than increasing any acreage in cotton, it definitely would reduce the acreage. Of course, I am basing that on actual, practical knowledge of the area and what will happen once we develop and get some sweet water, pure water, that will grow fruits and many other things that the present water will not grow due to the chemicals within that water. The particular material referred to in the report was taken from the original Bureau of Reclamation report, and apparently the assumption was there that certainly the acreage would not increase. It is my opinion, and it was testified before our committee at length by a great many people farming in the area, that cotton acreage would go down substantially and grain acreage, as such probably would disappear, because it is much more feasible economically to produce vines—that is, grapes and fruits of various types—nuts and many of the other specialty crops in this semitropical area than it is to produce things like grain or cotton which we are forced to do now because of the chemicals in the water which we are pumping from the deep wells.

If the gentleman will yield further, let me say this: So far as I am concerned, I am happy to accept his amendment. I realize that many times people in some of the areas would prefer not to have this language, feeling that it might cause some problem. However, I am in complete agreement with him; under no circumstances do I want to see, and I believe no one in California wants to see any increase in production of crops that are in surplus. It is my firm conviction, as I think it is that of the people of California, that what we would be permitted to do here under diversification is to reduce production substantially. On that basis I am happy to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman from California. I might say to the gentleman that it does not make sense to us to pay people to take cotton land out of production in one part of the country and then legislate to put land into cotton production in another part of the country. It does not make reason, although I recognize that in our agricultural approach in this country the rule of reason is not the rule of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to say the amendment the gentleman has offered has materially strengthened this bill; it has improved it. I want to commend him for offering this amendment.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] has expired.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. I think the gentleman's amendment makes a lot of sense and I certainly shall support it.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman. I might say to the gentleman that the junior Senator from California made the statement in the other body on the 12th day of May that the effect on the basic crops that would be affected in this area would be to reduce production and acreage. They want the land for the production of vegetables and other crops of that kind. I appreciate the support given me in protecting the growers of our basic crops. They are limited now by acreage allotments. My amendment provides that this bill shall not jeopardize those allotments and the water will not be used to increase surplus crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956. Said agreement shall recite that the liability of the United States thereunder is contingent upon the availability of appropriations to carry out its obligations under the same. No funds shall be appropriated to commence construction of the San Luis unit under any such agreement, except for the preparation of design and specifications and other preliminary work, prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety 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 to a day certain) after it has been submitted to the Congress, and then only if neither the House nor the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has disapproved it by committee resolution within said ninety days. If such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety 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 days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree that, if it later enlarges the joint-use facilities, or any of them, it will pay an equitable share of the cost to the United States of those facilities as initially constructed before utilizing them for the storage or delivery of water and will bear the entire cost of enlarging the same and if, as a part of said equitable share, it makes available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act and the use of the additional capacity for water service shall be limited to service outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

Sec. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint-use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (1) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (2) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the

operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction cost of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and amendments thereto, for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to be subject to the same limitations and obligations and to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483, 43 U.S.C. 485h-1) in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocations are attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State;

(j) the State shall not serve any lands within the Federal San Luis unit service area except as such service is required as a consequence of its acceptance of the care, operation, and maintenance of works under paragraph (g) of this section.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: On page 10, following line 10, insert following new section: section 4:

"If the Secretary proceeds to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis works

under the terms of section 1 of this Act solely as a Federal project, the operation shall be subject to the following restriction:

"Whenever the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed 150 parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity project."

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to protect the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta from undue infiltration of salt water during the summer months. This amendment provides that in the event the chlorides in the water at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal exceed 150 parts per million during the months of July, August, or September, the mean daily diversion from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to the San Luis unit via Tracy pumping plant and Delta-Mendota Canal as measured at the San Luis pumping plant shall not exceed the mean daily import to the Sacramento Valley from the Trinity River project, which shall be defined as the mean daily release from Whiskeytown Reservoir. The effect of this amendment would be to bar any pumping of water from sources which are natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in the event chlorides exceed 150 parts per million at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal. Since the Trinity River project will introduce additional water into the Sacramento River channel which is not natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, the residents of the delta would have no riparian rights as to the Trinity River water and, therefore, they would have no legal right to endeavor to bar the use of this Trinity River water in the San Luis project, even during the summer months of July, August, or September. However, this amendment would recognize the right of these residents of the delta to bar pumping in the San Luis project of waters which are natural to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta such as the water from the Shasta Dam, Folsom Dam, Monticello Dam, and other similar dams on tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River, whenever the chlorides exceed 150 parts per million at the head of the Delta-Mendota Canal. This amendment will give protection to the residents of the delta from undue salinity infiltration.

Since it has been stated both in the committee report on H.R. 7155 and in the floor debate that the primary period during which water will be pumped into the San Luis project will be during the winter months, this amendment should have no adverse effect whatsoever on the operation of the San Luis project.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SISK. I appreciate very much the problem the gentleman has in the area he represents, and I am fully cognizant of the problem he seeks to solve to be sure it does not recur. I am completely in accord with the position he takes. Therefore, I personally am very happy to accept the amendment the gentleman is offering.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to accept the amendment. It will relieve a situation which is worrying the people in the area the gentleman represents.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contracts the terms of which are as nearly similar as is practicable to those required by the Federal reclamation laws in the case of irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925; 43 U.S.C. 523).

SEC. 5. The Secretary is directed to plan the works authorized in this Act in such a manner as to contemplate and make possible the future provision of Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties heretofore anticipated as a possibility by the Acts of December 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852) and August 27, 1958 (72 Stat. 937). Construction of additional works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary, and the works have been authorized by Act of Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 9, strike out "December" and insert "October".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 11, line 20, strike "such" and insert "such".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project", dated December 17, 1956.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ULLMAN: On page 11, after line 22, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 through 5.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to strike out section 7 of the bill. I want to state at the outset, I am in favor of this project. It is an excellent project. It is one that is very greatly needed to develop fully the limited water resources of this area. But I want to explain something about this project. This is a joint undertaking, an undertaking between the Federal Government and the State of California. It has taken many months and many years of negotiations between the two groups in order to find some area of agreement in which they can go forward and develop these water resources. In this bill which is before you, they have arrived at partial agreement, an agreement only to this limited extent, it provides that at some time in the future, an arrangement shall be worked out between the State of California and the Federal Government as to the joint construction and operation of the San Luis project.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to go along with this concept because I think this is probably the only way we can proceed in order to get the water resources properly developed. But I am very much interested as I know my colleagues are in protecting the basic reclamation law, the practices and the safeguards governing reclamation that we have built up over these many years. I am particularly concerned about preserving the 160-acre limitation in this project. When the Federal Government spends money, the money of all the people of the Nation, to develop a reclamation project, the benefits should be spread as broadly and as widely as possible and we should be particularly careful that no large landowners or special interest gain special enrichment. That, in effect, is what this amendment says. Now this is a sound provision. It is one that the people of America have insisted upon all through these years. Section 7 would, in effect, say that the portion of the project that is beyond the Federal service area should not be subject to this limitation. Due to the vagueness of the Federal-State relationship and due to the fact that no agreement has been worked out, this, in effect, becomes a Trojan horse section—

it opens wide doors to special privilege. There are tremendous landholders here who are very much interested in getting all the benefits they can from this project. If we leave this section in the doors are open to circumvent the basic reclamation laws and the 160-acre limitation. The issue is this: Shall Federal benefits and Federal safeguards follow Federal investment? I am not here to tell you that we should try to superimpose upon the State all of our Federal requirements. All I say is that Federal benefits should follow Federal investments. If we leave out section 7, you have a complete bill. This provision was not included in the original legislation. Our committee experts say the section is surplusage. The only reason I can determine why it was put in the bill is because there are large landholders in the area who want to gain special privileges.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does not the gentleman from Oregon remember the discussion that took place in committee, to the effect that this was a part of the agreement between the northern and southern interests in California, and that they were supposed to be in agreement? This section 7 came before our committee and was treated by our committee as a part of the understanding between the interests in the State of California. The gentleman also understands, I think, that the committee on which he serves, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is not desirous of having these intrastate quarrels thrashed out on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon may be permitted to proceed for another 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. So it does follow that this language is in this bill for a purpose; that is, to show that wherever there is a State interest involved, if the State facility is paid for entirely by State funds, then the Federal law should not be applicable to that particular project or part of a project.

Mr. ULLMAN. Certainly what the gentleman has said is true. But this particular provision is one on which landholders and interests in the southern California area were particularly insistent. It has been said repeatedly on the floor that this section is redundant, that you do not need this language in the bill in order to carry forward the purposes of the act. It has been said repeatedly that this does not change the reclamation law. If it does not change the reclamation law, then why is it in the bill? I have grave fear, and many others join me in that fear that this section will be the vehicle to circumvent the 160-acre limitation. Why would there be this great fight over this section unless somebody had a great deal to gain?

The proponents of the section have said: "We do not want it to get into the courts." I say: What do you have to fear from the courts if you are not changing reclamation law? If it does change the reclamation law, then we should analyze that change on its own merits. This the committee has not done. If it does not change the reclamation law, it has no business in this bill. It is surplusage. There is no question of States rights here. On page 8, it says:

The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area.

We are not attempting to foist anything upon the State. All we want to do is to safeguard our Federal investment; make sure we maintain the safeguards on the Federal investment.

I hope my colleagues will concur in this amendment. The other body took several days to debate this issue. They finally struck this section out, and I am sure those who want this bill will vote to strike this section and allow the bill to become law.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to congratulate the gentleman. Fourteen or fifteen years ago this was a hot issue. It defeated a Democratic Senator for reelection from our State. The very associations and groups who are now advocating the repeal of the land limitation clause of the reclamation law are the same ones who were advocating its repeal then. You can tell me all you want to that there is not something to be gained by keeping section 7 in the bill. I do not believe it. The ones who are trying to retain it are the prototype of those who have been against the 160-acre limitation clause for the past 30 years.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement, and particularly because I come from southern California. I want to say, very frankly, I believe that if there was not something that some very special groups could see to their advantage from retaining this provision in the bill, I do not think it would be in. I can see no harm in taking it out. I do not believe in any way it will jeopardize the sale of bonds on the California project. I earnestly support the gentleman in what he is saying.

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

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the best that can be said of the arguments thus far made in favor of the pending amendment is that they are in error. What we have here is not one project, but two separate projects: One project to serve roughly half a million acres in Mr. Sisk's area, the

central Joaquin Valley, California, out of the Federal project; and in addition to the project to serve Mr. Sisk's area we have a separate State water project.

Both of these projects, because of the geographical facts of life in California, have to occupy the same reservoir site in order to store their water; so we got together on building a dam at the San Luis site, which is the only available site that will hold both State water and Federal water. They are each going to put their own water into it; they are each going to take their own water out of it. There is a sharing of the costs; the State is paying its fair share and the Federal Government is paying its share to construct this reservoir. I do not see why any Federal law should be imposed upon the water produced by the State any more than there is any reason why State law should be imposed on the Federal project. If anybody reads the Constitution and believes we have State governments and a Federal Government he should realize that this is a matter of States rights, and there should be no interference from the Federal Government.

Why do the people from southern California want this section 7 left in if the report says it is surplusage? Insofar as our committee and the Congress is concerned it is surplusage, but from the California State standpoint it is not surplusage. They look at it from the standpoint of removing the possibility of long litigious lawsuits over the next 20 years which will delay the project while those lawsuits are being carried through the various courts, and which would keep this arid and thirsty area from getting the water it needs for many years. I ask that it be kept in for that reason, and I ask that it be kept in for the additional reason that it will make it impossible for certain areas in Kern County to join in with the State-financed plan; and, as a consequence, the people further south who must take this water and use it in their factories, their homes, and their industries will have, by themselves alone, to build the conduit to carry this water up over the mountains and down into the valleys, a very, very expensive job. It will increase the cost to our workers and to our industries and to our homes unmercifully if we have to do this. So that is the second reason we wish to have this in.

The third reason, of course, is to avoid the delay in getting the bond issue, because you cannot issue State water bonds and get a financial house to float them while there is litigation pending. This particular section 7 spells out here once and for all what is a fact, that the Federal reclamation law does not interfere with the State project, and removes the possibility of carrying this thing up through the courts of the land through the course of some 20 years, with the consequent delay of getting water service to our people.

The most zealous protector of the 160-acre limitation that we know of in this land, the National Reclamation Association, under date of yesterday advised each and every one of the Members of this body that it recommends retention

of section 7. Of course, its recommendation is based on the very reasons I have given.

In closing its memorandum to the Congress, the National Reclamation Association said this:

The San Luis project is urgently needed. Your support for the bill, H.R. 7155, with section 7 included, would be very greatly appreciated.

That comes from the most zealous protector of the 160-acre limitation in the country. They know and they understand this situation, and they recommend that the amendment before you be defeated. They recommend it in the interest of the maximum use of water in this water-short land of ours, they recommend it in the interest of the progress of the West and thereby in the interest of the progress of the rest of the Nation. They realize that the arguments upon which the amendment before you is based are fallacious. They have analyzed the matter and they say to the Congress of the United States: "Act sensibly, keep section 7 in there, permit the project to go ahead as it should go ahead on a sound basis, recognizing the difference in jurisdiction between the State and Federal Government and if a 160-acre limitation is proper in the State area, let the State impose it."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] to delete section 7 from the San Luis bill.

Debate yesterday and today has opened up the question with which this amendment is concerned, namely, the question of how Federal reclamation law shall apply to a project of this unique nature which involves joint Federal and State investment. Let me reiterate that this is a unique problem because it is a joint Federal-State project that we are planning at San Luis.

Normally, Federal reclamation law would apply to a federally constructed reclamation project. Normally, it would not apply to a State-constructed project. But this is a joint Federal-State project and the entirely honest and legitimate question of how reclamation law shall apply here arises.

The bill in the original form proposes to answer this question simply by stating that water taken from the San Luis Reservoir to be used in the Federal Central Valley project shall be subject to Federal reclamation law and that water taken from the reservoir for all other purposes shall be specifically freed from Federal reclamation law. It is section 7 which states this latter provision.

This formula is unacceptable. It ignores the all-important fact that Federal reclamation law has traditionally been stated not in terms of where water is used, but in terms of the facilities through which it is developed. There can be no question about it. Title 43 of the United States Code, section 523, reads:

Water impounded, stored, or carried in Federal reclamation facilities shall be subject to Federal reclamation law.

Because this formula is unacceptable—the formula set forth in the present bill in its section 7—we should delete it as proposed in the Ullman amendment.

The fact is that waters to be accumulated in the San Luis Reservoir will have been developed elsewhere in the various mountainous regions of the State of California and will have been regulated and controlled by such facilities as Shasta Dam, Keswick Dam, Nimbus Dam, Folsom Dam, and others—all projects constructed with Federal funds. Then, on top of that, at San Luis itself, these waters shall have been stored in another facility dependent upon Federal funds. Let us not forget that the San Luis Reservoir substructure will be entirely a Federal project. If the State of California does, in the final instance, participate to make the San Luis Reservoir a joint Federal-State project—if it does, it will add to the basic Federal substructure.

Now, it is not my contention that the Federal reclamation law should apply to waters developed entirely by the State of California. What I am saying is that the definition of so-called State waters included in this legislation in its section 7 is simply not correct. In direct conflict with Federal reclamation law, the language of this section would set as a basis for the application of the law the standard of where it is to be used. Instead, the law traditionally applies on the basis of what facilities are used to develop and accumulate the water.

Clearly, then, section 7 of this measure is a device to bypass and confuse existing Federal reclamation law. It should, therefore, be removed.

I take issue with my good friend and colleague from the 14th District of California [Mr. HAGEN] who yesterday suggested that those of us who oppose the formula provided in section 7 should themselves offer clarifying language.

On the contrary, it is plain enough on the face of it that those who propose to bypass Federal reclamation law by putting forth this kind of formula, when their proposals are called to light and criticized, must then themselves suggest an alternative—presumably one more in line with traditional reclamation principles. Furthermore, if they cannot offer an acceptable alternative, I believe we have no choice but to strike section 7 from this measure and leave a final determination of the question to the courts.

I think it remains only to be pointed out once again that the result of passing this bill without cleaning up the matter of Federal reclamation law can only be unjust enrichment of the various large land owners who will benefit by receiving water from facilities built in some substantial degree with Federal tax revenues.

I urge strongly that our colleagues support the Ullman amendment, because, in doing so, we will be preventing the bypassing of Federal reclamation law. Then, with this question answered, we can join in supporting the San Luis project which is so vital to the State of California and which, in its large purposes, has my full support.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state at the outset that I was not in Congress at the time when my colleague from California waged his fight, and I am one of those who wants to retain section 7, and I was not a part of that fight. Nor does this San Luis project deliver any water to our particular section.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of retaining section 7 for three fundamental reasons; three. In the first place, this is the first joint reclamation project that we have had. Every time we have something in which the State participates it is a question: If the Federal Government puts some money in it, are they going to control? I think we ought to make clear so as to encourage other States to participate in reclamation that if they do participate with the Federal Government, there is no intention on the part of the Federal Government because they put some money in it to control the water that comes out of a joint project. And, you can only do that by keeping section 7 in so that the intent of Congress is known.

Second, this fear of the 160-acre limitation certainly ought to have no bearing here, because the organization that represents that group, the National Reclamation Association, is for retention of section 7. I am sure that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] believes in the National Reclamation Association; is that not true?

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

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to the gentleman that the National Reclamation Association generally represents large landowners. The National Grange, the National Farmers Union, and the labor organizations represent a great many taxpayers. Those organizations are all against section 7 and are supporting my amendment.

Mr. YOUNGER. I am very happy that the gentleman brought that up, the tax question, because it brings me to the third part—to my mind, the important part of this proposal—and that is the payer. Who is going to pay for this project? In my opinion, the people who are going to pay for this project are the ones whose attitude and whose recommendation we should pay some attention to. I have here a letter which I think most Members have received from the Feather River Project Association. Let me read from this the names of the associations which are joined here and want to keep section 7 in:

Partial list of California counties, agencies, organizations, and associations which have officially declared their support of the provisions of section 7 of H.R. 7155 (Sisk), a bill to authorize the Federal San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California: Irrigation Districts Association of California (represents 190 water districts in California), Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Basin Association, Eastern Municipal Water District, Riverside County Water Association, Santa Ana River Water Association, San

Bernardino County Supplemental Water Association, Chino Basin Municipal Water District, Mojave River County Water District, Mojave Water Agency, Mojave Desert Soil Conservation District, San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, California Farm Bureau Federation, Kern County Farm Bureau, San Bernardino County Farm Bureau, Imperial County Farm Bureau, Kern County Board of Supervisors, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors, League of Women Voters, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, and Feather River Project Association.

Southern California Water Coordinating Conference, which includes members representing the following: San Antonio Water Co., Southern California Water Co., Santa Fe Irrigation District, Calleguas Municipal Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, Southern California Water Works Association, Western Municipal Water District, Metropolitan Water District, Orange County Water District, Buena Vista Municipal Water District, California Water & Telephone Co., Central Basin Municipal Water Association, Orange County Municipal Water District, Compton Municipal Water District, San Diego County Water Authority, Orange County Municipal Water Authority, Palm Springs Water Co., San Bernardino Valley Municipal, Municipal Water District, United Water Conservation District, Ventura River Municipal Water District, Chino Basin Mutual Water District, Fallbrook Public Utility District, Riverside County Water Advisory Commission, Inglewood Water Department, Long Beach Water Department, Coachella Valley County Water District, and Oceanside Water Department.

I think if we pay attention to the people who are paying the bill, we will leave in section 7.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it pains me to disagree with my good friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], for whose motivation I have the highest regard. I just think they are wrong in this instance and I hope that Members listening will vote for or against this amendment on the basis of fact and logic rather than on the basis of emotion or the identity of persons on one side or the other of this question.

Section 7 in the bill was worked out very carefully with the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and representatives of the Governor's office in California, and at no time was it ever stated that there was any intention to change Federal reclamation law. I am certain if that were the case the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] would not have included it in his bill, because he has stated repeatedly that he supports Federal reclamation law.

Therefore, there is a disagreement only over the question of whether or not section 7 accomplishes more than we seek to accomplish, to wit, a clear statement of the presently prevailing interpretation of reclamation law applied to the facts of the San Luis project. If we want to label this section 7 which we seek to retain in the bill, it might be described as the antibarbarity section, the States rights section, the prevention of litigation section, the clarity and equity section; any one of these phrases would

fit it. It merely states what we consider the prevailing opinion to be with respect to current Federal law as applied to the facts which will be represented in the joint undertaking of the San Luis and the Feather River projects. The Congress has often codified and stated existing law in the interest of clarity and the interest of convenience. That is all we are asking you to do in the case of section 7. We agree that the state of the law is exactly as would be obtained under section 7, but we can foresee, perhaps, that some court 10 years from now might disagree with our interpretation unless the Congress says that this is the law.

Further, there is a very practical matter concerned. The viability of the Feather River project of the State of California, which is only indirectly connected with the San Luis project, is tied up in the fate of a \$1¼ million bond issue. That bond issue can be passed and sold only if it is evident to bonding house attorneys and purchasers and even potential customers of the State project that the State project, which is financed and paid for by the State, is not going to be subject to Federal management by the decision of some court 10 years hence. So this is a very practical caveat in the bill in the interest of clarity.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. As a matter of fact, the Federal investment in its service area is being reduced by reason of the fact that it is cooperating with the State in the financing of the dam.

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct.

I also want to point out that the State's contribution to the so-called joint structures is in excess of the Federal contribution in every instance; in other words, the State is going to pay exactly for what it gets and pay more than the Federal Government of the cost of these common structures.

You may ask why this should be of interest to someone from New York, Kansas, or some other State. This is an unique venture in partnership in that a State undertakes to make a major contribution to its own water development. Should this partnership venture fail for any reason, you will see the State of California back here several years hence asking for the Federal Government to build this total State project, and you will discourage the development of co-operative plans in other States, so that the potential Federal cost, created by the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, in my opinion, poses a real threat of large increases in Federal expenditures in the future. That is one of the reasons why we ask that you sustain our position on section 7. The savings that will be immediately achieved by this joint Federal-State project have been indicated. The State of California will pay for the total benefit of the State project from these joint structures. As a matter of fact this characteristic of separate identity is stipulated in several sections of H.R. 7155 in addition to said section 7. For

example subsection (f) of section 3 stated on page 8 of the bill before us declares:

The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area.

Except as it adds reference to drainage facilities specifically this language is an exact statement of the intent of, and the import and effect of, section 7. Simply stated said subsection (f) declares that State water deliveries shall not be subject to any Federal statutory or administrative regulation insofar as water deliveries are concerned and it is my belief that this language is also broad enough to cover the use of drainage facilities although section 7 is more explicit on this point.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] was speaking, I am quite sure that he did not intend to imply that every person who was in favor of retaining section 7 in this bill was in opposition to the philosophy and the principle of the 160-acre limitation. I am sure he spoke generally and not specifically, because in my own case I am wholeheartedly in favor of the 160-acre limitation. I will go so far as to say that if I were once again a member of the California Legislature and this proposal were before the legislature to limit the benefits of the State water project to 160 acres, I would vote for such a limitation. But my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon is not based upon the philosophy of the 160-acre limitation. It is based purely upon the philosophy of States rights. I thought the gentleman from Oregon put his finger squarely upon the issue which is here involved when he said, shall Federal benefits follow Federal investment? I presume the gentleman from Oregon believes they should and Federal regulation should follow benefits. I might say I agree with the gentleman. Is that a correct statement of the gentleman's point of view?

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is basically true. We have here a Federal-State project where an arrangement has not been worked out. We have no agreement and I have no way of knowing and no one has any way of knowing where the benefits will flow at this time. I only want Federal benefits to follow where Federal investment is made.

Mr. GUBSER. Then I have stated the gentleman's issue correctly: Shall Federal benefits, Federal regulation, follow Federal investment—and we both agree they should. The point I would like to make here is that Federal regulations do follow Federal investment in this case because Federal investment is for the San Luis service area which is a Federal service area. Because we are

building this jointly the Federal investment is \$60 million less than it would otherwise have been. All we are asking here today is for the State legislature to have the right to determine the rules and regulations which apply to the service area which is served by investment made by the State.

I think we should remember this. The State of California owns this land upon which this reservoir will be built and if this bill does not pass, that the State of California will build the San Luis reservoir. But, if the State of California builds the reservoir on land that it now owns, then the opportunity to use that site will be taken away from the Federal Government and we will never be able to finish the Central Valley project. The people in the Federal San Luis service area of the Central Valley project, mostly in the district of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], will not have the chance to receive Federal water because the State has already built a reservoir on the only site available. Let us remember this; we are not giving anything to the State of California for the non-Federal service area. We are asking the State for the right to build our portion of this dam on top of the one that the State is going to build anyway. So why under the point of view is it justifiable for us, because we are being taken along as a partner, to tell the State of California that for your part of the project which you pay for, you must follow the same rules and regulations that we follow for our part?

I was asked before I concluded my remarks to remind the House that this is not a power project and public power is not involved in any way. In fact, the San Luis project is a consumer of power rather than a producer. Since I was asked by a Member on our side to bring that point out, I am so doing at this time.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 1:30 p.m.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a little comment on this particular section of the bill. This is a controversial section which has created a great deal of fire. I want to state my position clearly because this was a part of some six or seven amendments which a group of us agreed to attempt to keep in this piece of legislation on behalf of some of our friends in southern California. These amendments were written into the bill which I introduced at that time. I carried on a consistent fight for all of those provisions. All of the provisions were written into the bill up until this point. I think my colleague from California [Mr. HOSMER], will agree that our joint efforts in the committee did manage to

retain this section. However, since that time a controversy has developed over the meaning of this language. If anything happens with this section in the bill that would not happen with it out of the bill, then we are amending the reclamation law. This is simply a legal practicality. The facts are that the people in my area are not particularly concerned, because our area is 100 percent under the reclamation law, but I simply wanted to make sure that the Federal project will be able to operate successfully under the reclamation law. At the same time I want to make sure that the State project can operate successfully under the State law. That is my position. That is what I think will happen under this bill, whether this section is in or out.

Unfortunately a situation has developed where a few people are apparently reading something into this section which we in the committee do not read into it; that is, that it might offer a loophole through which water could be secured which could not be secured without it.

With reference to a legal proceeding in court, it is my opinion that when the Congress speaks that will be it. There will be no more litigation with this section out than with it in. That was my position from the beginning, that I would do the best I could to get it to the floor and then abide by the decision of my colleagues. The other body saw fit to strike this section, as I say. In view of the controversy that has arisen, in view of the fact that we all agree that we do not want to amend the reclamation law, it is my opinion at the present time that the legislation would be less controversial if the section is stricken from the legislation.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. It is true that you have stated many times that you support the Federal reclamation law, including the acreage limitations, as applied to traditional federally subsidized projects.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Has anyone ever pointed out to you how this particular section 7 attempts to change the Federal reclamation law?

Mr. SISK. No. That is the point I wished to make. On the other hand, I have an idea that it has not been pointed out specifically that it would not amend it. Apparently it is the interpretation that various people have placed upon it, which has created the controversy.

Mr. HAGEN. It is your understanding that the present state of the law is that the Federal reclamation law would not apply to a wholly State-owned, State-financed project?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly right. It is my opinion, and it certainly is the intent of our committee and it is very accurately spelled out in the report accompanying this bill, that Federal law shall govern the Federal project and State law shall govern the State project; I believe that when the Congress

speaks that will be the intent; that Federal law governs the Federal project and State law the State project.

Mr. HAGEN. Is it not, therefore, fair to say that all section 7 does is to restate in the legislation what is already provided by current law?

Mr. SISK. That covers it precisely. The gentleman sat in the room at the time the agreement was made. This simply was inserted for purposes of clarification.

We intended and I believe that section 7 is merely a statement of existing Federal reclamation law and that, with or without section 7 in the legislation, the courts would hold that the sharing of a site and joint financing, construction and use of structures placed thereon as proposed in the San Luis legislation would not subject State water deliveries to Federal reclamation law. Further, it is my opinion that, acting pursuant to the legislation, with or without section 7, the Secretary of the Interior would have full legal authority to enter into a contract with the State of California spelling out the safeguard stated in section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ULLMAN) there were—ayes 81, noes 84.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ULLMAN and Mr. HOSMER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 122.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of \$290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. Said base sum of \$290,430,000 shall, however, be diminished to the extent that the State makes funds or lands or interests in land available to the Secretary pursuant to sections 2 or 3 of this Act which decrease the costs which would be incurred if the works authorized in section 1 of this Act (including provision for their subsequent expansion) were constructed solely as a Federal project. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 12, line 9, after "the sum of" insert "not to

exceed," and on line 9 strike out the word "plus" and strike out lines 10, 11, and line 12 through the period following the word "indexes."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the authorization to \$290,430,000. As the bill is now written, it authorizes the sum of \$290,430,000 "plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes."

Mr. Chairman, I raise this question so that we may have a limitation and so that we may know the amount that is authorized under this bill. As the language now reads, you would depend upon some engineering indexes to determine the amount of the authorization. You would have your \$290,430,000, and then it says "plus such additional amount as shown by engineering indexes." Now, whose engineering indexes? What engineering indexes? Let us say you had three or four engineering indexes, one showing an increase, one showing a decrease, and perhaps one showing the level to be as it is. What index are you going to take? I do not believe that the House should legislate in this manner. If it is going to run considerably over the \$290 million in the authorization during the period of construction, that will be known. There will be plenty of time to come back to the House and ask for this additional authorization, but it seems to me rather irresponsible to say that we are going to depend upon some engineering indexes when we do not know what engineering index is going to be used.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be adopted so that we will not exceed the \$290,430,000. If later on it becomes necessary to come back to the House and show why this additional amount is needed—as we have done in the past in the Central Valley project where there has been a later estimate—the funds will be provided. But, I do not believe we should have this kind of loose language in a bill when we have legislation in the future.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman tell me, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and familiar with authorizations generally, is this open end proposal common in authorizations for construction work?

Mr. BOW. I understand in the Central Valley, in some areas, that it has been done in the past, but if we made mistakes in the past and the estimates have been low many times, I think we should correct that now and say it shall not exceed a certain amount, and perhaps they will be more careful in the manner the money is spent rather than saying it will be \$290 million plus some engineering indexes later on. I think it is a rather reckless way of appropriating.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment and say only this: Simply because these open end bills have been passed before is no reason why we should not put an end to it, and this is a very good time to start.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman and I hope the Committee will go along with this amendment that we shall not exceed the amount; \$290 million is a great deal of money and an open end authorization saying that somebody's index later on will make it possible to spend a lot more is a little dangerous, I should say.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to oppose this amendment because very frankly I am anxious to see that this construction, as well as any other construction, be done as economically as possible. I agree to some extent with the comment of the gentleman from Iowa that just because this has been in other bills is not necessarily a reason to leave it in this bill. I will say, however, that so far as I know, for the last 50 years, throughout the history of reclamation projects, this is the language that has been used.

The position taken by the departments downtown, including the Bureau of the Budget, as I understand their position, the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers and others whose work is involved in this, is that this could save money; and, of course, there is some possibility that it might increase the cost. That is, they should be given the flexibility of following the construction indexes. This is a single index. There is not a multitude of these prepared. Actually the construction industry each month submits figures to a central filing section where they prepare what is called the construction index for that period of time. That has been followed by all agencies as the construction index. It is my hope that that index will show a reduction in cost of construction rather than an increase, although we have been faced with increases during the past 10 years; there is no question about that.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is there any possibility that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio can make any saving to the Federal Government in the construction of this facility?

Mr. SISK. There is no possible saving that I can see because what you would be doing, of course, would be giving them an authorization to go ahead and construct. Then you get to the point where you have spent all the money and you have a project that lacks a couple of million dollars of being completed. Certainly we are not going to let it stand uncompleted and unusable.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is there any possibility that it might lead to agreement of contracts that would be any more economical in the interest of the district or the Federal Government?

Mr. SISK. Based on my knowledge and understanding of the Department's

position and that of the construction people, I would say no. What it actually does is to place these people in a strait-jacket, to a certain extent. It might tend to cause them to go up in their costs. In other words, in this case, the ceiling would become the floor. That is something we always run into. I think this project, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, is going to be constructed for substantially less than this amount. I expect that it will be constructed for somewhere in the neighborhood of \$230-odd million. But I do feel that this amendment would place the Department and the construction agencies in a straitjacket which might tend to increase costs rather than decrease them.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Would it not have this effect, that those undertaking this construction work would realize that if they had to have a larger authorization they would have to come back to Congress for further legislation which would involve some time and some difficulty; and that would tend to make them more careful than if they had the leeway which the language in the bill would afford?

Mr. SISK. Of course that is possible, as the gentleman states it. However, as I say, it is my firm opinion that the people who are guarding the dollars down there are going to see to it that the contracts go according to these construction indexes as they have existed from year to year. That is my only reason for opposing the amendment. I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do. I am sympathetic with his position. I do believe that to give them the flexibility which they have under the normal language here is advisable. After all, the appropriation committee still has to appropriate the money and they can stop these appropriations whenever they desire. So there is certainly no desire on my part, or on the part of the committee, to take anything away from the appropriating power of the Congress, because I think it is essential not only to this project but to the carrying on of any other kind of construction carried on by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 12, line 19, after "Federal project" strike out the balance of line 19 and all of lines 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the figure that has been included in this bill as the cost of the San Luis project is \$290 million. By the language of my amendment, I just strike out \$192 million more, because the cost of this project is actually in excess of \$482 million. If there was ever an open-end proposition presented to this Congress, it occurs on page 12 in section 8, lines 19 to 23. The distribution and drainage systems should

be constructed by the Federal Government or by the water users at an estimated cost of \$192,650,000. If this language stays in the bill, instead of authorizing a project for \$290,430,000 plus, up or down, according to the indices, you are authorizing a project in excess of \$483 million. The Federal Government can build the distribution and drainage system, and there is absolutely no requirement to come back and ask this Congress or anyone else for the approval to build these features.

If anybody from California wants to stand up and tell me that that information is not correct, here is his opportunity to do it. This amendment just saves the taxpayers money and makes them come back to the Congress to get the approval for this \$192 million.

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

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

Mr. SISK. Here again the gentleman knows this is the normal language that is used in all these projects. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. This is a different situation. This is a joint State-Federal project. This is the first one that they ever had. In every bill that we have ever had before, the cost of the distribution system has always been included in the amount that has been authorized. This is the first time we have ever had a bill presented that does not have that amount included. This \$290 million does not take care of the distribution system. What my amendment does is just to say to the people of California that we will approve your project and if the State will enter in good faith into the type of contract which has been authorized, then there will be no responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to build the distribution system. If there is not a contract entered into and it becomes a full Federal project, before they can go ahead, they have to come back and ask the Federal Government for approval of \$192 million more.

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

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman in his amendment.

I should like to add my voice to those advocating the passage of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project. This project has much merit and has been already delayed too long.

For many years, the State of California has desired to cooperate with the Federal Government in the joint development of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project.

In the first place, construction of this urgently needed water storage project would have a double-barreled impact upon the State economically. Secondly, the Federal portion of the San Luis unit would make a most important resource contribution by furnishing much needed additional water to an area of almost 500,000 acres of highly productive farm lands on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. In addition, the San Luis storage unit would be an important link in the State's far-reaching plan for

moving water from surplus areas in the north to water deficient areas in the southern part of the State.

The lands in the proposed Federal service area are desperately in need of an additional water supply. Overpumping within the last decade has lowered the ground water table in excess of 400 feet, which has had the effect of skyrocketing pumping costs and forcing good acreage out of production.

Unfortunately, this agricultural economic tragedy is still in progress. Of the 500,000 acres in the service area, about 400,000 were developed for irrigation in 1950. A good percentage of these lands are now dry and unproductive because of the high pump lifts resulting from the falling water table. Prospects are that unless an additional water supply is brought into the area—such as would occur with construction of the Federal San Luis unit—the existing ground water supply is adequate to sustain somewhat less than 150,000 acres in irrigation. Without San Luis, therefore, two-thirds of a rich agricultural area will be an almost complete economic loss to the State.

The constantly lowering ground water table effects a sort of "creeping paralysis" in the once lush western San Joaquin Valley. This agricultural decline, moreover, is taking place in the face of California's continuing population growth, which is expected to make it the most populous State in the Union. In a rapidly growing State, where good farmland is limited by the available water supply, more land, not less, must be irrigated to keep up with growing State needs for food, fiber, and job opportunities.

The Federal San Luis unit, therefore, must be considered as a rescue-type development, vital to the continued economic development of the San Joaquin Valley and to the State of California and to the Nation as a whole. Everyone benefits if valuable natural resources can be developed and sustained.

The State of California has long recognized its upward population trend and the urgent requirement to develop its soil and water resources to meet its growing needs. A forward-looking State water plan developed in the 1920's laid the groundwork for the great Central Valley project. A complete restudy of that far-reaching early planning resulted in the California water plan, recently completed, one of the most ambitious State water programs ever advanced.

The first step in this new plan is the Feather River project and several features of the San Luis unit, such as the San Luis Reservoir, are a part of this project. Such joint facilities will play an important part in the State's scheme to carry water to its service area in the southern part of the San Joaquin Basin and across the Tehachapi Mountains to provide the growing metropolitan complex in the Los Angeles-San Diego area with an adequate water supply.

Furthermore, by constructing the San Luis unit on a partnership basis—with Federal-State cooperation—it is estimated that the Federal cost on this project would be some \$56 million lower than it would be if only the Federal unit were constructed.

In accordance with the proposed legislation, the facilities of the San Luis unit which are common to both the Federal and State plans would be jointly developed. Such cooperation is a necessity if the needs for water in the burgeoning Golden State are to be met in the future.

During congressional consideration in the other body of the San Luis unit legislation there was considerable discussion of the various facets of the excess land provision of the reclamation laws. Involved in the discussion were the lands to be irrigated in the Federal service area and, through joint development of some of the facilities of the unit with the State of California, the lands in the service area of the State's Feather River project.

There is no question that the owners of lands within the proposed Federal service area should comply with the 160-acre limitation in existing law. Before any water from the project could be furnished legally to these people, each prospective water user would have to enter into the customary recordable contract with the Federal Government to dispose of his lands in excess of 160 acres in a single ownership. This procedure would apply to all, including large landowners such as the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., which holds some 120,000 acres in the San Luis area.

The Senate was informed that the railroad company had stated it was not interested in selling its excess lands, but indicated it would be willing to pay interest on water supplied for its excess lands. Other landowners in the Federal service area have indicated they will comply with the acreage limitation, and it is true that the unit would be a feasible undertaking even if the Southern Pacific Railroad lands were excluded from project water service.

The question of whether the acreage limitation provision would apply to the lands in the State's service area has caused confusion and misunderstanding. It is understood the administration's view is, that since the State would fully pay for its share of the construction of the joint facilities prior to its use of them for the delivery of water, the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and thus the excess acreage limitation, would not apply to the State's service area. This would be true whether the legislation specifically exempts the State's service area from application of the Federal Reclamation laws, as does section 7 of H.R. 7155, or is silent on the matter as is S. 44, in the form it passed the Senate. There seems to be no precedent for application of the Federal Reclamation laws to the service area of a State-constructed storage facility.

Surplus crops will not be a particular problem so far as the San Luis unit is concerned. Consider these factors: The land is of high quality—more than 85 percent is classified in class 1 and 2. The growing season is long—over 250 days. Farms in the Federal service area will be of reduced size, as required by reclamation law. More and better quality of water will be provided by the new storage. Because of all these factors,

crops will be grown which are generally not surplus to the Nation's needs. Also, these same basic conditions will make this an extremely versatile agricultural area, responsive to shifts in demand for agricultural products. Should some particular crop encounter marketing difficulties, it would be easy for the San Luis area farmers to shift to a more profitable crop which is not in surplus.

The expected crops from the San Luis project area include: Truck crops 88,000 acres; deciduous fruits and grapes, 22,000 acres; miscellaneous field crops, 66,000 acres; alfalfa, 88,000 acres; irrigated pasture, 44,000 acres; long staple cotton, 132,000 acres, and grain and hay, 44,000 acres. With the project development, there would be a drastic reduction in the 162,000 acres of grain and hay now grown in the area.

When the question of surplus crops is raised, an accusing finger is generally pointed at the cotton which would be grown in the San Luis unit area. In this regard, however, it should be remembered that California-grown cotton is of the long-staple variety. This is high quality cotton and there is a demand for it in this country. Thus, it does not contribute to the surplus problem in short-staple cotton. Furthermore, efficient production methods and irrigation enable the farmers in California to grow this better quality cotton at a low cost per acre. Considering the competition that cotton is meeting from imports and man-made fibers, the welfare of the domestic cotton industry depends on lowering the cost of cotton by increasing quality and instituting more efficient methods of production, such as you would have in the San Luis area.

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

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

Mr. SISK. Actually, the facilities authorized by the language which the gentleman proposes to strike out here has absolutely nothing to do with the State project. There is not any part of the State project involved in this distribution system. This is a distribution system for a Federal project, and whether or not the people decide to contract with the Bureau of Reclamation under the normal procedure to construct the distribution system or decide under a bond issue or by some other method to construct, it is still part of the Federal project. Of course, it is covered by the reclamation law and has no part of the State project and no application to anything at all that has to do with the State project. I believe my colleague will agree with me on that.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me ask my colleague, the author of the bill, then if that is the case—are you willing to go back to section 8 and strike out the words "other than distribution system" and insert the sum of \$482 million, because that is what it becomes?

Mr. SISK. So far as I know, the statement by the gentleman that the distribution facilities have always been included in the total amount of money authorized, that is not my understanding. The gentleman may be right. It is my un-

derstanding that the normal language in these various projects which we have authorized—and the gentleman has been on the committee, of course, longer than I have—but it is my understanding that is the normal language we have always used in projects authorized in the 6 years that I have been on the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. And the Central Valley project and the Central Valley distribution system have all, or almost all, been built by the Federal Government. In this case, this language which is in the bill authorizes \$192 million more. What my amendment does is to tell the people of the area that if they want the Federal Government to build a distribution system, then they have to come back here again and get a further authorization.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield further to my colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. Let me say there are a good many of the systems which were not built on money furnished by the Federal Government, but were built on their own. On the other hand, many have been built under the terms of this type of language.

Mr. SAYLOR. And a great deal of the trouble in the Central Valley has grown out of the distribution system that the Federal Government built.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 12, line 23, after the word "interests", insert "but not to exceed in total cost the sum of \$192,650,000".

And on page 12, line 23, change period (.) to colon (:) and add "Provided, That no funds shall be appropriated for construction of distribution systems and drains prior to ninety calendar days (which ninety 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 to a day certain) after a contract has been submitted to the Congress calling for complete repayment of the costs of such distribution systems and drains within a period of forty years from the date such works are placed in service."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have been somewhat alarmed because of the fact that we did not come out and expressly state in this legislation the amount that should be authorized as the cost of the possible drainage and distribution installations. My amendment states that any contracts for this contemplated construction shall be placed with the Congress so that they can be reviewed so that they will conform to the procedures that we usually follow in such matters. The reason for this provision is, that all authorizations for reclamation projects do not carry this provision. Some projects do not necessitate the building of drainage and distribution facilities. In California it

so happens that a large part of the drainage and distribution facilities have been built by the local irrigation districts themselves. It is contemplated that such facilities will be constructed by the local districts in this particular project.

We have on certain occasions authorized separately certain distribution systems for California projects. However, in the planning and distribution of such projects at the San Luis project it is so much more practical, so much more feasible, so much more economical to plan for all the different construction facilities which are necessary. If it is found at the time of the primary construction that the drainage and distribution facilities, which mean so much to the success of the project, cannot be constructed by the local interests, then those facilities should be a part of the whole project and should be built by the Federal Government and the cost thereof should be returned by the users to the Federal Government. That is what my amendment provides. I think that it is a perfectly feasible way to take care of the situation. My amendment shows what the possible cost of this project may be. Remember that 99.99 percent of this project is repayable to the Federal Government. This does not provide for a 10-year development period for these distribution and drainage facilities. This provides that as soon as they are in shape to be put into operation the payments shall start.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good one and brings it out where we can see what these costs actually will be.

Would the gentleman explain why the operation and maintenance is in this bill when, in answer to an inquiry which I made yesterday of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] he said no operation and maintenance money would be used.

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, the operation and maintenance funds are provided annually by the great Committee on Appropriations. These funds are payable annually. Sometimes they are paid before the start of the irrigation system. At other times they may be delayed until later in the season. But in order to keep these authorizations from coming back to Congress from time to time we have used this language. It permits the great Committee on Appropriations to continue its control and authority over this portion of the reclamation program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in support of his substitute amendment, because this actually places in the bill the actual cost of the project, \$482 million. I think the Members of the House who are going to vote on this project ought to know the total amount in the project. I think the

manner in which it is now placed is a safeguard and that the committee should go along with the amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, once again I say it is a great pleasure to work with my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and take this opportunity to rise in support of the bill in its present shape, and congratulate the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, both Democrats and Republicans, for the very careful and excellent manner in which the committee has always, during my years in this body, considered and screened legislation coming before the committee. The illustration of leadership on both sides, the chairman of the committee, my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], shows the manner in which they approach consideration of legislation that comes before this excellent committee. It shows the teamwork, it shows the understanding. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a profound speech. It was logical. Some of us might disagree to his amendment, but not to the logic of his reasoning behind his amendment. The chairman of the committee offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute, but an amendment by reason of the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania accepts the amendment. That is the kind of teamwork in committee which produces the most constructive results.

This project is a great one that means much to the State and people of California. As far as I am concerned, coming from Boston, I am interested in projects all over the country. I do not feel because I come from Boston I should vote against a project that is going to marshal the natural resources of any section of our country in the service of the people of that section and indirectly the people of the entire country simply because it involves appropriations where other sections of the country might primarily benefit. I have voted for all these projects over the years. This is another project. It is in the best interests of our country. It is going to mean a great deal to the people of California, and I am supporting the bill, but I particularly wanted to take the floor to call to the attention of the House this fine teamwork and understanding that exists in the committee and to congratulate both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee for the manner in which they have approached the consideration of this bill in committee and on the floor, and the manner in which they approach the consideration of all bills referred to their committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does not the vote recur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Or will he withdraw his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Colorado being in the nature of a perfecting amendment, the motion to strike out the paragraph falls.

If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 514, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Ullman amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 22, strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 through 5.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 179, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—215

Abernethy	Burke, Ky.	Fascell
Addonizio	Burke, Mass.	Felghan
Albert	Burleson	Fisher
Alford	Byrne, Pa.	Flood
Anderson,	Carnahan	Flynn
Mont.	Casey	Flynt
Anfuso	Celler	Fogarty
Ashley	Clark	Foley
Bailey	Coad	Friedel
Barr	Coffin	Garmatz
Barrett	Cohelan	George
Bass, Tenn.	Cook	Gialmo
Beckworth	Cooley	Granahan
Bennett, Fla.	Daddario	Gray
Blatnik	Daniels	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Dawson	Griffiths
Boland	Delaney	Gross
Bolling	Dent	Halpern
Bowles	Denton	Hargis
Boykin	Dingell	Harmon
Brademas	Donohue	Harris
Breeding	Doyle	Hays
Brock	Dulski	Healey
Brooks, La.	Edmondson	Hechler
Brooks, Tex.	Everett	Herlong
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Hogan
Brown, Mo.	Fallon	Hollifield
Burdick	Farbstein	Holland

Holtzman	Miller, Clem	Rivers, Alaska
Huddleston	Miller,	Roberts
Hull	George, P.	Rodino
Ikard	Mills	Rogers, Colo.
Inouye	Mitchell	Rogers, Fla.
Irwin	Moeller	Rooney
Jarman	Monagan	Roosevelt
Jennings	Montoya	Rostenkowski
Johnson, Calif.	Moorhead	Roush
Johnson, Wis.	Morgan	Rutherford
Jones, Ala.	Morris, N. Mex.	Saund
Karsten	Morrison	Selden
Karsh	Moss	Shelley
Kasem	Moulder	Shipley
Kastenmeier	Multer	Sisk
Kee	Murphy	Slack
Kelly	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Keogh	Nix	Smith, Miss.
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Spence
Kilgore	O'Brien, N.Y.	Staggers
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Steed
King, Utah	O'Hara, Mich.	Stratton
Kirwan	O'Konski	Stubblefield
Kluczyński	O'Neill	Sullivan
Kowalski	Oliver	Teller
Lane	Passman	Thompson, N.J.
Lesinski	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Levering	Perkins	Thornberry
Libonati	Pfost	Toll
McCormack	Philbin	Trimble
McDowell	Pilcher	Udall
McFall	Poage	Ullman
McGinley	Porter	Vanik
McGovern	Powell	Vinson
Macdonald	Preston	Wampler
Machrowicz	Price	Watts
Mack	Prokop	Wier
Madden	Pucinski	Willis
Magnuson	Quigley	Wolf
Mahon	Rabaut	Wright
Marshall	Rains	Yates
Matthews	Randall	Young
Metcalfe	Reuss	Zablocki
Meyer	Rhodes, Pa.	Zelenko

NAYS—179

Abbott	Dwyer	Meador
Adair	Elliot, Pa.	Morrow
Alger	Fenton	Michel
Andersen,	Pino	Miller, N.Y.
Minn.	Ford	Milliken
Andrews	Forrester	Minshall
Arends	Fountain	Moore
Ashmore	Frazier	Mumma
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Murray
Avery	Fulton	Nelsen
Ayres	Gary	Norblad
Baker	Gathings	Norrell
Baldwin	Gavin	Osmer
Barry	Glenn	Ostertag
Bass, N.H.	Goodell	Pelly
Bates	Grant	Pierle
Baumhart	Griffin	Poff
Becker	Gubser	Quie
Belcher	Hagen	Ray
Bennett, Mich.	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Berry	Hardy	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	Harrison	Riehlman
Bolton	Hemphill	Riley
Bosch	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Bow	Hess	Robison
Bray	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Broomfield	Hoeven	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Broyhill	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Budge	Holt	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Schneebeli
Cahill	Hosmer	Schwengel
Canfield	Jensen	Sheppard
Cannon	Johansen	Siler
Cederberg	Johnson, Md.	Simpson
Chamberlain	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Chenoweth	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Chipperfield	Judd	Springer
Church	Kearns	Taber
Collier	Keith	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	Kitchen	Teague, Tex.
Conte	Knox	Thomson, Wyo.
Corbett	Kyl	Tollefson
Cramer	Lafore	Tuck
Cunningham	Laird	Utt
Curtin	Langen	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	Latta	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mo.	Lennon	Wallhauser
Dague	Lindsay	Weaver
Davis, Ga.	Lipscomb	Weis
Derounian	Loser	Westland
Derwinski	McCulloch	Wharton
Devine	McDonough	Whitener
Dixon	McIntire	Whitten
Dooley	McSweeney	Widnall
Dorn, N.Y.	Mailliard	Wilson
Dorn, S.C.	Martin	Winstead
Dowdy	Mason	Withrow
Downing	May	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Aspinall
NOT VOTING—38

Alexander	Forand	Rogers, Tex.
Allen	Gallagher	Santangelo
Barden	Gilbert	Scott
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Short
Blitch	Hébert	Sikes
Bonner	Jackson	Smith, Kans.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Buckley	Kilburn	Thomas
Chelf	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Wainwright
Diggs	McMillan	Walter
Durham	Morris, Okla.	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Pillion	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Johnson of Colorado for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Allen against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Pillion against.

Mr. Santangelo for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Wainwright against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Alexander against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. JONES of Missouri changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall I voted "no." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I, therefore, ask to be recorded as voting "present."

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MERROW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. UTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UTT moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 7155, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes, which is a bill similar to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. (a) That for the principal purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately five hundred thousand acres of land in Merced, Fresno, and Kings Counties, California, hereinafter referred to as the Federal San Luis unit service area, and as incidents thereto of furnishing water for municipal and domestic use and providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Luis unit as an integral part of the Central Valley project. The principal engineering features of said unit shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, a forebay and afterbay, the San Luis Canal, the Pleasant Valley Canal, and necessary pumping plants, distribution systems, drains, channels, levees, flood works, and related facilities. The works of the San Luis unit (hereinafter referred to as joint-use facilities) for joint use with the State of California (hereinafter referred to as the State) shall be the dam and reservoir at or near the San Luis site, forebay and afterbay, pumping plants, and the San Luis Canal. The joint-use facilities consisting of the dam and reservoir shall be constructed, and other joint-use facilities may be constructed so as to permit future expansion; or the joint-use facilities shall be constructed initially to the capacities necessary to serve both the Federal San Luis unit service area and the State's service area as hereinafter provided. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Luis unit, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Construction of the San Luis unit shall not be commenced until the Secretary has (1) secured, or has satisfactory assurance of his ability to secure all rights to the use of water which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the unit and the terms and conditions of this Act, and (2) received satisfactory assurance from the State of California that it will make provision for a master drainage outlet and disposal channel for the San Joaquin Valley, as generally outlined in the California water plan, Bulletin Numbered 3, of the California Department of Water Resources, which will adequately serve, by connection therewith, the drainage system for the San Luis unit or has made provision for constructing the San Luis interceptor drain to the delta designed to meet the drainage requirements of the San Luis unit as generally outlined in San Luis project report by the Bureau of Reclamation of May 1955, as transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, December 17, 1956.

(b) No water provided by the Federal San Luis unit shall be delivered in the Federal San Luis service area to any water user for

the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to negotiate and enter into an agreement with the State of California providing for coordinated operation of the San Luis unit, including the joint-use facilities, in order that the State may, without cost to the United States, deliver water in service areas outside the Federal San Luis unit service area as described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled "San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project," dated December 17, 1956. The Secretary shall not commence construction of the San Luis unit, except for the preparation of designs and specifications and other preliminary work, until the execution of such an agreement between the United States and the State, but if such an agreement has not been executed by January 1, 1962, and if, after consultation with the Governor of the State, the Secretary determines that the prospects of reaching accord on the terms thereof are not reasonably firm, he may proceed to construct and operate the San Luis unit in accordance with section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That, if the Secretary so determines, he shall report thereon to the Congress and shall not commence construction for ninety calendar days from the date of his report (which ninety 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 days). In considering the prospects of reaching accord on the terms of the agreement the Secretary shall give substantial weight to any relevant affirmative action theretofore taken by the State, including the enactment of State legislation authorizing the State to acquire and convey to the United States title to lands to be used for the San Luis unit or assistance given by it in financing Federal design and construction of the unit. The authority conferred upon the Secretary by the first sentence of this section shall not, except as is otherwise provided in this section, be construed as a limitation upon the exercise by him of the authority conferred in section 1 of this Act, but if the State shall agree equitably to share the total cost of constructing the joint-use facilities and as a part of its share to make available to the Secretary sufficient funds to pay the additional cost of designing and constructing the joint-use facilities so as to permit enlargement, it shall have an irrevocable right to enlarge or modify such facilities at any time in the future, and a perpetual right to the use of such additional capacity: *Provided*, That the performance of such work by the State, after approval of its plans by the Secretary, shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the project for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act: *And provided further*, That this right may be relinquished by the State at any time at its option.

Sec. 3. The agreement between the United States and the State referred to in section 2 of this Act shall provide, among other things, that—

(a) the joint use facilities to be constructed by the Secretary shall be so designed and constructed to such capacities and in such manner as to permit either (1) immediate integration and coordinated operation with the State's water projects by providing, among other things, a capacity in

San Luis Reservoir of approximately two million one hundred thousand acre-feet and corresponding capacities in the other joint-use facilities or (2) such subsequent enlargement or other modification as may be required for integration and coordinated operation therewith;

(b) the State shall make available to the Secretary during the construction period sufficient funds to pay an equitable share of the construction costs of any facilities designed and constructed as provided in paragraph (a) above. The State contribution shall be made in annual installments, each of which bears approximately the same ratio to total expenditures during that year as the total of the State's share bears to the total cost of the facilities; the State may make advances to the United States in order to maintain a timely construction schedule of the joint-use facilities and the works of the San Luis unit to be used by the State and the United States;

(c) the State may at any time after approval of its plans by the Secretary and at its own expense enlarge or modify San Luis Dam and Reservoir and other facilities to be used jointly by the State and the United States, but the performance of such work shall be so carried on as not to interfere unduly with the operation of the San Luis unit for the purposes set forth in section 1 of this Act;

(d) the United States and the State shall each pay annually an equitable share of the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of the joint-use facilities;

(e) promptly after execution of this agreement between the Secretary and the State, and for the purpose of said agreement, the State shall convey to the United States title to any lands, easements, and rights-of-way which it then owns and which are required for the joint-use facilities. The State shall be given credit for the costs of these lands, easements, and rights-of-way toward its share of the construction costs of the joint-use facilities. The State shall likewise be given credit for any funds advanced by it to the Secretary for preparation of designs and specifications or for any other work in connection with the joint-use facilities;

(f) the rights to the use of capacities of the joint-use facilities of the San Luis unit shall be allocated to the United States and the State, respectively, in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon. The United States shall not be restricted in the exercise of its right so allocated, which shall be sufficient to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and which shall extend throughout the repayment period and so long thereafter as title to the works remains in the United States. The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit service area;

(g) the Secretary may turn over to the State the care, operation, and maintenance of any works of the San Luis unit which are used jointly by the United States and the State at such time and under such conditions as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State;

(h) notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance of any works to the State, as hereinbefore provided, any organization which has theretofore entered into a contract with the United States under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 for a water supply through the works of the San Luis unit, including joint-use facilities, shall continue to have and to enjoy the same rights which it would have had under its contract with the United States and the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 1 of the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 483; 43 U.S.C. 485h-1), in the absence of such transfer, and its enjoyment of such rights shall

be without added cost or other detriment arising from such transfer;

(i) if a nonreimbursable allocation to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife has been made as provided in section 2 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080; 16 U.S.C. 662), as amended, the features of the unit to which such allocation is attributable shall, notwithstanding transfer of title or of the care, operation, and maintenance to the State, be operated and maintained in such wise as to retain the bases upon which such allocation is premised and, upon failure so to operate and maintain those features, the amount allocated thereto shall become a reimbursable cost to be paid by the State.

Sec. 4. In constructing, operating, and maintaining a drainage system for the San Luis unit, the Secretary is authorized to permit the use thereof by other parties under contract conforming generally to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws with respect to irrigation repayment or service contracts and is further authorized to enter into agreements and participate in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area of which the lands to be served by the San Luis unit are a part, to the extent the works authorized in section 1 of this Act contribute to drainage requirements of said area. The Secretary is also authorized to permit the use of the irrigation facilities of the San Luis unit, including its facilities for supplying pumping energy, under contracts entered into pursuant to section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1911 (36 Stat. 925, 43 U.S.C. 523).

Sec. 5. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the San Luis unit, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by the State or an appropriate local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to provide Central Valley project service, by way of the Pacheco Tunnel route, to lands and municipalities in Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties: *Provided*, That construction of the works to provide such service shall not be undertaken until a report demonstrating their physical and economic feasibility has been completed, reviewed by the State, and approved by the Secretary and by the Congress, and in no event prior to July 1, 1964, unless, in the meantime, the Governor of the State of California shall have notified the Secretary that the State approves the construction of such works by the United States.

Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works of the San Luis unit, including joint use facilities, authorized by this Act, other than distribution systems and drains, the sum of \$290,430,000, plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the San Luis unit as shown by engineering indexes. There are also authorized to be appropriated, in addition thereto, such amounts as are required (a) for construction of such distribution systems and drains as are not constructed by local interests, and (b) for operation and maintenance of the unit. All moneys received by the Secretary from the State under this Act shall be covered into the same accounts as moneys appropriated hereunder and shall be available, without further appropriation, to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 44, and substitute therefor the language in the bill H.R. 7155 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill, as amended.

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

A similar House bill, H.R. 7155, was laid on the table.

AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 27, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 530, Rept. No. 1613) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That H. Res. 27, Eighty-sixth Congress, is amended by striking out the period at the end of clause (7) on page 2 and inserting "; and" and by inserting after clause (7) on page 2 the following clause: "(8) involving the activities and operations of interstate compacts;"

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 533, Rept. No. 1616) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING A PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 532, Rept. No. 1615) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2130) to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the

five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PROVIDING FOR COMPREHENSIVE OPERATION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. COLMER), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 531, Rept. No. 1614) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7201) to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT INCENTIVE TAX ACT OF 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 5, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, March 8, 1960, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] had 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] had 22 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would reserve 5 minutes, just in case we need it for purpose of explanation.

Mr. MASON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all of my 20 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we began debate on this measure some weeks ago. At that time certain objections were raised to the proposed legislation, and in view of the fact that we were debating the bill under a closed rule as reported by the Rules Committee, it was felt that the best way to handle the objections was to reconsider the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means and adopt, if possible, committee amendments which would meet the objections.

There were three fundamental objections: One was that the administration and the Treasury Department took the position that this proposed legislation should be limited to the so-called underdeveloped countries.

The second was that we had written in the committee a so-called gross-up provision, which is a very technical tax matter quite difficult to explain, but nevertheless we had written it into this bill and had written it in other legislation pending before the committee.

The third had to do with labor standard conditions in the other countries of the world.

I think the Ways and Means Committee has met all of these objections. On yesterday I incorporated in the RECORD a comprehensive statement setting forth these committee amendments, setting forth the objections that had been raised some weeks ago, and our effort to correct these objections.

In the limited time available I do not propose to go into these matters in great detail, but as soon as general debate is over, which apparently will be in a few minutes, I will offer the committee amendments, which we are allowed to do under the rule and then will go into a general explanation.

One of the problems we had in the committee on so-called underdeveloped areas was the problem of defining these areas. This was finally worked out by the Treasury Department working in conjunction with the State Department and actually writing into the proposed law the so-called developed countries. I might read these to you: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and any of the countries within the Sino-Soviet bloc. That means that the other nations of the world, including the nations of Latin America, are eligible to participate in the tax-preferred provision of this proposed legislation.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. All Western Hemisphere nations are eligible with the exception of Canada.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

I might say that with the adoption of this amendment the Treasury Department and the administration approve the bill as written. I might also say that further objections to the so-called de-

veloped countries were raised by other groups, such as the AFL-CIO, and with the adoption of this amendment they too have directed a communication to the committee approving the legislation as drafted.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to corroborate the gentleman's statement in respect to the position of the Treasury Department. As I understand it, in the communication to the chairman of the committee they state:

While the labor standards amendment and import restrictions which are already in the bill would create serious administrative problems, the Treasury Department nevertheless would support the bill as amended.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman. The Treasury Department worked very closely with the staff of the Ways and Means Committee in drafting these amendments to the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. For my information and for the information of other Members of the House, would the gentleman be so kind as to briefly explain to the Members of the House what advantages would be obtained by possibly choosing to come under the provision, if it should become law, as contrasted with the existing foreign subsidiary provisions?

Mr. BOGGS. The only advantage that I know of would be that these companies could operate under the American flag. The present device that American business uses, of course, has to do with what the gentleman mentioned a minute ago, namely, the use of foreign-based corporations. Under this proposal, with the exception of developed countries which I read a moment ago, an American company could use the American flag in these so-called undeveloped countries. Of course, there is some question as to how much capital will be generated in these countries but it is something that we should do. We should at least give it a trial.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Would the gentleman attach any significance to the requirement under the foreign subsidiary act that the taxpayer is required to establish tax avoidance as not being one of the purposes of the creation of this subsidiary, and does the fact we do not have a similar provision in H.R. 5 make any difference?

Mr. BOGGS. H.R. 5 is much more restrictive than any foreign subsidiary operations. As a matter of fact, in the case of the foreign subsidiary mere declaration is conclusive. But we have no way that we can look into a corporation organized in Great Britain, Mexico, Canada, or in the Philippine Islands. Under this arrangement the American Treasury Department has complete availability of the documents and the records of the American corporation, so that under the arrangement proposed

here there is the same control that the Treasury Department has over all other domestic corporations. Under the foreign subsidiary there is none of that.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Is it not true that under existing law there is no limitation upon the exports back into this country or imports of manufactured articles abroad, but under H.R. 5 to remain qualified it cannot exceed 10 percent, which is a great advantage from the standpoint of foreign competition.

Mr. BOGGS. That is true. The gentleman knows that is true because it is his amendment which created that limitation. That is another restriction that does not apply to the foreign subsidiary which the gentleman from Michigan referred to.

Mr. BAKER. On that very point, that was the main source of our opposition here, as I got it, when the bill was before the House previously.

Mr. BOGGS. I think that is correct.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. I think this legislation has been improved since we considered it recently, but in reference to the section relating to the activities of American banks and their branch banking activities in these countries, do those branch activities continue to be exempt or entitled to deferred taxation?

Mr. BOGGS. The answer is, again, that this is tax deferral; not tax forgiveness. And, we do not try to limit it to any particular type of corporation that qualifies under the very restrictive provisions of the language in the Act, so that if a branch bank qualifies, then it is still in the legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Well, as the legislation now stands, the activities of branch banking by American banks in these countries would still be subject to this deferral privilege under this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. If they qualify under the other provisions of the bill, that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman would inform me whether Cuba is included as one of the underdeveloped countries.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, it is; that is correct. I might say to the gentleman, however, that there is very little prospect of any investment there.

Mr. PELLY. I do not think there are any profits there.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the author of the bill

please tell me whether one of the purposes of the bill is to give American industry a better opportunity to compete with foreign countries?

Mr. BOGGS. Precisely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, will the bill, if we adopt it, tend to lessen the number of jobs for our local employees?

Mr. BOGGS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you sure?

Mr. BOGGS. Well, only as sure as anybody can be about anything, I will say to the gentleman. It is our feeling and the feeling of the people who have studied this legislation that we will actually increase the number of American jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here at home?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the gentleman from Louisiana how this bill is going to increase jobs in this country. He has just made that statement and I would like to hear his answer.

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will refer to the statement which I incorporated in the Record today, as a matter of fact, the gentleman will note it on page A4203. The gentleman will note the areas where we sell the most and, of course, the things that we sell are the things that are made in this country, the areas where we have the most investment, you will note that the greatest one is Canada.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of investment is the gentleman talking about? Is he talking about private investment or the investments to the tune of billions of dollars that the taxpayers have in foreign aid all over the world?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Louisiana is talking exclusively about private investment. Canada, as far as I know—and I may be wrong. I see the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] here, who has made quite a study of Canada, and he can correct me—Canada, as far as I know, has never received any foreign aid from the United States. Will somebody correct me on that? I do not think so. Canada is our best customer.

Mr. GROSS. It is the only one that has been passed over if it has not gotten some of the foreign handouts.

Mr. BOGGS. So I say to the gentleman that the best evidence I can give in answer to his question is that if past experience means anything, then it means that the areas where we use our private funds, not taxpayers funds, are the places where the most American products will be purchased. I will give you another example. Mexico is a good one. Mexico is fast becoming one of our best customers on the basis of the investments we have there.

Mr. GROSS. I am lost as far as this bill is concerned. You have backed and filled so often on this bill since it was

before the House in March. Is it planned to dispose of this bill today or put it over for another 2 months?

Mr. BOGGS. I would invite the gentleman to support the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are you going to walk up the hill and down again, back and fill some more? How many amendments will be offered to this bill this afternoon that only a handful of Members have ever seen?

Mr. BOGGS. Two committee amendments.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman got trapped in his own closed rule; is that right?

Mr. BOGGS. I do not believe that I got trapped, no.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Louisiana had to go back to his committee in order to get some amendments to this bill, to make it palatable enough to sell to the Members of the House. He was hanging on the ropes when the bill was before the House previously, so he went back to the committee to get this monstrosity sweetened up and sugar-coated.

Mr. BOGGS. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays], my good friend, said the other day, he who fights and runs away may live to fight another day. Perhaps the gentleman has described it accurately, I do not know. I admire the gentleman and I hope the gentleman will support the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are the insurance guarantees put out by the ICA applicable to Americans who take their money and go abroad under the terms of the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. That is an entirely different law. The insurance guarantees come under the mutual security program.

Mr. GROSS. I know; but are the beneficiaries of this legislation entitled to those guarantees?

Mr. BOGGS. My answer would be yes, I should think so.

Mr. GROSS. So they get the benefit of this cheap insurance as to convertibility, as to expropriation and as to war-risk damage in some cases; and then also under the terms of this bill they get a tax deferral, or preferential tax treatment?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know—and I cannot really tell whether the gentleman is being completely serious or not—the insurance program was inaugurated to try to encourage private funds instead of Government funds to go into these areas. There are certainly some places on earth where they could be used. I do not know whether they have been used or not. We have seen the fantastic beating that the American investor has taken lately in Cuba. Whether or not the insurance program has been of help there or not, I do not know.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. When they get this insurance they pay a fee, a premium, just the same as anybody else does when he buys insurance.

Mr. GROSS. Sure, they do. But the gentleman is not trying to tell me that

Lloyds of London would offer this insurance at the premium rate the ICA charges. He does not mean to tell me that Lloyds of London would insure against war risk damage in some of these countries where ICA is insuring?

Mr. JUDD. There are two answers. The first is that ICA has not had any losses. So obviously the insurance was not too bad.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by not too bad?

Mr. JUDD. The risks were not too bad, if they have had no losses. Maybe Lloyds has been unwise in not getting in on this.

Mr. GROSS. They do not miss many bets.

Mr. JUDD. The other reason, the big reason for such Government insurance, is that these investment guarantees and insurance are given for investment in projects which are economically sound, but which are in countries where there are unusual political risks. You cannot expect private funds to invest in a project which, however attractive it may be, is in a country whose political future is uncertain. Yet it is to our advantage to have investments in that particular country—and we will need to put in Government funds, if private funds are not invested.

Mr. GROSS. Give some of these countries a little time and stop giving them millions of dollars through the foreign handout program and it will be demonstrated how good they are as risks. This country has handed out nearly \$100 billion in foreign aid since the end of World War II and yet the climate for American investors in some of these countries, including Britain and France, is still so poor that these investors take out insurance with the ICA to protect themselves as to convertibility and the seizure of their investments. Now you want to give the corporations of this country preferential tax treatment on their investments. I hope none of those who vote for this bill will try to cry on my shoulder when they seek funds from the U.S. Treasury for their depressed areas when one of the contributing factors to unemployment and idle industry is because special tax treatment is given to those who take their money abroad and benefit from the cheap foreign labor that is to be found all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. Church].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to address one specific question to the chairman of the subcommittee. I notice from the insertion that he put yesterday into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a third amendment will be proposed, seeking to make a corporation ineligible as a foreign business corporation if it has been operating abroad under substandard labor conditions. I should certainly approve the amendment; but I wonder if the gentleman could describe or define just what is meant by substandard labor

conditions; according to U.S. standards or the undeveloped country's standards—or what?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentlewoman asks a very pertinent question; the standards prevailing in the country involved.

Mrs. CHURCH. Without any attempt being made in any case to elevate such standards to meet our own standards of labor?

Mr. BOGGS. Our experience is that the American investor generally maintains labor standards that are not only comparable to that in the host country, but in most cases higher than those in the host country. I think the tendency definitely will be to elevate those standards to be comparable to ours. That is what we hope will happen.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then it is the hope of the gentleman that eventually standards abroad might be raised in order to lessen competition with our own workmen at home?

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly.

Mrs. CHURCH. I had hoped that such might be the case.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to speak on these two committee amendments proposed by the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] because I did not know about them until about 10 minutes ago; there are no printed copies on the floor nor is there a committee report. But I do believe that before we vote on this matter we ought to study the path this legislation has followed from its beginning.

Last year the bill was introduced. I do not know what they called it then, perhaps the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1959. But let us see what the intent of this legislation is. At the time the bill was introduced, under certain conditions, it gave the industry that would manufacture goods abroad, the promise to pay only 38-percent corporation tax instead of 52 percent. That is a differential of 14 percent, which is an enormous amount.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I do not want to take exception to the gentleman, but the gentleman is referring to one specific type of operation, namely, the Western Hemisphere corporation, which was passed during the war. This is the only type of corporation which gets this type of exemption. It applies only in that specific situation.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that.

Mr. BOGGS. It specifically does not apply to this legislation.

Mr. BRAY. I well realize that, because you did not get by with that. I spoke against that bill last year. I pointed out how, if passed, it was going to injure American labor and American manufacturers. Then the bill was changed by the committee, because the proponents could not get by with that 14 percent less taxes.

The American corporations pay 52 percent and these would pay 38 percent. In addition to that, they would not have to pay the taxes until they brought the money back to the United States.

Then, when the bill was brought to the floor here a month or so ago, the 38-percent corporation tax was eliminated, but they were allowed to leave their money abroad without paying taxes until the money was returned to the United States.

Then after debating it over a day, the proponents saw that they were not going to get by with that, so now they come to us with the two amendments changing it, whereby they put a sugar coating on this legislation so that this is to help depressed countries. Imagine trying to set up American labor standards in Pakistan or India.

The real object of this bill is as it states, the Foreign Investment Incentive Act of 1960. I do not know how much more incentive is going to be necessary to get American corporations to manufacture their goods abroad instead of in the United States. They are doing very well on that subject. Three thousand American concerns are now manufacturing goods abroad. I discussed this matter on the floor in detail when this bill was before the House last March.

Within the last month I have had conferences with labor in four different industries in my district as to the great damage that is being done them by goods brought into America from abroad, and in two of the industries, unless something changes within 2 years, are simply going to be out of business.

America has been helping all countries and peoples of the world, but I do believe we might spend just a little time and interest in trying to look after American interests and American workmen. Thirty billion dollars has already been spent by American money on factories abroad.

But let us get back to the intent of this bill. Once they get their foot in the door the supposed safeguards in this bill will be changed. Why do you have to give any more incentive to get American business to manufacture abroad? They are certainly doing a wonderful job doing their manufacturing abroad now.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the last statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, I would again call to the attention of the membership that under existing law there is no limitation on imports back into this country which are manufactured abroad. Under H.R. 5, we have limited that to 10 percent. I just cannot see for the life of me why, whatever your objection might be to any other provision of the bill, that is not in the interest of the American economy.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Is it not true under this bill imports back to this country are

limited to 10 percent of dollar volume of business of the foreign corporation, and 10 percent of their total volume might amount to 100 percent of the production of any particular industry in the United States.

Mr. BAKER. That is not the case.

Mr. DENT. That is the law, as I read it, and I beg the gentleman's pardon if it is not.

Mr. BAKER. If you manufacture say \$1 million worth of windows in a foreign country, you could only send back to this country 10 percent of that million dollars worth of windows which, if my arithmetic is correct, would amount to \$100,000 worth.

Mr. DENT. That is in dollar volume; is that not correct?

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

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the pending bill. Our free enterprise system is, in my view, the most potent and versatile weapon in the arsenal of the free world. We can best meet the challenge of the Communist bloc in the underdeveloped areas of the world by providing incentives to induce private American capital to go abroad and take with it the imagination, the skill and the vitality that has made our economic system the strongest that the world has known. This bill would provide such incentives.

Regrettably, the rules provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 respecting the taxation of income derived from abroad and the administrative regulations and rulings thereunder are predicated upon the form of business organization and transaction rather than upon substantive effect and business need. The tax consequences of operating abroad thus vary greatly depending upon whether or not the particular business is in a position to utilize a branch organization, a domestic corporation or a foreign subsidiary. At the present time the branch form of organization is at a decided disadvantage and businesses which are forced, for either legal or practical reasons, to utilize this form of doing business find themselves at a competitive disadvantage respecting businesses with more freedom of choice. American banks and American insurance companies doing business abroad are required by both practical and legal reasons to operate as branches abroad. In the case of banks, foreign depositors expect and rely upon the security of the entire capital funds of the U.S. bank and this capital strength cannot be translated into subsidiaries for the banking laws do not ordinarily permit the guarantee of the liabilities of a banking subsidiary. For this and other reasons found in the laws which regulate banking, had not the Committee on Ways and Means taken steps with respect to the provisions of H.R. 5 to permit U.S. banks to treat their foreign branches as though they were foreign business corporations, they would have continued at a competitive disadvantage in relationship to the banks of other countries.

The action taken by your committee to prevent the continuation of this

discrimination against United States banks is incorporated in the new section 957 which H.R. 5 would add to the Internal Revenue Code. This section would permit banks to treat their foreign branches for tax purposes as if they were separate foreign business corporations. For the foreign branches of an United States bank to be treated as foreign business corporations under the bill, they must elect such treatment and meet the qualifications for business in general, that is, they must derive 90 percent or more of their gross income from sources without the United States and derive 90 percent or more of their gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business. For this purpose, commissions and interests and income from gains on loans and investments which are ordinary and necessary in carrying on the trade or business of banking are to be considered as being derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

Under the bill the foreign branches of United States banks are to be treated, under regulations to be issued by the Treasury Department, in the same manner as if they were separate corporate entities except that under subchapter C the rules relating to contributions of property and to distributions are not to apply. However, distributions received by the United States parent bank from a foreign branch will be treated as dividends with respect to which a 100 percent dividends received deduction is allowed.

The bill also provides that a United States parent bank may in its first election with respect to its branches elect to treat a branch as if it were a separate foreign business corporation or combine it with branches in other countries as a foreign business corporation. The latitude provided by this election will provide the flexibility of business decision necessary to best cope with local conditions.

It will be noted that the treatment provided by the bill in the case of the foreign branches of U.S. banks does not become available until taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1963. In my view, this is unfortunate. However, the Treasury Department has informed your committee that it does not have the personnel to issue the necessary regulations to permit the implementation of section 957 before January 1, 1963. I have been informed by the U.S. banks doing business abroad that they stand willing and able to cooperate with the Treasury Department in the task of issuing the necessary regulations. In my view the joint efforts of the Treasury Department and the banking industry would result in the issuance of the necessary regulations long before January 1, 1963, and I express the hope that it will be possible for the Treasury Department to reconsider its view of this matter when the bill is before the other body.

U.S. insurance companies operating abroad are also required in many cases to utilize the branch form. In most respects their case is similar to that of U.S. banks and I regret that the treatment provided for the foreign branches of U.S.

banks is not also provided for the foreign branches of U.S. insurance companies. However, subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provides for the income taxation of life insurance companies is a most complicated provision. As stated by House Report No. 1282 accompanying the bill, a special situation exists in the case of life insurance companies and they have been included in the ineligible category of corporations under the bill only because of the difficulty in working out the interrelationship of the bill's provisions and the life insurance company tax treatment provided by subchapter L of the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly, they were made ineligible corporations for the present, without prejudice as to ultimate revision of this treatment until an opportunity has been presented for further study. It is my hope that the study will be completed before the bill comes up for consideration in the other body.

The life insurance industry stands willing and eager to cooperate in this study, and is, at the present time, engaged in working out the necessary technical provisions to implement a provision which would allow them to come within the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill by the House. I do not need to remind the Members of this body that economic subversion is an important tool of the Soviet bloc. Unless affirmative steps are taken to place American business in a position to compete with the Communist economic policies abroad, we face the possibility that we will find ourselves excluded from the markets of the world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute now in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

No amendments are in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The committee substitute is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

"(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act of 1960'.

"(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

"SEC. 2. FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

"(a) TAX ON FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—Part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 (relating to income from sources without

the United States) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"SUBPART F—FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS
"Sec. 951. Definition of foreign business corporation.

"Sec. 952. Gross, taxable, and reinvested foreign income of foreign business corporations.

"Sec. 953. Reinvested foreign income account.

"Sec. 954. Distributions, etc., from reinvested foreign income account.

"Sec. 955. Foreign taxes.

"Sec. 956. Special rules.

"Sec. 957. Elected foreign branches of banks taxed as foreign business corporations.

"SEC. 951. DEFINITION OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.

"(a) FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this title, the term "foreign business corporation" means a domestic corporation which has elected the treatment provided by this subject and which for the taxable year satisfies each of the following requirements:

"(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States.

"(2) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from—

"(A) the active conduct of a trade or business,

"(B) dividends from a qualified payor corporation (as defined in subsection (c)) which are out of earnings and profits of any taxable year for which such corporation was a qualified payor corporation (or would have been such a corporation but for the 10 percent stock ownership requirement of subsection (c) (1) (A)),

"(C) income (other than dividends) from a qualified payor corporation, and

"(D) compensation (other than compensation to which subparagraph (A) or (C) applies)—

"(i) for the rendition, without the United States, of technical, managerial, engineering, construction, scientific, or like services; and

"(ii) for the use of, or for the privilege of using, without the United States, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulas, good will, trademarks, trade brands, franchises, and other like properties (but this clause shall apply only to the extent that the compensation described in this clause does not exceed 25 percent of the corporation's gross income).

"(3) It derives not more than 10 percent of its gross income from the sale of articles which are sold by it for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States.

"(4) It is not an ineligible corporation (as defined in subsection (d)).

"(5) It furnishes for the taxable year, and for prior taxable years affecting (or affected by) an election under this subpart, such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of the income tax laws.

"(b) ELECTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An election under this subpart may be made for any taxable year to which this subpart applies and for which (after making the election) the taxpayer is a foreign business corporation. An election, once effective, shall continue in effect for all subsequent taxable years of the corporation making the election up to and including—

"(A) the taxable year for which the election is revoked by the filing of a notice of revocation, or

"(B) the taxable year for which the election is terminated by reason of the fact that (i) such corporation was not a foreign business corporation for both such taxable year and the preceding taxable year, or (ii) such

taxable year is the last taxable year of the corporation.

"(2) WHEN ELECTION MUST BE MADE, ETC.—An election under this subpart may be made by a corporation for any taxable year at any time during the first month of such taxable year or at any time during the month preceding such first month. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(3) NOTICE OF REVOCATION.—A notice of revocation (with respect to any taxable year) of an election under this subpart may be made only in such manner, and before such time, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(c) QUALIFIED PAYOR CORPORATION DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a domestic or foreign corporation shall be treated, with respect to another corporation, as a qualified payor corporation for any of its taxable years (including taxable years beginning before January 1, 1961) with respect to which—

"(A) at least 10 percent of its voting stock is owned by such other corporation,

"(B) it satisfies the requirements described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a), and

"(C) it derives 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For purposes of determining the tax of the taxpayer, no corporation shall be treated as a qualified payor corporation, with respect to the taxpayer or any other corporation, unless the taxpayer furnishes such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

"(2) DISQUALIFICATION FOR INSUFFICIENT FOREIGN INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL.—A corporation shall not be a qualified payor corporation for any taxable year if, on determining a percentage under section 954(b) with respect to such corporation (whether or not such corporation is a foreign business corporation), such percentage exceeds 20 percent. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a corporation shall be treated as engaged in only one trade or business.

"(3) OTHER SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of determining under paragraph (1) of this subsection whether a corporation is a qualified payor corporation—

"(A) income from another corporation shall be treated as from a qualified payor corporation if such other corporation satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1) (without regard to subparagraph (C) thereof), and

"(B) a foreign corporation shall be treated as an ineligible corporation if it is a foreign personal holding company.

"(d) INELIGIBLE CORPORATION.—For purposes of subsection (a) (4), each of the following (as determined without regard to this subpart) is an ineligible corporation:

"(1) A corporation exempt from taxation under subchapter F.

"(2) A corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922.

"(3) A regulated investment company subject to tax under subchapter M.

"(4) A personal holding company (as defined in section 542).

"(5) A life insurance company (as defined in section 801).

"(6) An unincorporated business enterprise subject to tax as a corporation under section 1361.

"(7) An electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371(b)).

"SEC. 952. GROSS, TAXABLE, AND REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

"(a) GROSS INCOME AND TAXABLE INCOME OF FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—For purposes of this title (other than section 170,

relating to charitable contributions or gifts, subchapter G of this chapter, relating to corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders, subpart C of this part, relating to Western Hemisphere trade corporations, and section 951)—

“(1) The gross income of a foreign business corporation shall be the sum of—

“(A) the gross income from sources within the United States, and

“(B) the amount (which shall be treated as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year) subtracted from its reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year, as determined under section 953.

“(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter to the extent deductible under part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income), as modified by this subpart, in determining taxable income from sources within the United States.

“(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term “reinvested foreign income” means the taxable income from sources without the United States (as determined under part I of this subchapter, with the modifications provided by this subpart).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

“(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

“(B) There shall be included, as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year, an amount equal to the taxes which (on applying section 955(c)) are deemed paid under section 902.

“(C) If the net long-term capital gain from sources without the United States exceeds the net short-term capital loss from such sources, then the reinvested foreign income for such taxable year shall be the sum of—

“(i) the reinvested foreign income (computed without regard to this subparagraph) reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of such excess, and

“(ii) the amount ascertained by multiplying the amount of such excess by the percentage obtained by subtracting from 100 percent the sum of the normal and surtax rates applicable to such taxable year.

This subparagraph shall apply only if the amount of reinvested foreign income determined under this subparagraph is less than the amount determined without regard to this subparagraph.

“SEC. 953. REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each corporation making an election under this subpart shall, for purposes of this subpart, establish and maintain a reinvested foreign income account. The amount in such account as of the first day of the first taxable year to which the election applies shall be zero.

“(b) ADDITIONS TO ACCOUNT.—The amount added to the reinvested foreign income account for any taxable year for which the corporation is a foreign business corporation shall be an amount equal to the reinvested foreign income for such taxable year.

“(c) SUBTRACTIONS FROM ACCOUNT.—

“(1) ORDER OF SUBTRACTION.—Any amount subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account of a corporation for any taxable year shall be treated as made first out of the addition to such account for such year, to the extent thereof, and thereafter out of the most recently added amounts which have not previously been subtracted.

“(2) AMOUNT OF SUBTRACTION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the amount of the subtraction from the reinvested foreign income account of a corporation for any taxable year shall be the sum of—

“(A) the amount which is treated under this subpart as distributed from such account for such year, plus

“(B) whichever of the following amounts is the larger:

“(i) the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year is increased by section 952(a)(1)(B) or 956(b), or

“(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made.

If a subtraction from the reinvested foreign income account for any taxable year is out of more than one addition to such account, subparagraph (B) shall be applied separately with respect to each taxable year of addition out of which the subtraction is made.

“(3) ENTIRE AMOUNT SUBTRACTED IN CASE OF REVOCATION OF TERMINATION.—Except as provided in section 381(c)(23), if an election under this subpart is revoked or terminated, the entire amount in the reinvested foreign income account shall be subtracted from the account for the last taxable year for which such election was in effect.

“(4) ACCOUNT NOT TO BE REDUCED BELOW ZERO.—Amounts subtracted under this subsection shall not reduce the reinvested foreign income account below zero.

“SEC. 954. DISTRIBUTIONS, ETC., FROM REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this subpart, the amount of any distribution to shareholders shall be treated as made out of the reinvested foreign income account. For purposes of this subsection—

“(i) the term “distribution” includes any distribution in redemption of stock or in partial or complete liquidation of the corporation, but does not include any distribution made by the corporation in its stock or in rights to acquire its stock; and

“(2) the amount of any distribution shall be the fair market value of the property distributed.

“(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF UNITED STATES INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, there shall be treated as distributed to shareholders for the taxable year, out of the reinvested foreign income account, one-half of the amount determined by multiplying the portion of the reinvested foreign income for the taxable year which is attributable to the active conduct of a trade or business by the percentage determined by dividing—

“(A) the sum of (i) the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's property within the United States, and (ii) an amount 2 times the amount paid or accrued during the taxable year for labor and personal services performed within the United States, by

“(B) the sum of (i) the adjusted basis of the taxpayer's property wherever located, and (ii) an amount 2 times the amount paid or accrued during the taxable year for all labor and personal services.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, only real property and tangible personal property (other than property described in section 1221(1)), and labor and personal services, which are ordinary and necessary for carrying on the trade or business shall be taken into account. In the case of a taxpayer engaged in two or more separate and distinct trades or businesses, separate computations shall be made under this subsection with respect to each such trade or business.

“(2) PARAGRAPH (1) INAPPLICABLE WHERE PERCENTAGE IS LESS THAN 10 PERCENT.—If the percentage determined under paragraph (1) with respect to any trade or business for any taxable year is less than 10 percent, paragraph (1) shall not apply to such trade or business for such taxable year.

“(c) HOLDING OF PROHIBITED PROPERTY TREATED AS DISTRIBUTION.—

“(1) PROPERTY HELD BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—If the taxpayer holds prohibited property at any time during the taxable year, it shall be treated as having made a distribution to shareholders out of its reinvested foreign income account for such taxable year.

“(2) PROPERTY HELD BY CERTAIN OTHER CORPORATIONS.—If the taxpayer owns (directly or through one or more other corporations) 10 percent or more of the voting stock of another corporation, it shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as holding a corresponding percentage of the property held by such other corporation which would be prohibited property if such other corporation were a foreign business corporation.

“(3) AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTION.—

“(A) MAXIMUM AMOUNT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—This subsection shall be applied, with respect to the taxpayer, at that time during its taxable year when it results in the maximum amount of prohibited property.

“(B) AMOUNT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WITH RESPECT TO PARTICULAR PROPERTIES.—For purposes of this subsection, the amount taken into account with respect to any property shall be the adjusted basis of such property, reduced by the sum of—

“(i) any liability to which such property is subject, and

“(ii) the aggregate amount treated as distributions for prior taxable years by reason of such corporation's holding such property. For purposes of clause (ii), a distribution for a prior taxable year shall be treated as attributable first to the properties constituting prohibited property which were held at the close of such taxable year.

“(4) PROHIBITED PROPERTY DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “prohibited property” means any property other than—

“(i) tangible or intangible property which is ordinary and necessary for carrying on a trade or business of the taxpayer (but only if for the taxable year or for the preceding taxable year 90 percent or more of the gross income of such trade or business is derived from sources without the United States),

“(ii) securities of another corporation which is a qualified payor corporation (or a corporation, at least 10 percent of the voting stock of which is owned by the taxpayer, with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect) for its taxable year ending with or within the taxpayer's taxable year or for the immediately preceding taxable year of such other corporation.

“(iii) obligations of foreign governments, but only to the extent that the aggregate adjusted basis of all such obligations does not exceed 15 percent of the taxpayer's earnings and profits accumulated after December 31, 1960 (determined as of the beginning of the taxable year),

“(iv) obligations of the United States, money, and deposits with persons carrying on the banking business, and

“(v) any loan to which subsection (d) applies.

“(B) SECURITY DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term “security” means any share of stock in any corporation, certificate of stock or interest in any corporation, note, bond, debenture, or evidence of indebtedness, or any evidence of an interest in or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing.

“(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (2).—

“(A) NO ATTRIBUTION THROUGH A FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to—

“(i) stock held in a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect, and

“(ii) stock and other property which (but for this clause) would be treated as held by the taxpayer solely by reason of holding stock described in clause (i).

“(B) NO DUPLICATION IN ATTRIBUTION THROUGH ANOTHER CORPORATION.—If (but for this subparagraph) any corporation would be treated under paragraph (2) as holding prohibited property by reason of—

“(i) stock in another corporation, and

“(ii) stock or other property held by such other corporation, there shall be taken into account under such paragraph only the amount determined with respect to clause (i) or clause (ii), whichever is the greater.

“(C) FAIR MARKET VALUE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHERE INFORMATION IS NOT FURNISHED.—For purposes of this subsection, the amount taken into account for any taxable year by the taxpayer with respect to any other corporation described in paragraph (2) shall be the fair market value of its direct or indirect stock holdings in such corporation, unless the taxpayer furnishes such information with respect to such corporation as the Secretary or his delegate has prescribed by forms or regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this subpart.

“(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LOANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, if any corporation makes a loan to another corporation which owns (directly or through one or more other corporations) 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the lending corporation, then—

“(A) If the lending corporation is a foreign business corporation (or a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect), it shall be treated as having made a distribution to shareholders, in an amount equal to the loan, out of its reinvested foreign income account for such taxable year.

“(B) If the borrowing corporation is a foreign business corporation, an amount equal to the loan shall be treated, for purposes of determining reinvested foreign income, as an item of gross income received at the time the loan was received. For purposes of applying this paragraph, each corporation in a chain of ownership (other than the lending and the borrowing corporations) shall be treated as having received, and in turn distributed, an amount equal to such loan.

“(2) OUTSTANDING LOANS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN TREATED AS DISTRIBUTIONS.—If any loan described in paragraph (1) remains outstanding in any taxable year of the ending corporation after the taxable year in which made, such loan shall be treated (for purposes of paragraph (1)) as made in such succeeding taxable year in an amount equal to the amount so outstanding, but the amount taken into account with respect to any corporation shall be reduced by the amount treated as distributions by such corporation for prior taxable years by reason of such loan.

“(3) CERTAIN OPEN ACCOUNTS AND OTHER COMMERCIAL LOANS EXCEPTED.—This subsection shall not apply in the case of any loan arising in connection with the sale of property, if the amount of such loan outstanding at no time during the taxable year exceeds the amount which would be ordinary and necessary to carry on the trade or business of both the lending corporation and the borrowing corporation had the sale been made between unrelated corporations.

“(e) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT TREATED AS DISTRIBUTED BY REASON OF PROHIBITED PROP-

ERTY AND LOANS.—The amount treated as distributed under subsections (c) and (d) for any taxable year shall not exceed the amount of a distribution to shareholders which (after the application of subsections (a) and (b)) would reduce the amount in the reinvested foreign income account to zero.

“SEC. 955. FOREIGN TAXES.

“(a) YEAR FOREIGN TAXES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this chapter (other than this subpart)—

“(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and

“(B) where an amount is subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account of any corporation, a ratable portion of such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made shall, for purposes of subpart A and section 164, be treated as paid or accrued during the taxable year for which the subtraction is made.

“(2) YEAR FOR WHICH NO REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME.—Paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to a foreign business corporation for any taxable year for which no amount is added to the reinvested foreign income account.

“(b) FOREIGN TAX CREDIT—OVERALL LIMIT TO APPLY.—In the case of a corporation to which an election under this subpart applies—

“(1) section 904(a) shall not apply,

“(2) the total amount of the credit in respect of taxes paid or accrued to all countries and possessions shall not exceed the same proportion of the tax against which such credit is taken which the taxpayer's taxable income from sources without the United States (but not in excess of the taxpayer's entire taxable income) bears to its entire taxable income for the same taxable year, and

“(3) the reference in section 904(c) to subsection (a) of section 904 shall be treated as a reference to paragraph (2) of this subsection.

In applying section 904(c), no amount paid or accrued for a taxable year to which an election under this subpart applied shall (except for purposes of determining the number of taxable years which have elapsed) be deemed paid or accrued under section 904(c) in any year for which an election under this subpart does not apply.

“(c) TREATMENT OF DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If any amount is added to the reinvested foreign income account of any foreign business corporation for any taxable year, the amount of taxes deemed paid by such corporation for such taxable year under section 902 (relating to dividends received from certain foreign corporations), by reason of taxes paid (or deemed paid) by any foreign corporation, shall be determined without reduction by reason of the ratio which the accumulated profits of the payor foreign corporation bear to its total profits.

“(2) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—Any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902, as modified by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“SEC. 956. SPECIAL RULES.

“(a) SURTAX EXEMPTIONS.—In the case of a corporation to which an election under this subpart applies, the surtax under section 11(c) for the taxable year shall be de-

termined by substituting for “exceeds \$25,000” the following: “exceeds \$25,000 (or, if smaller, the taxable income computed without regard to the amount subtracted from the taxpayer's reinvested foreign income account)”.

“(b) GROSS INCOME FOR TAXABLE YEAR FOR WHICH CORPORATION IS NOT A FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—For purposes of this title (other than section 170, relating to charitable contributions or gifts, subchapter G of this chapter, relating to corporations used to avoid income tax on shareholders, subpart C of this part, relating to Western Hemisphere trade corporations, and section 951), if an election under this subpart is in effect with respect to any corporation for any taxable year for which such corporation is not a foreign business corporation, the gross income of such corporation shall include (as an item of income derived from sources without the United States during the taxable year) the amount subtracted from its reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year.

“(c) APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 172 AND 1212.—

“(1) COMPUTATION OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME.—In computing reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

“(A) no net operating loss carryover or carryback, and

“(B) no capital loss carryover, shall be allowed from a taxable year for which the corporation was not a foreign business corporation.

“(2) LIMITATION ON YEARS TO WHICH FOREIGN SOURCES MAY BE CARRIED.—Except as provided in paragraph (3)—

“(A) no net operating loss carryover or carryback, and

“(B) no capital loss carryover, which is from a taxable year for which the corporation was a foreign business corporation, and which is attributable to sources without the United States, shall be allowed for any taxable year for which the corporation is not a foreign business corporation.

“(3) ADJUSTMENT IN CARRYOVERS ON REVOCATION OR TERMINATION OF ELECTION.—If an election under this subpart is revoked or terminated for any taxable year, then—

“(A) the net operating loss carryover from any taxable year for which the corporation was a foreign business corporation (hereinafter in this subparagraph referred to as “loss year”) to taxable years succeeding the last taxable year for which the election was in effect shall include the net operating loss carryover (reduced as provided by section 172(b)) from the loss year from sources without the United States, and

“(B) in determining the short-term capital loss provided by section 1212 for taxable years succeeding the last taxable year for which the election was in effect, a rule similar to the rule provided by subparagraph (A) shall be applied.

“(d) LIMITATION ON INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FURNISHED.—No information shall be required to be furnished with respect to any corporation under section 951(a)(5), 951(c)(1), or 954(c)(5)(C), for any of its taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, unless such information is of a character which was required to be furnished under the forms or regulations in effect on the first day of such taxable year.

“SEC. 957. ELECTED FOREIGN BRANCHES OF BANKS TAXED AS FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to the qualifications in subsection (b), an election may be made by a bank (as defined in section 581) which during the taxable year operates a branch in a foreign country, permitting such branch to be subject to taxation as a foreign business corporation for such year and subsequent years as provided in subsection (e). Such election shall be made in accordance with regulations pre-

scribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Each branch with respect to which such election has been made an election under this subsection shall be an "elected branch" for purposes of this section.

"(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The election described in subsection (a) may not be made with respect to a foreign branch unless such branch—

"(1) derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States; and

"(2) derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from the active conduct of a trade or business, which for purposes of this paragraph shall include commissions and interest and all income and gains from loans and investments ordinary and necessary for the carrying on of such trade or business.

"(c) CORPORATE PROVISIONS APPLICABLE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, an elected branch shall, except as provided in subsection (g), be considered a corporation for purposes of this subtitle with respect to operation, distributions, and any other purpose; and the electing bank shall be considered the sole shareholder thereof.

"(d) DURATION OF ELECTION.—The election under subsection (a) may be made for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962, and shall continue in effect for all subsequent years until terminated, either by notice of revocation filed by the taxpayer, or by failure of the elected branch for two successive taxable years to qualify under this section.

"(e) IMPOSITION OF TAXES.—An elected branch shall be treated as a corporation with respect to which an election under this subpart is in effect.

"(f) COMPUTATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—In computing the taxable income of an elected branch, there shall be allowed only such deductions and credits as are properly allocable to the operation of the business of such branch.

"(g) PROVISION INAPPLICABLE.—An elected branch shall not be considered a corporation, nor shall the electing bank be considered a shareholder, for purposes of subchapter C, except with respect to—

"(1) contributions of property, constituting either paid-in surplus or contributions to capital; and

"(2) part I thereof (relating to distributions).

"(h) MULTIPLE BRANCHES.—

"(1) COMBINING BRANCHES IN 2 OR MORE COUNTRIES.—If, at the time of making its first election under this section, a bank makes such election with respect to branches in more than one foreign country, it may (for purposes of this section) elect to make one or more combinations of such branches and to treat each such combination as a single elected branch. If, thereafter, a branch becomes an elected branch for the first time, such branch may be combined with any other elected branch (whether separate or combined).

"(2) BRANCHES IN SAME COUNTRY MUST BE COMBINED.—For purposes of this section, each branch in any one foreign country shall be treated as included within any election made under this section with respect to any other branch in such country.

"(3) TREATMENT TO BE CONTINUED.—If a bank for any taxable year elects to treat its branch in any foreign country separately or in a specified combination, such treatment shall (except as provided in the last sentence of paragraph (1)) be continued for all subsequent taxable years, unless the Secretary or his delegate consents to a different treatment.

"(i) DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—In the case of an electing bank which receives a dividend from an elected branch out of its reinvested foreign income account, there

shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount received as a dividend.

"(b) CERTAIN DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—

"(1) Section 243 (relating to dividends received by corporations) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) DIVIDENDS RECEIVED OUT OF REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME ACCOUNT.—If—

"(1) a domestic corporation receives a dividend from another corporation out of such other corporation's reinvested foreign income account (within the meaning of section 953), and

"(2) the recipient corporation, or another domestic corporation, is in control (within the meaning of section 368(c)) of the payor corporation,

then there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount received as a dividend.

"(2) Section 243(a) is amended by striking out 'In the case of a corporation (other than a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), in the case of a corporation'.

"(c) CARRYOVERS.—Section 381(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items of distributor or transferor corporations taken into account) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(23) SUCCESSOR FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATION.—If the acquiring corporation is a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951), there shall be taken into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart F of part III of subchapter N, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the reinvested foreign income account, and the items related thereto (including income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States), of the distributor or transferor corporation.

"(d) PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY INCOME.—Section 543 (relating to personal holding company income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) DIVIDENDS, ETC., RECEIVED BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to dividends, interest, or royalties (other than mineral, oil, or gas royalties) received or accrued by a corporation which (on applying this subsection) is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year if—

"(A) during its entire taxable year more than 50 percent in value of its outstanding stock is owned by a domestic parent corporation;

"(B) such domestic parent corporation, for its taxable year which ends with (or within which ends) the taxable year of the foreign business corporation—

"(i) is not a personal holding company; and

"(ii) would not be a personal holding company if such domestic parent corporation itself had derived its proportionate share of each item of gross income derived by each subsidiary for the taxable year of such subsidiary which ends with or within the taxable year of the domestic parent corporation; and

"(C) the dividends, interest, and royalties referred to in subsection (a)(1) are received or accrued by the foreign business corporation from another corporation—

"(i) in which the foreign business corporation owns, directly or indirectly, more

than 50 percent in value of the outstanding stock (or such lesser percentage as is the maximum percentage which the foreign business corporation may own under the law applicable to it or to such other corporation), and

"(ii) which, for its taxable year which ends with or within the taxable year of the foreign business corporation and for its two preceding taxable years (or for such part thereof as it was in existence), has derived 70 percent or more of its gross income from sources without the United States and from the active conduct of a trade or business.

"(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—

"(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term "foreign business corporation" includes a corporation with respect to which an election under section 951 is in effect.

"(B) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a corporation is a subsidiary of the domestic parent corporation if it is a domestic corporation and if (at any time during the subsidiary's taxable year referred to in paragraph (1)(B)) the domestic parent corporation held more than 50 percent in value of its outstanding stock; and the proportionate share with respect to any item of gross income of such a subsidiary is that percentage which equals the percentage of stock ownership at that time (during the subsidiary's taxable year referred to in paragraph (1)(B)) when such ownership by the domestic parent corporation was the greatest.

"(C) For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), if the trade or business referred to in clause (ii) thereof is of the same or similar or related character as the trade or business conducted by the domestic parent corporation, the percentage in clause (i) thereof shall be 25 percent in lieu of 50 percent.

"(e) FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS NOT INCLUDE CORPORATIONS IN AFFILIATED GROUPS.—Section 1504(b) (relating to definition of includible corporations for purposes of consolidated returns) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) A corporation with respect to which an election under subpart F of part III of subchapter N (relating to foreign business corporations) is in effect.

"(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) The table of subparts for part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subpart F. Foreign business corporations."

"(2) Section 901(d) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) For special rules relating to foreign business corporations, see section 955."

"(3) Section 903 (relating to credit for taxes in lieu of income, etc., taxes) is amended by striking out 'For purposes of this subpart and of section 164(b),' and inserting in lieu thereof 'For purposes of this subpart, subpart F, and section 164(b).'

"SEC. 3. CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO FOREIGN CORPORATIONS AND TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.

"(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 367.—Section 367 (relating to foreign corporations) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'In determining' and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In determining; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any exchange referred to in subsection (a) if such exchange arises out of, or in connection with, a transfer (whether or not in liquidation) of substantially all of the properties of a foreign corporation to a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951(a)). In

the case of such an exchange, the accumulated earnings and profits, if any, of the foreign corporation shall be treated (except for purposes of section 951) as having been distributed immediately before the exchange or liquidation to the foreign business corporation as a dividend.

“(c) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS BY FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of any exchange referred to in subsection (a) if such exchange arises out of, or in connection with, a transfer of foreign business property by a foreign business corporation (as defined in section 951(a)) to a foreign corporation in exchange for stock of such foreign corporation, if for its first taxable year beginning after such exchange such foreign corporation—

“(A) is controlled (as defined in section 368(c)) by one or more foreign business corporations, and

“(B) is a qualified payor corporation (as defined in section 951(c) with respect to each such corporation.

“(2) FOREIGN BUSINESS PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “foreign business property” means any property which is transferred for use, and within 6 months after the transfer is in use, by the transferee in the active conduct of a trade or business; except that such term does not include—

“(A) property described in section 1221 (1),

“(B) stock in a domestic corporation, and

“(C) stock in a foreign corporation, unless such stock is voting stock in a qualified payor corporation as to the foreign business corporation for its last 3 taxable years ending before the exchange and, for its first taxable year beginning after the exchange (1) is a qualified payor corporation as to the foreign corporation, and (2) derives 50 percent or more of its gross income from sources within the United States from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For purposes of this paragraph, stock which qualifies as property under subparagraph (C) shall be deemed property used in the active conduct of a trade or business.

“(b) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1492.—Section 1492 (relating to nontaxable transfers) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1492. NONTAXABLE TRANSFERS.

“The tax imposed by section 1491 shall not apply—

“(1) if the transferee is an organization exempt from income tax under part I of subchapter F of chapter 1 (other than an organization described in section 401(a));

“(2) if the stock transferred is “foreign business property” as defined in section 367(c) (relating to certain transfers by foreign business corporations); or

“(3) if before the transfer it has been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that such transfer is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes.”

“(c) TRANSFER OF INVENTORY TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 78. TRANSFER OF INVENTORY TO FOREIGN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—If any person transfers property which, in his hands, is property described in section 1221(1)—

“(1) to a corporation for which an election is in effect under subpart F (relating to foreign business corporations) of part III of subchapter N, or

“(2) to a foreign corporation,

in exchange for stock or securities in such corporation or as a contribution to the capital of such corporation, then such person shall be treated as having exchanged such property for stock in such corporation having a fair market value equal to the fair market value of the property so transferred.

“(b) NONAPPLICATION OF SECTION 351.—Section 351 shall not apply to any transfer of property described in subsection (a).’

“(2) The table of sections for such part II is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“SEC. 78. Transfer of inventory to foreign business corporations and foreign corporations.”

“(3) Subsection (d) of section 351 (relating to transfer to corporation controlled by transferor) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(5) For nonapplication of this section in the case of inventory transferred to a foreign business corporation or a foreign corporation, see section 78(b).”

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now being considered, of course, is a committee amendment to the whole bill; so this amendment is offered, I presume, in the form of an amendment to the substitute amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boggs to the committee substitute: Page 23, strike out the period at the end of the first line after line 17 and insert “, etc.”

Page 24, strike out the period at the end of line 1 and insert “, etc.”

Page 24, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert:

“(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources within less developed countries (within the meaning of subsection (e)).”

Page 24, lines 23 and 24, strike out “without the United States” and insert “within less developed countries”.

Page 25, line 2, strike out “without the United States” and insert “within less developed countries”.

Page 27, line 13, strike out “without the United States” and insert “within less developed countries”.

Page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out “FOREIGN” and insert “LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES”.

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

“(e) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED; ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO SOURCES WITHIN OR WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—For purposes of this subpart—

“(1) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED.—A less developed country is any foreign country (other than an area within the Sino-Soviet bloc) or any possession of the United States with respect to which, on the first day of the taxable year, there is in effect an Executive order by the President of the United States designating such country or possession as an economically less developed country for purposes of this subpart. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an overseas territory, department, province, or possession may be treated as a separate country.

“(2) CERTAIN COUNTRIES EXCLUDED.—No designation shall be made under paragraph

(1) with respect to Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

“(3) SOURCE RULES.—Items of gross income, expenses, losses, and deductions shall be allocated to sources within or without less developed countries under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such regulations shall, to the extent of the Secretary or his delegate finds practicable, be consistent with the principles of part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income).”

Page 29, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert:

“(A) the gross income from sources within less developed countries, and”.

Page 30, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 4 on page 31, and insert:

“(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter which are allocable to sources without less developed countries.

“(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term “reinvested foreign income” means the taxable income from sources within less developed countries.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

“(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

“(B) If the net long-term capital gain from sources within less developed countries exceeds the net.

Page 33, strike out lines 4 through 8, and insert:

“(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made.”

Page 34, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—

Page 34, line 25, strike out “within the United States” and insert “without less developed countries”.

Page 35, line 3, strike out “within the United States” and insert “without less developed countries”.

Page 37, line 20, strike out “without the United States” and insert “within less developed countries”.

Page 42, strike out lines 16 through 22, and insert:

“(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and”.

Page 43, beginning in line 1, strike out “such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possession of the United States” and insert “such taxes so allocable and so paid or accrued”.

Page 44, after line 3, insert: “For purposes of paragraph (2), the taxable income from sources without the United States shall be determined by including the amount sub-

tracted from the reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year and, if the corporation is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year, by excluding the items referred to in section 952(b) (relating to definition of reinvested foreign income)."

Page 44, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45, and insert:

"(c) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart, any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902."

Page 46, line 17, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 47, lines 6 and 7, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 48, line 1, strike out "a foreign country" and insert "a less developed country".

Page 48, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries".

Page 50, strike out "foreign" in lines 5, 14, and 19, and insert "less developed".

Page 52, line 15, strike out "paid" and insert "which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid".

Page 54, lines 12 and 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Page 58, line 19, strike out "without the United States" and insert "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Mr. BOGGS (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chairman. Would the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana be subject to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inform the gentleman from Iowa that under the resolution which we are considering this bill, House Resolution 468, committee amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been offered does two things. First, it eliminates the so-called gross up on dividend income. When that was last referred to on the floor of this body, someone thought it referred to our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, but, of course, our good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] knows that it does not. This provision was written into this proposed legislation having to do with the technical matter of computing the foreign tax credit on income earned abroad. Since that time, we have held hearings before the full Committee on Ways and Means to look into the question of whether or not this formula should be

changed. The committee has come to no resolution on that proposed legislation, and it was our feeling that whatever is done should apply across the board, and as I think the gentleman from New York made the point here in the original debate, if we kept this language as to the gross up in the bill H.R. 5 and did not incorporate it into any other legislation, then rather than equalizing the position of American investors abroad as compared with foreign investors competing abroad, we would actually penalize American investors to a greater extent than is now the case under existing law.

Mr. BOSCH. I might say the gentleman has put the proposition correctly.

Mr. BOGGS. The second proposition has to do with the so-called underdeveloped countries. In the debate a moment ago I read a list of the countries which are defined by the executive branch of the Government as developed countries. I might say that as far as I was concerned, again the gentleman from Iowa talks about being on the ropes and so forth. That may be true. I may still be. The only thing I am seeking to do is to pass a constructive piece of legislation which will be helpful to American business and competing abroad and not competing at home for American jobs.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Is there any restriction in this legislation on a corporation that builds its plant in a so-called underdeveloped country and expands it under the new amendment you are adding and then ships its products to the developed country in competition with its product it is now shipping to those developed countries all over the world from its U.S. production facilities.

Mr. BOGGS. I would say there are a number of kinds of restrictions over which we have no control; the so-called developed countries have their own tariff regulations and their own import restrictions and quotas and so on. I cannot answer the gentleman's question categorically. It has been the effort of our Government and governments all over the world, working through a General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, to reduce as much as possible restrictions on trade.

Mr. DENT. One of the main weaknesses of this legislation is that it gives to a corporation the right to go into an undeveloped country and build a plant and produce without restriction and ship to a developed country that we are now selling to. It does so under free tariff rules that you are talking about, because certain countries do not have any restrictions and no tariff laws against them. We can ship into any of the so-called undeveloped countries.

Mr. BOGGS. I would say to the gentleman that he does not correctly define the situation. In order to qualify as a corporation the American company must meet a whole list of qualifications. An American corporation engaged in the practice outlined by the gentleman would not be able to enjoy tax deferral on such income.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BRAY. Has this amendment been printed? I have not been able to get a copy of it.

Mr. BOGGS. The amendments were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 28. I have a copy of them here.

Mr. BRAY. Have there been any committee reports on this amendment?

Mr. BOGGS. No, because the committee report was previous to these amendments.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and take this time to inquire a little more deeply into the question which has just been raised under the provision of this particular bill relative to an American corporation locating in a foreign country, to determine where in the bill it prohibits this corporation from shipping manufactured goods from that particular plant into any other foreign country.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Let me try to answer the question first.

Under the so-called area of investment provision of H.R. 5 if there is a sale of these products to any third country it would constitute what is called distribution and that would disqualify the corporation for the income preferential. It is set out very specifically.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan will yield, I offered an amendment in the committee which was adopted adding the word "ultimate". The section now reads with that amendment in the bill: The third test which must be met by a domestic corporation if it is to be classified as a foreign business corporation is that it derives not more than 10 percent of its gross income from the sale of any articles for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States. The word "ultimate" certainly would not permit the shipping of goods to a third country and back to the United States. This is found on page 4 of the report.

Mr. KNOX. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee, it certainly would not permit the corporation to export to another foreign country and then that foreign country export to the United States. What I am concerned about, however, is the fact that this foreign corporation could start to absorb our export market that we had in other foreign countries by the goods manufactured in this one country being shipped to another country to which we ordinarily export from the United States. I have some reservations about this legislation, and I expounded on it when the bill was before the House some 4 or 5 weeks ago. One of them is the export of dollars and the export of jobs. Just recently by the medium of the press we were informed that the United States is still \$3 billion short in dollar payments. This is a matter of chief concern as far as I am concerned.

I think we may have some problem in taking care of some of our own depressed areas, and possibly we should look after them before we start to look after the underdeveloped areas of the world.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. One other point which I think the gentleman has just touched upon, as I understand, the bill provides a limitation of imports to 10 percent of the American manufacture. There is, as I understand, no limitation for a competing Japanese, German, or South American manufacturer; they can ship in all they want to, but we are limiting the American over there. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOX. They can ship in as much as they may desire and meet the tariff imposed by the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. But the American cannot.

Mr. KNOX. Under the provisions of this bill the American corporation will be limited to 10 percent of the goods manufactured in a foreign country and shipped directly or indirectly into the United States.

Mr. HIESTAND. That is, 10 percent of his production?

Mr. KNOX. Ten percent of that production.

Mr. HIESTAND. There is no limit on the foreign producer?

Mr. KNOX. The foreign producer is involved in the payment of tariff. They have to pay our tariffs in order to ship their goods into this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 29, after line 8, insert:

“(f) DISQUALIFICATION FOR SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) shall be treated as an ineligible corporation within the meaning of subsection (d) for any taxable year during which it operates in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any determination that this paragraph applies to any corporation for any taxable year shall be made by the Secretary of Labor. Any such determination shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the courts (including the Tax Court of the United States) in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of a deficiency in respect of income tax.

“(2) SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “substandard labor conditions” means aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment which is—

“(A) below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned, or

“(B) if there are no such minimum standards—

“(1) below the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or (if there are no other employers in the same industry) for other employers in similar industries in such country, or

“(2) where there are no average standards referred to in clause (1), substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of such country.

“(3) DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

“(A) INVESTIGATIONS.—On application of any affected domestic party (if the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that the conditions described in this subparagraph exist), or on his own initiative, the Secretary of Labor shall make an investigation to determine whether any corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

“(B) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.—For the purpose of any investigation under subparagraph (A), the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

“(C) CERTIFICATION.—If, pursuant to any investigation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Labor determines that a corporation has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions during any taxable year, he shall promptly certify such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

“(D) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE.—The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply with respect to investigations and determinations by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection.

“(E) TAXABLE YEARS AFFECTED.—No determination shall be made by the Secretary of Labor with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless, during such taxable year, the taxpayer has been notified that an investigation under subparagraph (A) has begun, or is continuing, with respect to such corporation for such year.

“(F) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to the performance of his functions under this subsection.

“(4) CROSS REFERENCES.—

“For provisions relating to the authority of the Secretary or his delegate to require the taxpayer to furnish information, see subsection (a) (5) and the last sentence of subsection (c) (1).”

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. As the gentleman from Louisiana knows, it was my privilege to cosponsor the original bill which he introduced, and I want to state that I think the amendments he has proposed to it, and which the committee has approved, will strengthen the bill. I would further like to say that I am surprised at the tenor of the discussion here today. We are having a review of practically all our general trade policies. I think the real issue at stake—and I would like to ask my colleague from Louisiana if he agrees with me—is whether, in encouraging economic development of the underdeveloped areas, that narrowing the scope of the legislation was a very wise move by the committee. The real issue confronting us is whether the genius of American

private enterprise, which we all boast about, will be given an opportunity toward helping the underdeveloped areas, and that is what we are concerned with here today. Our commerce today leaps over State lines; it goes abroad. American capital is already abroad. There is some competition, but when the balance sheet is totaled up at the end of the year we come out ahead of the game. But this legislation does not concern American foreign-trade policy. This legislation concerns putting private funds to work in helping the underdeveloped countries. Is that not a fact?

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman could not be more accurate, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I oppose the legislation in general.

Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. On what ground may I get recognition for the purpose of opposing the legislation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] for 5 minutes in support of the committee amendment, so the gentleman from Louisiana would have to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. At the expiration of the 5 minutes allowed the gentleman from Louisiana, may I be recognized to discuss the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If no other member of the committee rises in opposition to the amendment, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, just one brief explanation of this amendment. This amendment simply puts into the law another condition in order to qualify for deferral. What it says in essence is that any American firm that goes abroad, to another country, should faithfully execute and uphold the labor standards of that country. I think from the point of view of the reputation of our country that it is wise that our people who operate in these countries should at least conform to the standards existing in those countries. There is no punitive intent involved in this proposed amendment at all.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. While I have serious doubts about the bill, I think the gentleman's amendments have most certainly strengthened it in many ways. I am not quite clear, and I wish the gentleman would elaborate for a moment, what the Secretary of Labor does to ascertain in a country what the minimum wages in that country are. Assume that the country has no minimum wage.

Mr. BOGGS. Of course, in that case he has to look to the standards prevailing in the industry.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Average wage scales and so forth.

Mr. BOGGS. I might say to the gentleman under the procedures adopted some time ago by the President, the Labor Department has the responsibility for determining wage standards in other countries. This applies in the preparation of lists for trade agreement negotiations and so forth. So, the machinery is already in existence in the Department of Labor working through the labor attachés connected with our embassies.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman whether the amendment he has submitted is acceptable to the organized labor movement?

Mr. BOGGS. It is; very much so.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PELLY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with its enacting clause stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NATCHER). The Chair desires to inform the gentleman that his motion is not in order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the opinion of the gentleman from Iowa; I should like to ask him whether he does not agree with me that perhaps this is a case when we should ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill so that some of us may have the opportunity to study these amendments. Under the conditions that exist at the moment, there is a limitation on amendments and we cannot inform ourselves properly on what is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think the best procedure, let me say to the gentleman from Washington, would be to adopt the motion to strike out the enacting clause. Failing in that, I think the next best course would be to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee for this session of Congress. What the proponents of this bill want is to get the well-known tail in the crack in the door. That is all they want. They would accept anything; even down to the enacting clause, take it over to the other body, get what they want, and then bring it back here under the semigag rule of a conference report.

We have heard this amendment read. There has been almost no explanation, and there has been no opportunity to study it. There are not a dozen Members on the floor of the House who know what this amendment means, much less the one preceding it.

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

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

Mr. DENT. For the information of the gentleman, this amendment is strictly a face-saving amendment. There is not anything in it enforceable. There is not any law you can point to that would guarantee anything. If it does guarantee anything, all it guarantees is that any American who invests money in Hong Kong can pay 9 cents an hour and be perfectly all right under the law. All it guarantees in any instance is a repetition of this very thing that is happening now.

Here is a letter that just came in against the minimum wage law in these United States. And what does it say? It comes from the Maidenform company. I think some of the ladies would know what I am talking about, perhaps the men do not. But the letter says that the corset and brassiere industry now is losing 17 percent of its industry to the Hong Kong market. There is nothing in this bill, there is nothing in this amendment that will protect an American worker.

Three years ago we imported 3 million cases of glass into the United States. In the past year we imported 8 million cases of glass. I want to say that if you continue to buy retail and sell wholesale you will not have to worry about being in business.

Mr. GROSS. Keep right on talking; I want to hear more. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is providing facts that all Members ought to know.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia who has been trying to get time under this virtual gag rule and has not succeeded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman, I have been desirous of speaking on this legislation to say that it is not in the interest of our national security. Russia claims she has 75 crack divisions ready to take the field at an hour's notice. We have 21 divisions operative in NATO, including our own divisions. Within 30 days after the outbreak of hostilities those 75 Russian divisions would overrun the continent of Europe and seize all of the modern American plants that we have sent over there. They would not destroy them, but they would use them against us for the duration of the war.

This is the most silly, vicious legislation that has been proposed in Congress in the 14 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think it would be interesting to know what companies already in existence would be the beneficiaries of this legislation. I think if we learn that, we would have a sad story.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have a lot of information about this bill and what it purports to do. Practically nobody here today knows.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. As a practical matter, let us assume we had a firm here doing \$800,000 worth of business a year at the present time. Let us assume further that they are exporting \$400,000.

Under this bill, would it not be possible for them to cut their production in half and establish a foreign plant and produce the goods over there, and ship it from a foreign nation, and thereby reduce by half the employment in the industry established in this country?

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct. I make no profession of knowing what is in this bill now since it has been loaded with committee amendments that were never considered when there was general debate last March. I say again, I doubt if there are a dozen Members of the House who know what is now in this bill. This is a sad and sorry way to legislate. The bill is being written on the floor of the House and that is an irresponsible way to handle important legislation.

The enacting clause ought to be stricken and this proposal considered under full and free debate at some future time, if ever.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been before the House of Representatives all of this session. I will say to my good friend from Washington, who complained about not having an opportunity to study the language of the bill or any amendments, that these amendments were printed in full on April 28 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with a full explanation of them.

In addition, and this is something I seldom do, I circulated all of the Members of our body attempting as best I could to explain what is involved in these amendments. Believe me, there is no intention here, no effort, and no desire to do anything that is not completely, totally above board, that anyone cannot examine under any conditions.

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

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I know the gentleman has not tried to limit discussion, but many things have been brought up here which have brought questions from me. Under the manner in which this bill is being considered we cannot offer the usual pro forma amendments and then ask questions.

Mr. BOGGS. I have done the best I could to yield and to explain the legislation as best I could.

Let me say this: We live in difficult times. I would be the last person on earth to advocate exporting American jobs.

How do we judge so many of these matters? This is a piece of legislation which has the following support in the business community. It has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers.

And in the farm community it has the support of the farm groups, the Farm Bureau Federation and so on.

It has the support of all the labor organizations. I read you a letter which I have in my hand dated May 4, 1960, signed by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. He says among other things,

Several days ago the House Ways and Means Committee adopted two amendments which it proposes to offer to H.R. 5 when the House resumes consideration of the bill. The first of these amendments is designed to restrict the benefits of the measure to foreign investment in "less-developed" countries so designated by the President. This change will hopefully increase capital investment by American business in underdeveloped nations.

The second amendment is the one we are talking about now.

He says:

This amendment will hopefully assure adequate minimum labor standards.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does not the letter to which the gentleman refers close with a statement of approval?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, it does. It closes with this statement:

The AFL-CIO urges you to support these amendments and upon their adoption to vote for H.R. 5.

I say to my colleagues, it is very difficult for us to comprehend some of the problems involved here. But the idea that this is some device or some scheme to deprive people of work in our country is just wrong. What this really means is that the genius of American business, as the gentleman from Arizona so beautifully stated a moment ago, can be employed in this cold war with the Soviets. The gentleman from West Virginia talks about the defense implications.

Well, anyone who thinks that the cold war is over just has to read the press and see what is happening at this very moment in Paris. I say to you, we must use every device we have at our command.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. May I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this bill is designed to funnel these investments to the less-developed countries in the world, if the gentleman does not recognize that in many industries and the glove industry, for example, jobs are being taken away from people in this country precisely into these less-developed countries because of the fact that there is a great differential between the wages paid in those areas and the wages paid here in America and, therefore, this bill would, in fact, continue to take jobs away from this country?

Mr. BOGGS. No; that is not the purpose of the bill and I do not think it would have such a result.

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

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentleman that is not in order at this time.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 101, noes 93.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Boggs and Mr. Gross.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 107, noes 101.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the enacting clause be stricken out?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 160, nays 232, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—160

Abbott	Fallon	Lane
Abernethy	Feighan	Langen
Adair	Fenton	Latta
Alger	Flood	Lennon
Andersen,	Flynt	Lesinski
Minn.	Fogarty	Levering
Andrews	Forrester	Lipscomb
Ashmore	Garmatz	McCulloch
Bailey	Gavin	McDonough
Baldwin	George	McGinley
Bates	Glenn	McIntire
Baumhart	Gray	Macdonald
Becker	Griffiths	Marshall
Belcher	Gross	Martin
Bennett, Mich.	Gubser	Mason
Berry	Haley	May
Blatnik	Hargis	Meyer
Bosch	Harmon	Michel
Bow	Hays	Miller, Clem
Bray	Hechler	Moeller
Brock	Hemphill	Moore
Broomfield	Henderson	Morris, N. Mex.
Brown, Ga.	Hess	Moulder
Brown, Ohio	Hiestand	Mumma
Budge	Hoeven	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Canfield	Holland	Norrell
Chenoweth	Huddleston	O'Hara, Mich.
Collier	Jennings	O'Konski
Cunningham	Jensen	Oliver
Curtin	Johansen	Ostertag
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Pfost
Davis, Ga.	Jonas	Philbin
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Pilcher
Dent	Kearns	Pirnie
Derounian	Kee	Prokop
Devine	Kelly	Rabaut
Diggs	King, Utah	Rains
Dingell	Kirwan	Ray
Dixon	Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.
Donohue	Knox	Riehlman
Dorn, S.C.	Kowalski	Riley
Dowdy	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.

Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roush
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Selden
Shipley
Siler
Simpson

Slack
Smith, Calif.
Stagg
Stratton
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tollefson
Trimble
Utt

Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Weaver
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Winstead
Withrow
Younger

NAYS—232

Addonizio	Fisher	Monagan
Albert	Flynn	Montoya
Alford	Foley	Moorhead
Anderson,	Ford	Morgan
Mont.	Fountain	Moss
Anfuso	Frazier	Multer
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Ashley	Friedel	Murray
Aspinall	Fulton	Natcher
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Nix
Avery	Gary	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Gathings	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baker	Gialmo	O'Hara, Ill.
Barr	Goodell	O'Neill
Barrett	Granahan	Osmer
Barry	Grant	Passman
Bass, N.H.	Green, Pa.	Pelly
Bass, Tenn.	Griffin	Perkins
Beckworth	Hagen	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Halleck	Poff
Bentley	Halpern	Porter
Betts	Hardy	Powell
Boggs	Harris	Preston
Boland	Harrison	Price
Bolling	Healey	Pucinski
Bolton	Herlong	Quile
Bowles	Hoffman, Mich.	Quigley
Boykin	Hogan	Randall
Brademas	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Breeding	Holt	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, La.	Holtzman	Reuss
Brooks, Tex.	Horan	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Mo.	Hosmer	Rivers, Alaska
Broyhill	Hull	Rivers, S.C.
Burdick	Ikard	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Inouye	Robison
Burleson	Irwin	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Rogers, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Md.	Roosevelt
Cahill	Johnson, Wis.	Rostenkowski
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Rutherford
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	Saund
Casey	Judd	Schneebeli
Cederberg	Karsten	Schwengel
Celler	Karth	Sikes
Chamberlain	Kasem	Sisk
Chipperfield	Keith	Smith, Iowa
Church	Keogh	Smith, Miss.
Clark	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Coad	Kilgore	Spence
Coffin	King, Calif.	Springer
Cohelan	Kluczynski	Steed
Colmer	Lafore	Stubblefield
Conte	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Cook	Libonati	Teller
Cooley	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Corbett	Loser	Thompson, Tex.
Cramer	McCormack	Thornberry
Curtis, Mass.	McFall	Toll
Curtis, Mo.	McGovern	Tuck
Daddario	McSweeney	Udall
Dague	Machrowicz	Ullman
Dawson	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Denton	Madden	Wainwright
Derwinski	Magnuson	Wallhauser
Dooley	Mahon	Wampler
Dorn, N.Y.	Mailliard	Watts
Downing	Matthews	Weis
Doyle	Meador	Westland
Dulski	Merrrow	Wharton
Dwyer	Metcalf	Whitall
Edmondson	Miller,	Wilson
Elliot, Pa.	George P.	Wolf
Everett	Miller, N.Y.	Wright
Evins	Milliken	Yates
Farbstein	Mills	Young
Fascell	Minshall	Zablocki
Fino	Mitchell	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—40

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Santangelo
Allen	Hébert	Scott
Barden	Jackson	Shelley
Baring	Johnson, Colo.	Sheppard
Blitch	Kilburn	Short
Bonner	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Brewster	Lankford	Taylor
Buckley	McDowell	Thomas
Chelf	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Morris, Okla.	Walter
Durham	Morrison	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Patman	Willis
Forand	Pillion	
Gilbert	Rogers, Tex.	

So the enacting clause was not stricken out.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Alexander for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Johnson of Colorado against.
Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Elliott against.
Mr. Williams for, with Mr. Santangelo against.
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Gilbert against.
Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Short.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mrs. GRANAHAHAN, Mr. LOSER, and Mr. FRIEDEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WITHEROW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 5.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] had consumed 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, is it permissible for someone to speak for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. First, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this not be taken out of the gentleman's time, but at the conclusion of the 5 minutes granted to the gentleman from Michigan, it is my understanding that all debate will have expired and that we will vote on the committee amendment and then return to the House; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The vote will be on the amendment to the committee amendment in

the nature of a substitute and then on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I sought this time for the purpose of speaking briefly on the amendment, and also for the purpose of expressing my support of the legislation as a whole.

The amendment, as I understand it, simply requires that American foreign business corporations pay the going rate of wages abroad, which does not mean a great deal. I do not think the amendment is necessary to the bill at all.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] for having pressed for this legislation because it seems to me this is a practical step to enlist American private capital in the job of developing the underdeveloped countries of the world. That is a theme that I have been preaching ever since I came to the Congress 10 years ago.

It seems to me that economic development and the promotion of economic and political stability in the underdeveloped areas of the world and for the peoples who are emerging from colonialism and seeking to establish themselves in the world community, that that job of economic development, pursuant to our American traditions, belongs primarily to the private business community. This legislation, Mr. Chairman, would foster, encourage and stimulate private capital investment for the economic development of the underdeveloped areas of the world. It should be the role of government merely to support, encourage, and facilitate this natural economic process.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENT. Did the gentleman from Michigan get up and ask for time to speak in opposition and would that include any of us who are opposed to the bill, since he is speaking in favor of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no one else can be recognized.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants me to yield to him to make a statement, I will be glad to do so.

Mr. DENT. I do not think that is it. I just want to know if the rules of the House allow the time to be usurped by those in favor of the bill when some time is supposed, under the rules of the House, to be allocated to those who are opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Michigan stated that he rose in opposition to the amendment, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there any rule that permits any Member of the House to shape your argument?

Mr. MEADER. I think I am capable of making my own argument.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what anyone says, this bill does one thing.

It reduces taxes for somebody; American business abroad.

The only issue is whether that somebody deserves this priority of treatment.

I think not. If we are to consider a reduction of taxes, there are other areas of more justifiable need.

My principal objections to this bill as amended are the provisions under which the tax deferral privilege is extended to the income of branch banking activities of American banks in foreign countries. There is no reason why the tremendous profits of these banking operations in these countries should escape normal taxation.

These banking investments are made under considerable protection of the American flag and are frequently interwoven with loans made by the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the World Bank. The high risk portion of these loans are usually assumed by these other institutions which are supported by the American taxpayer.

The interest rates under which these American funds multiply in foreign lands are scandalous. They range as high as 20 percent in Peru, 24 percent in Chile, 36 percent to 40 percent in Argentina, and as much as 48 percent in Brazil.

If American capital is participating in the extortion of such exorbitant rates of interest in the underdeveloped areas of the world, the profits of such investment should certainly be subject to normal taxation, since these practices are incurring a tremendous injustice which the American people will have to correct in other ways at a cost many times the taxes involved.

I just want to say to the gentleman in respect to the amendment, I do not think the amendment improves the legislation enough to warrant its adoption because, regardless of what anyone says, this bill does one thing—it reduces taxes for somebody.

One issue is whether that somebody deserves this priority treatment. I think not. I think we have a great many other areas to think about first. It is for this reason that I oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. BARRY. Does this not just defer taxes?

Mr. MEADER. This simply defers taxes, but it does stimulate money going into these countries.

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Is it not true under this bill that any profits made by an American investor in a foreign country can be used for planned expansion and for plant construction in another undeveloped country without paying taxes in the United States on any profit whatsoever?

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

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], continues to make these statements that have no foundation in fact. The answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is "No." He would not qualify under the provisions of the act.

Mr. DENT. Will you show me in this legislation where you prohibit, instead of encourage, development of underdeveloped countries, by taking the profits made by an investment company? I can read the bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], has made this argument all afternoon. There is a formula set out in the bill called payroll and investment, and unless you qualify under that formula and other equally restrictive provisions, you cannot get tax deferment. As the gentleman stated, this is not a tax reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I just listened to the gentleman from Michigan rise to oppose the second amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs]. In the course of opposing the amendment, which according to the chairman of the subcommittee, was designed to greatly improve the bill, the gentleman from Michigan then proceeded to support the bill. This, Mr. Chairman, is what has happened to this bill from the first day it came on the floor about 6 weeks ago.

At that time, this bill, H.R. 5, was debated for many hours and then, because of the great opposition with no chance of passage, in the form the bill was offered, the Committee rose and the bill was set aside for future discussion. Now, today, the bill, H.R. 5, comes before the House, but we are told it is no longer that bill; that the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana, is offering two lengthy amendments that changes a great part of the bill. Under the rule today, each amendment has had 5 minutes of so-called explanation. Many Members protested that this explanation

was certainly nowhere sufficient to clarify the many important issues involved.

Therefore, I feel that, when I am asked to vote on legislation of this magnitude and with a completely new concept, I cannot vote for it with any degree of understanding or intelligence, I am constrained to vote against this bill. When the original H.R. 5 was debated, there was no question in my mind that this would not only save taxes for certain industries, but would also jeopardize, to the greatest degree, employment in our country. This I cannot tolerate.

Perhaps if there had been sufficient time to debate and study the amendments that we were told would clarify this view, a more intelligent understanding might have taken place.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point for the purpose of including an explanation of these amendments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. This analysis is as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means adopted two amendments to H.R. 5.

The first amendment deals with two subjects: First, it limits the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned and reinvested in the less developed countries; second, it eliminates the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations.

Limiting the provisions of H.R. 5 to the less developed countries conforms the bill to the suggestions of the Treasury Department and of the President in his budget message to the Congress this year. Under the bill as reported by the committee, the tax deferral privilege is available where the foreign business corporation derives most of its income from sources outside of the United States. Under the committee's amendment, this privilege is available only where most of the income is derived from the less developed countries. The foreign business corporation must earn at least 90 percent of its gross income within less developed countries and its subsidiaries must meet the same test in order for these subsidiaries to be qualified payor corporations.

The committee amendment limiting the provisions of the bill to less-developed countries also provides that the distribution rule relating to investment and payroll situated outside of the United States and also the rule relating to prohibited investments in the United States are to be amended to refer to investment and payroll situated in the less-developed countries and to prohibited investments outside of the less-developed countries. As a result the foreign business corporation will have the privilege of tax deferral with respect to its income from the active conduct of a trade or business only to the extent determined in relation to the ratio of its payroll and assets situated in the less-developed countries to its worldwide payroll and assets. Similarly a distribution

will result if certain property situated outside of the less-developed countries is acquired by the corporation. The committee amendment does not affect, however, the provision presently in the bill which provides that not more than 10 percent of a foreign business corporation's income may be from the sale of articles which are sold by it for ultimate use, consumption, or disposition in the United States.

Under the committee's amendment the President of the United States is empowered to designate which foreign countries and which possessions of the United States shall be regarded as less-developed countries except that he may not designate any area within the Sino-Soviet bloc. An overseas department, province or possession of a country may be designated as a less-developed country even though the mother country would not be so designated. The committee amendment also specifies certain countries, in view of the fact that they are considered to be economically developed, which may not be designated as less-developed countries by the President for the purpose of this bill. These are: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland. This does not necessarily mean, however, that all countries other than the ones mentioned will be designated by the President as less-developed countries. This is a matter left to the discretion of the President.

The second part of the first amendment as I previously indicated eliminates the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations. The committee has held hearings on the possibility of extending the gross-up concept to all dividend income received by American corporations from subsidiaries. This is now under consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means. In view of this it was concluded that it would be desirable to withdraw the gross-up provision in the present bill and apply the same rule in the case of foreign business corporations as is applied generally with respect to the gross-up for dividend income received from foreign subsidiaries. As a result, income on which the tax is deferred and which is placed in the reinvested foreign income account will not be increased by the amount of the foreign taxes paid with respect to this income. Also, the taxes which will be deemed paid with respect to this income will be only the portion of the taxes attributable to the income after the foreign tax. In other words, the concept laid down in the American Chicle Corp. case will continue to apply.

The second amendment relates to substandard labor conditions. A corporation will not be eligible to be treated as a foreign business corporation, or as a qualified payor corporation, for any taxable year if the Secretary of Labor determines, and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, that such

corporation has during the taxable year operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

Procedures: The determination of the Secretary of Labor shall be final as to whether a corporation is ineligible by reason of operation in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions except that it will be subject to review by the courts—including the Tax Court of the United States—in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of the deficiency in respect of income tax.

An investigation may be undertaken by the Secretary of Labor, on his own initiative, or upon the application of any affected domestic party if the Secretary has reason to believe that a corporation has been operating in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. It is not contemplated that the Secretary of Labor will undertake investigations unless he has sufficient information to warrant an investigation. Furthermore, in order for a domestic party to file an application for an investigation it must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor, that it is affected by, and has an economic interest in, the question of whether the foreign business corporation—or the qualified payor corporation—is operating in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. For this purpose an economic interest, for example, might involve the loss of sales, production, or employment due to the fact that a foreign business corporation or a qualified payor corporation is operating under substandard conditions.

It is not the intention of your committee that this provision be administered in a punitive fashion. Rather, it is anticipated that this provision will serve to make corporations that may have been operating under substandard labor conditions conform their labor standards to the required standards. Thus, in interpreting the language "for any taxable year for which" it is expected that the Secretary of Labor will wish to be satisfied that there is a pattern of operation under substandard labor conditions before making any determination.

The Secretary of Labor is also proscribed from making a determination with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless the taxpayer has been notified during such taxable year that an investigation is underway. Should an investigation continue into the succeeding taxable year, the Secretary of Labor must notify the taxpayer that the investigation is continuing during such succeeding taxable year and is applicable for such taxable year as well. It is also anticipated that the Secretary of Labor will expedite the completion of investigations that he has undertaken and, insofar as possible, limit the course of the investigation to the taxable year under consideration.

Standards: The term "substandard labor conditions" is defined by comparing the aggregate remuneration for employment paid by a corporation against minimum standards obtaining in the less-developed country in which the cor-

poration is operating. If such aggregate remuneration is below such standards, then substandard labor conditions are deemed to exist. It should be noted that the aggregate remuneration for employment includes all payments to or on behalf of employees, whether in money, services, goods, and so forth. This term comprehends not only direct wages but also fringe benefits and other payments for employment. The amendment provides a number of standards against which the aggregate remuneration is to be compared. The first standards are the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned. The standards required under the laws of the country are those that are applicable and generally in effect with respect to employers under the laws of the country concerned.

If there are no minimum standards required under the laws of the country, then the standards to be employed will be the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country. If there are no other employers in the same industry because the corporation in question is the sole employer in this industry, then the standards shall be the average standards prevailing for other employers in similar industries in such country.

If the standards referred to above are not available for use, then the standards to be employed shall be the standards generally prevailing in the industries of the country concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the great Ways and Means Committee on which Illinois is so outstandingly represented by our beloved dean, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and I would not presume to speak on the pending bill were it not for the fact that this is in a field of legislation in which I have some understanding from service on other committees and a great interest running back to the 81st Congress and the first year of the Truman administration.

Perhaps I should explain. President Truman had electrified the Nation with his point 4 program. The concept of that program appealed to the common sense of the American people.

In the development of that plan it was not intended that peoples in other and foreign lands could be helped by giving them doles. The concept was, and this is what appealed to the common sense of the American people, that they best could be helped by helping them to help themselves.

We thought, and I think soundly, that the best job could be done by encouraging private American capital to make investments in these undeveloped areas much as private capital in the developed areas of our own country earlier had made investments in the less developed areas. We thought that this would open the doors of opportunity and give chal-

lenge to the ambition of these peoples in undeveloped areas exactly as in an earlier period they had done to the peoples in our own then undeveloped areas.

But because of the risk of governments that might not be too stable and of currency problems a plan was devised of an insurance program guaranteeing American investors from these unusual risks. The jurisdiction then was in the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a new member. The present Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter, then a Member of the House, was among the witnesses that appeared before our committee during the public hearings on a bill to establish a program of insurance for private American capital invested in these then undeveloped areas. Although a new Member of the Congress and of the committee, through the graciousness of Chairman Spence and Ranking Minority Member Jesse Wolcott, who in my appraisal constituted a team of statesmen of superlative quality, I was permitted to participate in the hearings and in the discussions in the measure of my great interest in the subject. I was enthusiastically for the program, but I did not wish it to operate without consideration of the necessity of protection for labor. That is, then as now, I could see the danger to the labor of our own country if, in the development of other countries, we were not concerned that the wages of the workers should be brought, as prosperity came to those regions, to something of our own scale.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues would find it informative and illuminating to read the public hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee when first this genuine type of legislation was before the Congress.

When I became a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I was no stranger to the foreign investment insurance program, jurisdiction over which had been transferred from the Banking and Currency Committee, where it had originated, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The program had worked well. It had not only paid its own way but it had made a profit and there were substantial reserves. I would say that its record pretty well compares with that of the Export-Import Bank, which itself at the outset had been controversial but which now is acclaimed by everyone. Mind you, this is insurance, not given away, but fully paid for by the premiums.

But last year the administration of the program, overconfident because of past successes when policies were sound, was reaching out for new and perilous worlds to conquer. It proposed to increase its coverage, without adequate additional premiums, to an extent that would have spelled complete ruin. When I presented the matter to the attention of the House in its consideration of the mutual security bill of last year I was very happy that my colleagues by an overwhelming vote struck out the provision that would have wrecked the entire program. I say happy, Mr. Chairman, not in a personal sense, but in a sense that this program seemed to me

so important if we were to work out a program of helping undeveloped areas to help themselves we could not permit the instrumentality of our effort to be destroyed by reckless administrative ambitions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why were we interested in attracting private investments and private American businesses to these undeveloped areas? The answer is so simple that it should easily be understood by a child. We want a happy and a prosperous world. Wherever there is poverty there is unrest and there is danger. If we have goods to sell we can find no market for them in a country where there is only poverty. American ingenuity and American know-how can do so much wherever they are given a chance, and what it does in regions now undeveloped will bring back to us the blessings of a widened market and a spiritual lift of friendship.

H.R. 5, as I vision it, and strengthened by the amendments offered today, is just another forward step in the program that electrified the American people in the first year of the Truman administration. It gives American private capital a better chance to do the job. I urge its passage.

We cannot, with due respect for our taxpayers and the menace that lies in a constantly and alarmingly growing national debt, continue indefinitely to invest the public funds in helping undeveloped countries.

The money that we have put to such use, it has always seemed to me, is as water put in to prime the pump. Now that the pump is getting fairly started on the way to being primed we should not hesitate about helping the primed pump to function. I fail to see how my colleagues who have been loudest in crying out against our expenditures in our mutual security program in its economic phase can find consistency in opposing this bill which looks forward to the end of the necessity of such mutual security expenditures.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the general purpose of H.R. 5 is well understood in the city of Chicago. Some months ago, and I think by arrangement of our beloved dean, Tom O'BRIEN, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] addressed a tremendous audience of the leaders of Chicago, giving in detail the contents of his bill. It was a most representative audience. The exporters and the importers and the manufacturers and the leaders of labor, and the experts of Chicago in foreign trade and other fields were there. In the week following Congressman Boggs' address in Chicago I received 63 letters urging my support of this bill.

I am happy that the gentleman from Louisiana and the full membership of the Ways and Means Committee have seen fit to present amendments that meet the objections of those who have given it thoughtful study. I am especially happy that the gentleman from Louisiana has accepted an amendment protective of labor and that the bill as amended now carries the endorsement of organized labor as well as the organi-

zations of manufacturers and other groups of our citizenry. It is essential to the well-being of our own people, as well as those in the undeveloped areas, that we keep vigilantly in mind that no permanent good will comes to them or to us unless a broadening prosperity in those areas is reflected in the wages and working conditions of the workers, more and more approaching our own.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to the amendment.

The committee amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance, pursuant to House Resolution 468, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MASON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask whether or not I can clear the record by reading from the bill one line where I was questioned as to veracity?

The SPEAKER. All debate on the bill has expired.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 196, nays 192, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—196

Addonizio	Fino	Moorhead
Albert	Flynn	Morrison
Anderson,	Foley	Multer
Mont.	Ford	Murphy
Anfuso	Frazier	Natcher
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Nix
Ashley	Fulton	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Gallagher	O'Brien, N.Y.
Auchincloss	Gary	O'Hara, Ill.
Avery	Gathings	O'Neill
Ayres	Gialmo	Osmer
Baker	Goodell	Ostertag
Barr	Granahan	Pelly
Barrett	Grant	Poage
Barry	Green, Pa.	Poff
Bass, N.H.	Griffin	Porter
Bass, Tenn.	Hagen	Preston
Beckworth	Halleck	Price
Bennett, Fla.	Halpern	Pucinski
Bentley	Hardy	Quile
Betts	Harris	Quigley
Boggs	Harrison	Randall
Boland	Healey	Reece, Tenn.
Bolling	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Reuss
Bowles	Holt	Rhodes, Pa.
Boykin	Holtzman	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Hosmer	Rivers, S.C.
Breeding	Hull	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Robison
Brown, Mo.	Inouye	Rodino
Burke, Ky.	Irwin	Rogers, Fla.
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Roosevelt
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Md.	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Jones, Mo.	Rutherford
Cannon	Karsten	Saund
Carnahan	Karth	Schneebeli
Casey	Kasem	Schwengel
Cederberg	Keogh	Sisk
Celler	Kilday	Smith, Miss.
Chamberlain	King, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Chipfield	Kluczynski	Spence
Church	Lafore	Springer
Clark	Laird	Stubblefield
Coffin	Libonati	Teller
Cohelan	Lindsay	Thompson, N.J.
Conte	McCormack	Thompson, Tex.
Corbett	McGovern	Thornberry
Cramer	McSweeney	Toll
Curtis, Mass.	Machrowicz	Tuck
Curtis, Mo.	Mack	Udall
Daddario	Madden	Ullman
Dague	Magnuson	Wainwright
Dawson	Mahon	Wallhauser
Derwinski	Mailliard	Watts
Dixon	Matthews	Weis
Dooley	Meador	Westland
Dorn, N.Y.	Merrrow	Wharton
Downing	Miller	Widnall
Doyle	George P. Miller, N.Y.	Wilson
Dulski	Milliken	Wolf
Dwyer	Mills	Wright
Elliott, Pa.	Minshall	Yates
Everett	Mitchell	Young
Farbstein	Monagan	Zablocki
Fascell		Zelenko

NAYS—192

Abbott	Cook	Gross
Abernethy	Cooley	Gubser
Adair	Cunningham	Haley
Alford	Curtin	Hargis
Alger	Daniels	Harmon
Andersen,	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Minn.	Delaney	Hechler
Andrews	Dent	Hemphill
Ashmore	Denton	Henderson
Bailey	Derounian	Hess
Baldwin	Devine	Hiestand
Bates	Diggs	Hoever
Becker	Dingell	Hoffman, Ill.
Belcher	Donohue	Hogan
Berry	Dorn, S.C.	Hollifield
Blatnik	Dowdy	Holland
Bosch	Edmondson	Horan
Bow	Evins	Huddleston
Bray	Fallon	Jennings
Brock	Feighan	Jensen
Brooks, Tex.	Fenton	Johnson
Broomfield	Fisher	Johnson, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Flood	Johnson, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Flynt	Jonas
Broyhill	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Budge	Forrester	Kastenmeyer
Burdick	Fountain	Kearns
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	Kee
Burleson	Garmatz	Keith
Canfield	Gavin	Kelly
Chenoweth	George	Kilgore
Coad	Glenn	King, Utah
Collier	Gray	Kirwan
Colmer	Griffiths	Kitchen

Knox	Moss	Selden
Kowalski	Moulder	Shipley
Kyl	Mumma	Sikes
Lane	Murray	Siler
Langen	Nelsen	Simpson
Latta	Norblad	Slack
Lennon	Norrell	Smith, Calif.
Lesinski	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, Iowa
Levering	O'Konski	Staggers
Lipscomb	Oliver	Steed
Loser	Perkins	Stratton
McCulloch	Pfost	Sullivan
McDonough	Philbin	Taber
McFall	Pilcher	Teague, Calif.
McGinley	Pirnie	Thomson, Wyo.
McIntire	Powell	Tollefson
McMillan	Prokop	Trimble
Macdonald	Rabaut	Utt
Marshall	Rains	Vanik
Martin	Ray	Van Pelt
Mason	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Zandt
May	Riehlman	Wampler
Metcalfe	Riley	Weaver
Meyer	Rogers, Colo.	Whitener
Michel	Rogers, Mass.	Whitten
Miller, Clem	Rooney	Wier
Moeller	Roush	Winstead
Montoya	St. George	Withrow
Moore	Saylor	Younger
Morgan	Schenck	
Morris, N. Mex.	Scherer	

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Gilbert	Santangelo
Allen	Green, Oreg.	Scott
Barden	Hébert	Shelley
Baring	Jackson	Sheppard
Baumhart	Johnson, Colo.	Short
Bennett, Mich.	Judd	Smith, Kans.
Blitch	Kilburn	Taylor
Bonner	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Brewster	Lankford	Thomas
Buckley	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Chelf	Morris, Okla.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Passman	Walter
Durham	Patman	Williams
Elliott, Ala.	Pillion	Willis
Forand	Rogers, Tex.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Baring against.
 Mr. Elliott for, with Mr. Scott against.
 Mr. Santangelo for, with Mr. Alexander against.
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Bonner against.
 Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
 Mr. Johnson of Colorado for, with Mr. Barden against.
 Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Williams against.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Durham against.
 Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Taylor against.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Allen.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baumhart.
 Mr. Vinson with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Jackson.
 Mr. Morris of Oklahoma with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Pillion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF INCORPORATION OF CITY OF MARLBORO, MASS.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 535), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Marlboro, Massachusetts, as a town on May 31, 1660; and

Whereas from the time of its first settlement in 1657 the people of Marlboro have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the tercentenary anniversary of Marlboro will be celebrated June 10 through June 19, 1960, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings, and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Marlboro is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Marlboro, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Marlboro during the past three hundred years.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I have reserved the right to object to find out if we are going to have any more legislative business today.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further legislative business today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will be the final legislative action?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARLBORO TERCENTENARY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, May 31 of this year marks the 300th anniversary of the incorporation as a town of the city of Marlboro, Mass., in my district, and I am truly gratified that the House is making note of this outstanding event by extending its congratulations to the people of this historic Massachusetts community.

Actually, the history of Marlboro goes further back in time than the 300 years of progress which will be celebrated with impressive exercises from June 10 through 19. Marlboro is located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the very earliest days of American history.

Courageous bands of early settlers as early as 1657 carved out Marlboro from the wilderness and today many descend-

ants of these pioneers still reside in the community. These brave settlers helped to establish a civilization, a tradition, a way of life, and a history which live to this very day in the heritage which is so fortunately ours.

These early settlers of Marlboro helped to establish for all America the basic institutions of democratic government. They helped to forge a record of magnificent achievement that lives to this day.

It is therefore fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the House should make note of the struggles and bitter sacrifices of the pioneer people of Marlboro so that we and our posterity may benefit from the remarkable legacy of accomplishment these early settlers have left us. In recognition of the incorporation of Marlboro as a town, Mr. Speaker, the House today pays profoundly felt tribute to this community and its people by the adoption of my resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Marlboro, Massachusetts, as a town on May 31, 1660; and

Whereas from the time of its first settlement in 1657 the people of Marlboro have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the tercentenary anniversary of Marlboro will be celebrated June 10 through June 19, 1960, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Marlboro is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Marlboro, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Marlboro during the past three hundred years.

It is not possible for me in these brief remarks to recite in full the glorious history of Marlboro, but I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the highlights of this progressive community which I have the great honor to represent in the Congress.

Marlboro was incorporated as a town in 1660 by the Massachusetts General Court on petition from pioneer settlers from nearby Sudbury which was settled as early as 1639. It took its name after Marlboro town in Wilts County, England.

Marlboro, which became a city in 1890, now comprises about 21 square miles. The 1960 census gives Marlboro 18,759 residents, an increase of 3,003 over the 1950 count.

Like famed Rome, Marlboro is located on seven hills. It overlooks the gentle rolling valley of the Assabet in the central Massachusetts area. It is said that on a clear day landmarks some 40 miles away can be discerned in every direction from Sligo Hill since local claims have it that the city is the highest elevation 30 miles inland along the entire eastern

Atlantic seaboard. Few, if any, other communities have disputed this claim since Marlboro is 400 feet above sea level and is known as the Highland City.

Marlboro is known throughout the Nation for its famous shoe industry which dates back to 1836. By 1917, Marlboro was the world's eighth largest shoe manufacturing city, some 20,000 pairs being made daily. A few years later, it became the fifth largest shoe center in the United States, a remarkable achievement in comparison to the much larger cities manufacturing shoes. Shoe manufacturing is still one of the city's basic industries, but diversification has taken place in recent years, so much so that Marlboro now makes automobile batteries, metal stampings and dies, set-up paper and jewelry boxes, wire products, miners' lamps, industrial scale models, metal polishing plates, and industrial chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, in observance of its 300th anniversary, Marlboro has planned an elaborate program of events beginning June 10 and extending through June 19. Among the highlights of the observance will be a historical pageant with a large local cast to depict the growth and development of Marlboro from the time of its early settlement, the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the industrial expansion, through to the World Wars I and II and Korean conflict of the present century.

In addition, a huge parade will take place on June 12 with participating units from the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Present plans call for one of the largest parades ever to be conducted in the central Massachusetts area.

At the request of the general chairman of the Marlboro Tercentenary Committee, Mr. Louis F. Ghiloni, I was privileged to extend invitations to the Marlboro celebration to the armed services and it has been gratifying indeed to obtain such splendid cooperation from the various branches of the service.

Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding general of Fort Devens, will be reviewing officer at the parade, to which he has assigned the Fort Devens band, a platoon of troops, and color guard. In addition, Maj. Gen. J. F. R. Seitz, chief of staff, Headquarters 1st U.S. Army, Governors Island, N.Y., has requested a U.S. Army exhibit unit for display during the Marlboro celebration.

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, commandant of the 1st Naval District, Boston, is making available the Boston Naval Base band, a color guard, and Navy marching unit.

Col. William C. Lewis, commander, Westover Air Force Base, is insuring Westover participation in the Marlboro event. Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commander, 1st U.S. Coast Guard District, Boston, is endeavoring to work out Coast Guard participation.

In addition, plans are being made for a flyover of C-119G type aircraft over Marlboro in the early evening of June 10, opening day of the tercentenary observance, through the cooperation of Lt. Col. Gardner W. Mills, Air Force Reserve, commander, 732d Troop Carrier Squad-

ron, Medium—Reserve, Grenier Field, Manchester, N.H.

Marlboro is a city of beautiful homes and honest, industrious, hardworking people comprised of numerous, different racial backgrounds who work together with unity and loyalty to further the welfare of their beautiful city.

It is its people throughout the many generations which have transpired since its establishment who have made Marlboro the great city that it is, and is to these people, from the beginning to the present, that we pay our tribute today for what they have done in each succeeding generation down to this very hour to make this fine Massachusetts city stand out so brightly in the firmament of American communities. God-speed to them all.

I would like to express my deep personal thanks to my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Majority Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK, whose great interest and effective help have made possible the passage of this resolution.

I am also most grateful to Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK; the Honorable EMANUEL Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee; and the ranking minority member of this committee, the Honorable WILLIAM McCULLOCH; and also the distinguished members of the Rules Committee, Chairman HOWARD SMITH; and ranking minority member, the Honorable LEO ALLEN, without whose kind assistance the necessary action on this resolution could not have been taken at this time.

I am especially thankful to you, Mr. Speaker, for permitting the House to depart from today's heavy schedule so that the good wishes and felicitations of this Chamber might be conveyed to the city of Marlboro on the occasion of its 300th anniversary.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 666, which is designed to insure that America's fuels industries will be able to meet successfully the challenge of the future, in either peace or war.

The proposal will, when approved by the House and the Senate, establish a joint congressional committee to study the energy industries of the United States and make recommendations to the Congress for a national fuels policy. Such a policy would establish guidelines for the future conduct of America's basic energy industries—oil, coal, natural gas, and atomic power.

The Nation now has many separate policies affecting the fuels industries, but these policies are a crazy quilt of overlaps, conflicts, and loopholes administered by many different agencies. The consequent confusion is a detriment to

the national security of the United States and threatens its capacity for the expansion necessary to keep pace with its growing population and ever-rising standard of living.

What is needed is a single, integrated policy covering America's vital fuels industries and this would be the end result of my resolution.

Immediate action on the national fuels policy resolution is necessary because the situation of all three domestic fuels industries is rapidly becoming critical. The petroleum industry is suffering from a huge oversupply of oil and prices have been declining for the past 3 years. The ills of the coal industry are well known, and the natural gas industry is the victim of artificially depressed prices. Unless these trends are stopped, and stopped soon, the future of this vital segment of the American economy appears exceedingly gloomy.

The following four reasons dictate the formulation and adoption of a national fuels policy without delay:

This step has been proposed by every independent commission or study group to investigate the problem of American energy resources.

This step will enable the United States to maintain a sound domestic economy capable of the expansion demanded by the dynamic years ahead.

This step will be invaluable aid in the current economic cold war with the Soviet Union.

This step is vital to provide a strong, stable energy base to meet the needs of a possible future national emergency.

This resolution is particularly important to the State of Illinois. In 1958, the last year for which figures are available, the value of fuel production in my State was nearly half a billion dollars. Consequently the health of the energy industries is vital to Illinois' economy.

I am hopeful this resolution will find speedy approval on the floor of the House and feel a similar proposal in the Senate should also be approved during the present session of Congress.

DEDICATION OF THE HORACE HARDY LESTER REACTOR FOR MATERIALS RESEARCH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following address made by me at the dedication of the Horace Hardy Lester Reactor for Materials Research, Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., May 17, 1960:

Brigadier General Rust, Major General Schomburg, Mrs. Horace Hardy Lester, the Rev. Raymond Calkins, distinguished visitors, ladies and gentlemen.

It is not unusual for me to visit the Watertown Arsenal. I have been coming out here and working with the commanding general of the arsenal for many years. Together we

have worked out many problems not only of interest to the arsenal and the people of Watertown and the surrounding communities, but also of great importance to the defense of the United States. So it is not uncommon for this Member of Congress to visit the arsenal for various considerations and for various occasions.

Today, however, the situation is different. Today this is a great occasion. At this time we are here to mark a great milestone in scientific production here at the Watertown Arsenal. For me to have a part in this great occasion is not only a deeply felt honor but I believe it is somewhat a recognition of the labors that have been devoted to the work of this great arsenal operating in the defense of the Nation.

Today we are dedicating something new. In doing this it is my desire to pay tribute to those responsible for this work. As it always has been, as it is now, and as it will be in the future, the creation of something new requires the cooperation of many minds and many hands all the way from the dreams to the final reality.

The blazing of a new trail always requires complete cooperation of many people. There are those who plan it, those who get the operations under way, those who engineer and invent the processes and elements that must be developed, and finally, those who must do the work. A tremendous amount of time is required before this atomic reactor is actually ready to be constructed. Many persons have had a part. It is to all these people, the planners and the workers here at the Watertown Arsenal, we must give our thanks and appreciation for their interest, their loyalty, and their workmanship. I am sure that everyone here will agree with me that at the Watertown Arsenal is to be found some of the finest employees and loyal workers in the entire United States. Dedicated to their work, and dedicated to their country, they strive to do a perfect job. For this, not only the United States Army, but the people of this country, are grateful. Employees of this caliber and of this quality are invaluable in the defense of our country.

In the directing of our attention toward those largely responsible for this dedication today, we must give notice to the outstanding contributions and labors of the distinguished commanding general, of the Watertown Arsenal, Brig. Gen. C. E. Rust. The work he has accomplished, the contributions he has made, the problems he has surmounted, are worthy of the highest commendation. In one year, General Rust has done an outstanding and a most remarkable job at the Watertown Arsenal. It is men of his quality and ability that provide this Nation with a sense of security and confidence in their military forces. I am proud and pleased to have had the opportunity, as brief as it has been, to work with General Rust and to know him and his charming and capable wife. I wish them every success in their future undertakings.

In this dedication today it is our purpose to show our appreciation as a Nation and to honor the late Dr. Horace Hardy Lester, who lived to observe and indeed to participate in the early phases of one of the greatest scientific revolutions people of this earth have ever experienced. We are gathered here at the site of this nuclear reactor, evidence in itself of what has been happening so fast to our way of life—nuclear energy for economical power production is near and perhaps we'll see the harnessing of the energy of the sun tomorrow.

Here with us today, participating in this dedication, is Mrs. Horace Hardy Lester, the able and charming wife of Dr. Lester. All through the years of scientific research Dr. Lester was indeed fortunate to have constantly at his side the encouragement and the inspiration of his wonderful wife. Just

as he did, she too has lived to observe and to experience at first hand some of these great scientific developments which mean so much to people all over the world. Just as many of you are, I am extremely pleased to meet Mrs. Lester and to have her here with us today.

Dr. Lester saw all of this nuclear development in his day. It was not until 1896 that Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen discovered X-rays and 1903 saw the discovery of radioactivity. A nuclear reaction consumes the fuel of this reactor and releases radiation in the form of neutrons for research yet the neutron was not discovered until 1932, less than 30 years ago.

Radiation from this reactor will enable your scientists here to study, understand, and repair fundamental defects in the materials used for the production of weapons of the future. The same studies will be applicable to the needs of all of us in our daily life. Materials Research is receiving much attention and emphasis by the Department of Defense and the scientific groups of the Nation. Our military requirements in particular are extremely demanding in this age of space. The very best equipment designed by the experts is limited by the quality of available materials from which the hardware must be manufactured. This limitation is one of extreme importance to the national defense. Progress must be made in this area—we must go forward and produce more basic knowledge to apply in this area. We must do this with optimism and confidence. Your record here at Watertown warrants such optimism.

It is indeed commendable that your Materials Research Office here at Watertown employs a scientific staff of such competence that the Atomic Energy Commission has awarded license to build and operate a nuclear reactor. I know how severe the requirements of this agency must be and I am pleased, but not surprised, to find such a basic scientific capability at the Watertown Arsenal.

It is estimated that new knowledge available for adaptation to the needs of man now doubles about every 10 years. New knowledge derives directly from basic research. Dr. Lester was a strong promoter of basic research and a recognized pioneer in industrial radiography. Early in his career at Princeton he worked with the great Thomas A. Edison. Any Army officer who knew him will say that he begged willingly, prodded, and argued incessantly for better laboratories and equipment here at Watertown Arsenal. As your representative I was not spared and spent much time here and in Washington obtaining support for work inspired by people like Dr. Lester.

Dr. Lester wanted to keep this arsenal, our arsenal, in the front lines of progress and we have, with the help of such dedicated men, accomplished much. In 1948 the American Society for Metals, the largest metal society of the Nation, credited Watertown Arsenal with eight milestones of progress from 1900 to 1950, more firsts than any other single contributor. These included the first large alloy steel weldments for gun carriages, and centrifugally cast cannon tubes in the 1920's. In 1922 Dr. Lester was personally responsible for the development of radiography for foundry control. Later the spectrograph was developed for routine chemical analysis. Molybdenum high-speed steel was a Watertown Arsenal first as were cast armor plate and carbide cored ammunition. In the 1950's inspired by Dr. Lester this arsenal led the way in the development of the new metal titanium.

Now in 1960 we have here the first Army research reactor. Research must precede development and production and throughout the years it has been this capability to do high-quality research which has given us much of our workload in the shops. The

welded gun carriage of 1929 helped to keep us active in depression days—the centrifugally cast cannon tube made possible an increase in our production capability in World War II of many hundreds of percent. We are now in the missile business.

It is important that the arsenals keep an "in house" capability to advise the Chief of Ordnance, prepare technical specifications for procurement of weapons and inspect the items purchased. These responsibilities cannot be delegated. To keep such a capability you must do some of the research, development, and production yourselves. Only by practicing your professions and trades can you remain capable and progressive. You are a vital part of the science-industry-ordnance team which is so important to the defense of our country. To this extent our capability for preparedness depends upon you.

You are indeed fortunate to live here in one of the most important centers of technical knowledge in the world. Within a 50-mile radius of Watertown Arsenal are 45 educational, 26 electronic, and 28 research, development, and engineering organizations. Your position offers mutual opportunity for important exchange of technical views between universities, the industry, and the Army, a rare opportunity indeed to cross the communication barrier and tell the Army's story, its needs, and its problems to the scientific community.

My message to you today is this: Continue through the efforts of dedicated people like Dr. Lester to demonstrate new and progressive ability and I assure you that I will continue as I have these many years to fight for your cause here, and in Washington in the Halls of Congress.

AREA ASSISTANCE BILL

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am offering for consideration a new administration area assistance bill, H.R. 12286. This proposal incorporates eligibility criteria that the President in his veto message of May 13, 1960, stated he would accept. You will recall at the time the depressed areas bill was debated by the House, I pointed out that for 5 years the administration had been endeavoring to obtain passage of sound legislation that would be helpful to the chronically blighted and depressed areas. At that time, I offered as a substitute the administration bill that had been introduced by the gentleman from New York, Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN. As the President said:

The people of the relatively few communities of chronic unemployment—who want to share in the general prosperity—are, after 5 years, properly becoming increasingly impatient and are rightfully desirous of constructive action. The need is for truly sound and helpful legislation on which the Congress and the Executive can agree. There is still time and I willingly pledge once again my wholehearted cooperation in obtaining such a law.

If there is a genuine desire to be helpful to these chronic areas certainly there

is sufficient time for Congress to act. I would like to point out at this time the major items in the new bill:

First. The new eligibility criteria includes 1 more major area and 11 smaller areas than would the criteria in the original administration bill. In a spirit of compromise these criteria are those contained in the bill as it originally passed the Senate.

Second. The bill authorizes \$75 million in loan assistance for the construction or refurbishing of industrial plants. It should be pointed out that the vetoed bill also provided \$75 million for this purpose.

Third. Federal loan assistance is limited to 35 percent of the aggregate cost as in the original Administration bill and State or local participation must not be less than 15 percent. The balance of the funds would come from private sources and certainly a 50 percent participation can be expected for any project that offers promise of lasting benefits to the community.

Fourth. Housing and Home Finance Agency public facilities loan authorization would be doubled from \$100 million to \$200 million. The Agency would be required to give a first priority to applications for public facilities that will truly serve an industrial plant construction or refurbishing project authorized by the act. It also requires HHFA to accord next an equal priority to applications from (a) areas of substantial and persistent unemployment designated under the act, (b) small municipalities—which hold the only priority under existing law.

Fifth. A new section authorizes \$1.5 million annually for vocational education assistance in areas eligible under the act. The original administration bill contained no specific dollar authorization.

Sixth. An authorization of \$1.5 million annually for technical assistance includes studies of economic growth potential to eligible areas.

Seventh. Two million dollars is authorized annually for technical assistance to low-income rural areas and one-industry small towns to help them develop manufacturing activities and to diversify so that their economic vulnerability may be reduced.

Eighth. The bill provides Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce. The President pointed out in his veto message that—

S. 722 would have created a new Federal agency and would in consequence mean many unnecessary additions to the Federal payroll and a considerable delay in the program before the new agency could be staffed and functioning effectively.

Mr. Speaker, the people in these truly critical areas have a right to expect speedy action on the part of the Congress. As outlined by the President in his veto message, this is a bill that can become law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 7155 under consideration earlier today.

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

There was no objection.

THE LIMESTONE INDUSTRY

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the wave of destiny demands a strong America. To have a strong America, we must have strong agricultural production. We are being threatened by too many sources in the world today, and this means that we must remain stronger at home.

With agriculture holding the responsibility of keeping the "breadbasket" of the United States and the world filled, I would like to point out the following as recommended reading for each and every Member of the Congress today:

WE NEED THE LIMESTONE INDUSTRY ON OUR TEAM

(Talk by George H. Enfield, Extension Agronomist, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the 15th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., on January 19, 1960)

Bob Koch called me this last spring and he said, "How would you like to appear on the Limestone Institute Convention program?" You know, I was delighted. Back when I first started in agriculture after graduating at Purdue, my first job was to go into the laboratory and make tests on limestone for neutralizing value and fineness. So I thought it would be nice if I could come here and talk about your industry—the industry which makes the farmer a profit. Then I thought that I would like to come and give you an idea of what Extension really is. I thought, too, that it would be nice to come and see if there was not a possibility in making some changes. You see, we can always get crazy ideas and unless you get an idea now and then, there is no chance for change. You may think that some of these things are actually crazy. It doesn't make much difference to me though.

Now, really what is Extension? Extension is getting the agricultural and home economic information in usable form and out to the people. It is to furnish them with facts so they can make wise decisions and try to get farmers to change. Now we have been trying to get them to do something about agricultural limestone but it seems like an uphill proposition. Recently the Extension Service looked over their job and said—what is the major field of our endeavor—where should we put the emphasis?

Efficiency in agriculture was first. Further progress in the direction of improved efficiency in agricultural production is not only necessary, but mandatory. That was mandatory from the laws in the beginning. Limestone has long been recognized as one of the first steps in developing an efficient crop production program. To accomplish efficiency in all fields of agriculture, Extension has tried to cooperate with industry and other governmental agencies to hasten the

adoption of proven practices and to get them universally accepted by all. As production technology increases there is a need for changes in farming practices. Those who accept change have a real opportunity to not only help themselves but to help the community and the Nation as well. Research results help us to achieve higher standards of living only if we actually get these new practices put into effect.

Efficiency in marketing and distribution is second. In this field we hope to accomplish several things. We hope to reduce the cost of marketing farm products, we are trying to expand the market, and we are trying to help people understand the marketing system. If we are able to develop a better atmosphere for the limestone salesmen to operate in, we believe we will have accomplished one of the things which we set out to do. If your salesman is the right kind of a man and we are able to keep the right kind of a frame of mind in the farmer, it should make it possible for your products to be moved more easily into the market and the farmer will be as happy to pass the time of day with your salesman as he was with the merchants in the old time grocery store.

Next is conservation, development, and use of natural resources. The close-knit interdependency of soil, water, minerals, plants, animals, and man constitutes a seamless web of life, and it defies the efforts to deal with one of these resources effectively while ignoring the other. The pressures on our resources are growing year to year. We hope to encourage the development of these resources and help plan for their wise use. This is emphasized in our efforts to use limestone products on the soil for the purpose of establishing adequate conservation crops or covers for our land.

Proper management on the farm and in the home is important. The decisions to be made on the farm today are probably as numerous and more varied in subject than in any area of industry. The alternatives are many and unless all the factors are carefully considered, the choice may not result in a greater achievement or a greater satisfaction to the family. Extension tries to make the facts available to farmers so that he and his family might make decisions that are more than satisfying to the whole family.

In family living Extension's duty is not only to make more money for the farmer but its ultimate goal is to develop a citizen that is more cognizant of his obligation to his community and the Nation. Much of the work of this area is done in the field of home economics. Our efforts are with the idea of making the home life more meaningful to all.

Youth development is another of Extension's objectives. The rapid increase in the number of youths calls for a specially oriented program. It may be a surprise to some that the ultimate goal in 4-H clubs and older youth groups is not as it was in the past—which was to make its members better farmers for tomorrow. Today we try to better equip youth for the challenge of tomorrow, whatever his field of endeavor might be. It is significant, I think, that 9 out of every 10 boys on the farm today will need to find some other livelihood than on the farm if he is going to have a job by 1975. 4-H aims to help the young people acquire knowledge and skills, enjoy useful work, develop talent, appreciate values, recognize the importance of science in agriculture and home economics, explore career opportunities, appreciate nature, cultivate principles of healthful living, strengthen personal standards, and gain abilities and understanding to work cooperatively with others.

Leadership development is one of Extension's major contributions that will be so necessary in the future. The interdependence of the farmer on the other segments of society makes it imperative that the lead-

ership be developed to act as a catalyst for the group action and the betterment of society itself and to his community.

In the Extension Service there are countless opportunities for leaders to gain stature and at the same time perform a great service to others. Leaders are not born, they are developed. In this respect Extension has not only afforded the opportunity but tries to help, encourage, and train.

Community improvement and resource development need assistance. Extension has the responsibility of developing and organizing programs that have benefited both the farmer and nonfarmer resident. Community improvement ideally should involve all the people within the area. It must be developed to achieve the greatest rewards to society as a whole and geared to the speed of change acceptable to those affected. These efforts should result in the achievements that are satisfying and mutually beneficial. In short, it should make living more worth while.

We also believe Extension has a part to play in public affairs. The complexity of public problems has brought Government intervention in many fields. People traditionally desire freedom from such actions. Extension has been looked to for a long time for help—not for the decision—on how people should think, but for the facts and all the facts so they can make a better appraisal of the situation themselves. This is really a new field, but it must be given attention if the farm people are going to be able to make the kind of decisions they will need to produce their greatest satisfaction for them.

Now let's look a little at the aglime situation. But, first, our clientele. Our clientele are farm families primarily, but it may include urban, suburban, and it includes farm organizations. It includes all organizations that are interested in the farm and the farm people. It includes the handlers of farm products and suppliers. This is the limestone producer, the trucker, the railroad man, and it also includes institutes like the NLI that try to help make liming meaningful to the American farm. What is the situation about lime in this country? Sure there's a need for lime. Here are two examples: New York and Tennessee. In New York from about 28,000 soil samples they find that about 70 percent of their agricultural lands are acid enough to need lime. Go to Tennessee—with twice as many soil samples tested—and you get the same kind of a picture. There is a need for more agricultural lime. Why isn't this need noticed? Why do people fail to recognize this need? Is there no profit in it? Let's look at the results from one State—Pennsylvania. This is not just a 1-year trial, but the average of 28 years. This soil is not extremely acid; it's only medium acid, a pH of 5.5. You Hoosiers know that there are many soils in your State with pH even below 4.0. Now, as a result for applying aglime there is a large increase from 64 bushels up to 80 bushels of corn. Oats are not affected much. However, the hay was increased greatly. The gross yearly return per acre, \$39 compared to a \$7 cost. Almost \$31.50 per acre per year more than the unlimed land. Now I'm certain that even up in Vermont, where they package agricultural limestone in beautiful bags and spread it with some of the best equipment that I know of, you don't charge delivered and spread on land as much as \$125 a ton. Now that's what that limestone is actually worth—7 tons spread over a 6-year period and it returned back to the farmer a little over \$880. It's a dandy product that you have. Limestone—how much do we recommend and how much do we use? I didn't bring any figures because it varies from time to time, and who makes the recommendations? The recommendation, you may say, is 80 million tons annually. Some others may say 50 million tons annually. How

much do we use? Sixteen to twenty-two to twenty-five million tons. But really what does that mean? It means that if you would do the job for 10 years in a row, you would just barely have the job completed. Our land needs more than 80 million tons. You need to get the job done now, not 10 years from now. Ten years from now you've got to do the job all over again.

Let's get down to farm size. I picked a 240-acre farm. And what do we see on this farm? They started out to make an estimate of how much limestone it really needed. Forty acres does not need any limestone at all. Twenty acres need 3 tons to the acre. And it looks like another 80 acres needs 4 tons to the acre; and another 100 acres needs about 2 tons to the acre. Can you see the reason for soil tests in a situation like that, and this is not exaggerated. In fact, it should be chopped up more than that. Actually, you will probably find that much difference in any one field rather than that one farm. If you put limestone on according to what you find in one field, or what the average is for the farm we would need about 3 tons per acre. Put 3 tons on fields that need two tons or less—what do you get? Too much investment and the farmer doesn't get the returns on the investments he really expects. You put 3 tons down when you need 4 tons and then what happens? You think that your darned old limestone is no good. You put 3 tons on where you don't need any at all and then what do you say? Limestone is worthless. That's the reason we recommend that you have a soil test—in order to get satisfied customers from the good product that you people are producing and selling. I have here an example now as to what we are doing. I want to show you what it's costing this farmer. Let's say he starts buying limestone like he normally does at the present time. He gets about one-tenth as much as he needs. That's about what he buys each year. Now it doesn't cost him very much over the period of time if he just keeps adding on a little bit of limestone and provided we have someone to pay for about 50 percent of the cost of the limestone delivered and spread for him. This is based on limestone normally selling for \$5 a ton. I use \$5 because that's about the average in the United States. Then I had someone pay for 50 percent of it. So actually our product only costs the farmer \$2.50 a ton but he put on about one-tenth of what he needs to complete the job in 1960. By 1975, where will he be? This man would have about \$25,000 more money to handle it but you see it is not how much do you handle, it's how much profit do you make. The profit line looks just about the same. Limestone costs a little bit; the returns are great. You say that \$31.50 is too high. I didn't use that figure. I cut it less than half. It was only \$15 an acre that I used in calculating these results. How much does a man really make? He has a little over \$22,000 profit by 1975, enough to buy him a brandnew home or a new car every 5 years from the use of the product which you men are now producing. Now that's the way we have been trying to sell limestone in this country. Let's take a look at another situation. Now I'm going to say to Mr. X, "The sale's off. You don't buy limestone any longer for \$2.50 a ton out of your pocket and \$2.50 a ton paid by someone else. I'm going to charge you \$6 a ton." You see, that's a dollar above the average. All right, what does it really cost? "Oh," he says, "I don't have the money." "Well, go down to the bank and borrow it. It costs you 7 percent if you go down to the bank and borrow money for limestone, that's if you can borrow it and I think you should." So if there's a little increase in the cost down here, it should cost you roughly \$3,000 to get this farm limed all at one time. Now, what did he do? He bought 540 tons for 180

acres and slapped it all on according to need as indicated by the soil test. Now that's in the year 1960. Then about 8 years later he came along and put on 2 tons more on the land. You need that much for maintenance. So he put on another investment. How about his returns? His income goes up \$35,000. Now let's just say the costs are high compared with the first example where the farmer never got his farm limed. Let's look at the profits if you wish. The profit situation in the first 3 years looks a little bad. You don't make money out of limestone the first year you put it on. You hardly make anything the second year. You've got to grow the crops and then harvest them and feed them to the livestock to get the return. But, after that he's \$6,000 better off.

Are you limestone merchants trying to do the best job for your farmer customers and for yourselves? Why not tell him the whole benefit? Why try to clip the dog's tail off as fast as the hair grows out? The way we've been trying to sell limestone is to get the farmer to use enough limestone to correct the acidity found each year. You have been advertising limestone sales—50 percent off. Now that's what the man really hears before he opens his eyes and you haven't taken that sign down for the last 10 years. He says, "How much does it cost?" You see, he's not caring whether there's 50 percent off or not. But he finally reads the sign—limestone \$5 a ton—cost now \$2.50. But then let's look at what he really sees when he looks at the whole story. All sales limited to about one-tenth of the farmers' needs—see that's the way we've been trying to correct soil acidity in this country. You limit the quantity he can get. You've fenced him in.

Limestone is about the only product sold on the basis first ton one-half price—the remainder full price. What do we find in Kansas? This is a very recent survey too. One out of six farmers say at the end of the survey their neighbors are not using enough limestone. Why, they don't know very much about their neighbors—that's the only thing that that tells us. We know very well that the neighbors need more lime than that. They're very modest about what they think their neighbors need.

Three out of four people say they have never seen an ad for limestone for agricultural purposes. That is promotion work. Thirty-eight percent say they have seen demonstrations. We believe that Extension is doing as well as industry. You're getting 25 percent of the people—we're getting about 38 to 40 percent of them. Now, four out of five say they have used some limestone in the last 5 years—so they recognize the need for it. I'd ask you to remember two words—need and want. If they recognize the need, and that's something that Extension should do, want is created by a salesman. Here's what we really need in this country today. Four thousand full-time limestone salesmen that are able to sell ten trainloads of limestone a year. You say that's just outrageous and no one can do it. All he needs is to sell 40 customers, on the examples I showed you, 500 tons each and he's got the job done. If you will put that many salesmen on the road—you notice I charged a dollar more for your product than the \$5 average selling price. You ought to have the faith in your product and the ability of a good salesman. You need this extra dollar. This salesman ought to be an \$8,000-a-year man and you may want to get on the road yourself. And then you should followup with another \$2,000 expense account so he can operate like a real salesman. And then you'll need another \$2,000 for promotional materials. You need another \$1,000 for some research to keep your program before the people, even if it's no more than public relations. The trucker needs \$2,000 extra money so he too has an incentive to do a good job when he spreads the limestone. Add another

\$1,000 to the secretaries' salary so she will answer that telephone with a cheerful voice when those orders come rolling in. This will leave \$2,000 for the stockholder and an extra \$2,000 for the business manager.

This is our story. This is our suggestion. Let's see what industry has done. Fertilizer companies, I know, recognize the need for lime. More nitrogen is being pushed on our farmland year by year and every time they sell nitrogen they feel the need for a little more lime. If I were to go out today and try to sell limestone, I believe I would sell nitrogen because sooner or later I know they would have to come to me and buy lime. The more nitrogen we use the more acid our soil gets but this is no reason to stop using nitrogen. See how you create a customer? That's the way to do it—sell the other man's product and they'll come and buy yours. This is the situation I think for today. The fertilizer industry would like to have you on their team; Extension would like to have you on their team; but we need 4,000 players from your field. That's what we really need from the industry to make a success.

Gentlemen, it's been a pleasure for me. I hope it has given you some thoughts you can use.

COLLAPSE OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his 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. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to call the attention of this body to today's substantial gains of defense industry stocks with the collapse of the summit conference.

It is indeed a strange paradox that bad news for the world should be such good news for the stock market. The defense group of stocks, aircrafts, missiles, and electronics, as well as steels, took a sharp rise in the trading which was the heaviest in more than a year, as the ticker tape ran considerably behind floor transactions.

If prosperity in America depends on expanded defense production, it is time that we find a more suitable alternative.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING

Mr. HALPERN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, May 18, is the birthday of our two distinguished Senators from New York, JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING. I believe that it is a unique situation that both Senators from the same State will cut a birthday cake on the same day.

We in New York are intensely proud of our two Senators both of whom were former Members of this House. Their

able representation of the people of the Empire State has earned them a richly merited acclaim.

I am proud to count JACK and KEN among my good friends and I want to express my heartiest congratulations and every best wish to them on this their doubleheader birthday.

In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of this House shares the warm feeling, high regard, and deep affection for both of these fine gentlemen and great legislators, and join in this sincere wish for many, many happy returns of this significant day.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that the people of our country need more than an intelligent and understanding patriotism.

I believe that the study of history can be not only a most effective teacher of patriotism but maybe the only teacher of real patriotism. Our early forefathers understood this. Their successors endorsed this idea when they, in various ways, demonstrated their belief in the importance of history, including required study of American history in our public schools. They knew, as we should, that the more we know about the struggles of our Nation, the great men who initiated great ideas and led it and the better we understand the principles which sustain its people in periods of crises the deeper will be our feeling for our country.

We need to understand, too, Mr. Speaker, that our idea about patriotism can and maybe should change; ours, I believe, has changed. It has broadened since the time of Andrew Jackson and even since the Civil War period. The age we are privileged to live in may require a further extension of our idea of patriotism.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and because it is historically significant, with your consent and with consent of this House, I have chosen to speak today on a subject of great moment.

THE POLITICAL CONVENTIONS OF 1860, OTHER THAN THE REPUBLICAN

On February 2, 1860, Jefferson Davis introduced into the Senate of the United States a set of resolutions which were intended as a final statement of the terms on which the South would consent to remain in the Union. They were as follows: First, the Northern States must repeal their Personal Liberty Acts; second, the fugitive slave law must henceforth be rigorously enforced; third, Congress must assume and discharge absolute responsibility for the protection of slavery in every territory of the United States; and fourth, the freepoint doctrine, as enunciated by Stephen A. Douglas in his debates with Abraham Lincoln in the summer of 1858, must be finally and formally repudiated.

The Democratic conventions of the spring and summer of 1860 began with the meeting at Charleston, S.C., on April 23. Although the committee on the platform approved the Davis resolutions of the preceding winter, the majority of the delegates—as opposed to the party machinery—rallied to the support of Douglas, who, without a single dissenting vote was the choice of the northern Democrats. Thereupon the Alabama delegation, headed by the fiery William L. Yancey, haughtily arose and marched out of the hall, followed by the majority of equally wrathful delegations from South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. This left Douglas with less than the two-thirds support traditionally necessary for nomination by a Democratic convention; the remaining members accordingly adjourned, to meet at Baltimore on June 18.

Soon after the Charleston convention adjourned, to reassemble in Baltimore, the Constitutional Union Party held its first and only general convention, at Baltimore, on the 9th of May. Most of the States were represented, though not in all cases by delegates duly elected in primary meetings and conventions. Young as it was, the party was divided into two wings. The southerners, mostly representatives of the still surviving native American sentiment, desired to nominate Gen. Sam Houston, of Texas. The old Whigs of the North did not relish such a candidacy. They were adjured not to pay too much attention to gentility, but to take a candidate who, rough as he might be, would carry many of the Southern States.

Two votes only were necessary to effect a nomination, and on the second ballot John Bell, of Tennessee, secured the nomination as President and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, was the unanimous choice for second place on the ticket.

The following month in Baltimore the Democratic regulars split, the majority reaffirming their support of Douglas, and the bolters naming John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, one of the ablest statesmen of the South, destined himself to be the Vice President of the Confederacy, an ardent foe of secession, declared that "within a 12-month of the disruption of the Democratic Convention at Charleston the Nation would be engaged in a bloody civil war." So it proved, and meanwhile Mr. Lincoln's prediction, when his friends remonstrated against what they thought his reckless "House Divided" speech in accepting the Republican senatorial nomination in 1858, declared:

Gentlemen, I am out for bigger game. If Douglas answers this question [Can the people of a U.S. territory lawfully exclude slavery prior to the adoption of a State constitution?] he can never be President, and the battle of 1860 is worth a hundred of this.

LINCOLN'S NOMINATION—100 YEARS AFTER

On this 18th day of May in 1860—100 years ago—the Republican Party's national convention in a place called the

Wigwam in Chicago, nominated Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for the presidency of the United States.

Today and at the outset I want to give my thanks very personally to you, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, in particular, and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic alike, for the help and encouragement you gave my idea for commemorating the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth and now this historic nomination by some commentary in this hour here on the floor of the House of Representatives which I hope will be appropriate and which will be shared with my colleagues on both sides of this aisle.

For nothing is more significant about the immortality of Abraham Lincoln than the profoundly accepted fact that while he was given to the political world by the Republicans, he belongs almost as much to the other party and that he transcends them both. He has become our most American American and he emerges in his unique greatness as the undying embodiment of democracy itself under the republican form of government.

Lincoln is now the symbol of a political credo for all mankind.

The Lincoln symbol is the credo of integrity and decency, executive strength extraordinary, and benevolence and compassion in government.

His symbol is the credo of freedom for men everywhere.

No individual in the whole of recorded history, without exception, has done what Lincoln has done in the concrete to give to politics and government, to terms like liberty and equality, such depth and the moving coloration of a compelling religious spirituality to the body politic. This divine union of an abstract idea, with action and the living reality, and the prophetic and kindly fire that touched his utterances, have placed him—and consequently the American tradition—in the very forefront of man's march to freedom everywhere on this earth.

Today we take this hour or so to do honor to his memory and to the Republican convention that launched him on the world stage and among the greatest immortals of all time.

The focus of this commemoration—I repeat—is the single fact in the life of Lincoln that this day a century ago saw him nominated on the Republican ticket to the Presidency. The reason I took it upon myself, Mr. Speaker, to ask that a special note be taken of this event and the work of this convention is because it has seemed to me that its enormous strategic importance for the destiny of our country and mankind has somehow been overlooked in the total impact of Lincoln's life and the immense tragedy of his death. For we have to remember that the logical Republican candidate in 1860 was the redoubtable William H. Seward, of New York.

There were, besides him, some other formidable personalities also seeking the Republican nomination. They were such great men as Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio; Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania;

Edward Bates, of Missouri, and John McLean of Ohio.

Lincoln, it is true, had made a remarkable impression upon those who would become the delegates to this convention and to the people in his debates with Stephen A. Douglas and in his Cooper Union speech. But he was hardly to be compared as a public figure of national significance with the eminence—as of then—of so distinguished and so well known a personality as Seward: the Seward who had been Governor of New York; the Seward who had been a Senator since 1848, the Seward who was known everywhere as the leader of the Republican Party and as an outstanding fighter for the containment of slavery and against its extension. Of course it was held against Seward that he was too radical in his views on slavery. He had frightened some of his supporters with his prophecy of an "irrepressible conflict" and shocked others with his avowal, as he put it, "of a law higher than the Constitution."

This was presumed to alienate several States from his support.

As for the other seekers-after-the-presidency it was held against Chase that he was even more radical in his opposition to slavery than Seward although he, too, had had gubernatorial experience—two terms as Governor of Ohio, and had served one term in the Senate. Bates, of Missouri, did not fit with the strong German element in the Republican Party. McLean, a member of the Supreme Court, enjoyed the following of the conservatives but was regarded as too old. Lincoln's assets were the weaknesses of his opponents, and, in part, the limited knowledge the country had of his views. Thus he was free of any labels for either extremism or conservatism. Not having held national office, except for one term in Congress, he had no record upon which political agitators could seize for anti-Lincoln ammunition. That he came from Illinois—a doubtful State—proved another asset. The fact that he was a real moderate—not an extremist on the slavery question—a man if elected who would be safe was also a very important factor in his nomination. In addition he had the rustic and the humble background that would endear him to tens of thousands of voters. Warm and affectionate slogans that attached themselves to his name such as "railsplitter" and "Honest Abe" were not only effective but they were wholly true. Yet the overall fact remains that the nomination of Lincoln is one of the greatest phenomena in the history of American politics. Lord Charnwood, among the greatest of the Lincoln biographers, writing from the objectivity and the perspective of an Englishman, says of it:

This was the most surprising nomination ever made in America.

Perhaps one of the greatest motivating forces for the nomination of Lincoln was the basic feeling in that convention that this was the man to beat Stephen A. Douglas, the Democratic nominee.

What actually happened in that 3-day Chicago convention was as real, as true,

as indigenous a demonstration of the process of representative government—good and bad—as the history of political conventions records in the annals of political life on this continent. There were some clever off-beat political shenanigans. There were rough and tumble maneuvers. There were intensely emotional doings inside and outside that \$7,000 especially built cavernous barn called the Wigwam.

But, accepting all that, I am still very partial to a more contemplative and a more penetrating judgment. It is, it seems to me, that in the last analysis either an incredible and almost impossible combination of events vaguely described by some people as luck, or, as I believe, more simply and appropriately, the finger of God, determined the results of this convention. In spite of the fact that it was in the midst of so much shouting, in the tumult and the difficult confusion in that great wooden tabernacle in Chicago the right decisions prevailed. I know of few decisions in the life of man so pregnant for the good of our country and the fate of mankind as the decision by those that nominated—and therefore elected—Abraham Lincoln President of the United States in that dread, awful eve-year of the Civil War a century ago.

After the fact—and especially 100 years after the fact, it seems easy to reduce the complexities of the event down to simple analysis. Today we have whole shelves of books with detail and minutia, diagrams and diaries on the event. There is a whole library of commentary. But even now there are facets of that nomination about which, to the end of time, we can guess and speculate. But we know definitely and for certain this: Men who are free and men who are yearning to be free will everlastingly thank God for the decision by those voluntary and free citizens at that convention that vital May 18, 1860.

The Wigwam was an immense wooden box anchored against a brick wall. A hundred feet on one side and 180 feet on the other, it had excellent acoustics for an age before loudspeakers and given to stentorian oratory. It could hold 10,000 people. Perhaps four times that many sought admission. The political leaders, the delegates, the people, the roisterers and the bullies, represented the boiling point of a democratic ferment that extolled the great aims of the newly created Republican Party.

That Republican Convention represented in its composition, in its aims and in its platform the rich and the humble. It represented the vast wealth and sophistication of the East. It represented the burgeoning expansion of the West. It was industrial and agricultural and frontier. The spectacle of the country in 1860—4 score and 4 years after that great document for freedom, the Declaration of Independence—would have amazed and excited the interest and strained to the limit the capacity for wonderment of the Founding Fathers who, through implementing the spirit of that statement, set the stage for the immense growth and progress of this Nation.

For America now had the steamboat.
It had the photograph.
It had the telegraph.
It had the greatest wonder drug of its day—ether as an anesthesia.

There were farm implements within average reach.

There was the new marvel of the home and the factory; the sewing machine.

There were tools for carpentry beyond the wildest dreams of the colonial frontier: nails, spikes, screws, axes.

American firearms were being used by the royal bodyguards in China. They were preferred by the combatants in the Crimean War above all others.

There was the impact of the railroad integrating the Nation.

There was the engineering genius in the building of bridges that startled the world.

Boston had come up with an improved printing press unequalled in its day.

Many of the new things were widely available and relatively cheap.

Clocks cost little.

Steamers were fast.

Implements of all kinds saved human muscle and did much more in far less time.

That Wigwam in Chicago in 1860 reflected the immense and explosive energies for the common good released by the forces of freedom. It was the end product of free government under a Constitution the infinite decency of which—as we sit here today—is still the last great hope of mankind.

This was America.

But outside the Wigwam rumbled the impending peril of civil war. Here was the brink of war that very well might spell the doom of all that man and God had wrought on this soil in those incredible 4 score and 4 years during which America had grown from 3½ million to over 31½ million. And inside the Wigwam were men who had effected the passage a week before this National Republican Convention, of a resolution by the Illinois State Republican convention. This Illinois State resolution declared that:

Abraham Lincoln is the choice of the Republican Party of Illinois for the Presidency.

The resolution instructed the delegates "to use all honorable means to secure his nomination by the Chicago Convention, and to vote as a unit for him." When the young Republican Party gathered for its national convention, the second in its history, on Wednesday, May 16, 1860, there was a resolute and alert, and grimly determined and dedicated group of Lincoln leaders and strategists. For example, there were at the so-called Lincoln headquarters in the Tremont House, volunteers for the Lincoln candidacy: O. H. Browning, Judge David Davis, R. J. Oglesby, Leonard Swett, Jesse K. Dubois, Charles Ray and Norman B. Judd, who was to nominate Lincoln.

There also were William H. Herndon, Gen. John M. Palmer, Ozias M. Hatch, Stephen T. Logan, Gustavus Koerner, Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell. In the hands of these men—and especially of Judge David Davis—rested a mission

for posterity they successfully accomplished under circumstances of the great doubt and in a crisis not fully appreciated until later. There were, to be sure, internal problems in the Lincoln strategic command—while the candidate throughout the convention was in Springfield—and there were some basic differences on procedure with the candidate himself. But the voluminous record shows that loyalty and integrity held fast within the moral context of the time. History shows that an enormous victory of immense meaning for the ages—greater than these men could possibly know—was won the fateful consequential day.

There is a strong temptation to read the story of the Wigwam and Chicago in 1860 and imagine—out of proportion—the extent of the boisterousness and the consumption of liquor. Of course there was a good deal of that. But it could hardly be said that it was that kind of a convention. The soberest judgments and the most careful decisions were being made. Men worked at a cruel pace and afterwards—like Judge Davis—they wept almost as if they could peer down the corridors of time and envisage the greatness of their victory. That convention—that Republican Convention—dealt with many problems of its time and not alone with slavery.

The platform proper, or the discussions at the convention, or both, dealt with the issues and the ideals and principles of the time head on. While slavery was the shadow that clung like a cloud over the deliberations, yet that convention—for all its great concern with the slavery issues—had a wider and a deeper scope. Pertinent to the slavery issue finally was the reaffirmation in the platform of the thunder from the Declaration of Independence. "That all men are created equal"—giving that quotation in full. It proclaimed itself against disunion declaring the concept, I quote, "abhorrent."

The platform clamored for economy in the Federal Government asking for a return to, I quote, "rigid economy and accountability."

The platform demanded duties upon imports because, said the platform:

Sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.

We recommend—

Said the platform—

that policy of national exchanges, which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers any adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the Nation's commercial prosperity and independence.

The platform favored the, I quote, "complete and satisfactory homestead measure," which at the time of the announcement of the platform had already passed the House. The platform stood against any proposed restrictions to the rights of the newly naturalized foreigners and to any changes—impairing their rights in the naturalization laws.

The platform favored appropriations by Congress for river and harbor improvements "of a national character."

The convention in this platform declared a railroad to the Pacific Ocean "imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country."

This was a young Republican Party that looked brilliantly to the future with hope and with optimism, with action and with enthusiasm.

There was without a doubt a certain foreboding over the meaning of the monumental stakes that confronted the country. This played its part in the doubtful techniques that today engage the criticism as well as the fascination of the scholar. This manipulation of episodes on the lower level of events, and the generally rugged, frontier atmosphere of the 1860's lend themselves too invitingly to overemphasis by the journalistic approach. This is the approach that seeks more to be interesting than to be objective.

Representative government on this continent was young; it was tough; it was brazen, and it was brassy. It laved in its enthusiasms and its amazement with its own prowess. For the United States this republican form of government—by any standards—was, even then, the greatest success since Rome. If the Republican convention of 1860 proved anything it proved that what was here demonstrated, with all its tumult, its political guile, its uninhibited devices, was that government by consent of the governed—for all its imperfections—had basic soundness and was tough and flexible.

A catastrophic, bloody and dreadful test was in the offing.

But the words "conceived in liberty," and the words "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—soon to be magnificently reaffirmed—were real words, as actual and as demonstrable as life itself.

Those rock-ribbed Republicans, whether Seward men or Lincoln men, or supporters of any of the other candidates, mirrored pretty genuinely the genius of the America of that day. That Republican Convention was a nucleus of the United States in 1860: Industry, agriculture, finance, law, politics, journalism, culture—and just people. There were many examples of the so-called common man jammed inside and outside the great Wigwam. There were also so-called forgotten men, I am sure they were there, too, and in force.

Even if we had never heard of the phrase "smoke-filled room" in the political conventions of our own times, I think an excellent case could be made proving that nominating conventions, Republican and Democratic, have on the whole neither deteriorated nor improved since the convention that named Lincoln. They were basically sound and honest then, and they are basically sound and honest today, the superficial imperfections altered only by changes in habits, not changes in morals.

What were some of the episodes in 1860 moralists might frown upon?

The Seward camp appeared to have a more ear-splitting claque than the Lincoln camp was at first able to muster. They pressed close, shoulder to shoulder and fore and aft, in the rear and the galleries, and they created a vast volume of pro-Seward noise, in that hot and steaming assemblage. The Lincoln board of strategy under the generalship in this case of Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell, circumvented this imbalance by the surreptitious use of a hastily acquired printing press. By this process hard-bitten Lincoln men gained admission to the Wigwam with counterfeit tickets and simulated official signatures. By being on the job earlier they took up space in the Wigwam that crowded out the Seward men who struggled to get in later.

Another incident was the mechanism of delay to achieve the defeat of Seward.

This had to do with the actual or the pretended difficulty of counting the presidential ballots because of the declared absence at that instant of the needed tally sheets. The platform had at long last been adopted. The Seward men were anxious for the balloting for candidates at once. It was a practical certainty at the time that were a vote taken immediately the atmosphere of the convention was such that Seward would be nominated.

For precisely that reason the opposition to Seward—the Lincoln group and the others—sought delay.

The circumstance of the tally sheets provided a motive. The problem was communicated, amidst the hubbub, to the Chair by the secretary, and to the assembly by the Chair. Thus the Chair announced that while the presidential tally sheets were in fact prepared—they were not yet at hand, "but will be in a few minutes."

In the confusion came the motion to adjourn "until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning." There are questions about just how the vote to adjourn happened to carry. It was reported that there was, I quote, "very little voting being done either way." Nevertheless, the Chair announced that the adjournment motion had carried. And maybe it had. That delay may have meant the difference between Lincoln and Seward as the 16th President of the United States.

William Baringer in his book, "Lincoln's Rise to Power," writes:

Fortunate indeed for Abraham Lincoln that some Sewardites just then cared more for supper than for Seward.

Upon such sensitive and uncertain details hung what I like to think is one of the greatest decisions in the history of man.

Other incidents may be mentioned such as the seemingly reckless bartering of Cabinet posts for delegate support. They reveal the political acumen or—if you like—the human failings concentrated in a climate of great contest and explosive emotions. This is inherent in masses of people struggling under diverse leadership for great goals. But none of these incidents, nor all of them together, can, from the vantage point of a whole century mar the essential

grandeur, the essential integrity, the powerful conviction, that marked the Republican Convention in the Wigwam in Chicago in 1860. And all of it expressed itself with a granite honesty, and with force and meaning, in the personality of Abraham Lincoln.

Much can be said from today's perspective of the platform. More may be said on the detailed maneuvers that ended with victory for Lincoln.

I find, for instance, electrifying the debate that ended finally by the inclusion of some eloquent passages from the Declaration of Independence into the platform. I find moving the words of a German immigrant, a citizen and a delegate named Hassaureck, of Ohio. He captured the imagination of the convention with his eloquent appeal that the platform contain the words of Jefferson on "inalienable rights" and "the pursuit of happiness." And he won.

I marvel as all Americans must, how certain seemed the nomination of Seward. Reluctantly Horace Greeley, a resident of New York but a delegate from Oregon, wired his New York Tribune after a thorough canvass—we call them polls today. I quote:

My conclusion, from all that I can gather tonight, is, that the opposition to Governor Seward cannot concentrate on any candidate, and that he will be nominated.

Young Murat Halstead, to whose writings I am much indebted for part of the materials in this address, telegraphed to the Cincinnati Commercial:

Every one of the 40,000 men in attendance upon the Chicago convention will testify that at midnight of Thursday-Friday night, the universal impression was that Seward's success was certain.

The same guesses were made by James Watson Webb of the New York Courier and Enquirer, and by Henry Raymond of the New York Times, and they so wrote their respective newspapers.

There is some moody and interesting comment by Lincoln himself on this relation to his candidacy for the Presidency. In 1858, 2 years before the convention we commemorate today, he observed wistfully:

Just think of such a sucker as me as President.

On another occasion he put his lurking ambition in these words. He said:

The taste is in my mouth a little.

As for the convention proper, his position is stated best in his own words. They include his formula for victory. He wrote:

If I have any chance, it consists mainly in the fact that the whole opposition would vote for me, if nominated.

Lincoln added here:

I don't mean to include the proslavery opposition of the South, of course.

Then Lincoln goes on:

My name is new in the field, and I suppose I am not the first choice of a very great many. Our policy, then, is to give no offense to others; leave them in a mood to come to us if they shall be compelled to give up their first love. This, too, is dealing

justly with all, and leaving us in a mood to support heartily whoever shall be nominated.

It is to this statement of Lincoln's more directly that I referred when I spoke of his granite honesty and the basic integrity that governed the convention.

Lincoln's political captains at the convention paid no attention to sleep—only to victory.

The story of that third and climactic day is thrilling. The meeting opened with a prayer by the Reverend Mr. Green, of Chicago. Sensing the need of his country, the feeling of so many people at the grassroots, the great responsibility that rested on the delegates at this convention, thinking probably that he may be praying for Seward, who would have to carry out the decisions of the convention, but no doubt hoping it would be Lincoln, he gave to the convention delegates a spiritual uplift and to Americans a wonderful heritage with the following prayer:

O, we entreat Thee, that at some future but not distant day, the evils which now invest the body politic shall not only have been arrested in its progress, but wholly eradicated from the system. And may the pen of the historian trace an intimate connection between that glorious consummation and the transaction of this convention.

To catch some of the spirit of the Wigwam, I lift the following from Murat Halstead's excellent report:

The New Yorkers were exultant. Their bands were playing, and the champagne flowing at their headquarters as after a victory.

But there was much done after midnight and before the convention assembled on Friday morning. There were hundreds of Pennsylvanians, Indianians, and Illinoisans, who never closed their eyes that night. I saw Henry S. Lane at 1 o'clock, pale and haggard, with cane under his arm, walking as if for a wager, from one caucus room to another, at the Tremont House. He had been toiling with desperation to bring the Indiana delegation to go as a unit for Lincoln. And then in connection with others, he had been operating to bring the Vermonters and Virginians to the point of deserting Seward. Vermont would certainly cast her electoral vote for any candidate who could be nominated, and Virginia as certainly against any candidate. The object was to bring the delegates of those States to consider success rather than Seward, and join with the battleground States—as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, and Illinois insisted upon calling themselves. This was finally done, the fatal break in Seward's strength having been made in Vermont, and Virginia, destroying at once, when it appeared, his power in the New England and the slave State delegations. But the work was not yet done. The Pennsylvanians had been fed upon meat, such that they presented themselves at Chicago with the presumption that they had only to say what they wished, and receive the endorsement of the convention. And they were for Cameron. He was the only man, they a thousand times said, who would certainly carry Pennsylvania. They were astonished, alarmed, and maddened to find public opinion settling down upon Seward and Lincoln, and that one or the other must be nominated. They saw that Lincoln was understood to be the only man to defeat Seward, and thinking themselves capable of

holding that balance of power, so much depended upon, and so deceptive on those occasions, stood out against the Lincoln combination. Upon some of the delegation, Seward operations had been performed with perceptible effect. The Seward men had stated that the talk of not carrying Pennsylvania was all nonsense. Seward had a good tariff record, and his friends would spend money enough in the State to carry it against any Democratic candidate who was a possibility. The flood of Seward money promised for Pennsylvania was not without efficacy. The phrase used was, that Seward's friends "would spend oceans of money."

After the preliminaries of the opening session everybody was more impatient to begin the work.

I continue quoting from Murat Halstead's report:

Everybody was now impatient to begin the work. Mr. Evarts, of New York, nominated Mr. Seward, Mr. Judd, of Illinois, nominated Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Dudley, of New Jersey, nominated Mr. Dayton. Mr. Reeder, of Pennsylvania, nominated Simon Cameron. Mr. Carter, of Ohio, nominated Salmon P. Chase. Mr. Caleb Smith, of Indiana, seconded the nomination of Lincoln. Mr. Blair, of Missouri, nominated Edward Bates. Mr. Blair, of Michigan, seconded the nomination of William H. Seward. Mr. Corwin, of Ohio, nominated John McLean. Mr. Schurz, of Wisconsin, seconded the nomination of Seward. Mr. Delano, of Ohio, seconded the nomination of Lincoln. The only names that produced "tremendous applause" were those of Seward and Lincoln.

Everybody felt that the fight was between them and yelled approvingly.

The applause, when Mr. Evarts named Seward, was enthusiastic. When Mr. Judd named Lincoln, the response was prodigious, loud, and raging far beyond the Seward shriek. Presently, upon Caleb Smith seconding the nomination of Lincoln, the response was absolutely terrific. It now became the Seward men to make another offensive when Blair, of Michigan, seconded his nomination:

"At once there rose so wild a yell,
Within that dark and narrow dell;
As all the fiends from Heaven that fell
Had pealed the banner cry of hell."

The effect was startling. Hundreds of persons stopped their ears in pain. The shouting was absolutely frantic, shrill, and wild. No Comanches, no panthers ever struck a higher note, or gave screams with more infernal intensity.

Now the Lincoln men had to try it again, and as Mr. Delano, of Ohio, on behalf "of a portion of the delegation of that State," seconded the nomination of Lincoln, the uproar was beyond description. Imagine all the hogs ever slaughtered in Cincinnati giving their death squeals together, a score of big steam whistles going (steam at 160 pounds per inch), and you conceive something of the same nature. I thought the Seward yell could not be surpassed; but the Lincoln boys were clearly ahead, and feeling their victory, as there was a lull in the storm, took deep breaths all round, and gave a concentrated shriek that was positively awful, and accompanied it with stamping that made every plank and pillar in the building quiver.

The result is history.

Two hundred and thirty-three votes were needed to nominate.

Seward got 173½ on the first ballot. Lincoln got only 102.

Pennsylvania wavered, then moved from Cameron to Lincoln.

The second rollcall showed 184½ votes for Seward and 181 for Lincoln.

After the third balloting Lincoln was nominated. As everybody now knows a

switch of four Ohio votes from Chase to Lincoln did it. A New Yorker named Evarts rose to regret the failure to nominate Seward but nevertheless moved that the nomination be made unanimous. However, there is no evidence that the motion was ever put before the convention. Browning of Illinois made a speech for Lincoln.

Drama, good sportsmanship, and statesmanship was never better displayed than when Austin Blair, of Michigan, made the speech of the hour by telling the convention:

Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins (much applause); but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his fame is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with an eye single and with unwavering faith in times past. We martial now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Lincoln.

The spirit of the Lincoln men was dramatically described by Halstead with the following quote:

A Lincoln man who could hardly believe that the "Old Abe" of his adoration was really the Republican nominee for the Presidency, took a chair at the dinner table at the Tremont House, and began talking to those around him, with none of whom he was acquainted, of the greatness of the events of the day. One of his expressions was, "Talk of your money and bring on your bullies with you—the immortal principles of the everlasting people are with Abe Lincoln, of the people, by —." "Able Lincoln has no money and no bullies, but he has the people by —." A servant approached the eloquent patriot and asked what he would have to eat. Being thus recalled to temporal things he glared scornfully at the servant and roared out, "Go to the devil—what do I want to eat for? Abe Lincoln is nominated, G— d— it; and I'm going to live on air—the air of Liberty by —." But in a moment he inquired for the bill of fare, and then ordered "a great deal of everything"—saying if he must eat he might as well eat "the whole bill." He swore he felt as if he could "devour and digest an Illinois prairie." And this was one of thousands.

The job was done.

In Springfield during the day where Lincoln waited, a hundred guns were fired. In the evening there was a mass meeting. When someone suggested a book on Lincoln's life, Lincoln replied:

There is not much in my past life about which to write a book, as it seems to me.

Later, with a glance toward his home, he said:

Well, gentlemen, there is a little short woman at our house who is probably more interested in this dispatch (announcing his victory) than I am; and, if you will excuse me, I will take it up and let her see it.

Mr. Speaker, this National Republican Convention which I have so sketchily described is what we commemorate here

on the floor of the House of Representatives today. It was undoubtedly true that, as Seward prophesied, the War between the States was as he said "irrepressible" and inevitable. It may very well be that in any event the Union would have been preserved under Seward as under Lincoln. But the record shows that Seward, as Lincoln's Secretary of State, was a man of considerable stature but hardly of the stature of Lincoln. This we know: Had Lincoln failed of nomination much of the greatest and the most treasured wealth of the American tradition would have been lost to us and to mankind. We would have had no second inaugural. We would have had no Gettysburg Address. The Emancipation Proclamation would undoubtedly have been different. We would have lacked the enormous weight of Lincoln's thinking. The name Lincoln has touched all the world with fire and moved men seeking freedom to prodigious effort. Russia's Tolstoy, China's Sun Yat-sen, India's Nehru find inspiration in this greatest of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is good to ask ourselves—and I mean especially and particularly the Republican Party of today—it is decisive and pertinent to ask ourselves what can we take from this convention 100 years ago to guide us in this hour. I believe that the Republican Party can take some of the toughness and the ruggedness, the honesty and the decision as an inspiration to guide it in this hour. I believe that the Republican Party can take some of the progressive outlook of that day and make it applicable now. It was not a convention of special interests, and not a convention that sought to poise industry against labor, or labor against industry. It was not a party wedded to the past. The Republican convention of 1860 sought the good of the railroads, of agriculture, of labor, of business in general, of home products, and of the good and welfare of all the people. The monumental and inescapable evidence of what I say is the result of the fight for the nomination itself. When, I ask, when, in the history of any people, was a choice for leadership made more emblematic of a whole people, than the nomination of Abraham Lincoln? As we reflect on our own glorious history, let us note the rich heritage that is ours. May the spirit of unselfish sacrifice for the great ideal of freedom by those people we respectfully call our forefathers—especially that of Lincoln—have full sway in our political life. This will kindle our desire, inspire our faith, and make strong our judgment. Having done this, the attainment of a trinity of true greatness that Lincoln had and we need—courage, wisdom, and goodness—will be realized. Goodness to have the right; wisdom to know the right; and courage to do the right.

Probably the statesmen and all people who have influence on the world scene would do well to study the life of this great man.

The Republican Party of 1860, Mr. Speaker, did a service for humanity that will live through the ages and it is good that this distinguished body takes this occasion to commemorate the event.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa in calling the attention of the Members of the House to this very historic occasion.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today Abraham Lincoln was nominated by the Republican Party at a national convention in Chicago to be the party's candidate for the President of the United States. At the same national convention Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, was also nominated for the office of the Vice Presidency.

That Hannibal Hamlin was truly a great man there can be no question, for history and authentic records reveal that he moved in a multitude of ways to preserve the well-being of our Nation and to advance the dignity of the American citizenry.

BORN IN PARIS, MAINE, AUGUST 27, 1809

A citizen of Hampden, Maine, Hannibal Hamlin dedicated the major part of his adult life to public service, serving in high offices at both the Federal and State levels of government.

His political career had its inception when he was elected to represent his hometown of Hampden in the State legislature. Serving with distinction, he was elected speaker of this body, acting in that capacity for three terms.

In 1842 Hamlin was elected to the House of Representatives where, in the course of his service, he became recognized as an authority on parliamentary law and custom.

The early years of his congressional service were marked by his firm stand on slavery, and he asserted his opposition to slavery well in advance of the time when the major political parties of the time took a party position thereon. "Freedom," he said, "is national, and slavery is sectional." He branded slavery as a curse and a moral wrong, something to be endured only so far as the Constitution required it to be maintained.

Hannibal Hamlin typified the noblest type of American manhood, having a striking appearance that glowed brightly against a background of many personal attainments. He was a tall and graceful figure, having black and piercing eyes, a skin almost olive-colored, hair smooth and thick, and a manner that was always courteous and affable. He was a human claypot into which providence had poured generous portions of talent and personality.

Being a man steady of purpose, he was fixed with strong convictions. Possessed of a soul of peace and strength of character, he clung tenaciously to his ideals and values, thereby keeping himself free from the storms of uncertainties and doubts. So constituted, he was always firmly fixed on the object of his views, always able to concentrate all of his energies in devising ways and means to make his hopes and plans materialize.

We find his steadfast nature evidenced at a time when the effort was advanced to repeal the Missouri Compromise. As

a reward for his support of this repeal, he was promised liberal offers of patronage and other special forms of benefits from fellow legislators. However, believing as he did that slavery was an insidious institution, he could not be moved to enhance his personal fortunes through a sacrifice of his ideals, and he forthrightly turned these offers aside. He was a man who could not sell his soul for pieces of silver.

Hannibal Hamlin was elected Governor of the State of Maine in 1854, leaving this office after only a brief term of service when he was elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States.

His career in the Senate was no less spectacular than his previous service in other public offices, and he continued to gain high respect for his arduous application to official duties. Although a convincing speaker, he took the Senate floor infrequently, for he preferred, as he many times stated, to be "a working rather than a talking Member" of the U.S. Senate.

That he was held in high esteem by his colleagues in the Senate is indeed a rich compliment for this man, because he served in company with legislators who were remarkably astute and able. Among them were profound lawyers, eloquent orators, keen debaters, skillful parliamentarians, highly educated and scholarly men, and men whose strong native powers compensated for the lack of polish of formal education. Hamlin and his fellow Republicans were a minority in the Senate, only 20 in number. But what men they were, for the roster boasted the names of Sumner and Wilson, Foster and Dixon, Hale and Bell, Collamer and Foot, Seward and King, Simmons and Fessenden; also Simon Cameron, Ben Wade, Zach Chandler, Durkee and Doolittle, Lyman Trumbull, and James Harlan.

The crowning point of Hannibal Hamlin's colorful political life was his nomination and subsequent election to the high office of Vice President of the United States. The nomination proceedings during which Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin were selected to represent the Republican Party as candidates for these high offices pose as one of the most exciting events in the annals of early political history.

Before the Chicago convention of 1860 the nomination of Seward was considered a foregone conclusion, but Hannibal Hamlin had determined that the man to cope with the troubled times was the great son of the West—Abraham Lincoln.

He realized that the advancement of Abe Lincoln as the Republican Party's candidate for the Presidency represented a herculean task, for the sentiment of his own State of Maine was strongly disposed toward Seward. Further compounding the complexity was the fact that Hamlin was himself a very good friend and ardent admirer of Seward.

Nonetheless, Hamlin did not feel that Seward was the man of the hour, being convinced that he was neither a strong enough candidate to win the election nor an individual possessed of the qualities required of a President for those troubled days. Thus subordinating his

personal feelings to a deeper cause, Hamlin worked to advance the nomination of Abraham Lincoln.

A total of 203 votes was essential to a choice on the ballot, and the first ballot saw Seward, Lincoln, Bates, and Cameron fall far short of a vote necessary to nomination. And all the while the balloting was being conducted Hamlin busied himself advertising the merits of his candidate from the West, striving to convince refractory delegates that Lincoln was not only politically potent but admirably equipped to cope with the pressures of the Presidency.

That he was making progress in his efforts was reflected in the second ballot, with Lincoln claiming a percentage gain in votes substantially larger than Seward's. The second ballot had, in fact, brought Lincoln essentially abreast of his nearest rival.

Hamlin persisted in his efforts, endeavoring to pierce the armor of resistant delegates not with the hammer of harangue but with the lance of persuasion. His labors finally bore rich fruit when he succeeded in striking home with the delegates of the pivotal states of Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Indiana.

On a call of the third ballot, a general stampede took place in favor of Lincoln, the force of which swept the rail splitter into the nomination. On this ballot Seward gathered only 181 votes, while Lincoln harvested 228, this being 25 votes more than the 203 essential to the nomination.

Then, on the second ballot, Hamlin was selected as the Republican Party's candidate for the Vice Presidency.

There was a remarkable resemblance in these two men who were subsequently elected to occupy the highest offices of the land. Each was self-educated, each had sought after and practiced the law, and each had the quality of remaining firmly fixed in convictions derived from deep ponderings and critical examination.

Perhaps it was a dictate of destiny that these two men possessed of flint-like natures would stand at the wheel to steer our ship of state through the then turbulent waters of domestic and world uncertainty, each serving to bolster the other in the gigantic task of preserving the Union.

During their administration the shadow of civil war fell upon the land, and it is recorded that Lincoln frequently turned to Hamlin for encouragement, advice, and inspiration during those dark days. And Hamlin, himself possessed of soldierly instincts, enlisted in Company A of the Maine State Guards early in the Civil War, serving in the ranks several weeks when this company was ordered to duty.

It was a quirk of fate that prevented Hannibal Hamlin from becoming President of the United States, for had he continued in the Vice Presidential office during Lincoln's second term, he would have, with Lincoln's assassination, been elevated to that high office.

That Hamlin did not succeed to the Vice Presidency during Lincoln's second term was in no way owing to any act of Abraham Lincoln. In fact, when Lincoln was approached as to his choice of

candidate for that office, he made it abundantly clear that it was his private and personal belief that a renomination of the old ticket would best serve the interests of the Nation. However, political forces operating far beyond the reach of either one of these two men catapulted Andrew Johnson into the office of Vice President of the United States.

That Hannibal Hamlin harbored no resentment over the selection of Johnson to succeed him is evidenced by his conduct during the political campaign of that period. Stumping throughout the Nation, Hamlin lauded the Vice Presidential candidate, proclaiming him to be a man of real virtue and one deserving of trust.

After leaving the office of Vice President, Hannibal Hamlin was appointed collector of customs at the port of Boston in 1865. A year later he resigned that office, occupying himself with building the Piscataquis Railroad and in preparing for a senatorial contest in 1869. Successful in that election, he once again found himself in the Senate, and exercising the diligence that marked his previous legislative career, he was reelected with insignificant opposition at the end of his Senate term.

At the age of 72, after a long and varied career in public service, Hannibal Hamlin voluntarily retired from the Senate of the United States. Remarkably alert and seasoned with years of valuable legislative experience, he was urged by friends to continue in public service. He reasoned, however, that it was best that he depart the public scene at a time when his people wanted him to stay, rather than lingering on until they wanted him to go.

He retired to his quiet home on the Penobscot, submerging himself in his community where respect, honor, and love followed him wherever he walked. He emerged from retirement briefly to accept an appointment as Minister to Spain, an appointment tendered him by President Garfield. After serving a year in this capacity, he once again returned to Maine to renew his association with the friends he loved so well.

His last public effort was directed toward having Abraham Lincoln's birthday declared a national holiday, and it is reported that his powers of persuasion attained rare heights as he pleaded for this Nation to extend to Lincoln this tribute of remembrance and gratitude.

He died in 1891, on July 4, departing this earth on the birthday anniversary of this Nation, as did Jefferson and Adams. The memories of these founders of the Republic and of those, like Hamlin, who strived so hard to save it, these memories connected with the national holiday serve to deepen and heighten the day's significance as a sanction of the imperishable nature of the Union.

Great men have appeared on our national scene, being remembered by Americans because they gave of themselves something that enriched our Nation and ennobled human nature. There must be counted among these such a man as Hannibal Hamlin of Maine.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for a very eloquent and provocative address on a truly great American, Abraham Lincoln. I requested this time to comment on the role which the New Jersey delegation played at the historic Chicago convention.

Compared to some of the more populous States, New Jersey sent relatively few delegates to the Chicago convention. At a meeting in Trenton on March 8, 28 delegates had been chosen, each with half a vote. There had been considerable interest, both in and outside of the State, regarding the choice of delegates. It was generally recognized that New Jersey, together with Pennsylvania, would have an unusual amount of influence at Chicago, especially if their delegations were uncommitted.

The State convention at Trenton was referred to as the "Opposition" or "Black Republican" convention. Among those chosen were Marcus L. Ward, later Governor of New Jersey, and John Insley Blair, of Warren County, the railroad magnate who played a key role in the development of the Delaware Lackawanna and other railroads. Blair kept a diary at this time which, along with other papers, is now in the possession of the New Jersey Historical Society.

One of three delegates at large was my great-grandfather, Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, at the time a 43-year-old lawyer from Newark. He later served as a U.S. Senator from New Jersey, and as Secretary of State under President Chester Arthur. According to one newspaper account, some extremists criticized the selection of Frelinghuysen, despite his "high political character," because he had cooperated at a union meeting. If I may be excused a personal reference, my twin brother, Harry O. H. Frelinghuysen, has been selected to go out to Chicago this year as an alternate delegate from New Jersey.

In any event efforts were made at Trenton to instruct the delegation to support William Lewis Dayton, former U.S. Senator from New Jersey and in 1856 Republican candidate for Vice President. The effort failed, apparently, because it was generally felt that the delegation should be unpledged and unprejudiced toward any candidate. After agreeing that hearty support should be given whoever was nominated at Chicago, the meeting broke up with cheers for New Jersey's two favorite sons, William Dayton and William Pennington, then serving as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. Perhaps sig-

nificantly, the only public figures of truly national significance who were also cheered were William Seward and Abraham Lincoln.

The scene now turns to Chicago as delegates gather to help choose the next President. The New Jersey delegation had its headquarters, including a handsome parlor for conferences, at Richmond House, where the followers of William Seward also gathered. Plans had been made for New Jerseyans living in Chicago to offer the visitors a warm reception, but since some delegates arrived as early as Friday, May 11, and others not until the 15th, this proved difficult to arrange.

On May 15, however, after most of the New Jersey delegates had arrived at Richmond House, they were formally welcomed to the city. Responding for the delegates, Frelinghuysen gave what was described as "an impromptu but exceedingly well-expressed speech." The visitors were then escorted on a tour of the city.

Making plans for the transportation of some 40,000 visitors to Chicago must have required real thought. Every effort was made to make the trip attractive. One newspaper advertised a \$35 rate from Newark, N.J., to Chicago and return. A correspondent for the Newark Advertiser has left us an account of the special train which transported many of the New Jersey delegation, others from New York, and the delegates from Boston who brought their own band. The passengers, generally of a high order of intelligence and standing, were apparently soon able to overcome the usual taciturnity of strangers because of the common cause which brought them together.

After a rendezvous in Buffalo at the invitation of the mayor, a special train, properly decorated, with special accommodations for the delegates, left for Chicago at 6 a.m. on Monday, May 14. Crossing the suspension bridge wrapped in mists from Niagara Falls, the train was soon speeding along through the verdant, virtually untouched Canadian countryside. After taking the ferry at Windsor, the passengers continued the journey on the Michigan Central road. Every effort seems to have been made to insure a speedy trip. On two occasions engines were changed simply by disconnecting the exhausted engine and switching it off the track, with the train itself picking up the fresh engine under its own momentum. En route the inhabitants of villages and farms greeted the train with cannon, music, and cheers. At the occasional stopping places, not surprisingly perhaps, time was found for short speeches by the traveling dignitaries.

On the evening of the 15th the New Jersey delegation held its first caucus. By this time, of course, the political maneuvering was in full swing. As the leading contender, Seward naturally had many supporters active on his behalf. One evening Seward's headquarters at Richmond House was the scene of an elaborate champagne supper in the gentlemen's parlor, with everybody cordially welcome. General Nye of New York, ac-

accompanied by the well-known pugilist Tom Hyer, was reported to have invaded the headquarters of other hopefuls, "swinging \$500 in his hands" and offering even bets on Seward. There was only one taker. Tom Hyer, incidentally, had come out on the special train. He was evidently sufficiently well known to attract the attention of the local residents, who crowded around to seek a glimpse of his "finely developed frame."

The New Jersey delegates agreed informally to support their favorite son, William Dayton, on the first ballot. Thereafter they were to be "governed by circumstances." An informal poll showed that there were six votes for Seward with eight opposed to the New Yorker. As far as the New Jersey delegation was concerned, Lincoln's name was not directly involved at this stage. According to the New York Times, the New Jersey delegates were divided in sentiment. Nonetheless they were reported to have joined with Pennsylvania and Illinois delegates in a formal call on the Massachusetts delegation to point out Seward's unpopularity.

When the balloting began, New Jersey, represented by Thomas H. Dudley, who was serving on the Committee on Resolutions, offered the name of William Dayton. All 14 New Jersey votes went to their favorite son. In that count Dayton stood fifth, with Seward first and Lincoln second.

The swing to Lincoln began on the second ballot. When the tally was made, Seward and Lincoln were almost in a dead heat. New Jersey split its votes, with 10 still voting for Dayton and 4 voting for Seward. On the crucial third ballot, the New Jersey delegation gave eight votes to Lincoln, five to Seward, with one vote holding to Dayton.

As Blair put it in his diary, and with his own spelling:

Politicians had but little influence. The delegates appeared animated with but one mind. That was to take no trading politicians. Lincoln & Hamlin are such men taken from the people.

The Jersey delegation seems to have been animated more by a desire to "stop Seward" than to support Lincoln, about whom little was known in the East. Seward was weak in New Jersey because of his extreme views on the slavery issue. Lincoln's relative moderation on the question seems to have made him more acceptable to many members of the delegation. At any rate, the nomination was satisfactory to the rank and file of the opposition party and he was endorsed by most of the party's newspapers following the nomination.

The May 19 editorial in the Newark Evening Journal indicates why Lincoln was a generally popular choice:

Mr. Lincoln deserves and will have the support of the common people, for he is one of them. Born and lived in poverty, he had no time for the education of the schools. What he possesses, he has got by hard knocks, as he has his position in society by untiring self-cultivation, industry and effort. . . . His personal history and rise are so extraordinary and even romantic as must touch the hearts of the great mass of the people. . . . Then he is a conservative and safe man. Whatever he does is judicious

and marked with sterling common sense—a staunch friend of our institutions, the Constitution and the Union. . . .

The nomination of this eloquent and popular man has taken politicians by surprise. It crossed the wishes and efforts and contradicted the predictions of some of the most managing and skillful in such things. The people may be said to have made it themselves, and will therefore take care to make his election sure. Wherever the news was received it was celebrated with real enthusiasm. This city was a scene of tumultuous jubilation.

Meanwhile, a committee of delegates from the various States represented at the Chicago convention was selected to go to Springfield and officially notify Lincoln that he had been chosen. Ephraim Marsh, of Jersey City, and John I. Blair were among the members of this group. Blair described the incident in his diary:

We . . . called over to see the President and lady. We spent about 1 hour. . . . We found him quite a plain man, very intelligent and cautious. His lady was quite talkative and sociable. We left with the impression that they each could fill their stations with credit to the Nation. Mr. Lincoln is not to be called handsome; says he is 6 feet 3½ inches, spare and bony, indicates a hard-working man. His lady is short, full face. I told him and her when I left that I expected to call on them at Washington when they got in the White House, but I should ask for no office. I found he was very temperate—they gave us cold water, nothing else. He neither drinks rum, chews, or smokes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has been very modest in his comments about his ancestors. I should like to say that I discovered, in reading history, that the name "Frelinghuysen" is about as great and as common in the early history of our country as the name Adams. I have prepared some remarks dealing with the history and the lives of these people a little more in detail than the gentleman has, and I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The document reads as follows:)

GREAT-GREAT-UNCLE OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Theodore Frelinghuysen, son of Frederick Frelinghuysen. He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Millstone, N.J., March 28, 1787; pursued classical studies and was graduated from Princeton College in 1804; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1808 and commenced practice in Newark, N.J.; served as captain of volunteer militia in the War of 1812; attorney general of New Jersey from 1817 to 1829, when he resigned; declined the office of Justice of the Supreme Court in 1826; elected as an Adams Democrat in the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1829, to March 3, 1835; resumed the practice of law in Newark, N.J.; mayor of Newark in 1837 and 1838; chancellor of New York University, 1839-50; president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1941-57; president of the American Tract Society, 1842-48; vice president of the American Colonization Society; unsuccessful Whig candidate for Vice President on the ticket with Henry Clay in 1944; president of the American Bible Society, 1846-61; president of

Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., from 1850 until his death in New Brunswick, N.J., April 12, 1862; interment in First Reformed Church Cemetery.

GREAT-GREAT-GREAT GRANDFATHER OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Frederick Frelinghuysen, father of Theodore Frelinghuysen. He was a delegate and a Senator from New Jersey; born near Somerville, Somerset County, N.J., April 13, 1753; was graduated from Princeton College in 1770; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1774 and commenced practice in Somerset County, N.J.; member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey in 1775 and 1776; served in the Revolutionary War; was commissioned first major in the Minutemen, February 15, 1776; captain of the Eastern Company of Artillery, New Jersey State Troops, March 1, 1776; colonel of the 1st Battalion, Somerset County Militia, February 28, 1777; served as aide-de-camp to Brig. Gen. Phillimon Dickinson; Member of the Continental Congress in 1778, 1779, 1782, and 1783; clerk of the common pleas court, Somerset County, from 1781 to 1789, when he resigned; member of the State general assembly in 1784 and 1800-04; member of the New Jersey convention that ratified the Federal Constitution in 1787; member of the State council, 1790-92; appointed by President Washington brigadier general in 1790 in the campaign against the western Indians; elected as a Federalist to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1793, to November 12, 1796, when he resigned; commissioned major general in 1794 during the Whisky Insurrection; trustee of Princeton College, 1802-04; died in Millstone, N.J., April 13, 1804; interment in the Old Cemetery, Manville, N.J.

NEPHEW OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN'S GREAT GRANDFATHER—NOT A DIRECT RELATION TO PETER BUT A MEMBER OF THE FAMILY

Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen, cousin of Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen. He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Raritan, Somerset County, N.J., March 12, 1869; attended the public schools; interested in insurance companies; served in the Spanish-American War in 1898 as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and ordnance officer; chairman of the Somerset County Republican executive committee, 1902-05; member of the State senate, 1906-12; president of the senate in 1909 and 1910 and acting Governor of New Jersey ad interim; member of the Republican State committee, 1914-16; member of the New York Chamber of Commerce, 1912-26 and of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce, 1914-25; president of the State board of agriculture, 1912-25; president of the State board of education, 1915-19; elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1917, to March 3, 1923; unsuccessful Republican candidate for reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1922; trustee of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., 1918-28; delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1916, 1924, 1936, and 1944; re-engaged in the insurance business until his death in Tucson, Ariz., where he had gone for his health, February 8, 1948; interment in St. Bernard's Cemetery, Bernardsville, N.J.

Frederick Frelinghuysen, great-great-grandfather of Peter, his son was Theodore Frelinghuysen, great-great-grandfather of Peter, his nephew and adopted son was Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen, this man is the great-grandfather of Peter, his nephew was Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen.

GREAT-GRANDFATHER OF PETER FRELINGHUYSEN

Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen, great-grandfather of the present distinguished Member of the House, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, also of New Jersey, was the nephew and adopted son of Theodore Frelinghuysen and cousin of Joseph Sherman Frelinghuysen.

He was a Senator from New Jersey; born in Millstone, N.J., August 4, 1817; was graduated from Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., in 1836; studied law; was admitted to the bar in 1839 and commenced practice in Newark, N.J.; city attorney in 1849; member of the city council in 1850; trustee of Rutgers, 1851-55; member of the peace convention of 1861 held in Washington, D.C., in an effort to devise means to prevent the impending war; appointed attorney general of New Jersey in 1861; reappointed in 1866 and resigned the same year; appointed and subsequently elected as a Republican to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of William Wright and served from November 12, 1866, to March 3, 1869; unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1868; appointed U.S. Minister to England by President Grant in July 1870; confirmed after considerable opposition from Senators Sumner and Wilson, but declined the appointment; again elected to the U.S. Senate and served from March 4, 1871, to March 3, 1877; appointed a member of the Electoral Commission created by act of Congress approved January 29, 1877, to decide the contests in various States in the presidential election of 1876; unsuccessful candidate for reelection; resumed the practice of law in Newark, N.J.; appointed Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Arthur and served from December 19, 1881, to March 6, 1885; president of the American Bible Society in 1884 and 1885; died in Newark, N.J., May 20, 1885; interment in Mount Pleasant Cemetery.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the Democratic side simply that we may join in tribute to the man Abraham Lincoln, to whom the gentleman has paid tribute today and that we may, oddly, extend our thanks and gratitude to that convention that nominated Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency.

We admire Abraham Lincoln for many qualities. We admire him for his vision when he, as the minority leader of the Illinois Legislature, worked hard toward the improvement of the natural resources of Illinois at a time when a primitive State was growing and needed to make investments in its roadways and harbors along the rivers.

We admire him because of his great compassion and his firm conviction on the equal dignity of every human being.

We admire him for his courage when as the President of the United States it became his responsibility and he stepped out and made a firm decision in the Emancipation Proclamation which forever ended one of the most shameful institutions in our history.

We admire him for his intellectualism; he was a deep and a profound man, and all of his statements and writings reflect that.

We admire him for his great articulateness. I, for one, have always felt that Abraham Lincoln has never received appropriate recognition in the field of writing. I think he was one of the greatest American prose artists. Also I feel that this rises out of the basic solid quality and genuineness of the man.

As the gentleman has so well said, his greatness transcends party and we like to claim him with the Republican Party as a great American institution.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in complimenting the gentleman from Iowa for his thorough research on this very, very important episode in history, the 100th anniversary of this nomination which we celebrate today. I think the gentleman has very well recaptured the spirit of the Wigwam. I think he has demonstrated that he is one of the really great Lincoln scholars in this body. I believe that in unfolding this account he has made it live in a very dramatic way.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment a little on some of the sources he used in the preparation of this excellent material. The gentleman has referred to Rear Admiral Halsted. I wonder of the gentleman would care to add anything as to some of the excellent sources which he used.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Much of the material used has come from my own collection. I have in my office a list of books that I used as reference and there were newspapers that were used as sources. I think the New York papers are very good; the Cincinnati papers and, of course, the Chicago papers. I have quite a file of those. Most of my material was gathered from those sources. There is a new book written recently by a young man by the name of Don Johnson of the University of Iowa, which is fine source material also. It is a book on "Political Conventions in American History." The Library of Congress has been very helpful—a Mr. William Coblenz helped prepare most of the material in its final form. David Mearns and Lloyd Dunlap checked the manuscript for accuracy.

Mr. HECHLER. I think the gentleman has done an outstanding job in bringing to us not only the account of the convention but also its current meaning today. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield very gladly to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include as part of my remarks the text of three papers, the first one being a paper entitled "The Michigan Delegation at the Republican National Convention of 1860," prepared for me by Mr. George S. May, research archivist of the Michigan Historical Commission; second, an address given before a joint convention of the Michigan legislature on February 13, 1958, by Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president of the Abraham Lincoln Civil War Roundtable of Michigan; and third, a paper dated April 1960 entitled "Michigan and the Republican Convention of 1860," prepared by Mr. Lloyd C. Nyman, of Grosse Point Woods, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly about Michigan's part in this famous 1860 convention. It is a particular pleasure for me to do so at this time because this week happens to be Michigan Week and it is indeed appropriate that I should mention briefly the part played by the distinguished Michigan delegation at the Wigwam in Chicago 100 years ago.

Our delegation was headed by Austin Blair of Jackson, Jackson being, of course, the place where the Republican Party had been formed under The Oaks only 6 years earlier, and who subsequently became our war Governor of the State of Michigan.

The Michigan delegation was instructed to support the presidential nomination and candidacy of William H. Seward of New York, and adhered to that position throughout the three ballots which were taken at Chicago. As has been pointed out, of course, by the gentleman from Iowa and other speakers, a switch of four Ohio votes on the third ballot gave the nomination to Mr. Lincoln.

Austin Blair, who had been one of the strongest of Mr. Seward's supporters, having made for him the seconding speech, then arose and, with what the gentleman from Iowa has termed correctly good sportsmanship, made one of the outstanding addresses of the convention, a portion of which I should like to read at this time. I quote from Austin Blair's remarks following the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in Chicago 100 years ago:

Like my friend who has just taken his seat, the State of Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins; but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his name is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.

Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November. Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul. I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour, never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, the glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of an obvious feeling of disappointment and perhaps an early lack of enthusiasm in Michigan for Mr. Lincoln, nevertheless in the election of that year in November, Michigan gave Lincoln a margin of 23,413 votes over Mr. Douglas, the candidate of the Democratic

Party, which was almost the 25,000 majority promised by Governor Blair in his famous speech in Chicago.

It is a pleasure to speak here on this occasion. I want to commend our distinguished friend from Iowa for his having prepared this time and made these very moving remarks about the convention. I certainly express my appreciation to him for permitting all of us on both sides of the aisle to join this afternoon in calling attention to this historic centennial. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his appropriate remarks. I am sure the address he referred to by the great Governor of Michigan at that time was a real mark of statesmanship, one of our great heritages, of which we ought to be very proud.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matters which I earlier secured permission to include with my remarks are as follows:

THE MICHIGAN DELEGATION AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1860

Michigan was represented at the Chicago convention of the Republican Party of 1860 by the following delegates: Austin Blair, Jackson; Walton W. Murphy, Jonesville; Thomas White Ferry, Grand Haven; and J. J. St. Clair, Marquette, were delegates at large. Delegates from the State's four districts included J. G. Peterson, Detroit; Alex D. Crane, Dexter; Jesse G. Beeson, Dowagiac; William L. Stoughton, Sturgis; Francis Quinn, Niles; Erastus Hussey, Battle Creek; D. C. Buckland, Pontiac, and Michael T. C. Plessner, Saginaw.

Ferry was chosen vice president of the convention to represent Michigan. Stoughton was chosen secretary to represent the State. Murphy was appointed to the Committee on Permanent Organization, Quinn to the Credentials Committee, and Blair to the Resolutions Committee.

Austin Blair, who was chairman of the Michigan delegation, was shortly nominated by the Republicans as their candidate for Governor. He was elected, serving two terms from 1861 through 1864, and, because he was Michigan's "war Governor," he is one of the State's most famous Governors. Several of the other members of the delegation also had distinguished careers as public servants. Ferry was later a Congressman and a U.S. Senator from Michigan, and was acting Vice President in 1876-77. Stoughton rose to the rank of brigadier general during the Civil War and afterwards served two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. Hussey had been president of the famous Jackson convention of 1854 where the Republican Party was formed "under the oaks," and he held numerous public offices on the State and local level.

Michigan's delegation was pledged to support William H. Seward of New York for the Republican Presidential nomination. This pledge reflected the personal preferences of most of the members of the delegation and apparently also reflected the feelings of most Michigan Republicans. There are several reasons for Seward's popularity in Michigan. He was well known in the State, having visited and spoken in Michigan on numerous occasions. He was a New Yorker, which brought him close to the thousands of Michiganites who had been born and raised in that State. Finally, before the Republican Party had been formed in 1854, Seward, as a leading Whig, had enunciated most forcefully the antislavery principles which became such an important part of the Republican platform. Lincoln,

on the other hand, had spoken only once in Michigan, at Kalamazoo in 1856 on behalf of John C. Fremont.

Before and during the convention of 1860 strong efforts were made to get Seward supporters to drop him in favor of one of the other candidates. The main argument used against Seward was that although he was strong in the so-called safe States (such as Michigan) he could not carry the doubtful States. Particularly, it was said he could not carry Pennsylvania and Indiana. Both States held their elections in October, and it was said that Fremont's poor showing in these States in October 1856 caused serious defects among his supporters which led to his defeat nationally in the November elections in the other States. However, the Michigan delegation remained steadfast in its support of Seward.

William W. Evarts placed Seward's name in nomination, and his speech was received enthusiastically. Lincoln followers then greeted the nomination of Lincoln by N. B. Judd with what the official record described as "immense applause." The Seward and Lincoln forces then engaged in a duel to see which one could arouse the most enthusiasm for their candidate. Blair seconded Seward in what one member of the convention many years later still remembered as "one of the outstanding speeches of the convention." The Seward supporters followed Blair's speech with a tremendous demonstration. "No Comanches, no panthers ever struck a higher note, or gave screams with more infernal intensity," a convention observer declared. But then Lincoln's nomination was seconded and the demonstration that followed outdid the best the Seward forces could muster. "New York, Michigan, and Wisconsin delegates sat together and were in this tempest very quiet," the same observer reported. "Many of their faces whitened as the Lincoln yawp swelled into a wild hosanna of victory."

On the third ballot, on May 18, a switch of four votes in the Ohio delegation gave Lincoln the required number to win the nomination. Evarts, speaking for the Seward forces, arose and moved that Lincoln's nomination be made unanimous. Blair then arose, and spoke for the Michigan delegation which had cast its 12 votes for Seward on each of the three ballots. The eminent historian, William H. Henshew, has called the speech Blair now made "the speech of the hour." It showed "evidence of real sincerity" in pledging Michigan's support of Lincoln.

Blair said to the members of the convention:

"Like my friend who has just taken his seat, the State of Michigan, from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behests here today, she lays down her first, best loved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins [much applause]; but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his name is a portion of the history of the American Union; it will be written, and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away, and when Presidents themselves are forgotten in the oblivion which comes over all temporal things. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which shall go out to battle for Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois."

"Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November next. Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul.

[Tremendous applause.] I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour, never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, and glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority."

So hectic was the convention proceedings that it appears uncertain whether Evarts' motion was ever properly put and acted upon. Despite what Blair said, it appears that the Michigan delegation and the hundreds of Michiganites who were at the convention were sorely disappointed at Seward's defeat. The Michigan delegation returned home by railroad and tried to work up enthusiasm for Lincoln. One who accompanied the train recalled later: "We started out in a train trimmed with Lincoln banners, but in spite of the banners and in spite of Blair's earnest speeches, we did not get a cheer for Lincoln all the way from Niles to Detroit." In November, however, Michigan gave Lincoln a margin of 23,413 votes over the Democrat Douglas, almost the 25,000 majority promised by Blair at Chicago.

LINCOLN AND MICHIGAN

(Address by Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president, Abraham Lincoln Civil War Round Table of Michigan, before joint convention of the Michigan Legislature, February 13, 1958)

(Foreword, by Hon. Louis C. Cramton, State representative from Lapeer County: "Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Michigan: Abraham Lincoln was born on the 12th day of February, 149 years ago in a frontier cabin with one window and a dirt floor, and through this joint session of its legislative bodies, the State of Michigan today pays tribute to this preeminent world figure ever to be revered as democracy's exemplar. We are fortunate to have with us a notable Michigan authority on Lincoln, Mr. Arthur M. Smith, of Dearborn, president of the Abraham Lincoln Civil War Round Table of Michigan, who will address us on the subject 'Lincoln and Michigan.'")

Mr. Cramton, Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the senate and house and friends, Abraham Lincoln was born 149 years ago yesterday. He lived but 56 short years. For 21 years of this time he was at home, the dutiful son of what today we call an underprivileged family. In the remaining 35 years of his life he was to become the symbol of America in the hearts of millions here and abroad. Today we pause in a troubled world to pay homage to his memory. It is altogether proper that we should do so, for Abraham Lincoln symbolizes as does no other historical figure the triumph of a man and his ideals over his environment and the partisan struggles of his time.

The Legislature of Michigan is to be especially commended on this splendid custom of meeting in joint convention to commemorate the anniversary of his birth. I am very honored, indeed, to have been asked to address you today on the subject, "Lincoln and Michigan."

The able speakers on like occasions in previous years have given you inspired word pictures of Abraham Lincoln the man. These addresses, supported by scholarly research have been executed with admirable skill. Today I shall not attempt to duplicate these efforts. Instead, I shall speak to you about Abraham Lincoln the inventor and Abraham Lincoln the statesman—because in both capacities he was so closely associated with Michigan backgrounds.

As an inventor Abraham Lincoln made it his lifelong habit to inquire into the nature of things. He exhibited what he called the habit of invention; the habit of observation and reflection. As a statesman

he relied upon these observations and reflections as he formulated those policies which preserved the Union in his time and which can save the world in our time.

Today the world needs leaders who like Lincoln are both inventors and statesmen. As inventors they can observe and reflect upon the technology which has given us jet planes, radio, radar, and television. They can see more than destruction in the release of atomic energy. Space to them is more than a tactical weapon in an unrelenting war of ideologies. Probing the world about them, inventors specialize in doing the impossible. They have vision. They have a will to do. They have initiative.

When the knowledge and skills of the inventor are combined with the attributes of statesmanship, realistic political policies will emerge—policies which the world must have very soon if mankind is to survive.

Abraham Lincoln blended the mind of the inventor with the skills of the statesman in such perfect proportions that he stands today as the one great American to whom we can turn for timely inspiration, counsel and guidance.

Here is the secret for the growth of the so-called "Lincoln Cult." There are many students and collectors of Lincolniana in Michigan who, in common with other members of this cult, share the sentiment recently expressed by the eminent director of the Lincoln National Life Foundation of Fort Wayne, Ind., Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry.

"Abraham Lincoln," says Dr. McMurtry, "seems to take hold of people as no other historical character does. He is someone they can tie themselves to. He possessed a true nobility of character, yet he was like the rest of us in so many human ways. We feel that we really know him. Yet Abraham Lincoln remains a paradox."¹

Michigan met Abraham Lincoln as an inventor in 1848 when he looked upon our beautiful peninsula from the deck of the lake steamer *Globe*. Michigan met Abraham Lincoln the statesman when he addressed the Kalamazoo rally of Young Republicans for Fremont in 1856. This combination of inventor and statesman is indeed a paradox.

Rumor and speculation has it that Lincoln in his lifetime also appeared at Bay City, Pontiac, and Detroit. These visits have not been verified by acceptable proofs. In common with every Lincoln student in Michigan, I would like to see these visits verified. As of today, however, we know nothing about the reasons for such alleged visits nor do we know anything about Lincoln's part in them.

Despite the fact that other States were more fortunate in their contacts with Abraham Lincoln during his lifetime, Michigan today possesses a rich store of Lincoln materials and has made significant contributions to recent Lincoln studies. Thomas I. Starr found the long lost Kalamazoo speech and made it available to Lincoln students. He also published his historical researches on Lincoln and the Detroit River. Bruce Catton, noted author on Lincoln and Civil War themes is a native son of Petoskey. Carl Sandburg wrote his masterful "War Years" while living at Harbert. Valuable collections of Lincolniana are located at the Clements Library in Ann Arbor, in the Burton historical collections at Detroit, and in the Dwight B. Waldo collection at Western Michigan University of Kalamazoo. There are, in addition, a number of privately owned collections of Lincoln materials in Michigan, several of which are nationally known.

One of the best publicized bits of Lincolniana in Michigan is the Logan County Courthouse in Greenfield Village. Henry Ford, born 2 years before the death of Abraham Lincoln, was, like Lincoln, both an

inventor and a statesman. We know him best as an inventor but I am sure history will also know him as a statesman. The careful restoration of the Logan County Courthouse and the choice Lincoln items collected by Henry Ford reveal the close philosophical kinship which existed between these two inventor-statesmen.

There is a strong urge to tell you more about these fascinating aspects of Lincoln and Michigan but they are a part of another story. Let us then return to the two episodes previously mentioned—Lincoln's visit to Michigan as an inventor in 1848, and his visit to Kalamazoo as a statesman in 1856.

In Kalamazoo in 1856 Lincoln said the key to the greatness of America was that "Every man can make himself." Here is the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, the self-reliant inventor. But at the same time Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, added the qualification that such a man must be free; free that is from both physical and mental shackles and must be living in a nation, such as America, in which the government assures him the freedoms which he must have if he is to "make himself."

This blending of the philosophic inventor with the practical statesman in Abraham Lincoln provided the leadership which was extolled by Woodrow Wilson in his Chicago address at the centennial celebration of Lincoln's birth. Then as now we can join in Wilson's fervent plea, "God send us such men again."²

The balanced combination of inventor and statesman in Abraham Lincoln is not unique in American history. Before his time it had been possessed by Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. Possessing it, each had blended an inventor's vision with practical statesmanship to leave to this Nation the political philosophy and the structure of government so revered by Abraham Lincoln.

I have told you that Michigan first met Abraham Lincoln as an inventor. As a first-term Congressman from Illinois, Lincoln returned from Washington to Springfield by way of the New England States and the Great Lakes. In the early fall of 1848 he visited Niagara Falls and embarked at Port Buffalo as a passenger on the lake steamer *Globe*. The *Globe* reported at Detroit on September 29, 1848.³ A story in the Detroit Free Press the next day recounts that the steamship *Canada* in going down the river on Thursday night had run ashore on Fighting Island and was there when the *Globe* came up.

Here then was the spectacle—two great steamers in a great river—one passing safely to its destination, the other aground on a shoal. What visions this must have conjured in Lincoln's memory. What reflections this observation must have inspired. Here was a need. Here was a problem. Lincoln had had a personal, firsthand contact with the problems of river navigation. He had once floated a flatboat stuck on the Rutledge Dam in New Salem by the simple expedient of securing an auger from the shore and drilling a hole in the end of the boat which extended over the dam. This had allowed the water to drain out of the boat, and so increased its buoyancy that it floated over the dam after which the hole was plugged, and the boat continued on its trip to New Orleans.

Obviously, such an expedient was not possible with a Great Lake steamer trapped on the shoals off Fighting Island. There was no

place to transport the cargo or passengers. There was no way to lighten the load. Lincoln must have closely observed the activities of the crew of the *Canada* in wedging under the sides of the gunwales, empty casks, barrels, and even bales of straw to increase the buoyancy of the ship and float her off the shoals.

Lincoln reflected on this problem and decided to do something about it. When he returned to Springfield, he described these events to his partner "Billy" Herndon who in after years was to write that Lincoln, continued to think about this problem of riverboat navigation. As a result, he suggested attaching a kind of bellows on each side of the hull of the craft just below the waterline.⁴ By a system of ropes and pulleys, whenever the keel grated on the sand these bellows were to be lowered to the water and inflated and thus buoyed up the vessel was expected to float clear of the shoal.

When Lincoln reached home, Herndon tells us that, "he at once set to work to demonstrate the feasibility of his plan. Walter Davis, a mechanic having a shop near our office, granted him the use of his tools, and likewise assisted him in making the model of a miniature vessel of the arrangement as above described. Lincoln manifested ardent interest in it. Occasionally, he would bring the model in the office and while whittling on it would descant on its merits and the revolution it was destined to work in steamboat navigation."⁵ This model is now preserved and can be seen in Washington at the Smithsonian Institution.

Gains Paddock, an old resident of Springfield, remembered that when the boat model was completed, Lincoln, to prove his assertion that the Sangamon River was navigable, demonstrated his boat in one of the public watering troughs in the public square at Springfield.⁶

This invention was no passing fancy with Lincoln. When he returned to Washington early in 1849, he took the model with him and secured the services of a Washington patent attorney, Zenos C. Robbins. The model was filed, an application for patent was made, and on May 22, 1849, Abraham Lincoln was granted U.S. Patent No. 6,469.

Many Lincoln scholars have ignored these events, or have treated this invention as something of a curiosity. This I am unwilling to do. From an intimate professional association with inventors for nearly 32 years, I know that an inventor will not carry an idea as far as did Abraham Lincoln unless he is sustained by some broader vision. In all cases, the invention patented is but a means to an end—a mechanism, if you please, to give reality to a vision.

I am certain that Lincoln must have had a broader vision which caused him shortly after the war-threatened first inaugural, to think about his boat model and to have one of the Patent Office employees find it for him.⁷

What, then, can we say now, nearly 110 years later, motivated Abraham Lincoln, the inventor, to make this invention? Part of the answer to this question is found in the

⁴ Herndon incorrectly tells the story as involving the "ship Lincoln was on." There is no record of the *Globe* having been involved in this episode except as passing the stranded *Canada*.

⁵ This is also incorrect. Both the model and the patent show the bellows to be above the waterline.

⁶ Abraham Lincoln, Herndon & Weik—2 vol. ed., D. Appleton & Co. 1926. Vol. I, pp. 298-299.

⁷ Lincoln Lore No. 843, June 4, 1945 "Congressman Lincoln's Patent."

⁸ "Sights and Secrets of the National Capital," by Dr. John B. Ellis, published Jones, Jenkin & Co., Chicago, Ill.—1869, p. 348.

¹ Saturday Evening Post, p. 92, "The Lincoln Cult" by Charles W. White.

² Centennial address of Dr. Woodrow Wilson, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 12, 1909, as quoted in "Lincoln Lore No. 659," Nov. 24, 1941.

³ "The Detroit River and Abraham Lincoln," Thomas I. Starr. Bulletin of the Detroit Historical Society, vol. III, Nov. 5, February 1947.

platform upon which he waged his first campaign for the State legislature. Even at that time he had promised to work for improvement of the rivers. Lincoln was first of all a riverman who knew rivers from years of firsthand contact with them. He knew what rivers had meant to him. He knew them as nature's right-of-way to places where man wished to go. He knew the shallow streams which led to the greater rivers. He knew these great rivers as they joined the cities, villages, and peoples of the separate States and territories into one great and united Nation. He knew the need for transportation to the West. I believe he saw in the western rivers and in his little boat a ready answer to the problem of western exploration and western expansion.

Certainly to a riverman of Lincoln's experience, vision, and ability, the Detroit River with a great steamship fast on a shoal presented a challenge to his inventive mind. That his solution may have been impractical is beside the point. He had demonstrated what he was later to call the habit of invention; that is, the habit of "observation and reflection."⁹

The riverboat is but one example of Lincoln's scientific abilities. In the Lincoln Museum in Washington, D.C., there is a model of a small wagon which is attributed to Abraham Lincoln as the inventor. To date his inventorship has not been documented. If it can be established, then Abraham Lincoln was fully 20 years ahead of the art in his development of the type of vehicle steering which is common in the automobiles of today and in which each front wheel turns about its own spindle.

Many who knew him said he was a man of decided scientific bent of mind. Dr. Joseph Henry, one of America's greatest scientists, came to know Lincoln well by serving as his "scientific adviser" during the Civil War, and said that he "marveled at the President's grasp of scientific matters."¹⁰

Recently, I was privileged to examine the original longhand statement of Dr. John Allen which is now preserved as a part of the Robert Todd Lincoln collection in the Library of Congress. I was interested to note that this longtime friend of Abraham Lincoln had written in 1860, that Lincoln's mind was of a "metaphysical and philosophical order," and that Lincoln had made geology and other sciences a special study. Dr. Allen also comments on the fact that Lincoln "has an inventive faculty—is always studying into the nature of things."¹¹

"Behind the solemn, furrowed countenance of Abraham Lincoln was an inquisitive mind," writes Benjamin P. Thomas in his foreword to the recent book "Lincoln and the Tools of War." "It ranged" writes Thomas, "over the abstract and the infinite, the absolute and the immediate. It was philosophical, and at the same time was intensely practical."

"On the practical level," Thomas continues, "Lincoln's curiosity directed itself, among other things, to mechanical devices." Thomas quotes a fellow lawyer of Lincoln's who remembered that whenever Lincoln encountered a new piece of farm machinery on his rounds of the old eighth circuit, "he would carefully examine it all over, first generally and then critically; he would sight it to determine if it was straight or warped; and if he could make a practical test of it,

he would do that; he would turn it over or around and stoop down or lie down, if necessary, to look under it; he would examine it closely, and then stand off and examine it at a little distance; he would shake it, lift it, roll it about, upend it, overset it, and thus ascertain every quality and utility which inhered in it, so far as acute and patient investigation could do it."

"Living on the periphery of the machine age in America," Thomas observes, Lincoln "was keenly aware of the technological advances that were taking place about him. He pondered on the impact of those advances on mankind."¹²

After reviewing Lincoln's interest in the mechanical arts to provide superior arms for the north, Thomas writes: "That many of these devices failed does not mean that Lincoln was naive or absurdly a visionary. In many instances he was on the right track but simply ahead of his time."¹³

In today's frenzied race to train "scientists," let us remember that crash programs in scientific education may give us technicians but they cannot give us inventors or statesmen. For this we must train students in the fine art of observation and allow them the time necessary for reflection. While necessary to inventors, both are essential for statesmen.¹⁴

Lincoln's abilities as an inventor become of added significance when they are blended with his skills as a statesman. The inventor's habit of observation and reflection gave a special quality to the statesmanship of Abraham Lincoln which the distinguished historian, Allan Nevins, comments on in "The Statesmanship of the Civil War". "The special quality of Lincoln's statesmanship," says Allan Nevins, "was its extraordinary realism or practicality." Dr. Nevins then points out that what set Lincoln apart from other statesmen of his time was "his grasp of what was practicable at any given moment."¹⁵

It was as such a statesman that Abraham Lincoln paid a visit to Kalamazoo, Mich., on August 27, 1856. There, on that day, Lincoln delivered his address "Against Extending Slavery" and demonstrated how much he had observed and how much he had reflected upon the problems of that time. Here he was playing the role of a statesman. Standing before a large gathering, billed as a "foreign" speaker, he was to be "tested" as he faced an audience made up mainly of the more enthusiastic and radical elements of the new Republican Party.

As we now read his Kalamazoo speech, we see how patiently and how skillfully Lincoln there developed those fundamental positions which he was to state more fully and more eloquently 2 years later in 1858 in his "House Divided" speech at Springfield, Ill., and still again 2 years later in 1860 in his Cooper Institute speech at New York City.

What he observed at Kalamazoo must have been the subject of much reflection by Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

To many in the crowd at Kalamazoo, Abraham Lincoln was nothing but a name—they had come to hear the Battle Creek Glee Club and bands from Detroit, Ann Arbor, Jackson, and elsewhere. They had come to hear their idol "Zack" Chandler declare, "Let Kansas come in as a slave State and the North will make it a desert!"¹⁶ The majority of the crowd echoed the sentiments of George

C. Bates who declared that day, "Sooner than see another foot of slave territory added to the Union," he would "dash it to atoms". "Sooner," said he, "than to have the ship of state carry a crew of slaveholders, let her go down with all aboard."¹⁷

The crowd at Kalamazoo, as the crowds later were to do at Gettysburg and at the second inaugural, listened but did not comprehend the message of Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

In his Kalamazoo address, Lincoln, the statesman, recognized the problems then before the people. He saw the dividing lines formed between the slave States and the free States; between the North and the South; between the abolitionists and the supporters of slavery. He knew this division threatened the Union.

Recognizing these things in his speech at Kalamazoo; sensing that he was not speaking the sentiments of the crowd; Lincoln, the statesman, urged the crowd to forget these differences and join him in the most important issue of all; the preservation of the Union. Lincoln, the statesman, saw this as the only course if this Nation was to achieve the destiny which he was certain a divine providence had planned for it.

In his speech in Kalamazoo, Lincoln urged all to come forward, and help to maintain the Constitution "for," said Lincoln, "it is the only safeguard of our liberties."

Lincoln then concluded, "Come, and keep coming. Strike, and strike again." "So sure as God lives," he said, "the victory shall be yours."¹⁸

The Kalamazoo Gazette reported that "Mr. Lincoln * * * made a very fair and argumentative address, but was far too conservative and Union-loving in his sentiments to suit his audience."¹⁹

Lincoln, at Kalamazoo, had not yet attained the stature of a national spokesman on these issues. This was yet to come in the "House Divided" speech, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and finally in the acclaim with which the audience received his speech at Cooper Institute. In Kalamazoo, Abraham Lincoln was, at best, a successful lawyer and something of a local politician from a neighboring State. He was just beginning to be noticed as a national figure. There were those in the audience at Kalamazoo who remembered him as the politician whose devastating attack in 1848 on the venerable Lewis Cass²⁰ had been a deciding factor in defeating Michigan's only bid to place one of its sons in the White House.

There also were those in the audience who, like "Zack" Chandler, were offended by Lincoln's conservative views, and who were to become so openly hostile to Lincoln that 4 years later they were to hold the Michigan delegation for Seward when Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency.

I doubt if many in the crowd in Kalamazoo appreciated that they were observing the early flowering of Lincoln as a statesman. Yet, it was truly a statesman who proclaimed to the crowd:

"We are a great empire. We are 80 years old. We stand at once the wonder and admiration of the whole world, and we must inquire what it is that has given us so much prosperity, and we shall understand that to give up that one thing, would be to give up all future prosperity. This cause is that every man can make himself."²¹

⁹ Lecture on "Discoveries & Invention"—The Collected Works of Lincoln. Roy P. Basler—Rutgers University Press, 1953, vol. III, p. 356.

¹⁰ Quoted by Benjamin P. Thomas in the foreword to "Lincoln and the Tools of War" by Robert V. Bruce; Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1956, p. X.

¹¹ Robert Todd Lincoln Papers, vol. I, p. 10. Library of Congress.

¹² "Lincoln and The Tools of War", supra, pp. VII-VIII.

¹³ Ibid., p. IX.

¹⁴ See, "Man Is Not Primarily a Fact," Dr. Glenn Olds, Saturday Review, Feb. 15, 1958, p. 18.

¹⁵ The Statesmanship of the Civil War, Allan Nevins, the Macmillan Co., 1953, p. 60.

¹⁶ Kalamazoo Gazette, Aug. 29, 1856, as quoted in Starr-Lincoln's Kalamazoo address against extending slavery, p. 31.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Starr—Lincoln's Kalamazoo Address, pp. 45-46.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 42.

²⁰ Lincoln's remarks on Cass may be found in Clifton M. Nichols "Life of Abraham Lincoln," Most, Crowell & Kirkpatrick (1896), p. 107 et seq.

²¹ Starr, supra, p. 39.

Lincoln, the statesman, also spoke of our deep and abiding interest in keeping the territories open for homes of free people. "There is another thing," said Lincoln, "and that is the mature knowledge we have—the greatest interest of all. It is the doctrine, that the people are to be driven from the maxims of our free Government . . ."

The vision, the thoughts and sentiments of Lincoln, the statesman, at Kalamazoo find further expression in his "House Divided" speech. Remembering the problem of so expressing them as to reach his audience in Kalamazoo, we find Lincoln, the inventor, suggesting certain technical analogies and arguments based thereon which lie at the very heart of the "House Divided" speech.

It is Lincoln as a technician, an inventor if you please, who suggests the analogy of the sand casting mold and the frame timbers²² to support so effectively the conclusions of Lincoln the statesman, in the "House Divided" speech that the combination of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision is an effective machine for the extension of slavery.

The close-knit fusion of the inventor and the statesman in Lincoln is seen also in his lecture on "Discoveries and Inventions" given before the Phi Alpha Society, of Illinois College in Jacksonville, Ill., on February 11, 1859.²⁴

If time permitted, I should like to take you through this entire lecture for I believe it has a great deal of significance in the Lincoln story. One noted Lincoln scholar told me a few days ago, "That is the speech of a well educated man." Coming as it does between the "House Divided" speech and the "Cooper Institute" speech it shows the scope of Lincoln's interests and the intellectual growth which was to become so apparent in the "Cooper Institute" speech.

Let us turn our attention to some of the significant portions of this speech which reveal Lincoln as an inventor and as a statesman.

"I have already intimated my opinion," said Lincoln, in this lecture, "that in the world's history, certain inventions and discoveries occurred of particular value, on account of their great efficiency in facilitating all other inventions and discoveries." These included among others the discovery of America, and the introduction of patent laws.²⁵

After considering the problems in the inventing of writing, Lincoln saw it as a means of recording and preserving important observations, thus possibly leading "to an important invention, years and even centuries" later. "In one word," said Lincoln, "by means of writing, the seeds of invention were more permanently preserved, and more widely sown."²⁶

Lincoln was concerned about the inequality felt by uneducated people; about how such people looked upon the educated few as superior beings. "To emancipate the mind from this false and underestimate of itself," said Lincoln, "is a great task which printing came into the world to perform."

He then speaks of how difficult it is "for us, now and here to conceive how long it took to break its shackles" in order, as he put it, "to get a habit of freedom of thought, established." "It is," said Lincoln, "a curious fact that a new country is most favorable—almost necessary—the emancipation of

thought, and the consequent advancement of civilization and the arts."²⁷

After reviewing the course of invention through Asia and the older countries, this lecture continues on a very modern theme. " . . . we here in America," said Lincoln, "think we discover, and invent, and improve, faster than any of them. They may think this is arrogance; but they cannot deny that Russia has called upon us to show her how to build steamboats and railroads."²⁸

To Lincoln, the discovery of America was "an event greatly favoring and facilitating useful discoveries and inventions."²⁹

The "strong slavery of the mind" which concerned Lincoln in this speech, had to be broken before "freedom of thought" could be established. America was the new country so necessary to this "emancipation of thought."

This, then, brings us back to Kalamazoo and to the great empire whose cause he there stated as being "that every man can make himself."

Lincoln's message at Kalamazoo, and his lecture at Jacksonville, Ill., have particular applicability to the dilemma of free men in our troubled world today. Last November, Howard Fast, after leaving the Communist Party, wrote an article, in which he stated:

"Whatever the Communist Party once was, today it is a prison for man's best and boldest dreams. Tomorrow belongs to those who break down the prison walls that enclose the minds of man, not to those who support such walls. For mankind, the promise of tomorrow always has been and always will be the widening of intellect and horizon—in ever greater vistas of individual freedom."³⁰

The mental slavery as well as the physical slavery demanded by communism was abhorrent to the mind of Lincoln. The Communist ideology can exist only so long as it can forge and hold its subject peoples in the shackles of mental and physical slavery. Lincoln's concern about extending slavery into free territories as he expressed it at Kalamazoo, was "that the people are to be driven from the maxims of our free Government." Today, I am certain his concern would be directed toward communism—and this for the same reason—that it drives people from the "maxims of our free Government."

The voice which spoke through Abraham Lincoln in stating this issue at Kalamazoo still speaks to us today, but we must listen closely if we are to hear it above the noise and clash of ideologies and the shoutings of rabid partisans seeking to separate man from man and nation from nation.

The voice today, as it did in the time of Abraham Lincoln comes from the soul of a great man who is a scientist, dedicated to serving "God's lowliest creatures," and living today in primitive surroundings, beside a river which he knows well. He speaks to us today against a frontier background. With a belief in God, and a devotion to the cause of all mankind Albert Schweitzer has given us a philosophy for today and tomorrow in his "Reverence for Life," and last year in his "Declaration of Conscience." In these writings I hear not the voice of Albert Schweitzer—nor the voice of Abraham Lincoln—but the voice of a Divine Providence again speaking patiently to us, to caution, to direct and to inspire us in the never ending search for a solution to our problems of survival, in a world terrified by what yesterday were but scientific curiosities discovered in its course of man's unrelenting search for knowledge.

I believe it is symbolic of our times that today replicas of the sculptured busts of Abraham Lincoln and Albert Schweitzer sit side by side in a showcase in the Smithsonian Institution at Washington.

We need to understand the great principles and the idealism of these great thinkers if we are to profit from their example.

Turn your ears to Lambarene in equatorial South Africa, or to Gunsbach in Alsace-Lorraine when Albert Schweitzer is there. Listen as he speaks. You, too, can hear the voice. It is the voice we heard speaking through Lincoln at Jacksonville and at Kalamazoo but the words are Albert Schweitzer's:

"A man's ability to be a pioneer of progress," says Schweitzer, "that is, to understand what civilization is and to work for it, depends on his being a thinker and on his being free."

"Material and spiritual freedom are closely bound up with one another," Schweitzer asserts and then says, "Civilization presupposes free men, for only by free men can it be thought out and brought to realization."³¹

Lincoln the inventor—Lincoln the statesman—gave us the vision, gave us the courage and gave us the leadership which enabled this Nation to survive the tragedy of the Civil War and to become a world power dedicated to the principle that people are not to be driven away from "the maxims of our free Government." As an inventor, Abraham Lincoln supported other inventors in developing the war-born technology of the Civil War from which has grown the awesome technology of today whose imperative voice demands that we firmly establish here and now the principle stated by Lincoln speaking as a statesman in Kalamazoo; that peoples shall not be driven from "the maxims of our free Government."

John Wilkes Booth cut short the life of Abraham Lincoln just 41 days after the second inaugural. It is one of the ironies of history that Abraham Lincoln, the inventor and statesman, could not have lived to see and to have directed the conversion of the many war-born inventions into devices for the peacetime uses of all mankind. Lincoln, the inventor, and Lincoln, the statesman, would have seen in this vision come true—a nation strong and united; a nation dedicated to the principles of freedom.

In his writings, Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, fixed a course of freedom for this Nation and for all "other nations so conceived and so dedicated."

Denied in life the opportunity to see the Nation strong and physically united, Abraham Lincoln, the inventor, still had one last role to play.

The crowds which viewed his funeral car; the throngs which saw the train bearing the body of the beloved leader from Washington to Springfield, Ill., viewed all that was mortal of Lincoln in a setting new and strange to them. The car which carried the body of Abraham Lincoln on this last journey was the "Pioneer," the first luxury sleeping car built by George M. Pullman.³² Appropriately, this car was drawn by a locomotive named the "Union."³³

Lincoln, the inventor, would have been pleased to know that the railroads along the funeral route, in order to accommodate this new car, had to lay many miles of standard gage track, widen their bridges, and cut down their station platforms. This sad last journey supplied the impetus necessary to force standardization of tracks and equipment on the railroads of America.

²² Starr, supra, p. 39.

²³ Quoted from p. 165, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln" by J. G. Holland; published by Gurdon Bill, Springfield, Mass., 1866.

²⁴ "The Collected Works of Lincoln"—Roy P. Basler—Rutgers University Press, 1953, New Brunswick, N.J., vol. III, p. 356.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ "On Leaving the Communist Party," by Howard Fast, Saturday Review, Nov. 16, 1957, p. 15.

³¹ Albert Schweitzer, "Decay," p. 16, reprinted p. 5. Albert Schweitzer, an Anthology, the Beacon Press, 1947.

³² S. Gledion, Mechanization Takes Command—Oxford University Press, New York 1948, p. 453.

³³ Holland, supra, p. 530.

Thus, even in death, Abraham Lincoln, inventor, dreamer, prophet, and statesman, played an important part in achieving his vision of a Nation closely knit together.

Yes, the persistence of Lincoln, the inventor, has been rewarded. His beloved United States of America became united with the rails supplementing the rivers to join all of its parts into one great and indivisible Union. The little river boat of 1849 had been Lincoln's dream of one means to achieve this end. But the inventor of the boat became a prophet of the rails.

The eminent Lincoln scholar, the late James G. Randall, in "Mr. Lincoln," published last year, supports the picture of Abraham Lincoln as an inventor-statesman.

"Abraham Lincoln of Illinois," Randall says, "made it his business in the period preceding his presidential nomination to emphasize the peacetime pursuits of his country and to recover for his own day some of the Nation building stimulus of the fathers." "He was concerned with problems of slavery," Randall continues, "and with such a handling of those problems as would allay strife, as he hoped, but this was not all. He turned his thoughts also to discoveries and inventions, to the 'iron horse,' to 'hot-water power' harnessed to help mankind, to the '70 or 80 thousand words' of the English language to influences that tend to 'bring us together' and 'make us better acquainted,' to the harvest machine and the 'steam plow,' to the problem of 50 bushels of wheat to the acre."²⁴

In passing, may I here express the hope that as the forthcoming Civil War Centennial is observed in Michigan, the Planning Commission proposed in pending Senate bill 1111 will focus public attention on these peacetime pursuits of Lincoln's day and emphasize the way in which the citizens of Michigan worked with the citizens of the other States to recover the Nation building stimulus of the fathers as the swords of the Civil War were beaten into plowshares of the peace which followed.

Today our science and technology, also born of a great war, have forced upon us new dimensions of time and space and wholly new concepts of energy. There were no Sputniks in Lincoln's time; there were no intercontinental ballistic missiles; there were no atom bombs; there were no H-bombs. There were, however, grapeshot and shrapnel; explosives; gases and fire. The rifles of the Civil War had neither the range nor the awful destruction of a modern rifle. The cannons of that war had neither the range nor the frightfully destructive powers of a guided missile. The observation balloons and the crude electromagnetic telegraph of the Civil War were a far cry from the jet bombers, the space platforms, the radar, and the radio of the present age. Yet, as in all wars, all these things had this in common: they are used to kill young men; they are used to maim young men, and their use in war will solve no problems.

Today, we have the power, not only to kill and maim our enemies, but we can inflict our wrath on generations yet unborn. Upon all the generations of mankind yet to come we can inflict the terrible burdens of genes permanently damaged by the lethal rays of our atomic bombs. The inventors of the world have given us this power. With such power comes responsibility—the responsibility of world leadership.

If we are to learn but one lesson from our past history, it is that the gracious hand of an all-knowing providence has guided and directed the affairs of this great Nation through devoted and dedicated leaders, such as Abraham Lincoln, divinely inspired to accomplish, in the darkest moments of despair

and gloom, the task of keeping faith in America and in keeping faith in those ideals which have made this country great.

Abraham Lincoln, the inventor; Abraham Lincoln, the statesman, has given us the pattern for such a leader. Michigan is proud today that Abraham Lincoln found here the inspiration for his invention of the river boat; the birthplace of the party which elected him to the Presidency; and the platform that day over 100 years ago, in Kalamazoo, from which emerged Abraham Lincoln, the statesman.

"God send us such men again."

MICHIGAN AND THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION OF 1860

(By Lloyd C. Nyman)

The Republican convention of 1860 has found its place in the pages of history as a part of the written record of the life of Abraham Lincoln. As it was significant as a momentous event in his life, so it is significant in the history of our Nation. It was an important link in the dramatic events that preceded the Civil War. There is no doubt that the results of the convention added fuel to the flames that were smoldering in the South. It also marked the dedication of a young and powerful political party to a platform and a candidate opposed to the extension of slavery.

The role of the Michigan delegation in the Chicago convention became a minor one due to the simple fact that they had backed the wrong man. From the first they had supported William A. Seward of New York, and shared with their neighbor delegation from Wisconsin the distinction of unwavering loyalty to his cause until the last vote of the convention was cast.

The published historical events of the convention have been gathered by many authors from the Chicago newspaper files of that day, and it is doubtful if much more can be found to add to that part of the story. But, for the events relating to the Michigan Republicans, history and biography tell us little, and we must rely on the Michigan newspapers for the story of their activities. For the pungent editorials and colorful descriptions of the reporters of 100 years ago, we express our gratitude and our admiration.

A review of the editorials reveals the sharp political differences among the newspapers, and presumably, their readers. The Detroit Free Press, the Democratic paper, was solidly behind Stephen A. Douglas, the leading candidate for the Democratic nomination. The Detroit Tribune and the Detroit Daily Advertiser were pro-Seward, pro-Republican, and strongly antislavery. The Advertiser was also anti-Horace Greeley.

While it is not the intention of the writer to determine the "why" of the strong Seward sentiment in this State, mention should be made of contributing causes.

William A. Seward of New York was a popular political figure, commanding the respect of a large segment of the Republican voters. He had been Governor of New York, and was then serving in the Senate as an able statesman and adversary of the advocates of slavery. He was a leader of the "radical" antislavery group of Republicans, although he had alienated the more moderate Members by his statement that "there is a higher law than the Constitution." His campaign was in the hands of a clever political manipulator, Thurlow Weed, whose efforts to secure preconvention delegate commitments seemed to have brought Seward to the threshold of the nomination weeks before the convention.

In addition, it is pointed out by Thomas I. Starr that Zachariah Chandler was a strong factor in holding "Michigan in the Seward column at the Chicago convention of 1860, despite every influence that could be brought

to bear upon its delegates by other western groups."

Chandler had spoken in Kalamazoo in 1856 when Lincoln had made his only appearance in the State, speaking in behalf of Fremont for President. "Particularly did Lincoln trample on the toes of Zachariah Chandler. . . . From that day onward Chandler never could speak or think of Lincoln except contemptuously."

Although Chandler's biographer reveals that he had cast one of the four Michigan votes for Lincoln for Vice President in 1856, Chandler, a powerful political force, apparently changed his mind, and his enmity of Lincoln may have been the strongest reason for the Seward strength in Michigan.

Abraham Lincoln was just emerging as a national figure. He was well-known in Illinois as a State legislator, a one term Congressman, and a skillful lawyer and public speaker. He had achieved prominence only 2 years before in the senatorial battle with Douglas. The celebrated "debates" were carried in newspapers across the land. Although Lincoln lost the election in the legislature (as was the procedure then), he carried the majority of the popular vote, and more importantly, brought his name before the country as the champion of the principle that slavery should not be extended to the new States and Territories.

If he nursed further political ambitions, he remained discreetly quiet. In November of 1859 he wrote in a letter, "I have enlisted for the permanent success of the Republican cause; and, for this object, I shall labor faithfully in the ranks, unless, as I think not probable, the judgment of the party shall assign me a different position."

In February of 1860, he traveled to New York and delivered the famous address at Cooper Union in which he established himself as a leader of the Republican Party, and gave the eastern politicians the impression of a man to be reckoned with.

Although his Illinois friends were urging him to declare himself on the nomination, and despite the clamor of the friendly newspapers in Illinois, he would not commit himself. He received two offers to manage his candidacy, but he replied to one offer—"Even my friends, so far as I know, have yet reached a point of staking any money on my chances of success."

But less than a month before the Chicago Convention he wrote to Senator Trumbull: "As you request, I will be perfectly frank. The taste is in my mouth a little."

The Republican State convention in Illinois named him as their unanimous choice as the "rail-splitter candidate," but even then he was cautious. He would admit only that "the Illinois delegation will be for me from the start, and no other delegation will."

But in Michigan Lincoln was not mentioned in the newspapers until a day or two before the convention. On May 2, 1860, the Republican State convention met in Detroit at 11 a.m. at Merrill Hall, situated at the northeast corner of Woodward and Jefferson, now the site of the City-County Building, and placed its faith in William H. Seward. The platform adopted that day read in part:

"ARTICLE 9

"Resolved, That William H. Seward, the tried and lifelong supporter of the Republican principles; the statesman of his time; eminently conservative and national in his views; commanding in private and in public life the men of all parties, North and South, is our first choice as a candidate for the Presidency; and under his leadership we shall enter the contest with an unvarying hope that a glorious triumph awaits us over the broken and unorganized factions of the Democracy.

"ARTICLE 10

"Resolved, That our delegates are hereby instructed to cast the vote of Michigan for

²⁴ Mr. Lincoln—James G. Randall edited by Richard N. Current, Dodd, Mead & Co. New York, 1957, p. 3.

him as a unit, and use all honorable means to secure his nomination."

The following delegates were selected to meet in Chicago:

First District: Delegate at large, Hon. Austin Blair, of Jackson; alternate, G. W. Lee, of Livingston. District delegates: J. G. Peterson, of Wayne; H. T. Backus, of Wayne; A. D. Crane, of Washtenaw; D. Cramer, alternate.

Second District: Delegate at large, W. W. Murphy, of Hillsdale; alternate, W. B. Montgomery. District delegates: Jesse J. Beeson, Cass; alternates, D. Larbelere; Wm. S. Stoughton, St. Joseph; alternate, N. D. Sheets, Branch.

Third District: Delegate at large, J. W. Ferry, of Ottawa; alternate, J. H. Andrews, of Van Buren. District delegate: Francis Quinn, of Berrien; alternates, A. H. Cary, Erastus Hussey, of Calhoun; Seth Sprague, Montcalm.

Fourth District: Delegate at large, J. J. St. Clair, Marquette; alternate, Morgan Bates, Traverse City. District delegates: D. C. Buckland, Oakland; A. T. Grossman, Genesee; alternates, Michael T. C. Pressner, Saginaw; C. P. Parkhill, Shiawassee.

The platform commended the growth and vigor of the party, condemned the reckless expenditures of the administration in Washington, attacked the corruptness of the opposition, and significantly denounced the treachery involved in the admission of Kansas as a State.

A communication dated April 30 was read from the Sons of Michigan in Chicago, former residents of Michigan, advising that they had "secured for the use and accommodation of your delegates during the session of said convention, very desirable apartments in the Adams House of this city, one of our finest hotels * * * and tender to our Michigan friends who may be in attendance at that convention, their individual hospitality and personal service."

Advertisements in the Detroit papers announced that half-fare rates on the railroads be extended to those going to the Chicago convention. An item in the Detroit Daily Tribune of May 11 stated:

"A special train on the Grand Trunk Railroad will arrive in Detroit on Saturday morning with about 300 ladies and gentlemen, from the northern New England States, including the delegates to the convention. A special train over the Great Western Railway Monday noon will bring the remaining New England and New York delegation. A portion of the Michigan delegation will join them here.

"Mr. Thurlow Weed and ladies have engaged rooms at the Russell House for this Friday night. Persons going to Chicago from the interior will be accommodated by taking trains at 4:30 and 8 p.m. leaving Detroit."

On May 14 the Tribune noted:

"A special train over the Great Western Railway, which left Suspension Bridge (at Niagara Falls) at 6:05 this morning arrived at Windsor at 12:30. Portions of the distance were run at the rate of a mile a minute. Portions of the New York, California, Vermont, Connecticut, and Massachusetts delegations—and the whole accompanied by Gilmore's Band of Boston."

Among the delegates listed were Wm. Everts, chairman of the New York delegation, the notorious Tom Hyer, ex-Governor King, ex-Governor Fish, and General Nye.

"The Detroit Light Guard Band played 'Hail Columbia' as the passengers passed from train to the ferryboat *Union* and the large body of Republicans who were on hand from this side of the river made the welkin ring with cheers of welcome. The passengers, while eating the splendid dinner prepared for them on the *Union* * * * were entertained by the Light Guard Band, and as soon as the steamer * * * under the command of Capt. Henry Abbot, neared the Michigan Central docks, the guns boomed and cheer after cheer went up for Wm. H. Seward and the

delegations. As soon as the boat reached the dock, a rush was made for the Central train, composed of six large coaches, and all hands were seated. About two-thirds of the delegates wore Seward badges and a large silk banner, bearing upon its face a portrait of the New York statesman, was borne aloft by the accompanying New York delegation. The sight of the banner caused much enthusiasm. The feeling for Seward is very strong in all delegations. There being a few minutes to spare in the Michigan Central Depot, the Boston band played some national airs and Gen. Nye said a few words expressing the hope that he would on his return be able to stop at Detroit, and assist in ratifying the nomination of Seward. The train moved off at about 1 o'clock. The time to be made in about 8½ hours."

The newspaper accounts of the next 2 days told of the excursion trains moving across Michigan at 40 miles an hour with demonstrations "at every stopping place." One train left Detroit with six coaches "densely crowded" and arrived in Chicago with twelve coaches. Several trains embarked from Detroit with four to six coaches. We can imagine the gay scenes as the trains, loaded with delegates and visitors, banners and flags festooning the engine and cars. "Cannons and banners met the train at all principal stations." Jackson, the birthplace of the Republican Party, must have put on a real show, with Austin Blair, chairman of the State delegation, and soon to become Governor, making a speech at the station.

"On the line of the road, the greatest excitement prevailed. In the cities, in the villages, in the hamlets, in the fields, and on the road, whether the train waited at a station or glided like a mete on by, waving handkerchiefs, swinging 'tiles' (high silk hats) and shouting throats gave evidence of the deep sympathy universally felt in the cause and a Godspeed to the mission which it was bound. Those expressions were always responded to by the delegation."

From the Kalamazoo Telegraph a dispatch to the Tribune gave this interesting sidelight:

"Master Mechanic Sweet rode all the way to Marshall on the cowcatcher * * * and invited others to ride but no one accepted. * * * The train made five stops—Ann Arbor, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Niles and Calumet (Indiana). At Marshall the train changed engines at full speed. The Challenge raced ahead * * * the Racer started on * * * the train in pursuit of the new locomotive and without slackening speed the two were united without jar or confusion way to the west of Marshall. The same feat was also performed at Michigan City. * * * Tom Hyer raised \$75.89 as a purse for the four engineers among the passengers."

The Detroit Daily Advertiser reported that the delegation from Hillsdale brought a curiosity made by J. D. Meers of that city, "a chair made from 24 different kinds of wood—one kind to represent each State represented in the Convention, and to be presented to the successful candidate for President."

The Niles Republican of May 19 related: "The delegates from the New England States to the Chicago convention passed through this place on Monday en route to the Chicago Black Republican Convention. Speeches were made and cannon were fired. Massachusetts delegates were there full of treason abroad as at home. * * * The New York delegation wore Seward badges. Tom Hyer, the bully, accompanied the delegation to protect them. One of them got left by the cars and he had an opportunity to cool off in a strong anti-Seward city."

From further remarks, it can be deduced that the Niles Republican, despite its name, was a strong Democratic paper.

But the Detroit Tribune paused in its description of the gaiety to sound a sober

note. "The common bond of the party is opposition to the extension of slavery in the Territories of the Union. * * * With five new Territories now awaiting organization and five more organized and still maintaining a territorial form of government, these are the strongest reasons presented why the Republican Party should be specially true to its early policy in relation to the exclusion of slavery from the Territories and the Union."

One of the rarities uncovered from the files of the Detroit Tribune was a Seward song, "On the excursion from Portland to Chicago by the Grand Trunk and Michigan Central Rail Roads" to the tune of the "Star Spangled Banner."

"The Great Bridge is finished, 'Victoria' its name,

So wood up the tender and let loose the brakes,

The engine is ready we start with the train,
From the gem of the sea to the queen of the lakes,

To Chicago we dash with the speed of the wind,

More swift than the bird with the dark raven wing,

Leaving ocean, and city, and mountain behind,

For the prairies that bloom in the verdure of spring.

"Then gather in strength then ye men of the North,

Light the watch fires of freedom from seashore to mountain,

From East, South, and West, go gallantly forth,

Up the Father of Waters, from outlet to fountain,

In liberty's voice shall the Nation rejoice,

As the sons follow right in their father's first choice,

And the white flag of freedom waves proudly and free,

From the queen of the lakes to the gem of the sea.

"The heart of the Nation beats full, free, and strong,

For freedom and justice let all men unite,
While the Empire State speaks in defiance of wrong,

And the Keystone stands firm in defense of the right.

No slave-driver's whip shall subdue the Northwest,

Or taskmaster's footsteps pollute the fresh sod,

For New England is ready to join with the West

In devotion to duty, to freedom, and God.

"If Seward or westward we following chase
Or Fremont or Fessenden lead in the race,
We pledge to the cause our thought and our days,

And follow our leader and honor the man.
Our triumph shall cease when New York's finest son,

The ablest of statesmen, the purest of men,
Shall proclaim to the Nation our victory won,

And peace and content must resume their mild reign.

"So harness the steam horse and fill up the car,

We sweep to Chicago, we annihilate space,
By the river of Erie, the distance so far,
Is spanned in 2 days of this wonderful race.

The sea and the West are united in one,
So fill up the firebox and lower the brakes,

We sweep to the West with the speed of the sun,

From the gem of the sea, to the queen of the lakes."

Whether this song was actually sung is doubtful, but certainly we can be sure that Seward's name was on every lip, and his name must have found its way into more than one melody of the day.

Thus did these trains and others bring 3,000 delegates and visitors from Michigan to Chicago—"all of the finest, and truest, and most earnest kind, and all Seward Republicans, from the crown of their heads to the soles of their feet, first, last and all the time."

Chicago was then a city of only 100,000 inhabitants, and a very young city at that. When Lincoln came to Illinois only 30 years before, the State was but sparsely inhabited, and Chicago but a village. Even in 1860 the State was just emerging from a pioneer prairie wilderness, and much of its land was still to be cultivated.

As the delegations arrived at the 12th Street depot in Chicago, they were greeted with a rousing reception. A Chicago paper reported that the "depots beat like great hearts with their living tides * * * a brilliant festival * * * an army with banners."

The accounts go on, "Michigan Avenue was finely illuminated, and as the train neared the 12th Street depot, a brilliant rocket announced it to the crowd. Another rocket streamed from Jackson Street; a cannon boomed across the basin; the bands struck up, and hearty cheers from the thousands of throats welcomed the train now nearing the depot. And the Wide Awakes (the Republican marching societies of young men) with gleaming torches, as well as the crowd, took up their line of march."

The delegates were escorted to the Adams House by the Seward men with torches blazing and bands beating a martial air. If there was any travel weariness in the bones of the delegates, it was soon washed away in the tide of the joyous welcome.

The 42 hotels and innumerable boarding houses in Chicago were jammed with upward of 30,000 visitors. One account stated that the population of the city doubled. The more than 1,000 saloons and grog shops did a land-office business, although one reporter claimed seriously, "We have yet to meet the first individual with any appearance of intoxication." Men slept in hotel lobbies, on pool tables, and wherever they might lay their weary heads.

The eve of the convention found Seward leading all the straw votes. Reports of polls taken on the trains indicated he was far ahead. Even the Democratic Detroit Free Press advised its readers that in the forthcoming "Black Republican Convention" "Seward will lead, Bates will come next, Mr. Chase will run third, Mr. Cameron next, and then Mr. Lincoln." But the possibility of Seward's nomination caused many to tremble, and the Detroit Tribune of May 17 editorialized that "the fact that a majority of the convention is in favor of Seward no one denies, but it is also certain that a majority of the convention look fearfully to the election in case he is nominated."

This was the crux of the situation. They must nominate a man who could carry the "doubtful" States—solidify the East with the Midwest—and satisfy the overwhelming ambitions of the various candidates and their powerful backers. But, interestingly enough, in the same paper in which the Tribune announced the nomination of Lincoln, it carried an item from its correspondent in Chicago that "Seward will receive 200 votes on the first ballot, and I do not think it possible to beat him, and yet there may be such a combination to do it."

The convention was held in the Wigwam, an auditorium expressly built for the purpose by a group of Chicago citizens and decorated by a committee of local ladies. It was a wooden structure, two stories high, and measured 100 by 160 feet. By our modern standards, this would be a small build-

ing, but for that day it was huge. But large or small, it was able to hold more than 10,000 people. The Detroit Daily Advertiser cites a very careful account of the number inside the building on the day of the nomination.

In the galleries.....	3,550
On the stand.....	980
Under the galleries.....	5,870
On the stairs.....	650
Within the railing.....	1,100
Total.....	12,150

And "outside the building stood an earnest impatient excited crowd of 12,000 men, making the whole number of persons in the Wigwam and around it nearly 24,000."

The building was designed to take advantage of a slope in the land by providing a series of landings on which the spectators stood "jammed in so tightly that they could scarcely move." At the rear of the hall was a wide platform on which were seated over 500 delegates and newsmen. Running around three sides of the building was a gallery so pitched that "from every part a perfect view of the stage could be had." Here sat the ladies with their gentlemen who had accompanied them, and although designed to seat 1,200, the preceding report indicates that it was extremely crowded. One reporter counted 5,800 in this section.

There were amusing tales of men bribing women to take them into the gallery to meet the rule that men were allowed only in the company of the ladies.

There was the story of the Irish washerwoman who, seeing the gentleman to his seat, retired with her bundle and her fee. However, when an Indian squaw who was selling moccasins outside was pressed into service, it was more than the doorkeepers could stand. They decided that she was no lady.

The committee of Chicago ladies decorated the interior of the Wigwam with wreaths of evergreen and other festoons. It is said that some of the evergreens were brought by one of Charles Mear's ships from his logging camp on the west coast of Michigan. Colossal statuary paintings on arched panels decorated the back of the stage. On the sides of the pillars supporting the roof were pictures of famous and distinguished men. The auditorium was lighted with gas which made it "brilliant in the extreme."

Telegraph was used for the first time at a national convention, and wires were extended into the building so that reports of the convention could be sent by an operator who was seated among the reporters on the stage.

On the opening day of the convention, the Advertiser reported that "20,000 people assembled around the Wigwam waiting for it to open and when it was thrown open the rush for the inside was like the breaking loose of a mighty river. In 3 minutes after the main entrances were thrown open, not less than five thousand people entered the hall, running and leaping like men fleeing from some great danger."

The Detroit Free Press stated that "the morning opens with much excitement. The streets are crowded, and several processions have been formed, headed by bands of music. By invitation of the Michigan delegation, the New York delegates and visitors gathered at the Adams House to march together to the Wigwam. The procession was a striking feature of the morning. They marched in sections of four, consisting of two New Yorkers and two Michigan men, numbering between 3,000 and 4,000, all wearing badges inscribed 'New York Republican Association,' 'Michigan Republican Association,' and with the name of Seward for President, a banner with Seward's likeness being carried at the head."

The proceedings of the first day, May 16, were typical of political conventions. Little

transpired of interest unless it was the long debate concerning whether the convention should accept the invitation of the Chicago Board of Trade to entertain the delegates with an excursion ride on the lake, an event which would have interfered with the evening session.

The morning session of the second day, May 17, was taken up with the familiar reports of standing committees and the arguments pertaining to the seating of delegates. The slave-holding States were very nearly unseated, and the redoubtable Cassius Clay led the fight to see the border delegates take their place in the balloting. In the afternoon, the convention was aroused by the report of the platform committee which failed to include a reference to the Declaration of Independence. Battle-scarred old Joshua Giddings, of Ohio, a veteran of the antislavery fight, "took a walk" after an impassioned oration demanding that it be included. Then Delegate Curtis of New York made an eloquent speech that resulted in the insertion of the phrase "that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, etc.," and "venerable Giddings returned to the convention amid a great ovation."

When the platform was adopted there was a wild demonstration for about 10 or 15 minutes. When this had subsided, a motion was made to nominate a candidate for the presidency.

This, it is claimed, was the crucial point of the convention. If the nominations had proceeded, Seward would likely have been nominated on the first ballot. But, it was announced from the rostrum that the tallies necessary for recording the vote were not ready and that there would be a slight delay. At this point, a "voice" from somewhere was heard "moving that this convention adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Thus was Abraham Lincoln saved for the great victory.

All that night the State delegations met in caucus. Judge David Davis, of Illinois, Lincoln's manager, strove with his coworkers to mend their political fences. Despite Lincoln's refusal to be bound by any deals, Senator Cameron, of Pennsylvania, was promised a Cabinet post. Other promises were made, and the doubtful States were one by one brought into the Lincoln camp. Horace Greeley, the famous New York publisher, shunned by the New York delegation and seated as a delegate by proxy from Oregon, of all places, worked among the Eastern States to defeat Seward. Many began to see now that Seward could not win the election without the support of the powerful Northern States. The cocksure attitude of the Seward crowd was becoming a deterrent. The fact that it had appeared that he had the nomination "sewed up" was working against him. Thurlow Weed and his cronies had done their work too well.

That night Ward Hill Lamon and Jesse Fell, of Illinois, arranged for the printing of a large number of additional tickets and distributed them to the Lincoln men. The next morning, May 18, they lined up early and entered the Wigwam and filled the visitors seats. When the Seward crowd marched gaily to the doors, they found that they could not get in. If Illinois could not out-vote Seward, they were determined to out-shout him. "A Chicagoan reputedly able to shout across Lake Michigan was enlisted to take a strategic position in the hall and to bellow lustily whenever he received the signal. Another man, equally endowed, was placed in another part of the hall."

The conventions of that day were saved the long and dreary nominating speeches that must be endured today. Following Seward's nomination, Mr. Judd of Illinois said simply, "I desire, on behalf of the delegation from Illinois to put in nomination as a candidate for President of the United States,

Abraham Lincoln of Illinois." The other candidates were duly nominated and equally brief seconding speeches made, including that of Austin Blair of Michigan in behalf of Seward.

But the short speeches did not limit the demonstrations. The applause grew into cheers, then prodigious shrieks, and then pandemonium. Murat Halstead reports it thus: "Hundreds of persons stopped their ears in pain. The shouting was absolutely frantic, shrill, and wild. No Commanches or panthers ever struck a higher note or gave a scream of more infernal intensity. Thousands of hats flew over the hall * * * when Lincoln's nomination was seconded, the uproar was beyond description. Imagine all the hogs ever slaughtered in Cincinnati giving their death squeals together, and a score of big steam whistles going together, and you conceive something of the same nature. The Lincoln boys * * * took deep breaths all around and gave a concentrated shriek that was positively awful, and accompanied it with stamping that made every plank and pillar in the building quiver."

Then came the rollcall—233 votes out of a possible 465 were necessary for a choice. Seward received 173½, Lincoln 102, Cameron of Pennsylvania 50½, Chase 49, and "others scattering." Michigan cast its 12 votes for Seward.

Proceeding to the second ballot, Cameron withdrew. Seward polled 184½, a gain of 11 votes, but Lincoln tallied 181, a gain of 79.

As the third ballot began, the crowd became silent, and many watched their own tally sheets as the voting progressed. When every vote was counted, Seward had 180, but Lincoln polled 231½, only one and a half votes shy of nomination.

Joseph Medill of Chicago who had seated himself in the Ohio delegation, leaned over to whisper to David Cartter, chairman of the Ohioans: "If you can throw the Ohio delegation to Lincoln, Chase can have anything he wants." Cartter, a stammerer, bounded up excitedly: "I I a-rise, Mr. Chairman, to a-announce the ch-change of f-four votes from Mr. Ch-Chase to Mr. L-L-Lincoln."

The Chicago Tribune reported: "Deafening roar of stentorian applause arose from the immense multitude such as had never been equalled on the American Continent nor since the day that the walls of Jericho were blown down." A signal was given to the men on the roof, and the news was given to the crowd outside. A cannon fired a salute, and the crowd of 20,000 on the street greeted the news with a roar that could be heard above the din inside.

The Lincoln men were jubilant. The Seward adherents were crushed. But as the States, one by one, rushed to join the winning side, Mr. Evarts of New York moved that the nomination be made unanimous. Carl Schurz of Wisconsin and Austin Blair of Michigan joined in seconding the motion, and Blair made a "touching and effective speech."

"Like my friend who has just taken his seat (Schurz) the State of Michigan from first to last, has cast her vote for the great statesman of New York. She has nothing to take back. She has not sent me forward to worship the rising sun, but she has put me forward to say that, at your behest here today, she lays down her first, best beloved candidate to take up yours, with some beating of the heart, with some quivering in the veins (much applause) but she does not fear that the fame of Seward will suffer, for she knows that his fame is a portion of the history of the American Nation; it will be written and read, and beloved long after the temporary excitement of this day has passed away. We stand by him still. We have followed him with a single eye and with unwavering faith in times past. We marshal now behind him in the grand column which

shall go out to battle of Abram (sic) Lincoln of Illinois. Mark you, what has obtained today will obtain in November next.

Lincoln will be elected by the people. We say of our candidate, God bless his magnanimous soul. [Tremendous applause.] I promise you that in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, where the Republican Party from the days of its organization to this hour never suffered a single defeat, we will give you for the gallant son of Illinois, and glorious standard bearer of the West, a round 25,000 majority."

In Detroit the Democratic Free Press commented that all the black Republicans were down in the mouth at the nomination of a man who was beaten by Douglas and "whose reputation as a beaten candidate would not desert him for years."

The Republican Detroit Daily Advertiser stated "that it took by surprise the majority of citizens * * * who had confidently expected the nomination of Seward." But it added that "the wisdom of the choice was readily seen and acknowledged. As soon as the nomination of Mr. Lincoln was confirmed by subsequent dispatches, without waiting for a choice for candidate for the Vice President, extensive preparations were made for celebrating the event in an appropriate manner."

"In less than a half an hour after the reception of the news, the two brass guns of the Frontier Guards had been rolled out on the Campus Martius, and each had been furnished with 50 full cartridges. Later in the evening the whole front of the Advertiser office was brilliantly illuminated and from a central window hung a banner with the words 'Lincoln and Hamlin' in large poster type, inscribed on it. A bonfire was started in the street, just in front of the office. The whole proceedings last night were terminated with one tremendous hurrah for Lincoln and Hamlin."

Around the State there were celebrations and mixed emotions. Owosso fired 100 guns, Kalamazoo 50 guns, and Pontiac, presumably less enchanted or short of powder, fired 33 salutes.

The returning delegations from Michigan met with mixed receptions. The Niles Republican cited the reception of Delegate Francis Quinn:

"Longer faces were never seen on Main Street. 'Abominable,' said one. 'Seward has been beaten by some contemptible trick,' said another. Finally after the elapse of a day or two, Quinn arrived from Chicago. He endeavored to rally the disappointed. He went around to get a subscription of powder. Some of them refused to give a cent. But enough was raised to make about 5 small charges, and handbills appeared announcing there would be a grand ratification meeting on Main Street in front of the Inquirer office. Saturday evening came. A large number of Democrats assembled, as it was in front of where they were to hold a meeting to nominate delegates to the county convention, and several Republicans and numerous boys. There being so few present, it was resolved that they adjourn to Kellogg's Hall. Up they went some one hundred and fifty to hear what excuse Mr. Quinn had to give for the defeat of Seward."

Thos. Starr notes: "So bitter was the anti-Lincoln feeling in Michigan, sponsored by Chandler, that the special train of the Massachusetts delegation to that convention, whose leader, John A. Andrew, won the Wigwam delegates to Lincoln on the third ballot, was all but mobbed at Detroit on its return trip over the Michigan Central Railroad."

In the South, the drums of war were heard more clearly. The gauntlet had been thrown down. The "house was now dividing," and the issue would soon be drawn whether it would be "all one thing or all the other."

In Springfield, Abe Lincoln had walked from home the morning of the nomination to the public square. He visited the office of a friend just returned from the convention and listened to his account of the early proceedings. Later, with one of his friends from the Illinois Journal, he tried to pass the time away at the bowling alley, but the alleys were all busy. They tried to play billiards, but the tables were all engaged. They then went to the newspaper office to hear the reports of the balloting. Shortly before noon, the wire came announcing a great victory. "We did it, glory to God," wired Delegate Knapp. Lincoln shook hands all around and then said:

"There's a little woman over yonder on Eighth Street who is deeply interested in the news. I will carry it to her."

And he might have pondered on the prophetic words of the invocation on that historic day of the convention:

"O, we entreat Thee, that at some future but not distant day, the evils which now invest the body politic, shall not only have been arrested in its progress, but wholly eradicated from the system."

And we might well ponder the concluding sentence: "And may the pen of the historian trace an intimate connection between that glorious consummation and the transaction of the convention."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Roy P. Basler, editor, "The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln."

William E. Barton, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln," volume 1, Indianapolis, 1925, pages 425-435.

Murat Halstead, "Caucuses of 1860," Columbus, Ohio, 1860.

Ward Hill Lamon, "The Life of Abraham Lincoln," Boston, 1872, pages 447-453.

John G. Nicolay, "A Short Life of Abraham Lincoln," New York, 1911, pages 144-151.

John G. Nicolay, and John Hay, "Abraham Lincoln, a History," New York, 1890, volume 2, chapter 15, pages 255-278.

Addison G. Proctor, "Lincoln and the Convention of 1860," the Chicago Historical Society, 1918.

P. Orman Ray, "The Convention That Nominated Lincoln," the Chicago Historical Society, 1916.

Carl Sandburg, "Abraham Lincoln, the Prairie Years," New York, 1926, volume 2, pages 339-352.

Carl Schurz, "The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz," volume 2, New York, 1907, pages 173-188.

Thomas I. Starr, "Lincoln's Kalamazoo Address," Detroit, 1941, pages 30-31.

Benjamin Thomas, "Abraham Lincoln," New York, 1952, pages 210-213.

NEWSPAPERS

Detroit Free Press, 1860.

Detroit Daily Advertiser, 1860.

Detroit Tribune, 1860.

The above found in the files of the Burton Historical Collections, Detroit, Mich. Dr. James Babcock, chief.

Kalamazoo Telegraph, 1860, from the files of the Kalamazoo Public Museum, Alevis A. Praus, director.

Niles Republican, 1860, from the files of the Niles Public Library, courtesy of Mrs. Janet H. Evart, curator, Fort St. Joseph Museum.

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

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

Mr. ROBISON. I want to take just a moment to congratulate and commend all who have taken part in this commemoration. I particularly wish to pay my respects to my friend from Iowa, who has rendered this tribute, for his part in presenting such a beautiful and moving

tribute to Abraham Lincoln, a great Republican and a great American.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the best accounts I have read of Lincoln's nomination in 1860 is the article which Philip Van Doren Stern has written for the NEA Service and which appeared in the Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen recently.

Under permission granted to me, Mr. Speaker, I include the article:

**CANNONS FIRED IN JOY AS LINCOLN NOMINATED
100 YEARS AGO**

(By Philip Van Doren Stern)

When the Democratic National Convention met at Charleston, S.C., in the spring of 1860, the party was so strong that anyone it nominated for the Presidency was automatically elected.

Lincoln's lifelong rival, Stephen A. Douglas, was the obvious favorite. Most people, including Lincoln, thought Douglas would surely be the next President. But Douglas had lost the support of the South, and the Buchanan administration opposed him. The whole political picture changed overnight when the Democratic convention, after dragging on for nearly 2 weeks, adjourned without agreeing upon a nomination.

The historically impregnable party split into dissident groups to hold three separate conventions to nominate three different candidates, making it difficult for any one of them to be elected. The new Republican Party, which had entered the national scene only 4 years before, now had a good chance to elect a President.

The obvious Republican candidate was William H. Seward, former Governor of New York, U.S. Senator, and distinguished member of the bar. There were other possibilities—Chase, of Ohio, Bates, of Missouri, Cameron, of Pennsylvania, and many more. Lincoln was among them, but despite the name he had made for himself with Cooper Union speech and the tour of New England that followed, he was far down on the list although he did admit to a friend that "the taste (for the presidency) is in my mouth a little." When he wrote those words, he knew the Democrats were in trouble.

Something happened then that caught the imagination of the public. Richard James Oglesby, who was to become a Civil War general and the Governor of Illinois, knew John Hanks, cousin of Lincoln's dead mother, Nancy Hanks. John Hanks had seen Lincoln grow up in Indiana and had helped him cut fence rails when the family moved to Illinois in 1830. Oglesby sought him out, and the two men made a trip to a clearing near Decatur to get a few rails from the 30-year-old fence.

On May 9, at the Republican State convention in Decatur, John Hanks, a lifelong Democrat—made a sensation by carrying two of the original Lincoln rails into the hall. Lincoln was there, and he immediately became the "rail-splitter" candidate. The name stuck and became popular.

Being nominated by the Illinois State Republican convention helped, but a long, hard struggle was to be expected at the Chicago national convention on May 16—Seward's 59th birthday.

A huge wooden structure, holding 10,000 people and called the Wigwam, had been built for the convention. To it streamed thousands of visitors, most of whom were unable to get inside the building.

It was a colorful occasion, even more colorful than a presidential convention is today. And since everyone knew that the man chosen might very well become the first Republican President, there was a tense air of expectancy.

The convention was quickly organized; then a platform denying the right to ex-

tend slavery to the territories was adopted. On the third day, May 18, the real business of picking a candidate began.

That morning a thousand of Seward's followers marched to the Wigwam led by a swaggering military band. In the big hall Everts of New York presented Seward's name; Judd of Illinois named Lincoln; other States followed with their favorite sons.

Only Seward and Lincoln got loud applause. When their names were seconded, the applause and cheering rose to a tremendous crescendo. People threw hats and handkerchiefs into the air as the rival backers tried to shout each other. Then, according to an eyewitness, a Lincoln supporter, "Henry Lane of Indiana leaped upon a table, and, swinging hat and cane, performed like an acrobat." He shouted, too, but his voice could not be heard in that mighty uproar.

After that wild outburst, the convention settled down to voting. The first poll gave Seward 173½ votes; Lincoln 102; with the others trailing. Needed for the nomination: 233 out of 465 votes.

A second ballot was taken. Lincoln gained New Hampshire and Vermont, then Pennsylvania. These gave him 181 votes against Seward's 184.

On the third and final ballot Lincoln ran up to 231½ with only 1½ needed to win. Carter of Ohio rose to cast four of his State's votes, and the crowd suddenly became quiet. Carter was known for his stutter, and he stuttered as he spoke:

"I rise—Mr. Chairman—to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase—to—Mr. Lincoln."

The silence held for a brief moment, then the crowd roared out. Someone signaled to a man stationed on the roof with a signal cannon, yelling to him:

"Fire the salute. Abe Lincoln is nominated."

The cannon told thousands of people outside what had happened, and the Wigwam was suddenly surrounded by a sea of noise. The roar of the crowd was punctuated by the resounding boom of exploding gunpowder as the cannon was fired, reloaded, and fired again and again.

The smell of gunpowder drifted down to the people outside; it came in through the open doors of the Wigwam, and hung heavily in the spring air.

The acrid odor was soon to become familiar to many of the young men who were shouting their heads off in Chicago that day. And they would hear the sound of cannon again. Sumter was less than a year away.

Mr. Speaker, adding to the significance of this event is an address on Abraham Lincoln which was made last year by Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University. The address was made before the Michigan Legislature as part of the sesquicentennial observance of Lincoln's birth and it certainly has a place among the words which have been spoken today. Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD as a part of these proceedings, as follows:

AN ADDRESS ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN BY DR. MORDECAI W. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE JOINT CONVENTION OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

(Foreword by Hon. Louis C. Cramton, Representative from Lapeer County: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, members of the senate and house of representatives of Michigan, through this joint session of the senate and house of representatives of the State of Michigan, which in 1861-65 gave such loyal and heroic support to Abraham Lincoln in his wise and courageous

leadership in our Nation's greatest crisis, in his demonstration of the capacity of this Nation to rule itself, joins with the Nation and the wide world today in paying tribute to him as the exponent of real democracy, the worldwide symbol for human freedom. It was 150 years ago today that this great leader was born. On this great occasion we are highly privileged to have with us to voice the day's message, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, Washington, D.C., a great institution, with worldwide influence; himself a splendid example of the rich heritage of human capacity and vision his race has brought to the world since Abraham Lincoln's leadership made this Nation actually a nation of free men. It is my privilege to present to you my very generous friend, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, who will give to us today's address.)

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cramton, distinguished members of the Senate and House of the great State of Michigan, I am deeply grateful to you for the privilege which you give me today of joining you in meditative appreciation of our great leader, Abraham Lincoln—the man whose name is the greatest of all names connected with popular government in the history of the world. I have come to you today, bearing in my heart a deep sense of personal indebtedness to this man, for I am a child of slaves. My father was a slave and my mother was born a slave. Both of them were set free by Abraham Lincoln. Along with the deep sense of debt which I bear in my heart toward him is another which is akin to it, namely, the sense of debt which I bear toward you and for your kindred in this State who, under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, made so very large an investment of devotion and suffering in that cause which made it possible for us to be free. I know that if that humble minority to which I belong could be aware that I am here today they would want me to tell you that they will never forget these things. They will remember the name of Abraham Lincoln and the citizens of these free States as long as they live, and they will cherish these revered memories and hand them down to their children and their children's children until the end of time.

I want to thank the members of this senate and house because your interest in this minority is still vibrantly alive. In recent years you have responded in a wonderful manner to the leadership of the Honorable Louis C. Cramton in the house, by crossing all party lines to establish a Fair Employment Practices Act in this State, which undertakes to provide an open door of economic opportunity for every citizen, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. Several years ago I had the privilege of coming here to attend a banquet which was given in honor of Mr. Cramton, at which time outstanding Members of this body and your distinguished Governor heaped honors upon him for his diligent and unwearied devotion to the passage of this Fair Employment Practices Act and for the outstanding character of his devotion to the public good. My heart throbbed with joy at this banquet, for I have known and loved Mr. Cramton for 32 years. He is the best living example of Abraham Lincoln whom I know of in this world.

In undertaking to talk with you about Abraham Lincoln today I must approach him from that angle of his life which interests me most deeply. I am a teacher of young men and women. Among my graduates who give me greatest pride are a few who have become distinguished servants of humanity in the field of the public life. I am always searching for those qualities in men of distinction which have proved effective in the public life, hoping to be able to speak with my students about those qualities in such wise as to cause them to

study and to reflect upon them, with the purpose of making these qualities a part of the basic ingredients of their lives. Of all the men in the public life of the world who have deeply impressed me in this respect, Abraham Lincoln is one who grows on my affections year by year. The qualities of his heart and mind are remarkable, beyond measure, in their fitness and power to sustain and to transform the institutions of the democratic public life. Now if you will remember that this is a school teacher and a child of slaves talking with you, having perhaps a bigger message in his heart than he is able fully to articulate, you will try to think with me as I speak. In this way your own intuitions will supplement what I have to say and may turn an otherwise stumbling effort into a matter of power.

For the purposes of our mediation I want to divide the life of Abraham Lincoln into three periods. The first period, from 1809 to 1854, I would call the period of preparation during which his great personal powers were in the making. The second period, from 1854 to 1860, I would call the period of political creation, in which, under great difficulties, he nourished and brought to leadership in the Nation a political vehicle of decisive power. The third period, from 1861 to 1865, the period of victorious achievement, during which, under the pressure of violence, suffering, and death he obtained the great political ends for which the world reveres him—the emancipation of the slaves and the preservation of the Union.

THE FIRST PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE 1809-54

The great work of emancipating the slaves and the preservation of the Union, for which Abraham Lincoln will be remembered throughout the ages, was done in the last of the three periods from 1861-65, and the decisive political events preceding this great work were brought to pass in the period from 1854 to 1860. It has been customary to pass over this first period of 45 years in a cursory manner as if it were really of very little importance. It appears that Abraham Lincoln himself rather thought of it in this way. He was a man who spent very little time thinking about the days of his boyhood and early manhood. When people tried to make a great deal of it, he said, "Why, it is a great folly to attempt to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be condensed into a single sentence, and that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy: 'The short and simple annals of the poor.'" When an effort was made, just before he became President of the United States, to have him speak about this period at great length, he did consent one time to sum it up in 500 words. He wrote these words as though his real life had begun in 1854. He spoke of the limited heritage which he received from his parents. His father and mother were poor. He was born in a log cabin and lived under very crude conditions in frontier communities of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois where there were many animals and few men. His father was a man of little learning, and in his own boyhood he had little chance for schooling. There was only a very simple three-R school with very poor teachers available, and he was able to get only about 12 months of schooling in that. He confessed that when he was about 21 years of age he did not know very much, and that thereafter he never had a chance to learn, except by his own efforts. He reviewed the two or three little jobs he had. He mentions with some pride and joy his experience as a captain in the Black Hawk War. He calls very brief attention to his three terms in the State legislature and his one term in Congress, speaking of them as if these terms of office had yielded very little satisfaction, because he left them both for the practice of law in the small towns and

country circuits, not presenting himself again for either State or national office. He described himself modestly as a man 6 feet 4 inches tall, but he did not tell you that he was also a gangling, loose-jointed, long-legged man, with long arms and big hands, a great big head, with serious lines in his face, deep and melancholy. He probably wore his clothes as if his trousers were unpressed and coat hanging loose, as long as he lived. He was just an ordinary man. One of those who knew him well says, lately, that the father of his wife spoke of him with derogation as being a man of "the poor white trash" whom he did not want his daughter to marry. In fact, that is the way he would have been classified if he had lived in Virginia whence his father and mother came.

But there was a whole lot more to the life of Abraham Lincoln in those first 45 years than he himself took time to mention. For in those 45 years this man developed by his own efforts one of the most powerful groups of qualifications for political leadership ever to be found in history. These are the qualities which made him the power that he was from 1854 to 1861, when he became President of the United States, and which led him in the years 1861 to 1865 to become the Emancipator of the slaves and the preserver of the Union.

A VIVID AND POWERFUL ETHICAL DISPOSITION

Now what are those qualities? First of all, Abraham Lincoln developed in those early years a vivid and powerful ethical disposition which he made radically applicable to every human being whom he touched—whatever his race, color, creed, sex, or national origin—and he extended it even to animals. He was especially sensitive in the presence of cruelty, either to men or animals, and often found it impossible to pass by an animal in distress.

This was no quality merely given to him. Maybe the greatest part—the instinctive part—was given to him, but he cultivated the rest of it deliberately and thoughtfully. He had the same experience that most of us have when we pass by a man or an animal suffering from cruelty or distress. He got a message from his heart which told him: "This is your kinsman and he is hurt. Are you going to help him?" Again and again in his life he tried to pass by, but again and again he would come back deliberately, thoughtfully, and help that man or help that animal. He kept this up constantly until it became an habitual disposition of his life, and it never weakened until the day he died. He was never able to look on cruelty complacently. He was never able to look at men and women who suffered from any unjust cause without feeling identified with them. This is where he got his great conviction that slavery was wrong, that the cruelty connected with slavery was wrong, that a cruel thing like this had no business to exist on this earth, and that somehow or other it ought to be done away with. There is no place on record where he ever said anything different from that. He said it over and over again, because it was a considered judgment, arising from the heart, confirmed by the reflections of deliberate intelligence and nourished as a part of his life.

A THOROUGH ACCEPTANCE OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

In the second place, Abraham Lincoln was a man who had a thorough grasp of the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, and he accepted the radically transitive universal ethics of that Declaration of Independence with all his heart. I do not mean merely that he accepted it intellectually. He accepted it as a part of his very being. Abraham Lincoln had one of the most precious habits that a man can have in this world—the habit of prolonged aloneness in meditation and in thought. Being impressed by the

language of the Declaration of Independence, for example, he would go off with it by himself, or he would sit alone by the fire when there was no one at home but himself or when other people were sleeping. Then, wrapping his long legs around the chair and putting his arms on the back of the chair, he would read the words alone, asking himself, "Now, just what was it that these men had in mind when they wrote these words?" Of all the politically significant words written on paper, these were the most precious to him:

"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 it or to abolish it, and to institute a new government."

These words he turned over and over in his mind until the spirit of them possessed him through and through, and until he felt the electric possibilities of them in all the aspects of his being—intellectual, moral, and spiritual. Of these words he said, "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but I hope to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men."

Whenever you hear him speak about "the Union" this is what he is talking about. He is never talking merely about the physical union of men in the physical territory of the United States. He is talking about that Union "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—the most hopeful community of life, the most powerful community of life, the most creative community of life in the world. And when he said that, above all things, he wished to preserve the Union, this is what he meant. He felt that these words of the Declaration of Independence were the electric cord sweeping through the entire Declaration of Independence, the foundation and inspiration of the Constitution of the United States, and that there was no cruelty, no evil, no neglect of human rights or human welfare that could long endure in the presence of their moving and cleansing power.

A MASTERFUL POWER OF COMMUNICATION

In the third place, Abraham Lincoln acquired in early life a masterful power of communication. In all the history of public political speech there is no man in this country who ever had a greater power than Abraham Lincoln. It was an intellectual power, because he was a thoughtful man who gathered his facts and arranged his arguments with great care. He carefully studied grammar. He studied the language of the Bible and pondered it and absorbed it in his system. He studied mathematics, not in order that he might become a mathematician, but that he might reason precisely, consecutively, and with a clear and powerful relatedness. But there was something more than intellectual power in his speaking. There was a moral power and often persuasive moral beauty in what he said. He respected and loved the people to whom he was speaking. He believed in the capacity of the most ordinary man to understand the most profound ethical and political truths, if he needed them for his life. And when he spoke to such men he was not making an oration of words. He was speaking what he deeply believed. He was speaking directly and simply as if the fate of the World were depending upon his being understood.

Sometimes when he spoke his rugged, melancholy face would light up like a lamp and throw a glow of persuasive beauty to the very ends of the auditorium. People loved him, believed in him, flocked to him, because he bought their allegiance with the gold of sincerity and clarity that came to them from a pure heart.

HABITUALLY SIMPLE AND TRUTHFUL IN INDIVIDUAL RELATIONS

Another of his great qualities—the fourth—was his habituation of himself in his actions to simple and truthful relationships with individual human beings. You can see this nowhere better than in his practice of the law. If a client had a crooked or an unjust case, he would not take it if he knew it beforehand. If he took the case and found out afterwards that the cause was crooked or unjust, he would do everything consistent with the law to get out of it. He was helpless to use his best powers in the presence of the necessity to defend cruelty or crookedness. But if you had an honest case, very often the first thing he would try to do was to see whether he could adjust it without going into court, and especially if the case involved cruelty and injustice, he would put his whole life and soul into that case. He would address himself to the jury in simple, direct, and unadorned speech, and when he came to the cruelty involved, his language would sometimes burn with a fire of indignation as if to scorch the very ground on which he stood. And when he had finished, what did he charge you? Just about what it would take to buy the groceries and to take care of the most ordinary expenses of living. He did not take your case for the accumulation of money. He took it for the joy of setting things right, for the privilege of being vehicular toward the establishment of justice.

A SENSE OF HAVING GREAT UNSPENT POWER

Along toward the end of this preparatory period of his life, the fifth quality developed within him, which is remarkable to think about: he developed a sense of having great unspent power and a sense of melancholy distress because that power in him had never had a chance to be used up fully in some great cause. He walked about conscious of that power and with the feeling that some day the occasion would arise when he would use it for everything that he had in him. He respected that occasion and looked toward it, afar off, with melancholy hope, and because he respected that far off occasion, he never would sell his powers cheaply. He would not sell them for money. He was a poor man and the powers he had could have made him a great corporation lawyer and could have gotten him riches quickly, if he had gone to the big city; but he knew that what he had was too precious for money and he would not sell it so. He would not sell it either in order to cheat people out of their votes. In the first election in which he ever sought office, he said simply, "I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by my friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high protective tariff. These are my sentiments. If elected, I shall be thankful, if not it will be the same." And although he went to the State capital three times and to Congress once, as the elected representative of the people, he quit them both with very great dissatisfaction of heart, because he was occupying political power and moving about among men who accepted political power without having any great cause at stake. For him to be in political office with no great cause to use up his powers, was too cheap an occupation. He did not like it. He did not want it. He

stayed at home, nourishing his powers, waiting for a great and worthy day to come.

Now I want to suggest that here in this preparatory period of his life Abraham Lincoln developed five of the greatest possible human qualities: (1) A vivid and powerful ethical disposition, livingly applied to every type of human being, urging him to respect them, to deal truthfully with them and to allow his compassion to go out to them whenever they were cruelly treated or left alone with struggles that they could not endure; (2) a wholehearted devotion to the Declaration of Independence, so that the city of justice which he saw when he read it lived in his mind's eye like a city built by God. He longed to be of great use to that city, and would rather have died than to have betrayed it; (3) remarkable powers of communication: simple and direct speech to people whom he loved, unadorned and never mixed with deceit; the marshaling of facts accurately and honorably, the drawing of conclusions with inexorable logic; reverent of truth, and at times throbbing with a passionate devotion to justice which caused his face to radiate with hope and expectancy; (4) a sustained habit of simplicity and truthfulness in his everyday actions affecting ordinary people. When he practiced law in a circuit of 14 different counties, he met and served a multitude of men whose names were without celebrity of any kind. He saluted them with courtesy, served them truthfully and honorably, loved them and enjoyed their trust. They called him "Honest Abe" and knew that he was a man who was utterly reliable, who when he gave his word meant what he said and would do it, whatever it cost him in time or effort or money; (5) a great sense of power residing in him—intellectual power, moral power, spiritual power looked up with an immense energy of devotion—but power waiting for a great and worthy occasion of use, not to be sold cheaply, not to be used for the heaping up of money, nor merely to buy high office. There was only one piece of goods he wanted most eagerly to buy—a great cause that would consume his powers as a great fire consumes wood. That cause came to him in 1854 when the Missouri Compromise was repealed. The whole country was shocked with a sense of crises that swept like wildfire into every State of the North and it swept into the heart of Abraham Lincoln. He knew that his hour had come. At once he laid aside everything and straightway went where he could place himself at the disposal of a powerful inward necessity to strengthen the people in this crisis, for the life and death struggle between slavery and the Union which he loved.

SECOND PERIOD OF LINCOLN'S LIFE—1854-60

One who reads the history of the second period of Abraham Lincoln's life, from 1854 to 1860 will find him giving an unparalleled devotion to political action. First of all, he made a decisive change in party allegiance. He was a Whig, but he saw that the struggle with slavery required something better than the split allegiance of Whiggism. He looked at the Democrat Party and saw that it had kneeled beyond recovery to the slave system. He looked at the possibility of coalition across the Whig and Democrat lines, and he saw the weakest, the most flabby, the most untrustworthy combinations of men on the basis of self-interest, and his heart repudiated what he saw. He looked around again and saw a new party, with only 120,000 votes over the entire Nation, but it had a program. It said in effect: "Our program has just two parts. One: slavery is wrong; two: we are going to stop it. We are going to leave it in the States where it is already established, because the Constitution provides that it has a right to be there, but we are going to shut the door to all the western territories, and not a step in that direction

will it be allowed to advance." Abraham Lincoln liked that program. It was simple. It was unequivocal. It corresponded to the way he felt about slavery, corresponded to what he thought about the preservation of the Union. It constituted a cause to which he could devote all his powers. And this he unreservedly did.

SINGLE-MINDED AND IMMEASURABLE POLITICAL DEVOTION

Lincoln was not blind. He knew that it would normally take over two million votes to bring a party to national power in this country, but the difference between 120,000 votes and 2 million votes was not big enough to overawe him. He felt and knew that he was a man of power and that with the help of God he and his earnest associates, with single-mindedness devotion, could make up that difference. This capacity for single-minded and immeasurable devotion Abraham Lincoln most certainly had. In the history of parties in this country there is nowhere a record of devotion superior to that which this man Lincoln put into the building of the Republican Party between the years 1854 and 1860. In this undertaking he subordinated entirely his personal ambition to hold political office. He saw with clear eyes that unless a party devoting its whole life unequivocally to the restriction of the growth of the slave system and the deliverance of the Union from the danger of dominance by that system, could be brought to effective power, no office would be fit to have. And so when public office was set before him again and again he would not take it. "I have a duty to perform," he thought, "I must do everything in my power to put this party into shape to come to power. This is the power that alone can be decisive". Three times in 2 years he sacrificed his own personal ambition to put somebody else ahead of him because he believed it to be good for the party.

UTMOST USE OF HIS POWERS OF COMMUNICATION

He put all of his remarkable powers of communication at the disposal of his cause. He sought out and obtained direct confrontation with Douglas, the greatest proponent of slavery, and conducted a series of debates with him, which turned out to be one of the most determinative debates ever carried on in the world. He took the program of the Republican Party and expounded it from every helpful angle that deep moral conviction and logic could conceive; he defended it from every angle that sincerity and logic could command, until by his convictions and his thought he had established it in an impregnable and persuasive position.

When he began this series of debates and speeches in the Illinois senatorial campaign in 1858 he was scarcely known outside of Illinois. When he had completed them, the most intelligent and resourceful men on the eastern seaboard sent for this man of the one-horse towns and crowded Cooper Union in New York to hear him. If ever there were any of us who felt contemptuous toward a man of no university education—toward a poor man of no cultural family background and no university education—let us read again this speech produced by one who was called "the poor white trash." Let us read again his powerful putting together of historic facts; let us read again the masterful analysis of the arguments of the supporters of the slave system; let us observe again the intellectual power and moral sagacity with which he reduced the whole thesis of the slave masters to a demand that slavery henceforth be considered not only lawful but right. Then let us behold this gangling awkward son of the frontier, ignited from the depths of his being by moral conviction about the wrongness of slavery and its fateful danger to the Union,

and with his rude melancholy face glowing with persuasive light, holding this great audience of intelligent and resourceful New Yorkers and easterners in all but breathless silence, as he commandingly called them to put aside everything and support this Republican movement with all their hearts to halt the onward march of this wrong and evil thing and to put it in a place where it could no longer imperil the life of the Union. Here indeed, once again from the humblest depths of life, there had come a man of intellectual, moral, and spiritual power of the highest significance for all mankind.

AN UNCANNY SENSE OF STRATEGY

There is just one more quality appearing in this second period of Abraham Lincoln's life which I wish to comment upon. The man acquired an uncanny sense of strategy. In the Illinois senatorial elections of 1858, he daringly followed this sense of strategy against the advice of all his friends, in a manner which was decisive in securing the national political victory of his cause.

This remarkable sense of strategy grew out of a quality in his life which only appears in the lives of men who have an unusual faith in the operative power of moral sincerity. There is an opposite but corollary conviction which they have. It is the conviction that evil is incapable of perfect organization. This means that the supporters of righteous causes are not always obliged to overcome evil by the possession of overwhelming power to break it down and drag it out. There is always operating among the supporters of evil causes a tendency toward internal disintegration and self defeat. If they can be steadily confronted with the vigilant and sustained cohesion of men of righteous purpose, who give evidence of growing power, the supporters of the forces of evil will tend somewhere to crack internally and to facilitate their own defeat. There came a time when Lincoln saw this possibility at work in the proslavery forces.

He saw it in the initial and growing opposition of pro-slavery extremists, to one of the most honorable qualities in Stephen Douglas, the greatest leader of the pro-slavery forces; namely, against his disposition to affirm that the doctrine of "squatter" or popular sovereignty, in which he believed, admitted the possibility that a particular territory might, by its own vote, keep slavery out of its own boundaries. Douglas had honestly affirmed this opinion in the congressional debates on the Kansas constitution, and in doing so he had greatly angered the extreme pro-slavery forces in the South. Lincoln saw that if Douglas were skillfully questioned in the senatorial debates in Illinois, he would be led by his ambition to be reelected to the Senate, to reaffirm this belief in the right of a particular territory to exclude slavery, in spite of the language of the recent Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court, which held that there was no lawful way in which a territory could do this. Lincoln saw that in so doing, Douglas this time would anger the extreme pro-slavery forces in the South. Lincoln saw that if Douglas were skillfully unendurably angered, the extreme proslavery forces would split the Democrat Party rather than to support Douglas for the presidency in 1860, and that this split would open the way whereby in the national elections of 1860 victory would be possible for the Republican cause opposed to the extension of slavery. Lincoln meditated long upon a stratagem to produce these results.

Lincoln's friends opposed such stratagem on the grounds that it would make it quite possible for Lincoln and the Republican Party to be defeated by Douglas in the Illinois senatorial elections. Lincoln admitted this possibility, but counting up the cost to himself and to his party he concluded that

even such a loss would be worth enduring in order to bring the Republican Party and its cause to national victory in 1860. So, at Freeport, Ill., on August 27, 1858, in the second debate with Douglas, he proposed the determinative question. Just as he foresaw, Douglas answered honestly and unequivocally: "In my opinion the people of a territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State constitution. * * * It matters not what the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please."

This was the answer which Lincoln sought and foresaw. It came to be the most important question and answer in the entire series of debates, for it probably determined the destiny of the Nation in relation to slavery. In Illinois, the results turned out to be just what Lincoln's friends had feared. Even some Republicans in Illinois joined with the Democrats in elated support of Douglas, and Lincoln was defeated for the Illinois Senate.

But the national results which Lincoln foresaw came swiftly to pass. When the National Democratic Convention nominated Douglas for the Presidency on a platform in support of popular (squatter) sovereignty, the hard core of extreme proslavery forces in the South were so embittered that they walked out of the convention. They were not going to endure the folly of agreeing with any condition under which slavery could be shut out of any State or territory. This exodus split the Democrat Party. Thereafter, Breckenridge was nominated to represent the hard core of proslavery extremists, and two Democrat Parties went into the national election against the Republicans who had now nominated Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency. The election was further complicated by the entry of a four-splitter party.

The Republican Party, with its declared purpose of halting the extension of slavery had been so nurtured in solidarity—so strongly cohesive—that it came out of the election with 1,860,000 votes—almost 16 times the voters polled in 1852 and 40 percent more votes than they polled in 1856. And although the combined opposition of three parties polled an overwhelmingly larger volume of 2,810,000 votes, the split in the Democrat Party proved to be decisive. No one of the three opposition parties reached a higher vote than the 1,370,000 votes which went to Douglas. The Republican Party with 1,860,000 popular votes and 180 electoral votes had won the election. The cause dedicated to the halting of slavery was chosen to control the Nation.

Abraham Lincoln awoke one morning to find that in less than 6 years he had nurtured the Republican forces opposed to the extension of slavery into full maturity and had projected them into the control of the Nation. He stood there trembling like a boy—a man whose only previous experience in public administration had been the post office job of a one-horse town, where he could carry all the daily mail in his hat, had been elected to the Presidency of the United States. By one of the most remarkable rises to power in history, he now had come to the place where he had the power to do the one thing of all he most desired—to halt the westward march of the slave system and to place it back where it could no longer threaten the destiny of the Union which he loved.

COMPASSION FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH

Now I come to the third and last period in the life of Abraham Lincoln. In this period I wish to concentrate attention entirely upon a quality which first appeared in the early days of his conflict with the slave system,

but which reached its greatest development only in this third period; namely his compassion toward the people of the South.

In the earliest days of Abraham Lincoln's fight against slavery he learned how to do what is almost impossible; how to fight an evil cause without entertaining malice and enmity toward the men who support that evil cause. He hated slavery but he never hated the slaveowners or the people of the South as a group. When he agreed, as he did agree, that the Constitution required him to leave slavery alone in the Southern States, he did not agree to this merely for the sake of taking a political position. He agreed to it because he believed in the righteousness of this position and because he intended to be loyal to it. Abraham Lincoln did not feel that the people of the South were different in any fundamental respect from the people of the North. He did not feel that they supported the slave system, because there was some peculiar element in their human make-up which inevitably required them to do this. He knew that the people of the South had not hated the slave system. The people of the North were just as much responsible for the development of the slave system as the people of the South. Moreover, he knew that there were hundreds of thousands and even millions of white people in the South who held no slaves, and would like to get rid of the slave system, but now that the slave system had come to be the only working economic system in the South, they did not know how to get rid of it. He was not sure that he himself would know how to get rid of the slave system if he were then so situated in the South. Instead of hating the southerners, therefore, his compassion went out to them with a loving heart. He knew that the slave system was injurious to them as well as to the Nation, and he wanted to bring it about some day that they would be in a position to put the slave system aside, and to unite freely in their hearts with their brethren of the North in support of the Union. He wanted to keep them in the Union so that a Union committed by majority leadership to the proposition that all men are created free and equal could be decisively helpful to them in working out a way to overcome the slave system and to establish complete freedom from it in their institutions and in their hearts.

One of the most beautiful things about Abraham Lincoln's thinking during this period of his life was this: that although he was obliged to approve the taking of arms, and to justify and to carry through the killing of men in battle, never did he, under any circumstances, allow the actualities of war to alter his compassion for the people of the South or to harden him into hating them or into despising them. When, on the one hand, some of his advisers urged him to despise them and to let them go their evil ways into secession, and when, on the other hand, some of his advisers urged him to take advantage of the secession, to break his personal and his party pledges and vindictively to free the slaves in spite of the Constitution to the contrary, his answer was always substantially the same, "I will not do it. They are still members of the Union. It is my purpose that they shall remain so. If we keep faith with them and do our full duty in bringing the expansion of slavery to an end, we can eventually find a way to do away with slavery in their midst, with their consent and cooperation. In all these matters I am the one who is responsible, and I must have some principle of my own to act upon. It is my duty to do this and I will do it."

Not only did he persist in his compassion, he reached out his hand in loving solicitude, endeavoring to persuade them. "Brothers," he said in effect, "you have made a great mistake. You have seceded from the Union, which is precious to us all. You have taken

up arms against your country in order to advance a cause which will destroy the Union. You would not have done this but for the evil influence of the system of slavery on your institutions and in your hearts. Come now, give up the slaves. I will have the Government of the United States compensate you with money in full for every slave that you give up." This was the length to which compassion took him and held him until the day when he met the Captain of Eternity in a decisive way.

There came a time when the Union's cause had lost so many battles that it looked as if victory was going to be impossible. He saw, instead, that the proslavery armies, with the help of 4½ million slaves, could possibly win the war, destroy the Union, and set up slavery permanently. A greater disaster was not conceivable to his mind. Down on his knees, he came to recognize that the hand controlling this war was not his own. The living God Himself was now in charge of events and through these events He was speaking to him, saying "Abe, I am vetoing your plan to leave slavery alone in the South. I want the slaves set free now. As Commander in Chief of the Armies of the Union you have the right to do it, and you have the power to do it. It will bless the slaves for you to do it. It will bless the South for you to do it, and it will save and bless the Union for you to do it. I want you, Abe, to do it now." And on his knees Abraham Lincoln heard the Captain of Eternity and rose with a reverent determination to do it. On a day thereafter when he took his pen in hand to sign the Emancipation Proclamation which could, supported by the 13th amendment, free all the slaves, and free the body and the soul of the South and of the Union from the curse of slavery, he found that his hand was trembling. "Wait, a moment," he is reported to have said to the man who was near him, "I am about to sign the most important paper that any man can sign in the world and my whole soul is in it. Let no trembling of my hand appear in this signature."

And so it came about that he who in all humility had seen no honorable way to deal with slavery except to halt its western progress while leaving it alone in the South—no doubt for years and years to come—now saw that God had given him the privilege to wipe it out entirely. And he did it with a heart full of gratitude and of trembling joy.

The suffering of Lincoln and of the Nation did not cease after the Emancipation Proclamation. The northern armies lost in battle, again and again. The number of the dead piled up and up. The monetary resources in the banks were giving out. The enormous cost of the war in men was so great that riots began happening in the Northern States and some men refused to register to go into the Army. Abraham Lincoln was about to lose the election, in the midst of divided counsel and for want of face. But just a few days before the election, Sherman marched into Atlanta. Grant and his men laid hold on some victories. The people, moved by these things, flew back to Lincoln because they trusted and loved him, and reelected him President by an overwhelming vote. With the armies moving toward victory and the people once again united, what did he do, when he came to his second inaugural address? What would you have done? What would Napoleon have done? What would any conqueror in the history of the world have done, that you know about? In all probability, he would have given his heart to the hardening process of war and would have stood up at the inaugural and said to the people of the South, "You can see all the suffering that you have brought upon yourselves and your country. You can see now that your cause

is becoming hopeless. You can see that we are justified in the most ruthless dealings with you in order to bring this war to an end. You are not fit candidates for merciful dealings in any way." But he did not do this. No, his compassion for the people of the South was, by this time, too great for such thinking. He did not want them to be defeated in that way. He did not want them groveling in humiliation before his feet. What did he say?

"The Almighty has His own purposes. Woe unto the world because of offenses—for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh. If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses, which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove and that He gives both the North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid with another drawn with the sword as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"

What then did he do? His compassion was so deep and so thoughtful that instead of scorning and branding his brethren, instead of threatening and humiliating them, he put his arm around them in suffering and said, "This suffering that we are enduring together, we together have brought upon ourselves from the hands of a just God who is displeased with what both of us have done about slavery." The fact is that his compassion had deepened more than ever, for just a few days before the inaugural address he had once more sought to have his Cabinet promote a joint resolution in both Houses of Congress offering the Southern States \$400 million in U.S. bonds, to be allotted among them in proportion to the property in slaves which each had lost. He saw the greatness of their suffering and his heart went out to them in their need. He wanted with all his heart to hasten their recovery, and to hasten their return to the Union.

When the war was over and the victory was won, and when his advisers wanted to know, "Whom shall we seek to hang; upon whom shall we lay the retribution of death?" "Nobody" was the answer of his compassionate heart. "These are our brothers. Tell them the gate is open. Let them come home and let us work together for the rebuilding of the Union."

An assassin killed him. But what more could it mean to him to be physically shot down? For 4 long years he had been killed all the day long by the continuing obligation to carry on a war against his brothers. For him to die was nothing. He knew all along that he was expendable and might have been killed at any time. Some men looked at him lying in death and said, "Well, at last he is dead. He ought to be dead. He should have been dead long ago. Blessed be the man who killed him." But today we all know that the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all, that with his stripes we all were healed, and that with the 4 years of his dying and at length by his physical death, God redeemed this Union from slavery and purified her soul.

How beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of them that bear the glad tidings of emancipation, glad tidings of Union, but, above all, the glad tidings of a man inwardly driven by universal respect for all mankind,

a man wholly committed to that Union which was "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," a man masterful in sincere and simple communication of the truth, a man pure in his heart toward every individual human being with whom he came in contact, neglecting none, a man reverent of all his powers and using them up in a great cause as if they were but wax under a lamp, a man unequivocal in his beliefs, diligent in his purposes to restrict and to overcome evil, but filled with a compassion so deep and beautiful that he always loved his very enemies.

Do you tell me that the history of the United States says that slavery was abolished and the Union was preserved by the victory of the Civil War? I tell you it is not so. There was one place in America where the slave was always free; there was one place in America where the Union was never broken—there in the heart of Abraham Lincoln. That is why we love him, black and white, North and South. That is why they love him in every nation in the world. That is why they will love him a thousand years from today. For he was liberty. He was union. He was freedom.

"O, God, what can we ask Thee?
That in every legislature in the land,
In every Governor's chair, and in
The White House itself,
Again and again we may have
One more man like Abraham Lincoln."

Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by Dr. Allan Nevins:

LINCOLN AND DEMOCRACY

(Text of an address by Dr. Allan Nevins, annual Lincoln dinner, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 11, 1960, sponsored by the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia in cooperation with the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission)

With those people who think we make too much of the Lincoln anniversaries, it is difficult for a reflective man to feel any patience. As the ancient Roman household found inspiration in annually celebrating the natal day of its most illustrious ancestor, our American household finds refreshment each year in reverting to the example of its greatest exponent of democracy. For it is as the essential hero of democracy that we recall Lincoln. Any just definition of democracy would note the fact that it has a different meaning in America—we hope a richer meaning—than in other lands. Politically, it signifies a form of government in which the machinery is controlled as directly as possible by a majority of all the people.

In a broader sense, democracy represents a certain general condition of society rooted in our Anglo-American origins, shaped by circumstances in which the frontier and free immigration have been prominent, and involving not only the political tenet of popular sovereignty but a related group of corresponding tendencies covering the whole field of moral, social, and even spiritual life.

In either the narrow or broad sense, democracy denotes a revolutionary movement in human affairs, which has a set of determined opponents ranging from Sir Henry Maine to William Graham Sumner, and a body of ardent champions ranging from John Stuart Mill to Woodrow Wilson. Not for Americans alone, the name of Lincoln best typifies both political and social democracy.

Lincoln's life offers a panorama of contrasts as remarkable as any in history, and the author of a recent book, "The Lincoln That Nobody Knows," indeed calls it a study in contrasts. Among the facts of his life which conflict with preconceived notions of what is probable, one paradox holds a central place. It is this:

That a man who knew democracy so intimately, in a period when it was full of violence, crudity, and corruption, should have been so completely untouched by cynicism as to the system; nay, more, that a man too clear-sighted ever to be fooled by surface pretensions, too realistic and honest to conceal his convictions, should have said so little in criticism of democracy and nothing in essential derogation of it.

More caustic statements on democracy as a form of government can be found in a paragraph of John Adams than in all Lincoln's speeches; more fault-finding with democracy as a social system in a page of H. L. Mencken than in all Lincoln's works. Yet Lincoln knew far more expertly than these men the seamy side of democracy.

Lincoln's faith in the people was so simple, spontaneous, and warmhearted that we tend to accept it as inborn and unchangeable. He himself—though actually it was changeable—gave it that interpretation with reiterated emphasis.

"This is essentially a people's war," he told Congress when it first met after Sumter. It was a contest, he went on, to preserve that form of government which would elevate the condition of all men, and he was "most happy to believe that the plain people understand and appreciate this." Throughout the war, even more than before it, the people were foremost in his thoughts. He declared at one point that he could never betray "so vast and so sacred a trust as these free people have confided to me."

In his policies, he was anxious to keep the mass of fair-minded people with him, taking a position neither too conservative nor too radical. "I hope," he informed Zack Chandler, "to stand firm enough not to go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause." In keeping the masses with him, he relied upon the persuasive logic exhibited in his State papers and letters. His evident object was not to make smart hits, or win rhetorical triumphs, but to reason with and convince commonsense folk. "If ever there could be a proper time for mere catch arguments," he wrote in his December message in 1862, "that time is surely not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

As he stated in his letter to Greeley on saving the Union with or without slavery, he would correct errors when shown to be errors, and adopt new views so fast as they should appear true views; and when he did so, he would inform the people. Down to Appomattox, he clung to the maxim he had enunciated in Chicago in 1850: "Wisdom and patriotism, in a public office, under institutions like ours, are wholly inefficient and worthless, unless they are sustained by the confidence . . . of the people."

Men may believe fervently in liberty but reject democracy; Lincoln's position was a pole apart from that of such thinkers as Burke, a passionate libertarian but no democrat. Burke wrote that he never addressed himself to the vulgar nor to that which alone governs the vulgar, their passions. Lincoln pointedly addressed himself to the vulgar and to their reason. He never abused an honest opponent. He was so anxious not to repress honest discussion that he thought posterity would more likely criticize him for excessive leniency with copperheads and traitors than for excessive severity.

He was proud that the war neither postponed nor muted a single political campaign. "We cannot have free government without elections," he declared. Pitt was said to love England as an Athenian loved the city of the Violet Crown and a Roman the city of the Seven Hills; so it was that Lincoln loved the American democracy. His mind

had not bent toward abstract thinking, and we look in vain in his writings for any body of generalizations on government. We meet rather an instinctive conviction, which experience never corroded.

Yet this man who so completely accepted his identification with the common people had taken laborious pains, from an early age, to raise himself above their level mentally and morally. When Herbert Croly remarked that the youthful Lincoln was as different from the ordinary Sangamon Valley citizen of his day as St. Francis of Assisi was from the ordinary Benedictine monk of the 13th century, he offered no explanation of the fact. The people about young Lincoln, busy with pioneer tasks, were hostile to intellectual effort; young men preferred the tavern or grocery to books, and boisterous sport to study. Duelling, Indian fighting and hunting made heroes, and the admired leader was the Davy Crockett type who distained personal restraint.

One illustration will exhibit the turbulent side of frontier manners. Andrew Jackson, when in the White House, told a friend how a Tennessee bully had once tried to pick a quarrel with him by treading thrice on his foot. "As quick as a flash," said President Jackson, "I snatched a small rail from the top of a fence, and gave him the pint of it full in his stomach. It doubled him up. He fell at my feet and I stomped on him. . . . If any villain assaults you, give him the pint in the belly." This was the spirit of too many backwoodsman who reared log cabins on Congress land, fought Indians with long rifles, and subdued the wilderness with axe, sidemeat, whisky, and calomel.

Lincoln completely transcended this environment. Where others proved their manhood by intemperate speech and acts, he trained himself in kindness, moderation, and generosity. We need not recall the hundred examples of his magnanimity; he always followed the principle which he finally summed up in his statement that he had never willingly planted a thorn in another man's pillow, and in his letter advising a young man against a quarrel, for quarreling befogged in the mind.

Meanwhile, among a rude folk at best indifferent to intellectual effort, he found means of systematic mental discipline. "Anybody who gives me a book," he said, "is my best friend," and his instinct for books useful in maturing his powers was unerring. He trained himself to think by Abel Flint's "System of Geometry and Trigonometry" as well as Robert Gibson's "Theory and Practice of Surveying"; later, he said, he nearly mastered six books of Euclid. He nourished his imagination by "The Pilgrim's Progress," "Robinson Crusoe," and "Aesop's Fables," three volumes owned by his step-mother. He corrected his English by Kirkham's "English Grammar," for which Mentor Graham said he walked 8 miles—the very copy is now in the Library of Congress—Bailey's "Etymological Dictionary," and "The Kentucky Preceptor," with its classic selections. He improved his style and cadence, and enriched his mind, not only by the Bible, but by Shakespeare and Burns, to whom Jack Kelso introduced him. From Blackstone he drew a faculty of exact statement and something of the spirit of English history as well as a knowledge of legal principles.

Altogether, he could well admonish a student later in life that any youth can read as profitably in primitive communities as in cities: "The books, and your capacity for understanding them, are the same in all places." How wide his reading actually was in New Salem days, no one can say. F. Lauriston Bullard, a veteran student of Lincoln, hazarded the statement that in these years he probably gained as much in intellectual development as Henry Adams gained at Harvard; and at any rate, he never

said that his New Salem years had been wasted, as Adams said of his Harvard sojourn.

The important fact is that he trained himself to reflect, and to express his well-pondered conclusions with precision. He had a deliberate but retentive mind; like a piece of steel, as he put it, "very hard to scratch anything on it, and almost impossible after you got it there to rub it out." According to a clergyman who rode on a Connecticut train with him just after the Cooper Union address, he remarked: "I am never easy now, when I am handling a thought, until I have bounded it north and bounded it south, and bounded it east and bounded it west". If he did say this, the Cooper Union speech perfectly illustrated the assertion.

Actually, no real mystery lies behind the ascension of Francis of Assisi or Lincoln above their fellow men. As Carl Sandburg shows us, the explanation lies in native bent and inherent genius. Lincoln resembled the Robert Burns he so much admired in his in-born capacity to distill from meager materials whatever strengthened the mind and ennobled the spirit. The Scottish plowboy poring over Pope's "Homer" and Allan Ramsay's poems at his Ayrshire fireside, and the Illinois railsplitter with his Blackstone and Shakespeare, were satisfying much the same thirst.

This kindling of an adolescent flame is happily no uncommon phenomenon. We meet it in the career of the Massachusetts Senator with whom Lincoln worked closely during the war, Henry Wilson. Bound out at 10 to a farmer who put him at drudgery, Wilson managed, before he gained his freedom at 21, to read a thousand books; he counted them. We find the same natural idealism and desire to excel intellectually and morally in a multitude of other poor lads. Some came to take Lincoln for a model; David Lloyd George, for example, the orphan whose cobbler uncle sent him to a penny school in Wales until he could educate himself by reading Cassell's "Popular Educator" and a host of other works, among them "The Life of Lincoln".

What is remarkable in Lincoln—what does defy easy explanation—is that he manifested so little consciousness of the superiority he had attained. Among rude, aggressive, selfish men, he became urbane, moderate, and generous. Among unlettered, impulsive, and unthinking people he was cultivated, restrained, and deeply reflective. Joseph H. Choate has told us how he and other New Yorkers went in 1860 to hear Lincoln at Cooper Union, expecting to be assailed by stump humor, special pleading, and frontier rhetoric, and how they were impressed instead by the sinewy strength of his plain argument. "It was marvelous to see how this untutored man, by mere self-discipline and the chastening of his own spirit, had outgrown all meretricious arts, and found his own way to the grandeur and strength of absolute simplicity." Yet of condescension to the vulgar, he never showed a trace. The humblest fellow townsman he treated as equal.

In one respect, to be sure, he did assert his superiority to his opponents: in perception of truth. He was scornful of Douglas' sophistries, of Pierce's casuistry, of Buchanan's evasions and cowardices. In every other respect, he took men on his own level. Miss Octavia Roberts of Springfield, gathering material for her book on "Lincoln in Illinois," talked with a Portuguese woman who had been a servant in the old Globe Hotel when the Lincoln family once stayed there. This woman recalled how quickly Mrs. Lincoln resented what she thought saucy talk. But there is a world of meaning in her comment on Lincoln: "He was common, like someone that is poor."

In social life sheer good nature might explain much of Lincoln's outlook; but in

politics he was far from good natured—he was savagely in earnest. The political paradox in his life is all the more remarkable. He believed firmly in political democracy, but just what was it in his time? In Illinois Gov. Thomas Ford, whom he knew, wrote a remarkable State History portraying democracy in repellent hues. Ford played such predecessors as Thomas Reynolds with a merciless scalpel; he showed that little men were leaders in the first generation of statehood, how mean their motives, how sordid some of their acts. Nor were the people exempt from acid criticism.

The Illinoisans had cruelly maltreated Black Hawk and his Sauk and Fox Indians; they had murdered Joseph Smith and his brother, and driven the Mormons across the Mississippi at the point of the musket; they had indulged in wild financial excesses during the internal improvement era, and had wavered on the brink of debt-repudiation later. The shabby side of political morals was lighted up by the conduct of Gov. Joel A. Matteson, one of the few men Lincoln despised, who, after nearly gaining that Senate seat that Lincoln sought was proved guilty of theft from the State treasury, and compelled to restore nearly a quarter of a million dollars. The Alton riots and murder of Elijah P. Lovejoy gave the Illinois Shield a sorry blotch.

In the Nation, political democracy had equally inedifying aspects. From Lincoln's point of view the Mexican War was impossible to defend. Slavery undermined the political integrity of the Government, and a succession of weak Presidents—the commonplace Fillmore, the forcible-feeble Pierce, the timid Buchanan—had no policy but one of dodge and delay.

Thaddeus Stevens said that the House of Representatives, when he entered it, was a place of Bowie knives, revolvers, and howling demons. It was a sad light that was cast on democracy by Bleeding Kansas, the assault of Brooks on Sumner, the eclipse of civil liberties throughout the South, the territorial greed embodied in the Ostend Manifesto, and the bloody raids of filibusters in Central America. For that matter, how the Civil War itself would have shocked the Fathers of the Nation as a negation of all their hopes. Punch published an apt cartoon which depicted the shade of George III poking the shade of Washington in the ribs against a background of fighting troops, and ejaculating: "What d'ye think of your fine Republic now? Eh? Eh?"

Lincoln of course had a large firsthand experience of the demagogic, log-rolling, planless side of democracy. As a young legislator, he had played his part in the craze which fastened an almost hopeless debt on the young State for a system of public works vote without surveys, estimates, or careful discussion; he had been one of the adroit lobbyists who had removed the capital from Vandalia to Springfield. He had seen all the vicious features of the spoils system in the Jacksonian Era, and the bad results of a blind party adherence to a military hero. As he expressed it, the Democrats were a horde of hungry ticks who stuck to the tail of the Hermitage Lion until after his death. He thought the acts and policies of the proslavery administrations just before the war disgraceful. "Our Republican Robe," he said, in his Peoria speech of 1854, "is soiled and trailed in the dust."

Nor should we forget that in his wartime dealings with democracy, Lincoln experienced three painful failures. His passionate desire during his first 5 weeks in office was to avert war, an end toward which he strove at any cost, save the sacrifice of principle; he was thwarted when the hotheaded southerners fired on Sumter. In the next 17 months, his principal effort, next to the prosecution of the war, was to persuade the Border States to accept his plan of gradual compensated

emancipation. He put the utmost intensity of feeling into this effort. "Oh," he said to Isaac Arnold and Owen Lovejoy on July 13, 1862, "how I wish the Border States would accept my proposition. Then you, Lovejoy, and you, Arnold, and all of us, would not have lived in vain." He believed that acceptance would lead to an early termination of the war. But the very day after his conversation with Arnold, the border Congressmen said, "No."

Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri rejected his plan. In the ensuing 18 months his principal aim, next to conquering the South, was to persuade the majority in Congress to adopt a moderate scheme of reconstruction. Again, he failed, and in 1864 had to veto the vindictive Wade-Davis bill. The policies on which he most set his heart, in short, broke down.

Meanwhile, he might well have complained of public impatience, of the failure of the people to keep the armies sufficiently filled to avert a draft, of the widespread profiteering, cheating, and skulking, and of the mischievous effort of the Senate to dictate a new Cabinet after Fredericksburg.

He never complained except of individual men, and never lost faith. His best trusted associate, Secretary Seward, did sometimes grow utterly discouraged. We who bear the responsibility in Washington, Seward wrote his wife in 1862, see the war as a sad, painful, fearful reality. "To the public, who are not directly engaged in it, it is a novel, a play. . . . They weary and grow restive if the action of the war drags, or loses its intensity. They pronounce the piece a failure, and propose to drive the manager out of the theater. Who could believe that nations could be made or saved in civil war, when the people act like this?"

After the elections that year, Seward honestly feared that partisanship might effect the national ruin. On another occasion he wrote his wife that nothing preserved his faith in American democracy but reading history. "Selfishness crops out in everything, everywhere. It offends and alarms us constantly; but we learn from history that selfishness always existed, and always was more flagrant than now."

Gideon Welles likewise lost faith. When he watched the defeatist antics of Fernando Wood, he concluded: "But the whole city of New York is alike leprous and rotten." In such vicious communities, he thought, free suffrage was debased, and some outside control was needed. In his youth, he had believed that the popular voice was right, "but alas, experience has shaken the confidence I once had." In short, he doubted that democracy could succeed among "the strange materials that compose a majority of the population in our large cities," for demagogues would obtain the mastery.

Thaddeus Stevens felt a deeper mistrust. Called the Great Commoner, he was supposed to cherish a special feeling for democracy. Yet during and after the war, he came to a sardonic belief that misgovernment was chronic, and when near his end he sadly commented: "With all this great struggle of years in Washington, and the fearful sacrifice of life and treasure, I see little hope for the Republic."

These were men whose belief in democracy was shaken by the stormy time; many others never had a real faith in democracy. The planter statesmen of the South in the era of Jefferson Davis, Howell Cobb, Robert Toombs, and Judah P. Benjamin were like Calhoun in being natural antidemocrats. Representing a minority even in the cotton kingdom, they had to guard a great special interest, and so combated every theory of government and society which weakened their position.

By 1860, many of them openly repudiated the ideas of Jefferson. When Alexander H.

Stephens, defending the Union before the Georgia Legislature in 1860, asked what form of government could be preferred to America's, Robert L. Toombs interjected: "England."

Of a different type were some of the Northern radicals, humanitarians and egalitarians, but not true believers in democracy. Of Charles Sumner, for example, it was truly said that he had unbounded sympathy for the poor Negro, but none to spare for the poor white man.

And in a still different category fall those who, reared in Lincoln's generation, turned against democracy as postwar materialism engulfed the land. Henry Adams, writing a novel entitled "Democracy," saw little hope for it. Ambrose Bierce, an Indianian sprung from the plain people, decided that popular government was one vast fraud. In "The Devil's Dictionary," he suggested his creed. "Politics: The conduct of public affairs for private advantage." "Deliberation: The act of examining one's bread to see which side it is buttered on." "Pocket: The cradle of motive, and the grave of conscience."

Mark Twain's disillusionment became so abysmal that in his last years, seeing war, greed, and cruelty rampant, he used to speak of "the damned human race." Doubtless he should not be judged by words he wrote after a long series of private misfortunes and bereavements had deepened his bitterness. But even when fairly young, he was cynical about democracy, as his novel, "The Gilded Age," shows. His approach to pioneer communities, to legislatures, to lobbyists, to business, to Mississippi steamboating and California mining, was primarily satiric. In "Life on the Mississippi," he wrote a paragraph on the frontier which Lincoln would have thought but wryly amusing:

"How solemn and beautiful is the thought that the earliest pioneer of civilization . . . is never the steamboat, never the railroad, never the newspapers, never the Sabbath school, never the missionary—but always whisky. Such is the case. Look history over; you will see. The missionary comes after the whisky—I mean, he arrives after the whisky has arrived; next comes the poor immigrant with ax and hoe and rifle; next, the trader; next the miscellaneous rush; next the gambler, the desperado, the highwayman, and all their kindred in sin of both sexes; and next, the smart chap who has bought up an old grant that covers all the land; this brings in the lawyer tribe; the vigilance committee brings the undertaker. All these interests bring the newspaper; the newspaper starts up politics and a railroad; all hands turn to and build a church and a jail—and behold, civilization is established forever in the land."

Of this cynicism, this disillusionment, we find not the slightest touch in all of Lincoln's writings. When he saw our Republican robe soiled and trailed in the dust, he blamed false leaders, not the people. We must purify the robe, he said, and as soon as he became Chief Magistrate, he set himself to the task. While he never defined his concept of democratic government in detail, it was undoubtedly that which John Stuart Mill had enunciated in 1835. "If the bulk of any nation possesses a fair share of . . . wisdom," wrote Mill, "the argument for universal suffrage is . . . irresistible; for the experience of ages, and especially of all great national emergencies, bears out the assertion that, whenever the multitude are really alive to the necessity of superior intellect, they rarely fail to distinguish those who possess it." They so distinguished in 1860; they chose even better than they knew. They elected a leader whose type of democratic leadership meant a happy blend of Jefferson's profound if rather uncritical faith in the people, and Hamilton's sense of the importance of a constructive plan.

It would be as hard for us to conceive of Lincoln writing sourly and satirically of the people and popular government as of Walt Whitman so writing. Whitman held that the entire Nation shared the guilt of slavery; he pictured the ugly, debasing side of war in contract-hungry cities, in Washington, and on the battle field with relentless pen. But he felt certain the people would emerge from their bloody ordeal with a truer bond of comradeship. With a perceptible degree of purification, Lincoln also felt that. He felt it much more strongly than Whitman, because he had a better understanding of the historic roots of democracy; for as a lawyer and politician, he had given careful study to the basic documents which between 1170 and 1790 established the American system. From the time he first read them in an appendix to the volume of the Statutes of Indiana which he early acquired, he had steeped himself in these writings of the founders of the Nation. To him, they were sacred. Of the Constitution, he said in Congress in 1848, that it should not lightly be touched: "It can scarcely be made better than it is." For the Declaration of Independence he felt a still deeper reverence, and when its spirit warred with the letter of the Constitution, he stood by the Declaration. Every nation, he said in Chicago in 1856, needs a central idea. "The central idea in our political public opinion was, and until recently continued to be, the equality of men."

It is not enough, therefore, to say that Lincoln's spontaneous, optimistic belief in democracy was founded on the same rock as Whitman's, a sympathetic appreciation of the virtues of the common man. In part it was. He was a citizen, as Lord Charnwood says, of that far country where aristocrat and democrat are judged by simple worth alone; and like Whitman, like Burns, he had a profound sense of the greatness which is often found in men of low as of high station. Mere rank meant little to him, as he showed when he once offended Secretaries Stanton and Welles by sending them a document with the endorsement: "Referred to Mars and Neptune."

But an important part of the foundation rock of Lincoln's conviction was his thorough study of the theory and early development of democratic government. How well he appropriated what is valuable in the teachings of Washington and Adams, of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison is evident in the Cooper Union Address and First Inaugural. Compared with Whitman, he was an expert political scientist. He also had, what Whitman lacked, a powerful sense of ideological world mission of democracy. He knew that democracy might not be so efficient in a brief crisis as a dictatorship, of which men like General Hooker spoke longingly during the war. But he also knew that in the long run, government of the people has greater endurance and stability, and a larger power to call forth and educate talent, than any other; and at Gettysburg he expressed his long-held confidence that its example would ultimately convert and conquer other peoples.

But the largest reason, I think, for Lincoln's fervent belief in democracy reached a little deeper than the considerations just named: it lay in his increasing conviction, from 1848 onward, that the masses of the North were becoming possessed by a great moral idea, which would ultimately regenerate the country. They were rising to meet the demands of a cause larger than any they had known since 1789.

Other men caught glimpses of this ocean-heave of American democracy. Carl Schurz, for example, wrote a German relative just after the election of 1856:

"The last weeks were a time when public matters made much more demands than ordinarily upon the American system. You

over there in your decrepit Europe can hardly imagine how a great idea can stir up the masses of the people to their depths, and how an enthusiastic struggle for principle can thrust aside for a certain time all other interests, even the materialistic ones. * * * A general struggle of opinions among a free people has in it something unbelievably imposing; and you never see with greater clearness what a far-reaching influence political freedom exercises upon the development of the masses."

This German Forty-eighter knew inspiration when he saw it. Just the same view was expressed by the illustrious English liberal, Richard Cobden, who toured the United States in 1859. He found the North in the grip of stirring emotions. They were a sign, he saw, of vigorous health. "The concentrated earnestness with which political parties were at work in the United States," he wrote later, "inspired me with full faith that the people of the country would, in spite of the difficulties and dangers of their political issues, work out their salvation."

Lincoln felt the popular pulse begin to beat with new energy when the Wilmot Proviso almost passed Congress. He felt the movement grow in urgency and strength as Mrs. Stowe published "Uncle Tom's Cabin," as the Underground Railroad gave defiance to the Fugitive Slave Act, as millions of Northerners rose in wrath against what they deemed Douglas' betrayal of freedom in the Kansas-Nebraska Act, as the new Republican Party swiftly became a giant of crusading idealism. This popular espousal of a new moral idea gave Lincoln's house-divided speech and his debates with Douglas a grip on the attention of the whole Nation. The North was presenting the impressive spectacle which gave the French liberal, *Elle Gasparin*, his title for the powerful book he published early in the war, "The Uprising of a Great People."

The war brought the upheaval to its climax. It was no surprise to Lincoln that depressing as was the amount of confusion, selfishness, and limppness revealed by the conflict, far greater was the display of heroism, devotion, and generosity.

The plain people rose to save the Union and vindicate the type of government which would elevate the condition of all men. Countless soldiers proved ready to give the last measure of dedication. Countless mothers were proud to lay their costliest sacrifice on the national altar. Proud was the word the mother of Robert Gould Shaw used when she was told that Governor Andrew had offered him the command of the Negro regiment, the 54th Massachusetts: She said, "I would be nearly as proud to hear that he had been shot." Later she heard that too.

There were countless fathers like Commodore Smith, who, said Hawthorne, uttered the finest short speech of the war. His son commanded the frigate *Congress* in Hampton Roads when the *Merrimac* began battering her to pieces, and the old commodore knew that his boy would die before he hauled down the colors. When informed that the *Congress* had surrendered he said, "Then Jo's dead"—and Jo was dead.

There were countless public officers as devoted as the much-tried Stanton, whom an aid once surprised with his head bowed on his desk, weeping and exclaiming over and over, "God help me to do my duty." In the face of a nation giving so much to a sacred cause, Lincoln would have felt it treason to humanity to utter a word that would be construed as disheartened or cynical.

When the war ended, the historian John Lothrop Motley wrote from Austria to a Boston friend to say how glad he was that the nightmare of fire and blood had ended.

"Believing in no government but that of the people, respecting no institutions but democratic institutions," he felt sure "that the future of the whole world is in our hands if we are true to ourselves." He paid tribute to Grant as a master of the art of war: "What could be more heroic than his stupendous bashfulness?" Of Lincoln he wrote that he was afraid to speak for fear of overenthusiasm. "But I am sure that through all future ages, there will be a halo around that swarthy face, and a glory about that long, lean uncouth figure such as history only accords to its saints and sages."

We may be certain that Lincoln would have shrunk from this as overenthusiasm indeed. But the President would heartily have endorsed the statement which Motley sent at the same time to the author of "Tom Brown at Rugby":

"MY DEAR HUGHES," it ran, "the true hero of the whole war—the one I respect and admire even beyond Lincoln and Grant (although I have not yet found anyone who is willing to go quite as far as I do in regard to both these men)—is the American people."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing may I close with words on this subject that were used in this Hall by that great historian-poet, Carl Sandburg, incidentally, the only private citizen who never held high office who has ever addressed a joint session of the Congress. The speech he made on that occasion has now been translated in over 34 languages at the request of that many foreign countries to be used in their educational institutions and in their public libraries.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall at the close of that great speech he asked:

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? Something of it is in this present occasion—in the atmosphere of this room. His beloved friend, Owen Lovejoy, had died in April of 1864. Friends wrote Lincoln and he replied that the pressure of duties kept him from joining them in efforts for a marble monument to Lovejoy, the last sentence of his letter reading:

"Let him have the marble monument along with a well assured and more enduring one in the hearts of those who love liberty unselfishly for all men."

Today we may say, perhaps, that the well assured and most enduring memorial to Lincoln is invisibly there—today, tomorrow, and for a long, long time yet to come. It is there in the hearts of lovers of liberty—men and women—this country has always had them in a crisis—men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include various newspaper articles, and speeches.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln has for a century been the most popular subject in America.

I will not belabor this afternoon's memorial to him with more than a few

words. But to me they are significant. They concern Mr. Lincoln's connections with an enterprise of great importance to the largest market area in my southwestern Iowa congressional district.

And in a collateral sense it is important to the whole Nation, because it involves the vital railroad industry.

Lincoln made an important contribution to the history of railroading in Iowa and America when, as President of the United States, he was confronted with the problem of locating the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific.

While stopping at Council Bluffs in 1859, he had met Gen. Grenville M. Dodge, who had just completed extensive railroad surveys west of the Missouri for the Rock Island Railroad. Lincoln recalled this visit when Congress passed the act providing for a transcontinental railroad and promptly called General Dodge to the White House for a conference.

These two meetings with Grenville M. Dodge, now of revered memory in Council Bluffs, more than perhaps anything else, fixed Council Bluffs, Iowa, as the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific.

A memorial to Lincoln has been erected on the bluff at Council Bluffs overlooking the Missouri River, where he and his Iowa friends stood in 1859 and looked westward across Nebraska.

A painting of the historic conference between Lincoln and Dodge occupies the most prominent place in my personal office. I am never more than a few moments distant from a thought of Lincoln. I consider that his unrivaled spot in human history is due to the fact that he belongs to everyone. We Republicans regard him as our patron saint, but we can share him with the whole world. He was truly America's right man at the right time.

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we, in Indiana, are especially proud of Abraham Lincoln because it was in the rolling hills of southern Indiana where Lincoln grew up and developed his great character which is now revered throughout the world.

We are also proud of the part that our State played in the Republican National Convention that nominated Abraham Lincoln for President in the "Wigwam" in Chicago a hundred years ago today.

From a very early age I have heard Hoosiers talk of Indiana's part in the nomination of Lincoln. A few days ago I had the opportunity to discuss Indiana's activities at that national convention with Mr. Hubert Hawkins, secretary of the Indiana Historical Society, which organization, incidentally, is 130 years old. Mr. Hawkins gave me a brief account of Indiana's part in that important convention. This account was documented by Kenneth M. Stamp's "Indiana Politics During the Civil War," published by the Indiana Historical Bureau, 1949; an article by Charles Roll, "Indiana's Part in the Nomination of

Abraham Lincoln for President in 1860," published in Indiana Magazine of History, March 1929; and Reinhard H. Luthin's "The First Lincoln Campaign," 1944.

Moderation on the slavery issue and the sectional conflict typified the Indiana Republican Party in 1860. The failure of John C. Fremont in 1856 to carry the State was remembered as an evidence of the weakness of the extreme antislavery position with Hoosier voters. Consequently, the candidacy of William Seward of New York evoked little enthusiasm in Indiana. Friendly consideration was, however, given to Edward Bates of Missouri, Abraham Lincoln of Illinois and Judge John McLean of Ohio. Schuyler Colfax of South Bend led a strong group of Hoosier editors in supporting the Missourian and he enjoyed the influential backing of Horace Greeley. Bates' prospects for Hoosier support were weakened by the sturdy opposition of the German element in the Indiana Republican Party led by Theodore Hielscher, editor of the Indianapolis *Freie Presse*, who refused to forget his cooperation with the Know Nothings, a nativistic movement. Consequently, the Indiana delegation to the Chicago Convention was uninstructed.

With an electoral vote of 13 and 26 votes in the Republican convention Indiana constituted a prize worth any candidates seeking. With the same number of electoral votes as Massachusetts, Indiana ranked fifth in the Nation and only Ohio had a stronger political voice in the Old Northwest. Hoosier support was all the more sought after because of Indiana's status as a doubtful State. Lincoln recognized this point in a letter to Caleb Smith:

We might succeed in the general results without Indiana, but with it failure is scarcely possible.

Lincoln's adherents in Indiana worked hard in his behalf between the mass convention at Indianapolis and the Chicago convention. Cyrus M. Allen, Henry S. Lane, and Caleb B. Smith spearheaded the Lincoln drive.

The Indiana delegation reached Chicago on May 12. Representatives of Bates, Lincoln, and other candidates assiduously wooed the Hoosiers. An informal poll on May 15 indicated that Lincoln was in the lead. The final decision was made on the morning of May 17. A Bates supporter, John Defrees explained:

We Bates men of Indiana concluded that the only way to beat Seward was to go for Lincoln as a unit.

After the 17th, the Indiana delegation was solidly behind Lincoln.

Once committed the Hoosiers did yeoman service in rallying additional support of the Illinoisan. Henry S. Lane, Republican candidate for Governor of Indiana and chairman of the Philadelphia convention, was one of those who spent the night of the 17th seeking votes from undecided delegations. One witness saw Lane "at 1 o'clock, pale and haggard, with cane under his arm, walking from one caucus room to another, at the Tremont House." Lane told the delegates that Seward's nomination

would insure his defeat in Indiana. A report was widely circulated that the Republican candidates for Governor in Indiana, Illinois, and Pennsylvania would give up their candidacies if Seward were nominated. Being well aware of the Hoosiers' natural love of politics, I can picture in my mind the great zest and love of political battle with which that Hoosier delegation entered into that great drama that would influence world history, the nomination of Abraham Lincoln. I envy those Hoosiers of a century ago.

On Friday the 18th Lincoln's nomination was seconded by Caleb Smith and Henry Lane led the Hoosiers into the wild demonstration. When the balloting began, Indiana's 26 votes were cast for Lincoln. This vote was pivotal. Only one other State, Illinois, demonstrated such unanimity in support of Lincoln on the first ballot and it undoubtedly had an important psychological impact.

Indiana never wavered in the subsequent balloting and Lincoln was nominated on the third ballot. The Hoosiers returned home with the jubilant consciousness that they had contributed decisively to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, a candidate who had spent 14 important years of his life in Indiana. They were even more elated by the conviction that they had secured a nominee who could carry Indiana in November.

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

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has called the attention of the House and the country to the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln as the Republican candidate for the Presidency. As it has been pointed out, Ohio had a great deal to do with Lincoln's nomination. Realizing this, I asked the Canton Repository, one of Ohio's outstanding newspapers, in my congressional district, to check on the editions of their paper of a hundred years ago to determine what part, if any, our congressional district might have had in this nomination. It turned up some very interesting facts.

Abraham Lincoln's nomination 100 years ago today as the Republican candidate for the Presidency was assured by the dramatic announcement of an influential man from Massillon, Ohio, in my congressional district.

He was David K. Carter, chairman of the Ohio delegation to the Republican national convention in Chicago's huge wigwam.

The wooden wigwam, which could hold 10,000 persons, was constructed especially for the 1860 Republican convention.

U.S. Senator William H. Seward, the preconvention favorite, led Lincoln on the first two ballots.

Seward's margin on the second ballot was three votes—184 to 181—with 233 of 465 votes needed for the nomination.

The third ballot began. New York switched its vote from Seward to Lincoln, whose total rose to 231½, only 1½ votes away from the nomination.

Mr. Cartter commanded the attention of the packed convention hall as he rose. He possessed a booming voice and he stuttered.

What he then was to say would start the tall, unhandsome man from Illinois on the way to the White House.

"I rise, Mr. Chairman," began Mr. Cartter, "to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase, of Ohio, to Mr. Lincoln."

The nomination was assured. A cannon was fired on the Wigwam's roof to tell the world that "Honest Abe" was going to represent the young Republican Party at the election the next November.

After the delegates made Lincoln's nomination unanimous, Mr. Cartter submitted the name of Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, for nomination as Vice President.

Hamlin was nominated on the second ballot, according to the account in the May 22, 1860, edition of the weekly Ohio Repository.

Lincoln remembered Mr. Cartter after he got into the White House as the Nation's Civil War President. He appointed the Massillon man as Minister to Bolivia and as chief justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

According to an account in E. T. Heald's "The Stark County Story," Mr. Cartter was active in a move to bring the railroad through Massillon.

The charter under which the Ohio Legislature granted construction rights to the Ohio & Pennsylvania Railroad was the result of a meeting in Massillon in November 1847.

The meeting was called after Mr. Cartter headed a committee which in a meeting at Pittsburgh in 1846 failed to convince officials of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, Pa., that a railroad should be constructed through Massillon from Pittsburgh to Chicago.

Dr. Isaac Steese, a prominent Massillon banker and landowner, attended the convention with Mr. Cartter as a delegate. Dr. Steese's vote likely was one of those which Mr. Cartter switched over to Lincoln.

Dr. Steese and others organized the First National Bank of Massillon during the decade before the memorial convention in the Wigwam. He was president of the bank—then Stark County's largest—until his death in 1874.

"It was said that not 20 men in the Nation were better informed on politics in the large sense of the word," wrote Mr. Heald of Dr. Steese. He also was interested in farming and other business undertakings.

Dr. Steese's daughter, Annie, married Frank L. Baldwin. She later donated her home and grounds for the Massillon Public Library and Museum.

Another Stark Countian who attended the 1860 convention was Thomas W. Saxton, junior editor of the Repository. He was the son of John Saxton, founder of that newspaper.

I am indebted, indeed, to the Canton Repository for the research which made the facts I have cited here available to me.

I think it is most interesting to know that my congressional district, which gave the Nation William McKinley, was

also responsible for the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, and that the same man who cast the votes to assure the nomination of Lincoln placed in nomination Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, as Lincoln's running mate.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in the sequence of events preceding the War Between the States, few had such profound significance as the nomination of Abraham Lincoln for President of the United States. Today we celebrate the centennial of that nomination.

One of the finest contemporary newspaper reports of the Republican Convention of 1860 was published by the Washington Evening Star. This account has been reprinted in the Sunday, May 15, edition of that newspaper with an excellent commentary by Staff Writer John W. Stepp. This article accurately depicts the drama and excitement surrounding the convention, and inclusion in the RECORD will assure proper preservation of this succinct account of one of the most momentous events in America's rich political heritage:

THE STAR STORY OF THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE CIVIL WAR—THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION OF 1860

(By John W. Stepp)

The Republicans were confident of prevailing in the 1860 presidential election, regardless of their choice of a candidate. After all, the northern and southern factions of the Democratic Party had split—hopelessly, it seemed—on the slavery issue in their convention 2 weeks earlier in Charleston, S.C.

As the Republicans convened on May 16, the man who seemed most likely to become their standard-bearer was William H. Seward, Senator and former Governor of New York, who was resolutely antislavery in his views.

Abraham Lincoln's celebrity, such as it was, stemmed chiefly from his debates with Stephen A. Douglas, the Illinois Democrat, in the 1858 senatorial campaign, and from his address in February 1860 in New York's Cooper Union.

Missouri Judge Edward Bates' appeal was to the conservative wing of the party.

[From the Evening Star, Wednesday, May 16, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE LATEST NEWS—TELEGRAPHIC—THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION—SPECULATION AS TO CANDIDATES

CHICAGO, May 15.—Nothing is of course determined as to the candidates. The friends of the different men proposed are all confident of the success of their favorites.

Lincoln is urged by the delegates from Illinois, but his alleged want of administrative ability is the objection raised against him. After a complimentary vote for him, Illinois will likely go for Bates.

[From the Evening Star, Thursday, May 17, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

CHICAGO, May 16.—Long before the hour for the meeting of the Republican Convention today, the vicinity of the wigwam was thronged with thousands eager to gain admittance to its spacious enclosure. It is estimated that 30,000 strangers are in the city. Within the scene was very exciting.

As soon as the doors were opened the body of the wigwam was solidly packed with men, whilst the seats in the galleries were packed with ladies. The interior was handsomely decorated with evergreens, statuary and flowers. It was estimated that 10,000 people were within the building.

[From the Evening Star, Friday, May 18, 1860, p. 3, col. 5]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, SECOND DAY

CHICAGO, May 17.—The platform, as reported, resolves as follows:

"Congratulates the country that no Republican Congressman has countenanced threats of disunion and denounces these threats as an avowal of contemplated treason."

"That the new dogma, that the Constitution carries slavery into the territories, is a dangerous political heresy."

"The reopening of the slave trade is denounced."

[From the Evening Star, Saturday, May 19, 1860, p. 3, col. 6]

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, THIRD DAY

CHICAGO, May 18.—The convention now proceeded to ballot for a candidate for President. The first ballot resulted as follows:

Seward 173, Lincoln 102, Bates 51, [Simon] Cameron 50.

There being no choice, a second ballot was had, as follows: Seward 184½, Lincoln 181½, scattering 38. Whole number of votes 404; necessary to a choice, 203.

The third ballot then took place, and a general stampede of all the forces opposed to Seward took place in favor of Lincoln. It resulted as follows: Lincoln 228, Seward 181.

Mr. Lincoln was therefore declared the nominee. The result is said to have been brought about by the Pennsylvania friends of Mr. Cameron. [Mr. Cameron was a political boss of the Keystone State.]

During the preliminary proceedings, Lincoln's friends exerted their lungs to the utmost, and showed a noisy predominance over Seward's forces.

... On motion ... the nomination of Mr. Lincoln was made unanimous.

... On the second ballot Senator [Hannibal] Hamlin [of Maine] was nominated [for Vice President].

HOW THE NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED

The intelligence of the nomination, when conveyed to the people outside the wigwam, created a scene of the wildest excitement which beggars description. Cheer upon cheer rent the air, while cannon sent forth their roar after roar. At least thirty thousand people participated in the excitement.

SKETCH OF MR. LINCOLN

The Hon. Abram [sic] Lincoln, of Illinois, who has so unexpectedly become the nominee of the Republican party for the Presidency of the United States, is known to a very limited extent, never having exhibited any ability as a statesman, or particularly distinguished himself in any other way. He was born in Hardin County, Ky., February 12, 1809; received a limited education; adopted the profession of the law; was a captain of volunteers in the Black Hawk war; at one time a postmaster of a small village; four times elected to the Illinois Legislature; and a representative in Congress from Illinois, from 1847 to 1849. A couple of years ago he was the Republican candidate for U.S. Senator, in opposition to Mr. Douglas. Both gentlemen stumped the State, and their discussions excited much attention throughout the country, as they were marked by great ability. The contest resulted finally in the return of a Democratic Legislature, and the reelection of Mr. Douglas to the U.S. Senate. Since that time, Mr. Lincoln has been prominent as a politician and traveling stump orator in behalf of republicanism, having within a few months past delivered several political lectures in various cities and towns at the North. He is a speaker of considerable ability.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there is more than sentiment for Abraham Lincoln in our thoughts as we observe today

the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's nomination as Republican candidate for President of the United States. There is, more importantly, the recognition that many of the great advances that have resulted in the United States becoming the foremost power in the world today—economically, culturally, militarily—can be attributed to sound principles as set down and adopted at that second Republican Convention in Chicago, May 16, 17, and 18, 1860.

Today, 100 years after Lincoln's nomination as Republican candidate for President and subsequent election, this Nation celebrates a century of progress—continual advancement for a better and more purposeful life.

Lincoln, one of the most quoted of all Americans, is popularly known for his many immortal phrases on moral issues. Among the sagest of all his counsel was the following statement that is so timely and carries such import for us today:

"That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public Treasury by favored partisans."

Mr. Speaker, a sound fiscal policy is today as much a part of the Republican Party's philosophy as it was 100 years ago, and we who are privileged to be affiliated with that party are as dedicated to its principles as were the first Republican leaders. Last year, in what unquestionably was the greatest expression of public opinion directed at Congress in my 11 years on Capitol Hill, Mr. and Mrs. America, with singleness of voice and purpose, demanded that their duly elected Representatives in both Houses of Congress live within the Nation's collective means. The public insisted that wasteful, deficit spending be halted and that the Federal Government demonstrate fiscal responsibility.

There are a number of vital items of legislation that this Congress must enact if it is to discharge its responsibilities and keep faith with its citizens. I urge my colleagues to be guided by these principles in the relatively few weeks remaining of the 86th Congress, and that all sincere effort be made to pass such legislation as we can reasonably expect will meet with the approval of the President. I am sure, in this connection, that his demands relating to the key bills before Congress are most reasonable.

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL is to be commended for taking this time so that we can all pay tribute to one of our Nation's most courageous leaders.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted to repeat everything said by my distinguished colleagues, who have spoken so inspiringly and informatively of Abraham Lincoln on this 100th anniversary of his nomination for the Presidency of the United States, I would feel I would not be saying a bit too much about Abraham Lincoln and his influence on the life and destiny of our Nation; yes, Mr. Speaker, on the life and destiny of the whole world. In several nations where I have traveled officially

as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I could observe very attractive statues, lifesize, of this illustrious Civil War President.

For many years prior to my first coming to this great legislative body 14 years ago, I had the great privilege of being president of the Abraham Lincoln Club at Long Beach, Calif. I am sure that there are many thousands of Californians who are appreciative of his place in history for understanding between people of the human race which was the policy and practice of President Lincoln—both in and out of office.

One of the paragraphs in his message to Congress in 1861 which I always remember and emphasize as very, very appropriate always, is as follows:

The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all, and consequent energy and progress and improvement of condition to all.

I love to read and reread this statement by him during the debates with Stephen Douglas in 1858:

When I was a boy, I spent considerable time along the Sangamon River. An old steamboat plied on the river, the boiler of which was so small that when they blew the whistle, there wasn't enough steam to turn the paddlewheel. When the paddlewheel went around, they couldn't blow the whistle. My friend Douglas reminds me of that old steamboat, for it is evident when he talks he can't think, and when he thinks, he can't talk.

Senator Douglas is of worldwide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party have been looking upon him as certainly at no distant day to be President of the United States. They have seen in his round, jolly, fruitful face post offices, land offices, marshals and Cabinet appointments, charge-ships and foreign missions, bursting and sprouting out in wonderful exuberance ready to be laid hold of by their greedy hands. And as they have been gazing upon this attractive picture so long, they cannot bring themselves to give up the charming hope. On the contrary, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face, nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out. These are disadvantages all taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and principle alone.

I recall the following quotations of his:

With malice toward none; with charity for all;
With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right,
Let us strive on to finish the work we are in;
To bind up the Nation's wounds;
To care for him who shall have borne the battle,
And for his widow and orphan—
To do all which may achieve and cherish,
A just and lasting peace among ourselves
And with all nations.

Stand with anyone that stands right,
Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, we Members of this great legislative body should not be remiss in remembering that Abraham Lincoln was a duly elected Member of the

House of Representatives in his day and was a member of the Illinois delegation in the House from March 4, 1847, until March 4, 1849; and while he and his wife were here in Washington during that period they lived at Mrs. Spriggs boarding house here on the Hill where the Library of Congress now stands. In checking through my reference file about him, I find that on Tuesday, April 26, 1849, I made remarks in the House of Representatives entitled "Lincoln, Martyred Friend of the South." Every year since that it has been an inspiration to me to participate in doing something to remember him.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this discussion led by my able friend and colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and relate to you something about Lincoln in New Hampshire.

We owe our chief knowledge of this subject to Judge Elwin L. Page's book, "Lincoln in New Hampshire," published in 1929. The author in his preface states that upon reading Dr. William E. Barton's "Life of Lincoln" he was struck by Barton's emphasizing the failure hitherto of Lincoln biographers giving adequate consideration to the effect of Lincoln's speeches during the latter's visit to New England in February and March, 1860.

In the winter of 1860 Lincoln delivered his famous speech at Cooper Union—the speech that first brought him seriously to the attention of the East; that predisposed the anti-Seward faction in Lincoln's favor, and which consequently brought about the latter's nomination the following May in Chicago.

Lincoln spoke at Cooper Union on the evening of February 27, 1860. The following evening he spoke before a large audience in Railroad Hall, Providence. The next day, February 29, he was on his way to what must have seemed to him a far northern country indeed—the State of New Hampshire. On Thursday, March 1, he spoke at Concord in the afternoon, and at Manchester in the evening. At Concord he was introduced by Gov. Frederick Smith, who presented him to his audience as "the next President of the United States." As Dr. Barton remarks, "Such an introduction was exceptional," and the author adds ironically that at Norwich, Conn., where Lincoln spoke later, the speaker who preceded Lincoln "went the full length of the general imagination and suggested Lincoln might be the next Vice President."

On Friday, March 2, Lincoln spoke at Dover, and finally, the next evening, at Exeter, spending Sunday with his son Robert, who was attending the famous preparatory school in the town. This speech in the little town on Saturday evening, March 3, 1860, marked the final appearance of Mr. Lincoln in the State.

In all, Lincoln spoke 11 times in New England. As Barton says, biographers of Lincoln have not considered adequately the effect of these New England speeches. Several of these biographers, for example, state that Robert Lincoln was at Harvard at the time of his father's tour of New England. On the

contrary, having failed to pass his entrance examinations for that institution, he was at Phillips Exeter Academy, "boning up." Robert did not enter Harvard until 7 months later; one of his father's reasons for coming East was to look into his son's situation; had Robert been safely matriculated at Harvard in the winter of 1860 his father might not have delivered the Cooper Union speech, and the New England tour might not have been made.

Barton describes the situation in the following words—his book was published in 1925, the year before Robert Todd Lincoln's death:

Robert T. Lincoln is a very reticent man, and for the most part declines to speak for publication concerning his father; but one thing he modestly affirms, which is that he made his father President. In the autumn of 1859, Robert went to Cambridge expecting to enter Harvard. He was required to submit to an entrance examination covering 16 subjects, and he failed in 15 of them. The Lincoln family wrote him not to return home, but to enter Phillips Academy at Exeter, N.H., and complete his preparation. This he did, and at the end of a year was able to enter Harvard and complete a regular course. But Mr. Lincoln was somewhat anxious about Robert's studies, and one of his reasons for being ready to visit New York and speak at Cooper Institute was to visit Robert and see how he was getting on at Exeter. Robert T. Lincoln believes that if he had failed in less than 15 studies his father might have been less solicitous, and might not have delivered the Cooper Union speech, or having delivered it, might have returned from New York direct to Springfield. As it was, he determined to visit Robert and make a few speeches in New England.

As to the Lincoln speeches themselves in New Hampshire, there are, alas, only two summaries in reportorial fashion—that is, in the third person. They, however appear to be fairly adequate, considering the lack of press facilities in little New England towns 100 years ago, and the probable lack of shorthand skill on the part of the reporters. The two summaries which have come down to us appear in the Manchester Daily American for March 2, 1860, and the Dover Inquirer for March 8.

The concluding portion of the Dover report is most certainly reliable, for it is, almost word for word, a literal transcription of the final exordium of the great Cooper Union address: indeed, it is quite possible that Lincoln read from proofs, or the morning issue of one of the several New York papers of February 28, which contained the full text of the address from the original manuscript Mr. Lincoln turned over to Horace Greeley's New York Tribune. Mr. Lincoln's last recorded words in New Hampshire, via the Dover Inquirer, were as follows:

To satisfy them [the slaveholding States] said Mr. Lincoln, is no easy task. We must not only cease to call slavery wrong, but we must join with them in calling it right. Silence will not be tolerated. Douglas' new sedition law must be enacted and enforced. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must pull down our free State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from the taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their trou-

bles proceed from us. Wrong as we believe slavery to be, we should let [it] alone in the States where it exists, because its extirpation would occasion greater wrongs, but we should not, while our votes can prevent it, allow it to spread over the national territories and overrun us in the free States. Neither should we be diverted by trick or stratagem, by a senseless clamor about "popular sovereignty," by any contrivances for groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong—the "don't care" policy of Douglas—or Union appeals to true Union men to yield to the threats of dis-Unionists, which was reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners but the righteous to repentance—none of these things should move or intimidate us; but having faith that right makes might, let us to the end, dare to do our duty.

To Judge Page's delightful and exceedingly valuable book "Abraham Lincoln in New Hampshire," which has rescued and preserved Lincoln's New England tour from obscurity, we owe the following charming account of Mr. Lincoln's last day in New Hampshire:

On that Sabbath just 1 year before his first inaugural, Abraham Lincoln shuffled off the thought of politics and gave himself to rest. Early in the morning he walked out Front Street and along the muddy road toward Kingston. Arriving at a fork some 2 miles out, he took the right hand, leaving Kingston road, and wandered on another mile. Then he heard the pleasant roar of a river a bit to the left. Following the sound, he bore off on a crossroad and came upon Pickpocket Bridge. There he found young William H. Belknap, an Exeter printer, hanging over the rail and watching the swollen stream tumble down the falls. Lincoln joined the youth in gazing at the fascinating spectacle. As seems usually to have been his custom when other human beings were near, he engaged the youth in conversation. What was said was of little moment and was soon forgotten, but that chat with Abraham Lincoln was a lifelong satisfaction to the future townclerk of Exeter. The story that during his Exeter stay Lincoln saw a small boy fishing for eels near the Great Bridge and borrowed his crude alder pole to try his luck may be untrue, but is in keeping with the simple manner of Lincoln's casual contacts with the townspeople.

Lincoln worshiped that Sunday in the Second Church of the New Parish. The meetinghouse stood in the corner of the Academy yard near the present site of the public library on Front Street. The edifice was removed years after Lincoln's visit, and the parish has ceased to exist. The pew in which he sat has been preserved with great care and is now in the First Church. It was the property of Commodore John Collins Long and Mary Olivia Long, true representatives of the Exeter aristocracy of the day. The minister of the church at the time was the Reverend Orpheus T. Lanphier.

After the service Lincoln walked with Robert to the boy's lodgings in the Clarke (or Simeon Folsom) house on Hemlock Square, at the corner of High and Pleasant Streets, just over the Great Bridge. In their crossings of the river, however, the two usually took the rather shorter way over the lower bridge at the Island and thence out Pleasant Street. In the portion of the house fronting on this street, in the left-hand, second-story room, the Lincolns had their Sunday dinner.

During his days in Exeter, Lincoln was seen much in Robert's company. That is one point upon which the evidence is clear and full. The father entered with real zest into the boy's interests and his companionships with the other students. This was the prime object of his trip into New England, and in spite of political calls he accom-

plished it. For these purely private pursuits he had Wednesday evening, Saturday afternoon, and all of Sunday afternoon and evening.

Lincoln appears in these contacts with the boys and with the townspeople he ran across to have been ever simple and sociable, a man thoroughly enjoying his brief snatches of holiday. A story was told by Albert Blair of a little gathering of academy boys in Bob's room on Sunday evening. Into the chatter Lincoln entered with true boy-like spirit. Bob remarked that one of the party, Henry Cluskey, played the banjo. "Does he?" said Lincoln in his high-pitched voice. "Where is the banjo?" "In my room," replied Cluskey. "Can't you get it?" "Oh, I don't think you would care for it, Mr. Lincoln." "Oh, yes. Go get it." And so the owner of the banjo went and fetched it from his room several blocks away, and played upon it. Lincoln listened with unaffected pleasure. "Robert," he said, "you ought to have one." What the youngsters chiefly remembered about their friend's father was that when he talked with Bob, or the boys gathered around, the deep seams of his face broke into a series of twinkling lines. Every boy was at once drawn to him, as he was to them.

The holiday—

Writes Judge Page—

was all too short. At a few minutes before 7 on Monday morning, March 5, 1860, Lincoln boarded the train at Exeter for Hartford, where he was to deliver a major address. Never again would he breathe the bracing air wafted down from the White Mountains, to meet and mingle with that from the caves of the misty Atlantic.

And thus—

Concludes Judge Page—

Abraham Lincoln passed from the sight of New Hampshire, but not from her memory.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Illinois, as throughout the Nation, Democrat and Republican alike, revere the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

It is fitting, therefore, that, although a Democrat, I feel privileged to join in this tribute to Lincoln on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his nomination by the Republican Party of 1860 as its candidate for President of the United States.

However, I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to another great American, another stalwart son of Illinois, that great leader of the Democratic Party, Stephen Douglas.

If, as many historians say, Lincoln's debates with Douglas gained him national stature and led to the presidential nomination, it was because Douglas already had risen to preeminence in the political life of this country.

It was the mark of the man that Douglas, once Lincoln became Chief Executive amid the flames of civil war, forsook partisanship and loyally supported his Commander in Chief.

An interesting account of this final episode in the stirring life of Illinois' "Little Giant" is given in the following account prepared at my request by Mr. John T. Rodgers, editorial specialist with the history and government division of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

The great political battle, formally opened by the ominous "House divided" speech at Springfield, Ill., on June 16, 1858, was at last

decided—insofar as it could lawfully be decided—by the returns as they filtered through from the North on the evening of November 6, 1860.

And the defeated—but still indubitably great opponent of that most fateful political field? I cannot, I feel, do better than to quote from Miss Tarbell's "Life of Lincoln," which, after three score and 5 years, still casts an indefinable charm. Speaking of the inaugural ceremonies on that foreboding March 4, 1861, Miss Tarbell writes:

"A few moments' delay, and the movement from the Senate toward the east front began, the Justices of the Supreme Court, in cap and gown, heading the procession. As soon as the large company was seated on the platform erected on the east portico of the Capitol, Mr. Lincoln arose and advanced to the front, where he was introduced by his friend, Senator Baker, of Oregon. He carried a cane and a little roll—the manuscript of his inaugural address. There was a moment's pause after the introduction, as he vainly looked for a spot where he might place his high silk hat. Stephen A. Douglas, the political antagonist of his whole public life, the man who had pressed his hardest in the campaign of 1860, was seated just behind him. Douglas stepped forward quickly, and took the hat which Mr. Lincoln held helplessly in his hand. 'If I can't be President,' he whispered smilingly to Mrs. Brown, a cousin of Mrs. Lincoln and a member of the President's party, 'I at least can hold his hat.'

"Douglas' conduct cannot be overpraised," wrote the 'Public Man' in his 'Diary.' 'I saw him for a moment in the morning, when he told me that he meant to put himself as prominently forward in the ceremonies as he properly could, and to leave no doubt on any one's mind of his determination to stand by the new administration in the performance of its first great duty to maintain the Union.'

"Immediately after the firing on Fort Sumter, Douglas accompanied George Ashmun to the White House, at the latter's suggestion, to assure the President of his support. He was cordially received and heard the President read a draft of the proclamation calling for 75,000 volunteers to suppress rebellion. His only criticism was: 'I would make it 200,000.' Otherwise their accord was complete. In the columns of the newspapers next morning Democrats read the President's proclamation and a dispatch (written by Douglas) announcing the determination of Senator Douglas fully to sustain the President in the exercise of all his constitutional functions to preserve the Union. From this time on Douglas was in frequent conference with the President. It was on Lincoln's advice that he left the Capitol to rouse the people of the Northwest to the seriousness of the crisis. He spoke twice on the way, both times with obvious emotion, deprecating secession and pleading for the support of the Government at Washington. On April 25, he made a remarkable speech to his own people in the capitol at Springfield. Fifty years later, men who had been his political opponents could not speak of it without emotion. 'I do not think it is possible,' wrote Horace White, 'for a human being to produce a more prodigious effect with spoken words' (Herndon-Weik, Lincoln II, 126-27). His great sonorous voice reverberated through the chamber until it seemed to shake the building, stirring men and women to a frenzy of excitement. In a few weeks that great voice was still. Stricken soon after with typhoid fever, he battled resolutely as ever with this last foe, but succumbed on June 3, 1861, his last words a message to his two boys bidding them to obey the laws and support the Constitution."

Thus did not the least of the sons of Illinois pass over the Great Divide, his last

thought—his very last breath—in support of the Union he so dearly and zealously loved.

LINCOLN AND WISCONSIN

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa has done a real service to take the leadership in commemorating the anniversary of President Lincoln's nomination as the first Republican President on May 18, 1860. I would like to add some Wisconsin Lincoln history to our proceedings today.

1. LINCOLN IN THE BLACK HAWK WAR

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1832, Black Hawk and his band of Sauk Indians crossed the Mississippi River from Iowa into northern Illinois, angry at the treatment his people had received and intending to start an Indian uprising if he could.

Upon news of the invasion, Gov. John Reynolds, of Illinois, called for volunteers. Abraham Lincoln, then 23 years old and living in New Salem, responded promptly to the appeal, and while serving in the campaign spent some 11 days in southern Wisconsin.

Telling later about his experiences, Lincoln said he served nearly 3 months in the war, met the ordinary hardships of such an expedition, but was in no battle, although he "had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes."

On April 21, 1832, the recruits from New Salem met on a farm 9 miles from the village and formed a company of mounted volunteers with Lincoln as captain. A week later they were mustered into the State service, becoming a part of the 4th Illinois Regiment of Mounted Volunteers. After an excursion into northwestern Illinois, the company was sent to Ottawa on the Illinois River. There on May 26 Lincoln reenlisted for 20 days as a private and a day later transferred to still another company, the Independent Rangers, which company was mustered out on June 16.

Lincoln at once reenlisted for another 30 days in the Independent Spy Corps. On June 22 this company left for northwestern Illinois and began a march up the Rock River in pursuit of Black Hawk's main force.

On July 1, 1832, the army crossed Rock River at Turtle Village—today Beloit, Wis.—the soldiers sleeping on their arms behind log breastworks that night, to be ready for surprise attack. On July 6 the army marched up the east bank of Lake Koshkonong and made camp 4 miles above the mouth of the White Water River. There at General Atkinson's headquarters Lincoln and his comrades in the company were honorably discharged "with the special thanks" of the general on July 10.

Lincoln and a companion returned by horseback and canoe to New Salem, reaching the village soon after July 17.

Numerous stories of Lincoln in the war have been told, most of them without documentation. One is that while captain of the company the men reached a narrow gate. Unable to remember the command for single file, Lincoln ordered them to fall out for 2 minutes and re-

form on the other side. Another is that when asked if he was afraid of Black Hawk, Lincoln said, "Well, I guess not. I'm no chicken."

The experience did teach Lincoln to appreciate how fighting men thought and felt. In the war he faced danger, often expecting Indian attack at night. He learned what war meant to the common man, and perhaps carried his sympathy for the private soldier into the Civil War.

2. LINCOLN'S SECOND VISIT TO WISCONSIN, SEPTEMBER 30-OCTOBER 2, 1859

Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1859, Lincoln delivered the annual State fair address in Milwaukee. The State fairgrounds then were located near what is now 13th Street near Wells.

The Milwaukee speech stands as Lincoln's only formal address on the subject of agriculture. It was carefully prepared, as though he fully appreciated its importance in a commanding agricultural State. It reveals Lincoln as one of clear vision on the future of farming; in fact, some of his prophecies now seem amazingly accurate in the light of present technical developments for scientific and less burdensome farming.

The speaker evaluated boldly the respective rights of labor and of capital as he saw them. He was outspoken also in advocating a broad educational policy for his fellow citizens, having particular reference to the need for a blending of schooling and occupational training for workers.

That evening Lincoln spoke extemporaneously at the Newhall House in Milwaukee and the next day, October 1, delivered two antislavery speeches in Rock County—one at Beloit in the afternoon and one at Janesville in the evening. The two local newspapers reported the speeches in the form of editorial reviews, with scarcely a direct quotation from the speaker.

The Beloit Journal—weekly—October 5, 1859, reported that a large crowd and a band met Mr. Lincoln at the station. At 2 o'clock a packed hall heard him introduced by Mr. Bannister, president of the Republican club.

"Then 'Old Abe' commenced the clearest and most conclusive vindication of Republican principles, as well as the most unanswerable demonstration of the fallacy and utter absurdity of the Douglas doctrines, which we ever listened to."

The Beloit address was heard by several prominent Republican leaders of nearby Janesville, including an ardent abolitionist, William H. Tallman, who persuaded Lincoln to ride with him in his carriage to Janesville and deliver an address that evening. Lincoln consented, and after the speech that—Saturday, October 1—night, spent the night, the next day, and the following night at Tallman's house.

The Janesville speech was reported in the Janesville Morning Gazette, October 4:

When Mr. Lincoln made his appearance he was greeted with cheers, and was introduced to the people by Dr. Treat, the president of the Republican club. * * * When he came to make his points tell, and to

drive home his logical conclusions, the evidence of his profound thought was apparent, while his powers of satire and wit flashed out brilliantly, and rather startling the audience by their unexpectedness.

The Tallman house, the only identifiable house in which Lincoln is known to have slept while in Wisconsin, is now a public museum, the headquarters of the Rock County Historical Society.

3. BIRTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party was born in 1854. There is no dispute as to the year of its formal organization, although debate still goes on as to the exact birthplace. Most historians accept Ripon's claim as the birthplace of Lincoln's party.

The first recorded meeting of "Republicans" was held by a number of Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats in the Congregational Church at Ripon on February 28, 1854, at the call of Maj. Alvan E. Bovay, a prominent Whig. A resolution was adopted providing that, if the Kansas-Nebraska bill passed, the existing Ripon party organizations should be abandoned and a new party, to be called the Republican, should be formed.

When the bill did pass the Senate, Major Bovay called a second meeting, which was held on March 20 in the Ripon schoolhouse. By a house-to-house and shop-to-shop canvass, he obtained attendance of 53 voters, out of not more than 100 eligible in the town. The meeting voted to dissolve the local Whig and Free Soil organizations, and a committee of five was appointed to form the new Republican Party.

Many years later Major Bovay said of the schoolhouse meeting:

We went into the little meeting, Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats. We came out of it Republicans, and we were the first Republicans in the Union.

The spring and summer of 1854 saw many other meetings, held under one banner or another, that brought Republican organizations into being in Michigan, Ohio, Iowa, and Maine.

The most notable meeting—notable because it was a formal convention that adopted a platform and nominated a full State ticket—was held "under the oaks" at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, 1854. The convention resolved "that we will cooperate and be known as Republicans until the contest be terminated."

The movement begun in the Ripon church and "under the oaks" at Jackson had changed the political face of the Nation.

The little Ripon schoolhouse, still standing, is labeled "Birthplace of the Republican Party."

4. THE CONVENTION AND ELECTION OF 1860

Mr. Speaker, at the Republican National Convention held in Chicago May 16-18, 1860, the Wisconsin delegation consistently cast its entire 10 votes for William H. Seward on each ballot.

Carl Schurz, one of the delegates and chairman of the Wisconsin delegation, seconded the nomination of Seward and after the nomination of Lincoln by the convention made a brief speech in re-

sponse to a motion by Mr. Evarts, of New York, that the nomination of Lincoln be made unanimous.

Schurz said, in part:

The delegates of Wisconsin were instructed to cast their votes unanimously for William H. Seward. * * * We stood by Mr. Seward to the last, and I tell you we stand by him yet, in support of Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois. * * * Again, do we stand by Mr. Seward as we did before, for we know that he will be at the head of our column, joining in the battle cry that unites us now, "Lincoln and victory."

5. CARL SCHURZ AND THE CAMPAIGN OF 1860

Mr. Speaker, from the close of the Wisconsin State convention, March 1, until after the November 6 election, Schurz was almost constantly busied with work for the national cause. On May 30 at the Milwaukee ratification meeting he delivered one of the best of his short speeches, pointing out how the convention had refused to compromise Republican principles. He paid a high tribute to Seward. Then he spoke of Lincoln, using language which must have introduced him most favorably to the millions, especially in the East, who had been taught to look upon the Illinois lawyer as a second- or third-rate man.

After lecturing throughout the country in the summer and fall, Schurz returned to Wisconsin for the last 2 weeks of the campaign. He made numerous speeches in the city and county of Milwaukee and covered, by team, a large share of the great German community near Lake Michigan. The results in Wisconsin, as well as in Indiana, Ohio, St. Louis, and Pennsylvania, spoke of his almost superhuman effort to swing the German vote for Lincoln.

In the election of 1860, Wisconsin cast 86,113 votes—56.6 percent—for Lincoln, 65,021 votes—42.7 percent—for Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, the information I have used today has been collected by the Wisconsin State Historical Society from the following sources: Edward P. Alexander's "Lincoln Comes to Wisconsin;" Publications of the Lincoln Fellowship of Wisconsin, 1943 and 1949; Joseph Schafer's "Carl Schurz."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today the Republican Party made one of the wisest decisions in its history. It chose as its presidential nominee a tall, somewhat ungainly man who represented Illinois in our own House of Representatives. We pause in our legislative duties today to pay tribute to the nomination of Abraham Lincoln.

Can words ever describe our feeling for this humble giant of a man? I think they can, Mr. Speaker, for it was Lincoln himself who showed us how powerful, how effective, how moving simple words could be. Of course, it is presumptuous of us to suppose we could say anything to match the classic words of Lincoln; we can only find consolation in the thought that Lincoln was but a man, and his example showed us the heights of wisdom man can attain.

Recall that Lincoln lived before the development of mass communications, that such a thing as a "TV personality" was undreamed of. Yet he was able to bring tears to the eyes of grown men

when he spoke, affect an audience so deeply that it could not applaud, unite a Nation divided. He has been called the Shakespeare of politics, and this is entirely fitting.

That his words guide Republicans today is testimony to the enduring quality of his prose. We still hold that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do, at all, or cannot, so well do, for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities."

For the last 20 years I have been privileged to represent in the House of Representatives more than 350,000 fellow residents of New Jersey. They will never know the daily feeling of honor and pride that I have experienced in the knowledge that they have chosen me to speak their will in the same body that once knew Abraham Lincoln as a Member. Yes, the Republicans chose well at their second national convention on May 18, 1860, and Americans everywhere will always applaud their action.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Iowa in this observance of the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, Nebraska was a territory in 1860 when Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President by the Republican Party. Nebraska was allotted six votes at the Chicago convention. A. S. Paddock, of Fort Calhoun, Nebr., acted as vice president of the convention, each State and Territory having a vice president and secretary. H. P. Hitchcock, of Omaha, acted as secretary from the Nebraska Territory.

Other members of the Nebraska delegation to the convention included O. H. Irish, Nebraska City, a member of the committee on permanent organization; John R. Meredith, Omaha, committee on credentials; Samuel H. Elbert, Plattsmouth, committee on business; A. Sidney Gardner, committee on resolutions, Phineas W. Hitchcock and E. D. Webster, both of Omaha.

Paddock later served as Senator from the State of Nebraska from 1875 through 1881. Members of the Hitchcock family also served the State in high office in later years, Phineas W. Hitchcock being elected a delegate to Congress from the territory to the 39th Congress and serving as Senator from 1871 to 1877. His son, Gilbert M. Hitchcock, was a Representative in Congress in the 58th, 60th and 61st Congresses and served as Senator from Nebraska from 1911 through 1923. He also established the Omaha Evening Herald and purchased the Omaha Morning World, which now exist as the Omaha World-Herald, Omaha's only daily paper. Mr. Hitchcock's widow is now a resident of Washington, D.C.

On this occasion I wish it were possible for me to say that Nebraska's six votes in the 1860 convention were solidly for Lincoln, but that was not the case. In fact only one of Nebraska's votes was cast for Lincoln on the first ballot, with two for Seward, two for Chase, and one for Cameron.

On the third ballot, when Lincoln was nominated, our Nebraska delegates still cast only one vote for Honest Abe. But of course the nomination was made unanimous a few minutes later, after Nebraska and many other delegations had switched their entire vote to Lincoln.

Although Nebraska is the only State to honor Lincoln by naming its capital city after him, he apparently never set foot in our State. In 1859 he came as close as Council Bluffs, Iowa, across the Missouri River from Omaha, and made a speech there. William J. Petersen in his book "Lincoln and Iowa" reports:

It attracted a good crowd, even though it was unscheduled, and it elicited conflicting reactions from the Republican and Democratic editors of Council Bluffs. The friendly Nonpareil praised his "masterly and unanswerable speech" and the "dexterity with which he applied the political scalpel to the Democratic carcass." The Weekly Bugle spoke in a derisive vein of Lincoln's effort, but admitted that his defeat by Senator Douglas had "magnified him into quite a lion" at Council Bluffs. Lincoln stayed at the Pacific House on this occasion and made his speech in Concert Hall.

Since this is also the 100th anniversary of the founding of the pony express, it is interesting to note that the pony express carried President Lincoln's first inaugural address across Nebraska. The distance from St. Joseph, Mo., to Denver, Colo., 665 miles, was covered on this historic trip in 69 hours.

Nebraska has long been proud of the fact that it is one of the major railway centers of the continental United States. Without a doubt, it is due to Nebraska's vast railway system that it is now the No. 1 stock market in the world and that it is attracting new industry every day. It was in 1863 that Peter Day, chief engineer of the Union Pacific Railroad, received a telegram in Omaha which announced that President Lincoln had fixed the initial point of the railroad on the "western boundary of the State of Iowa, opposite Omaha."

What is said to be the last signature of President Lincoln appears on the commission reappointing Alvin Saunders of Iowa to be Governor of the Territory of Nebraska. The commission is dated April 13, 1865. Governor Saunders states in a note written in his own hand at the bottom of the document:

The signature of President Lincoln attached to this commission was evidently the last official signature made by him—he signed it before leaving for the theater where he was assassinated, and left the commission on his desk without stopping to fold it, and where it was found when the room was opened after his death. These facts were communicated to me by one of the clerks.

In 1867, shortly after the admission of Nebraska to the Union as a State, it was decided that the capital would not remain in Omaha. Senator J. D. H. Patrick of Omaha moved that the new capital should be named after President Lincoln. The name was promptly approved, and the capital of Nebraska is still named Lincoln in fond memory of that famous President.

The Lincoln Monument stands on the west side of the Nebraska Capitol lawn

as an additional tribute to that famous American. It was designed by Daniel Chester French and was completed in 1912. The following description of the statue is found in "Nebraska, a Guide to the Cornhusker State":

Abraham Lincoln is portrayed standing in a meditative pose, with head bowed and hands clasped, before a large granite tablet on which the Gettysburg Address is engraved.

The original model of the statue is in the Lincoln Tomb in Springfield, Ill., while a replica of the statue is to be found in the Chicago Museum of Art.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the historic Wigwam Convention, which nominated Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency, assembled in Chicago 100 years ago, May 16, 1860.

Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, coordinator of information for the House of Representatives, has reconstructed that convention from the rich Lincoln Archives in the Library of Congress.

Because that event "opened a new era in our national history," I include Mr. Sullivan's summary of the convention in the proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with two brief quotations from Abraham Lincoln in the years 1860 and 1861, expressing his great humility as he left Springfield, Ill., for Washington.

The article and quotations are as follows:

CHICAGO'S FIRST NATIONAL CONVENTION—ABE LINCOLN'S NOMINATION IN THE HISTORIC WIGWAM 100 YEARS AGO THIS WEEK, OPENED A NEW ERA IN HUMAN HISTORY

(By Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information, U.S. House of Representatives)

The convention which picked Abraham Lincoln as its presidential candidate assembled in Chicago 100 years ago this week. The Republican Party was only 6 years old.

Few participants in that historic convention suspected that their deliberations would lead to the abolition of human slavery in the United States, in less than 4 years.

The convention assembled in the newly constructed Wigwam on Wednesday, May 16, and Lincoln was nominated on Friday, May 18.

Years later the distinguished British historian, Lord Charnwood, described the convention's choice as the "most surprising nomination ever made in America."

The Wigwam, completed only a month before, accommodated almost 10,000 persons. Constructed entirely of rough lumber the magnificent edifice had cost \$7,000. The city of Chicago, then less than 30 years old, had reared the Wigwam in a bold bid against mighty New York and stately Philadelphia for its first national political convention. The rugged, blustering West was emerging as the new power center of U.S. politics.

Lincoln did not go to Chicago for the convention, but remained at home in Springfield, close to his family and intimate friends. He had confided to young reporter Henry Villard months earlier that his wife, in 1859, had predicted his election some day to the Presidency of the United States.

"Just think of such a sucker as me as President," Lincoln said laughingly to Villard.

Like many other convention winners through the years, Abe Lincoln never publicly announced himself a candidate for the Presidency. But he did move about the country freely after the celebrated Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858; and early in 1860

he ventured as far as New England, and to the historic Cooper Union in New York City, for speaking engagements.

Upon his return to Springfield, early in March, he began writing personal letters to prospective convention delegates in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kansas, and Kentucky. On May 12, 4 days before the convention assembled in the Wigwam, two trusted political intimates from Illinois, Jesse K. Dubois and Judge David Davis, were in Chicago "ready" in Lincoln's words, "to confer with friends from other States."

To another friend Lincoln wrote in confidence a few months before the convention, "The taste is in my mouth a little." And to a Chicago banker who had invited him to bed and board during the convention, Lincoln wrote a few days before May 16: "I am a little too much a candidate to stay home and not quite enough a candidate to go."

Murat Halstead, telegraphed to the Cincinnati Commercial May 16, that 25,000 visitors were in Chicago for the convention. The current of the universal twaddle as the convention opened, he added, was "that Old Abe will be the nominee."

Halstead remarked his journalist room-mates had been irrepressible to a late hour, and he had caught them playing cards early next morning to determine who would pay for a round of gin cocktails before breakfast.

Horace Greeley, the distinguished New York abolitionist editor, and himself an aspiring darkhorse before convention, was a striking figure in the crowded hubbub of Tremont House, the Republican headquarters hotel.

Lincoln's friends won their first victory in the platform committee, where they were successful in defeating the abolitionists' demand for a total denunciation of slavery. The Lincoln moderates carried the day with a plank ignoring slavery in the original States, but forbidding any extension of slavery into new territories as they might be organized. The platform also called for a railroad to the Pacific Ocean, to be assisted by Federal grants.

The first rollcall for President gave William H. Seward, New York, 173½; Lincoln 102; Edward Bates of Missouri 48; Cameron of Pennsylvania 50½; and Salmon P. Chase of Ohio 49. The total vote was 465, with 233 necessary to nominate.

As the second rollcall began the rumor spread that Pennsylvania's votes for Cameron would swing to Lincoln. The final tally on this rollcall showed Seward 184½; Lincoln 181.

The Seward forces realized they were defeated. They saw now that Lincoln's personal preconvention canvass of the delegates by mail already assured him a vast majority of the 100 scattered votes still to swing to make a nomination.

Early in the third rollcall, word spread through the Wigwam that Lincoln was the man. About midway in the call, Ohio interrupted to switch 4 votes from Chase to Lincoln—sufficient to make the required majority of 233 for Abe. At this juncture, Halstead noted, "there were thousands cheering with the energy of insanity."

New York then moved to make the nomination unanimous.

Lincoln's political genius had found succinct expression in a preconvention letter to an Ohio delegate: "Our policy, then, is to give no offense to others—leave them in a good mood to come to us if they shall be compelled to give up their first love. This, too, is dealing justly with all, and leaving us in a mood to support heartily whoever shall be nominated."

This firm policy of peaceful coexistence with all the "favorite son" candidates at length paid off when Seward, the uncompromising firebrand abolitionist, failed to command a majority on the second ballot.

The 1860 Wigwam convention, in short, demonstrated the prescient wisdom of Lincoln's original position in the 1858 debates with Douglas. "I did not at any time say I was in favor of Negro suffrage. . . . I declared against it." He had frankly admitted a total lack of Federal authority to abolish slavery in the original States, and was inclined personally not to "disturb" existing slave areas, but only to limit the spread of slavery to new territories. In the convention, this proved to be the political middle-ground which finally won the majority from the hardshell abolitionist, Seward.

Carl Sandburg emphasizes that Lincoln and Douglas were so close together in their fear of political sectionalism that several prominent Republicans had suggested Douglas, the Illinois Democratic Senator, reelected in 1858, might make a better Republican presidential nominee than Abe Lincoln in 1860.

In their great debates, both men, in Illinois, had sought to subordinate any question which tended to draw a sharp political line between the North and South. To this end, Lincoln was at pains to make clear he did not insist that Missouri should emancipate her slaves. Questions touching racial equality, intermarriage and such, he dismissed as "false issues."

Douglas likewise ignored all arguments for complete abolition, and agreed with Lincoln on the exclusion of slavery in all new territories. Lincoln demanded this exclusion by congressional enactment, while Douglas would leave the question to popular vote in the new areas as they approached statehood.

Lincoln was in the telegraph office in Springfield when news of the second ballot flashed from Chicago.

"I've got him," he exclaimed as he read the tally showing his own gain of 79 votes, against a gain of only 11 for Seward.

Then Lincoln and his friends moved over to the Journal office to await the third ballot. Soon Mr. Zane, the editor, rushed into the room with the Wigwam decision, calling for three cheers for the next President. Bedlam broke in all Springfield.

When a friend suggested a biography in book form, Lincoln replied, "There is not much in my past life about which to write a book."

After shaking hands all around, Lincoln joined the street crowds outside the Journal, saluting and greeting all who approached him. At length, glancing toward his house he said, "Well, gentlemen, there is a little short woman at our house who is probably more interested in this dispatch than I am; and if you will excuse me, I will take it up and let her see it."

About 6 weeks later, on July 4, Lincoln wrote his old Springfield friend, Dr. A. G. Henry, now in Oregon, to the effect " * * * today it looks as if the Chicago ticket will be elected."

November 6 again confirmed Lincoln's X-ray political judgment. The popular vote stood: Lincoln 1,866,452, Douglas 1,375,157, Breckinridge 847,953, Bell 589,581.

The electoral vote: Lincoln 180 (18 States), Breckinridge 72 (11 States), Bell 39 (3 States), Douglas 12 (1 State).

Had the Lincoln opposition got together on a fusion ticket, the results would have been different only in New Jersey, California, and Oregon, for a total of 11 electoral votes. Lincoln still would have won with 169, a clear majority in his own right.

That's how things went a hundred summers ago.

LINCOLN'S POSITION ON SLAVERY

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the Nation; but

can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national territories, and to overrun us here in these free States? (Cooper Union, N.Y., February 27, 1860.)

LINCOLN'S FAREWELL TO SPRINGFIELD FRIENDS, FEBRUARY 11, 1861, AT THE RAILROAD STATION AS HE LEFT FOR WASHINGTON

My friends: No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feelings of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all yet will be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this anniversary day to pass without my boasting of the fact that Abraham Lincoln was nominated to the Presidency in Chicago, Ill., as the son of my home State of Illinois.

To be sure, Kentucky has its claim. That is where he was born. And Indiana has its claim. That is where he was raised as a boy. But it was in Illinois that he rose to greatness.

It is with pride that we make these special claims. At the same time, we recognize that Lincoln does not belong to any one State. He belongs to all Americans. He belongs to the ages.

Chicago was impressed with its responsibilities as the host for the nomination convention in May of 1860. They erected a special building for the occasion at the southeast corner of Lake and Market Streets. It was called the Wigwam. It was characterized at that time as a "gigantic structure, the largest audience room in the United States."

An advertisement in the Chicago Tribune urged citizens to donate all the chairs they could spare for the gallery. It is an interesting fact that to get into this gallery for the convention gentlemen had to be accompanied by ladies.

The Chicago Tribune reported that this rule for gallery admission led to many curious bargains. Schoolgirls were urged to accept a quarter or half dollar to escort a gentleman to the gallery. Some of the enterprising girls found they could make considerable pocket money by entering different doors with different gentlemen.

Although women did not have a vote in those days, they demonstrated their party loyalty by tastefully decorating the convention hall. And so, from the very day of the foundation of our Republican Party women have played a part in our party's activities. Today they play a part beyond measure.

All this is Americana, never to be forgotten. In reviewing the life of Abraham Lincoln we are constantly inspired. His words and deeds show us the way in our efforts to serve our beloved country.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, many Kansans are aware of the effect Lincoln had on the controversy over whether Kansas should come into the Union as a Free or Slave State.

The Kansas-Nebraska bill was the basis of the famous Douglas-Lincoln debates in their campaign for Senator from Illinois. Douglas, the Democrat, won. Douglas became the leader of the northern Democrats in the Senate. The chief political issues that were fomenting in the 14 years period just prior to the Civil War was an attempt on the part of the Old Whigs and northern Democrats to chart their course through the political seas so as to avoid the rocks of discord caused by the slavery question. The alignments of some of the political leaders in various States were constantly shifting from Whig to Democrat and from Democrat to Whig.

Both of these parties took no positive stand on the slavery question. Lincoln, in his debates with Douglas, strongly indicated the necessity for a positive position on slavery when he said:

This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free.

This statement was the harbinger of a new party.

Throughout the New England States the tide was rising for a more positive stand on the question of slavery. The start was made at Ripon, Wis., in 1854, to organize a new party which would take a definite stand on slavery. This new party—Republican—strongly offered the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which would leave it to the settlers whether Kansas and Nebraska would be slave or free. In 1856, Lincoln supported John C. Fremont, Republican candidate for President, making some 56 speeches in his behalf. Buchanan, the Democrat, was elected. Lincoln returned to his law practice in Springfield, Ill.

The Republican Party was kept alive over the question of slavery. The moneyed and illustrious-named American key people needed to keep the new party functioning were to be found in the eastern part of the United States. Chief among them were William K. Seward, of New York. Seward became the chief spokesman for this newly organized party. He and his friends, during the years of 1858-59, were constantly on the alert and formulated plans to name the Republican nominee for 1860.

Lincoln—at the insistence of his mid-western friends—was also active. It is common knowledge that Lincoln came to Kansas in 1859 at the insistence of his Kansas friends, in order to build him up to be the Republican nominee. Lincoln was received enthusiastically wherever he stopped and spoke. He was promised by his warm admirers the Kansas votes at the coming Republican Convention in Chicago.

But then, as now, there is many a slip between "cup and lip."

Herewith is a letter from the Ewing collection manuscripts from the Kansas State Historical Society. This letter was written by Thomas Ewing, Jr. It explains the feeling that existed in

Kansas. They wanted positive action and Seward seemed to have the qualifications demanded.

Here is the letter:

LEAVENWORTH, KANS., May 6, 1860.
HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
Springfield, Wis.

DEAR SIR: You will probably have observed that the Kansas delegation to Chicago were instructed by the convention by which they were selected to cast their votes (if they should have any) for Mr. Seward, and that Mr. Wilder, who is for Mr. Seward from choice, was chosen as the delegate from Leavenworth, over Colonel Delahay who was understood to be strongly in favor of your nomination. I have desired that you should know how both those things happened—and as I cannot be at Chicago, where I had expected to talk the matters over with you or with some of your personal friends, I shall take the liberty explaining them to you directly by letter.

Here as nearly everywhere in the North, Mr. Seward has more ardent, zealous and earnest admirers than any other candidate—and they are in the radical wing of the party which has possession of nearly all the presses, and controls all the minor conventions and less important movements of the party. As it was by no means certain that the Kansas delegates would be accorded seats in the national convention, or the right to vote, the great majority of the party took no interest in the movement, and the meetings called to appoint delegates to the Territorial convention were scarcely attended at all except by the managers. In that convention no interest was taken in any subjects except in selecting the delegates, three of whom are first for Mr. Seward from choice, but all of whom regard you as a highly acceptable and available candidate. The convention selected men who had done good service for the party and received no honor or reward and who well merited the compliment of an appointment, none of whom were selected with reference to their preferences among the gentlemen named for the Chicago nomination.

In the apportionment Leavenworth was accorded but one delegate, Wilder, who has done a great deal of hard work for the party here, had announced himself as a candidate for the place more than a year ago, and the place had been accorded to him without dissent, until the time for selecting delegates to the Territorial convention was near at hand. Colonel Delahay then, feeling assured that the great majority of the Republicans of Leavenworth favored your nomination, became a candidate in opposition to Wilder. The colonel was on all hands regarded as one of our best men and as representing truly the preferences of the majority of our Republicans, but he had just had one of the best offices of our poor Territory. Wilder had worked as hard, had held no office, and had all along been accorded this place, and as he had a big start, and the most money, the colonel could not make the race against him.

Our delegation at Chicago will, in perseverance of instructions, if given a vote, cast it for Mr. Seward. Three of them will adhere to him pretty tenaciously. Mr. Seward and Chase dropped, I think you would be the next choice of every man in the delegation.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS EWING, JR.

In the three ballots necessary to nominate Lincoln Kansas regularly cast its six votes for Seward. Kansas Republicans joined the Lincoln parade too late to do much good except to have their final votes recast with the winner.

MR. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Iowa in commemorating this 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States, and include herewith material abstracted from "Caucuses of 1860: A History of the National Political Conventions of the Current Presidential Campaign," by M. Halstead:

THE CHICAGO CONVENTION, MAY 15

The crowd is this evening becoming prodigious. The Tremont House is so crammed that it is with much difficulty people get about in it from one room to another. Near 1,500 people will sleep in it tonight.

The Bates movement, the McLean movement, the Cameron movement, the Banks movement, are all nowhere. They have gone down like lead in the mighty waters. "Old Abe" and "Old Ben" are in the field against Seward. Abe and Ben are representatives of the conservatism, the respectability, the availability, and all that sort of thing.

First day—Official roll of the convention

Kentucky, 12 votes:

At large: Geo. D. Blakey, Russellville; A. A. Burton, Lancaster; Wm. D. Gallagher, Peewee Valley; Charles Hendley, Newport.

Districts:

1. Abner Williams, Covington; H. G. Otis, Louisville.
2. Fred Frische, Louisville; E. H. Harrison, McKee.
3. Joseph Glazebrook, Glasgow; Jos. W. Calvert, Bowling Green.
4. John J. Hawes, Louisville.
5. H. D. Hawes, Louisville; Lewis M. Dembitz, Louisville.
6. Curtis Knight, Kingston; Joseph Rawlings, White Hall.
7. A. H. Meriwether, Louisville; Henry D. Hawes, Louisville.
8. H. B. Groaddus, Ashland; L. Marston, Millersburg.
9. Edgard Needham, Louisville; J. S. Davis.
10. Jas. R. Whittemore, Newport; Hamilton Cummings, Covington.

A Committee on Permanent Organization was constituted as follows: [List given.] Kentucky, Allen J. Bristow.

A DELEGATE FROM KENTUCKY. Mr. President, I would suggest that the name of all the States be called. [Applause.]

THE CHAIR. Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi [great laughter], Louisiana, Alabama [laughter and hissing], Georgia, South Carolina [laughter], North Carolina [feeble hisses and much laughter]. I believe that includes the names of all the States.

The Committee on Credentials was made up as follows: [List given.] Kentucky, Charles Hendley.

The committee on business was constituted as follows: [List given.] Kentucky, Louis M. Dembitz.

The convention had proceeded thus far with its business, when a communication, inviting the convention to take an excursion on the lake, was received and accepted, and then indefinitely debated, much time being frittered away.

The committee on resolutions was appointed: [List given.] Kentucky, George D. Blakey.

The favorite word in the convention is "solemn." Everything is solemn. In Charleston the favorite was "crisis." Here there is something every 10 minutes found to be solemn.

A new ticket is talked of here tonight, and an informal meeting held in this house since I have been writing this letter, has given it an impetus. It is "Lincoln and Hickman." This is now the ticket as against Seward and "Cash" Clay, of Kentucky.

Second day, Republican Wigwam, Chicago, May 17, 1860

The convention was proceeding into battle. War then took place about credentials. A great deal of speechmaking followed. David Wilmot made an attack on delegations from slave States that had no constituencies. The next thing was a speech from Dr. Blakesly, of Kentucky, who mentioned that Kentucky had voted for Wilmot for Vice President in 1856, in the Philadelphia convention. He inquired whether he could be forgiven for that sin? Cries of "yes," and he sat down. First knockdown blow for old Kentucky.

Third day

First ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 5; Lincoln, 6; Wade, 2; McLean, 1; Chase, 8; Sumner, 1. The leading contenders were William H. Seward, of New York, 173½; Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, 102.

Second ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 7; Lincoln, 9; Chase, 6. Result of second ballot of the leading men: Seward 184½; Lincoln 181. Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, received 2 votes.

Third ballot:

Kentucky: Seward, 6; Chase, 4; Lincoln, 13.

While this ballot was taken amid excitement that tested the nerves, the fatal defection from Seward in New England still further appeared. The number of votes necessary to a choice were 233, and I saw under my pencil as the Lincoln column was completed, the figures 231½—one vote and a half to give him the nomination. In about 10 ticks of a watch, Catter, of Ohio, was up. Every eye was on Catter. He said: "I rise, Mr. Chairman, to announce the change of four votes of Ohio from Mr. Chase to Mr. Lincoln." The deed was done. There was a moment of silence. Then, there were thousands cheering with the energy of insanity.

One of the secretaries, with a tally sheet in his hands, shouted, "Fire the salute. Abe Lincoln is nominated." As the cheering inside the Wigwam subsided, we could hear that outside, then the thunder of the salute rose above the din.

Ten States and the District of Columbia insisted upon casting unanimous votes for Old Abe before the vote was declared. One of the States was Kentucky.

During the dinner recess a caucus of the presidents of delegations was held. After dinner we had the last act in the drama.

The nomination for Vice President was not particularly exciting. Cassius M. Clay was the only competitor of Hamlin, who made any show in the race; and the outside pressure was for him. At one time a thousand voices called, "Clay, Clay" to the convention. If the multitude could have had their way, Mr. Clay would have been put on the ticket by acclamation.

First ballot for Vice President: The two leading contenders were Hamlin 194 votes; Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, 101½ votes. Kentucky cast 23 votes for Clay.

Second ballot: Hamlin 367 votes; Clay 86. Kentucky cast 23 votes for Clay.

Now that the business of the convention was transacted, we had the usual stump speeches, and complimentary resolutions, and the valedictory from the chairman, and the "three times three" upon adjournment for the candidate.

The city was wild with delight. The "Old Abe" men formed processions, and bore rails through the streets. A hundred guns were fired from the top of the Tremont House.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on this day, when we are looking back 100 years to the nomination of President Lincoln, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to speak about another, who also played a great part in that era, and who also

was a candidate for the high office of President 100 years ago.

He was passed over for a far greater man, but William H. Seward was a great man in his own right and would probably be remembered more today had his career not been overshadowed by the man whom many consider the greatest and first American President. Lincoln was a true product of our own country; he was born well after the colonial times. In this he was different from the Founding Fathers, and for this reason his influence was altogether different from theirs.

Lincoln had the supreme gift of a great administrator, he knew how to choose the right man for the job he wanted to fill. This he did, regardless of personality or past differences.

He chose William H. Seward and surely never regretted that choice.

Seward was born in Florida, Orange County, N.Y., 1801. He graduated from Union College at 19.

He taught school in Savannah, Ga., to help defray his expenses and was admitted to the bar at Utica, N.Y., in 1822, at the age of 21. He then moved to Auburn, N.Y., where he made his home and entered upon the practice of law. He entered politics as a National Republican, a party whose only title to fame seems to have been that it was anti-Masonic. This party's life was of short duration, roughly 6 years, and Seward then changed his allegiance to the Whigs.

He received the Whig endorsement for Governor and was elected in 1838 and served for two terms, having come back after being defeated by one William L. Marcy. Seward, as Governor, favored public works and a liberal spending of public money, although the State was financially embarrassed at the time he took over the reins of government.

Seward was at heart a liberal and somewhat of a trailblazer. He was an early political opponent of slavery, but never a follower of such men as Garrison who devoted themselves to moral agitation.

After his second term Seward retired from public office and distinguished himself as a lawyer in his hometown of Auburn.

When the Whigs came back into power in 1849, for a brief period, they nominated and sent William H. Seward to the U.S. Senate. It can be truly said in this case that the office sought him; he did not seek the office. In his first prepared speech in the Senate he made the rather startling statement, and I quote: "There is a higher law than the Constitution." He was violently attacked by the Democrats for his statement and immediately tried to temporize and explain it away. This seems to have been one of the keys to his character. He believed supremely in compromise, and to use a modern term, never going beyond what the traffic, in this case public opinion, would bear. He also stated at this time:

An irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become

entirely a slave-owning Nation or entirely a free-labor Nation.

This statement he also tried to retract after a storm of protest broke over his head.

By 1854 it became evident that the Whig Party was moribund and Seward worked energetically and successfully to bring the remnants together into the newly emerged Republican Party.

Many expected that he would receive the nomination of this new party that he had done so much to create, but the party passed him over twice, for Fremont in 1856 and Lincoln in 1860.

Lincoln immediately appointed Seward Secretary of State. Although it seems hard to realize today, most of the Cabinet and many of the people considered the new President as somewhat of a nonentity and looked to Mr. Seward for guidance through the very difficult times ahead. Seward felt much the same, not out of vanity, but simply because he felt that his experience as Governor of New York and in the U.S. Senate fitted him for the arduous days ahead.

Seward felt strongly that the Union could be saved without a war between the States. He even had a fantastic idea of provoking a foreign war to unite the country and save the Union. Here President Lincoln stepped in and proved to all that he was indeed the helmsman of the Ship of State. The very first one to acknowledge and follow the President's leadership was William H. Seward.

Seward remained on as Secretary of State after the death of President Lincoln. He himself was attacked in his home by a fellow conspirator of John Wilkes Booth at the same time that the President was assassinated. Mrs. Seward died as a result of the shock and his son and two others who came to his assistance were wounded by the assassin.

Seward was an interesting character. He probably had more of the characteristics of a diplomat than any of the politicians of our country. He was a great believer in the adage that: He who fights and runs away will live to fight another day. This is, of course, the basis of true diplomacy.

Seward had visions, sometimes quite fantastic ones, but he was always willing to listen to reason and give up anything as impossible, for instance, as the consolidation of the Union through a foreign war. This faculty for broad and far-reaching undertakings is probably best exemplified by his purchase of Alaska from Russia for \$7,200,000. This was long known, in fact still is in some quarters, as Seward's folly.

So here, once more at a crucial time in the history of the country, we had a man in high place, willing to give his life and talents to his country and his loyal devotion to his President without any personal ambition whatsoever.

As long as our country produces such men she will be great and we will be free.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the centennial anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in the Wigwam at Chicago on May 18, 1860, will undoubtedly produce claims from many sections of the country that a certain State or

locality had much to do with the selection of our first Republican President. In this connection it is not my inclination to belittle any such claims, but rather to reemphasize the important part played by the Keystone State delegation to that fateful convention when the Nation's future was in such precarious balance.

Two of the leading candidates were William H. Seward, of New York, and Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, both of whom were considered as "shoo-ins" by their respective delegations. Seward, however, was handicapped by the vigorous opposition of Horace Greeley who wielded a powerful influence across the Nation and also by the flat statement by Gov. Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, who predicted a 50,000 Republican majority from his State but not if Seward was the candidate. At this juncture Cameron, who was guaranteed Pennsylvania's 56 votes on the first ballot, plainly indicated that he was more interested in being appointed Secretary of the Treasury and promised his delegates to Lincoln on the first ballot if he was assured of that post. From then on, despite Lincoln's refusal to be bound by any deals, Pennsylvania was in the thick of it on the Emancipator's side and joined in the jubilation when he was nominated on the third ballot.

My primary purpose, however, of injecting myself into this discussion of the political maneuvering leading up to Lincoln's nomination, is to bring forth for the record the part Chester County, Pa., my home county, had in preparing the way for the solid support Lincoln received from Pennsylvania shortly after that State's delegation arrived in Chicago in that fateful month of May 100 years ago. In 1955 the Republican County Committee of Chester County celebrated its 100th anniversary and on that occasion published its anniversary booklet from which the following article is taken:

LINCOLN AND CHESTER COUNTY

(By Priscilla Lewis Cox Southwell)

This is an old county one of the original three first formed under William Penn. West Chester is an old town too. Yet few will take note as they pass of the historic buildings and distinguished landmarks where so many county leaders lived, where so much of our county future was shaped.

At 28 West Market Street were made decisions that affected the Republican Party here and in the Nation too. The modest brick building 100 years ago contained two offices from which Abraham Lincoln was started on his way to become the first Republican President.

Two men had offices there and were joined in a common political aim—to give to the lawyer from Illinois enough recognition in the East to secure his nomination for President in 1860.

Joseph J. Lewis, a well-known lawyer, and Samuel Downing, a printer and publisher, were both at 14 East Market Street (since renumbered 28 West). Joseph J. Lewis was born in Westtown in 1801, Burgess of West Chester for 5 years, delegate to the Harrisburg Convention of 1832 where the Whig Party was formed, and provost of the law department of Lincoln University. He was active in a period where political concepts and governmental control were fluctuating, a

half-century in American history where the lines were being drawn between what constitutes the two major political parties today.

One of his most famous cases was the defense of Casper Hanway, tried for treason. He had tried to prevent a Maryland slaveowner from recapturing a runaway slave. The Maryland man was killed, and Casper Hanway brought to trial. Joseph J. Lewis defended him and secured his acquittal.

About the same time in West Chester Samuel Downing was publishing the Chester County Times, a newspaper later absorbed by the American Republican. It was known for its abolitionist sentiments. Hence it is logical that these two men came together with kindred feelings about the threat of slaveholding in new States.

This feeling between the slave States and the free really prompted the formation of the Republican Party and in a sense drew the lines between the North and the solid South. The Democratic Party became allied with interests seeking to extend slaveowning, the Republican with those who wished for freedom in new States as they entered the Union.

In Chester County such beliefs appealed to a citizenry whose ancestors were largely Quaker, innately respecting the individual man. There had long been an underground railroad in the country, with stations in West Chester, Longwood, Willistown, and Uwchland, to name a few.

So here on Market Street were two men who sympathized with all the speeches being made by Abraham Lincoln out in Illinois. How they came to publish his autobiography introduces another Chester Countian.

In Toughkenamon, New Garden township, in 1808 was born Jesse W. Fell. He went west in 1828, to Illinois in 1833. When Lincoln was in the State legislature from Sangamon County, Ill., he and Jesse W. Fell lived in the same boardinghouse. They became friends, and the Lincoln-Douglas debates were undertaken at the urging of Jesse W. Fell.

In 1858 Fell began to think of Lincoln in terms of the Presidency. He had an essential humility which appealed to people, and his efforts on the slavery question were making him prominent and popular in the Midwest.

Then Jesse W. Fell remembered his own native State of Pennsylvania. He knew the weight that it carried in choosing the candidate for Presidency and was convinced that if Lincoln could become well known in the East, the Pennsylvania delegation with those in Illinois and Indiana would insure his nomination, regardless of any favorite son backed by the New York delegates. At that time New York and Pennsylvania had the most delegates at the nominating convention.

In Bloomington, Ill., a newspaper was also being edited by another Lincoln admirer, Edward J. Lewis, brother of Chester County's Joseph J. Lewis. Here originated the connection between Lincoln and this county. For Lincoln was persuaded to write a brief autobiography to be sent back to Joseph J. Lewis here.

Brief it was, only three pages in his own handwriting, of which, he said with characteristic and cadenced simplicity:

"There is not much of it, for the reason, I suppose, that there is not much of me."

These three pages are now in the Library of Congress, and a photostat copy in the Chester County Historical Society. When Joseph J. Lewis received this short autobiography, it constituted all that was known of Lincoln's life. For many years even Lincoln himself did not realize that his ancestors had lived near Morgantown, Pa., before they migrated to Kentucky.

Out of these simple pages Joseph J. Lewis reworked the first biography of Lincoln. Samuel Downing, his friend and associate, printed it. Almost at once it was reprinted in the New York Tribune and Chicago Press and Tribune, then in many other papers over the country. To this national recognition has been attributed Lincoln's nomination in 1860.

All this originated in the building that stands quietly on West Market Street, where today our Republican Representative PAUL B. DAGUE and the Republican County Committee, with C. Gilbert Hazlett as chairman, have their offices—where nearly 100 years ago two Republicans helped to start Abraham Lincoln on his way to become the first Republican President of the United States.

In commenting on Mrs. Southwell's article I have only one or two things to add. First, it might be mentioned that Lincoln's great-grandfather, Mordecai Lincoln, once worked at a forge in northern Chester County. Also it seems appropriate to call attention to the fact that the Jesse W. Fell who is reported as having played such an important part in the Lincoln buildup is an ancestor of former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, a fact that only emphasizes how so many otherwise brilliant people slip away from their conservative moorings. That my office was located for some 10 years at 28 West Market Street, West Chester, the scene of much political activity in the last century as well as in this, has no particular significance.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today we are privileged to celebrate a momentous anniversary in the history of our Nation. It is the 100th anniversary of the nomination of Abraham Lincoln as the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States of America.

In paying tribute to the memory of this great and beloved man, who gave so much to our country, I would like to emphasize three expressions of philosophy by President Lincoln which appear to me to have a strong bearing on present-day events.

They are:

First. On government:

In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere. * * * In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong.

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

Second. On liberty and security:

It has long been a grave question whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its own existence in great emergencies.

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves and, under a just God, cannot long retain it. * * *

If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions.

Third. Peace and war:

The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am. None who would do

more to preserve it. But it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NOMINATION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the Presidency. In the same year, 1860, he was elected the first President of the newly established Republican Party. He and his Vice President Hannibal Hamlin of Maine carried forward a program based on unity, progress, individual rights, and liberties. So vital have these principles appeared to the citizenry that of the 18 Presidents we have had since 1860, only 4 have been Democrats.

Few men in history have kept their courage so high through one failure after another as did Mr. Lincoln. A deeply religious man he never faltered once he had set his course. His consistent faith in the wisdom and understanding of the Eternal Father of all mankind gave him an inner strength, a balance, a steadiness which carried him through what to many seemed insuperable difficulties.

With it all he was a man of delightful humor, of great human understanding, simple in his own desires, gentle in his ways. It was said of him that wherever he went he took light with him. Once roused he was like a flame, but his objections were based upon fundamental principles that to him were the foundation stones of our whole way of life.

We do well, Mr. Speaker, to pause for a moment on the 100th anniversary of the nomination of one of the great men of history who served this country through a period of great darkness as its President and who gave his life in that service. Of Abraham Lincoln it can be said that he truly demonstrated that leadership is "just wisdom and courage and a great carelessness of self."

Let me leave with you a few lines written by James Thompson McKay known to us as "Lincoln's Burial or the Cenotaph":

And so they buried Lincoln? Strange and vain!

Has any creature thought of Lincoln hid In any vault, neath any coffin-lid, In all the years since that wild spring of pain?

'Tis false—he never in the grave hath lain. You could not bury him although you slid Upon his clay the Cheops Pyramid, Or heaped it with the Rocky Mountain chain.

They slew themselves; they but set Lincoln free.

In all the earth his great heart beats as strong,

Shall beat while pulses throb to chivalry And burn with hate of tyranny and wrong. Whoever will may find him, anywhere Save in the tomb. Not there—he is not there!

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the use of Calendar Wednesday procedures is orderly, and in line with long-established rules of the House.

In 1949, the so-called 21-day rule was enacted. A year later, the late Representative E. E. Cox, of Georgia, offered House Resolution 133 to repeal the 21-day rule. On January 20, 1950, it was debated. During the debate the following statements were offered in support:

Representative James Wadsworth, of New York. Two hundred and eighteen Members could take a bill away from us by signing a petition; and if we would only use Calendar Wednesday, the standing committees would have Wednesdays to call up bills which they have reported and which are upon the calendar.

Representative Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts. I think we should go back to our orderly procedure, and then on Calendar Wednesday allow the committee chairmen to bring up bills that they may not have gotten a rule on from the Committee on Rules.

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts (then the distinguished minority leader). The adoption of this rule will not prevent legislation from coming to the floor. Through the vehicle of Calendar Wednesday, any committee can instruct its chairman to call up legislation. The will of the majority of the House cannot be refused.

On January 3, 1951, at the beginning of the 82d Congress, the late Representative Adolph Sabath, the then chairman of the Committee on Rules, called up House Resolution 7, which reenacted the rules of the 81st Congress. Judge Cox of Georgia proposed a substitute which went back to the rules prevailing before the 81st Congress and repealed the 21-day rule.

Once again the principal arguments in favor of repealing the 21-day rule were the citations of the discharge petition and Calendar Wednesday. The theme of the proponents of repeal was to return to orderly procedure. Some of the distinguished Members who spoke to these points were:

Representative LEO ALLEN, then as now the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, who said:

There are two ways that the membership of this House can get bills to the floor for final determination. You have the right to sign the discharge petition, which takes effect when 218 names appear thereon, and on Calendar Wednesday you also have the right to be recognized, so the Rules Committee does not have absolute power on any bills.

Representative Herter, now the Secretary of State in President Eisenhower's cabinet:

We have had in the rules of the House for many, many years a provision known as Calendar Wednesday. Why not return to what was an orderly method of procedure?

Representative Carl Curtis, of Nebraska said:

The notion that the Rules Committee can thwart the will of the majority is without foundation of fact. A petition signed by a

bare majority can bring a bill to the floor. In addition . . . we have Calendar Wednesday. . . . A vote against the Sabath proposal and in favor of the Cox proposal . . . is a vote for orderly procedure.

Representative CLARENCE BROWN, then as now, a member of the Rules Committee, said:

In addition to that (the discharge petition) there was and is a provision in the rules establishing Calendar Wednesday . . . on which day the roll of the legislative committees are called and, if a majority of any committee wants to bring up any bill, it can do so when that committee is called.

COLLAPSE OF THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE UNDERSCORES NEED FOR A NEW AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the sobering news from Paris this afternoon that the summit conference on which so many of the hopes of the world had been focused has now broken up without ever getting started is a tragic development that has shocked and disturbed every Member of this House. I know we all deplore the outrageous performance of the Soviet Premier and deeply resent his disgraceful efforts to humiliate the President of the United States. In this critical hour I know we all stand with Mr. Eisenhower regardless of our own politics and completely repudiate the efforts of the Soviet dictator not only to interfere in our own domestic political elections, but also to drive a wedge between the United States and our free world allies. The President was completely right, of course, in not backing down at Paris and in not groveling in the dirt as Mr. Khrushchev said he must do. Indeed, when the day ever comes—and I know it never will come—that an American President has to grovel in the dirt before anybody, then this country is certainly at an end.

But, Mr. Speaker, while we stand together with the President it is also perfectly obvious that the disaster at Paris has altered almost overnight the whole world strategic and political situation.

We face a different world today than we faced just 2 weeks ago. And as Members of this House we must recognize the full extent of this shift and must move swiftly to deal with it. From here out the going gets tougher. From here out the true nature of the bitter struggle between communism and freedom will become more clearly apparent than it has been in the past several months.

Mr. Khrushchev thought he could lull us into sleep. He thought he could "con" our leaders, to use a vernacular phrase, into letting down their guard. He thought we would be willing to do almost anything to get peace. And when he found that this was not going to be the case after all, he blew his top, as we have just witnessed at Paris, and now has shifted crudely to a rougher, tougher line, but a line which is certainly familiar enough coming from the Kremlin, and a line which is directed to the same old

Communist objective of world domination with the same old ruthless determination and energy.

It will be just a matter of time, Mr. Speaker, before the Russians put the squeeze on Berlin. We must be ready for that. And it will be just a matter of time before they put the squeeze on our other allies, too, from whose shores our worldwide military forces are presently operating. In fact, they are already putting on the squeeze, and have been since the shooting down of that U-2 aircraft.

The initial Russian attack has been aimed at Pakistan, at Norway, and at Turkey, with our other bases also coming under increasing attack.

The Governments of Japan, Norway, and Pakistan are relatively stable. We hope they will successfully weather these threats. But there is no question that the Japanese Socialist opposition will make the most of the U-2 incident in an attempt to wreck the proposed Japanese-United States mutual defense treaty, scheduled shortly for Diet debate and passage. And it is to be hoped that the rather shaky and crisis-wracked nations of Iran and Turkey will be able to withstand these latest Russian exercises in ballistic rocket blackmail.

Speaking recently at a National Day celebration at the Czechoslovak Embassy, Mr. Khrushchev warned that Soviet rockets would be used to retaliate against bases in any country that permitted U.S. planes to take off on intelligence missions over the Soviet Union.

It is conceivable, Mr. Speaker, that the Russian effort to squeeze us out of our overseas bases could be partially successful. Our Africa Moroccan airbases have already been written off. Those in Libya and Saudi Arabia are none too secure.

And the loss of any further Mediterranean, Middle East, Scandinavian, southeast Asia, or Far Eastern bases would certainly have very profound strategic consequences on our own defense structure as well as on NATO itself.

If the Quemoy-Lebanon crises of 1958 proved no further thing it showed how absolutely essential seagoing, mobile air bases are in any crises situations that may develop, from police actions to limited war or even total war.

The modern, mobile *Forrestal* attack carrier with its 100-plus aircraft can operate upon the vast ocean expanse, completely independent of any foreign land bases. Aircraft carriers operate in international waters and establish American sovereignty over that constantly changing patch of sea in which they operate. They are sovereign mobile bases of the United States. They are under tight supervision and control of our Navy. They operate without infringing upon the sovereignty of allied or neutral nations. They are not susceptible to the "zeroing in" of Khrushchev's rockets. They do not endanger the United States or our allies and friends.

Foresight is much rarer than hindsight, but it takes no great foresight to visualize a day—perhaps not too far in the future—when many of our present

fixed bases on foreign soil can be effectively neutralized either by Russian rockets or by their diplomatic and economic threats.

Surely we in Congress must act now to see that this great country of ours is never forced to defend itself without either fixed foreign bases or mobile floating bases.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Khrushchev rattles his rockets so blatantly today across the seas there can be no more appropriate answer, in my judgment, than for the Members of this Congress to authorize construction of the new Navy carrier which the Defense Department has requested and which his actions have now made so necessary to our overall national defense in the difficult days that lie ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill, H.R. 5, which was passed today.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. THOMAS (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) for May 18 through May 23, on account of official business.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for May 18, on account of illness.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BROCK, for 10 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. ROBISON), for 10 minutes, on May 19.

Mr. COOK (at the request of Mr. KASEM), for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON, the following Member was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KYL.

(At the request of Mr. KASEM and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. BOWLES in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. BRADEMANS.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake.

S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements.

S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin.

S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 19, 1960, 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:

2159. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for Bolivia as administered by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) of the Department of State and its predecessor, the Foreign Operations Administration, pursuant to the mutual security program for the fiscal years 1954 through 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2160. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board covering the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan System, and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2161. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies

of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2162. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Ng Ging Sheung, also known as Ng Wong San, Ng Ging Ngew, and Stephen Ng, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2163. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Karl Knoepfl, also known as Charles Knoepfl, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to establish a revolving-type fund in the Treasury for the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2165. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and extend the duration of the authorization of grants for State water pollution control programs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

2166. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the report of the President on determinations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 for the quarter ending March 31, 1960, pursuant to section 103(b) of the act for transmittal to the chairmen of the House Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations; to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

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. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 530. Resolution to amend House Resolution 27, 86th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 531. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7201, a bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 532. Resolution for consideration of S. 2130, an act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 533. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1157, a bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8212. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the Reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the Reserve components, and for other purposes; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11787. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority for flight instruction for members of Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12200. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize reduction in enlisted grade upon approval of certain court-martial sentences, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11952. A bill to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 402. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact related to the regulation of mass transit in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12125. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 12108. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 8127. A bill to provide for the hospitalization at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, of certain nationals of the United States adjudged insane or otherwise found mentally ill in foreign countries, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. S. 747. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands which are a part of the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area and the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, located in Will County, Ill., to the State of Illinois; with amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1502. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System; with amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth report pertaining to selected aspects of military procurement

(Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9541. A bill to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12286. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 12288. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12289. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 12290. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 12291. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 12292. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that whenever cotton is bartered or exchanged, either the identical cotton acquired from Commodity Credit or an equal quantity of substitute cotton shall be exported; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12293. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 12294. A bill to provide for a National Academy of Culture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 12295. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains, to provide a high-protein food distribution program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 12296. A bill to provide for the striking of medal in commemoration of Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12297. A bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to con-

sult with interested persons in small communities and rural and isolated areas on the technical and other problems in providing adequate television service at a reasonable cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12298. A bill to establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 12299. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 709. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 710. Joint resolution to establish the third Thursday in August of every year as Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 534. Resolution authorizing the printing of the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives during the 85th and 86th Congresses; 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. AYRES:

H.R. 12300. A bill for the relief of Abdulkarim Ahmad Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12301. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jesus B. Verendia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 12302. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Yen Male; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12303. A bill for the relief of Yip Fook Q. and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12304. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of Mollers' Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., the Alpha Shipping Co., Ltd., and Lancashire Shipping Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 12305. A bill for the relief of Caridad P. Buncab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 12306. A bill for the relief of George Edward Barnhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 12307. A bill for the relief of Erasmo Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12308. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Marrella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

467. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of 130 members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, residents of the 32d Congressional District, New York, urging the enactment of H.R. 4483, the minimum wage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.