

By Mr. DERWINSKI:
H. Res. 267. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mrs. CHURCH: House Joint Resolution No. 6 adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to Federal aid to education and memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public or fully accredited not-for-profit private school, or to any fully accredited college or university and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of \$1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska in opposition to H.R. 869 which would reduce pensions paid members of veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to acquiring and establishing the John Muir Home in Martinez as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H.R. 6640. A bill for the relief of Rosario Pollina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. DOYLE:
H.R. 6641. A bill for the relief of Gordon Liu Brooks and Jackie Lee Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:
H.R. 6642. A bill for the relief of Hom Fay Ming, also known as Leung Fay Ming and Hom Fay Heng, also known as Leung Fay Heng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 6643. A bill for the relief of Adam Blimbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:
H.R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Julius Benikosky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:
H.R. 6645. A bill for the relief of Hsi Hu Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:
H.R. 6646. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Cozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:
H.R. 6647. A bill for the relief of Juan Manuel Manila del Campo and his wife, Macrina Luna de Manila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN (by request):
H.R. 6648. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Alpuerto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. JOHNSON of California:
H.R. 6649. A bill for the relief of C. W. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 6650. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:
H.R. 6651. A bill for the relief of Thame Zaharias Papantoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:
H.R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Mary Barbadian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6653. A bill for the relief of Maurizio Placidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H.R. 6654. A bill for the relief of Groziella Connavo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:
H.R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Cecil A. Sims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:
H.R. 6656. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Frances Sutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Joseph Greene, Kathleen Greene, and their minor child, Joseph Edwin Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 6658. A bill for the relief of Tsai Chiou Seng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GSA and Customs Service Propose Hindrance to Development of Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach currently represent a capital investment of some \$280 million. However, by 1970 the port of Long Beach alone will represent an investment of \$300 million, and Los Angeles Harbor plans similar expansion. Yet, the General Services Administration has proposed that harbor development be held back by the dead hand of the past. It has proposed to institutionalize a 22-mile mistake at unnecessary cost to the Federal taxpayer by building multi-million-dollar customs headquarters into a new Federal office building in the traffic-choked, landlocked Los Angeles Civic Center.

Originally, customs headquarters were placed in central Los Angeles, 22 miles away from the harbor, because the two manmade harbors were then little more than mudflats and lacked many of the facilities necessary to commerce.

This is no longer true. The harbor area communities now number more than 1½ million residents. The harbor area is the hub between the two metropolitan areas of Los Angeles to the

north and fast-growing Orange County to the east and south. All banking and commercial facilities necessary for foreign trade exist in the port cities.

No other harbor in the United States has its customhouse 22 miles away. Most are within a few blocks of the harbor. Construction of this absentee customhouse has been protested by port officials at both harbors, by shippers, by customs brokers, by Los Angeles County officials, by importers, and by a resolution unanimously passed by the California State Assembly.

Smithsonian Institution's Hall of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I have written to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to request information on plans for the exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries at the new Museum of History and Technology.

Some time ago I received a press release from the National Coal Association calling attention of residents of mining communities to the need for tools and equipment to be displayed in the new Hall of Coal. I am interested in learning whether adequate material has been

obtained by those in charge at Smithsonian; if not, Members of Congress from mining regions could undoubtedly perform an important service by giving publicity to the project.

The people of Pennsylvania have a basic interest in the proposed exhibits on coal, steel, and related industries. Our history is closely associated with the early use of the ironmaking process developed by William Kelly. Some of the earliest commercial coal mines in the United States were operated in Pennsylvania.

The exhibits at the Museum of History and Technology will give American and foreign visitors alike an opportunity to understand the outstanding advances that have taken place in these industries. The building can be one of the most effective media of pointing up the progressive nature of the U.S. coal and steel industries.

For some time coal has been accused of being a backward industry. Critics have found it convenient to blame many of the industry's problems on lack of foresight. The fact is that the coal industry has an outstanding record in improvement of productivity through research and technology. With the co-operation of a progressive union, the United Mine Workers of America, coal management has installed such highly mechanized mining processes that today coal is selling at the mine on an average of 26 cents per ton lower than the price a decade or more ago.

This is the information that needs to be brought to public attention. Coupled with data on coal reserves, it will serve

to provide assurance of a continued energy supply for centuries to come. It will also notify visitors from abroad that America has a vast storehouse of energy that can be utilized either as an ingredient in the production of an enormous war machine or in the manufacture of materials that will contribute to a better life now and in the years to come.

After meeting with representatives of the Smithsonian Institution, I shall relay to Congress the information that I have obtained on the new Museum of History and Technology. I am certain that all my colleagues will want to have a progress report of this nature from time to time.

National Little League Baseball Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our young people, dedicated to the highest ideals of citizenship and teamwork, sportsmanship and character, form the backbone of our country. Today more than a million boys in every corner of our Nation are developing these qualities through participation in the Little League Baseball program.

Representing as I do the congressional district which embraces the national headquarters of Little League Baseball, I am particularly proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the Presidential proclamation establishing "National Little League Baseball Week" in response to a concurrent resolution enacted by the 86th Congress:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

Whereas active participation by youth in appropriate physical activities contributes to their fitness and to the maintenance of our national vigor and vitality; and

Whereas little leagues in communities throughout the Nation have made it possible for thousands of young boys to take an active part in our national game of baseball; and

Whereas Little League baseball not only promotes the physical well-being of the players, but also instills into them the qualities of fairness, cooperation, and discipline—qualities which contribute to the development of good citizenship; and

Whereas the Congress, by House Concurrent Resolution 17, agreed to June 1, 1959, has requested the President to designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of each year as "National Little League Baseball Week," in recognition of the national and community benefits resulting from Little League activity: Now, therefore,

I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning the second Monday in June of 1961 and the week beginning the second Monday in June of each succeeding year as "National Little League Baseball Week."

And I invite the people of the United States to observe that week in schools, parks, athletic fields, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to emphasize the importance of the physical development of our Nation's youth.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1961, and of the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

[SEAL]

By the President:

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

A Century of MIT—A Dream Fulfilled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to extend to the president, teaching staff, student body, and alumni of the illustrious and world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology my very heartiest congratulations upon the 100th anniversary of its establishment.

This institution started from very humble beginnings 100 years ago. As it grew through the years it changed its base of operations, first, from Summer Street and then, Back Bay, Boston, to the present extensive facilities on Memorial Drive, Cambridge, and it is continuing to grow, not only in physical plant, but in rapidly increasing usefulness to the Government, American industry and the scientific world.

So renowned have been the contributions of this great institution in the fields of engineering, technology, research, and development, science and industry, that I would not venture to try to evaluate the most beneficial and deeprooted impact it has exerted upon the growth and development of modern civilization.

The history of this truly great Massachusetts institution has, indeed, been a saga of accomplishment far beyond the wildest dreams of its founder, Dr. William Barton Rogers, a record of achievement so vital and crucial in many respects as to defy full analysis, a shining epic in shaping the life of men and affairs in the 20th century.

MIT has been an admirably organized team operation in the best sense of the word, and outstanding leadership, outstanding teachers, outstanding scientists, engineers and administrators have played effective roles in the work and expansion of this great scientific institution.

MIT has produced many great leaders who have taken their place in the topmost ranks of American educators, engineers, scientists, and businessmen. It has reared generation after generation of the most valuable and useful technically trained experts. It has greatly benefited our economic system and industrial structure and has contributed inestimably to the Government both in war and peace in remarkable and fabulous ways through extending the horizons and boundaries of scientific knowledge and bringing it into play

industrially and practically in implementing the miracles and marvels of the space age.

On MIT's 100th birthday many dignitaries of science and technology gathered from all corners of the earth to hail the occasion and to participate in the various programs of celebration and enlightening scientific discussion.

From Europe, the Near East and Asia and elsewhere outstanding scientists, political leaders and other great minds have come to celebrate the occasion. The distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the distinguished American Secretary of State, a notable member of the British Parliament and others joined in some of the programs.

The American people and Government entertain highest admiration and deepest gratitude for the magnificent contributions of MIT throughout the years.

It is my hope and prayer that these contributions will continue to grow, and that they will, as in the past, be directed toward the building of a greater, free, humane, scientific community in our great country and in the world, which in the space age will greatly help to bring the choicest blessings of peace, plenty, and happiness to mankind, and exalt the free spirit of man.

Results of Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during the 7 years I have served the 23d District of Ohio in the U.S. Congress, I have attempted to keep the closest possible contact with the individual thinking of the residents of this suburban Cleveland area. One of the highest income, high-intelligence districts in the Nation, its constituents are quick to respond to my regular newsletters, opinion polls, and annual traveling office meetings.

The opinion poll is mailed yearly to the home of every registered voter in the district—this year to 135,000 homes in all. The response is excellent, underscoring the interest these voters take in national affairs. This year nearly 25,000 returned the questionnaire, some 1,500 of them amplifying their views in additional letters on key issues. I know of no other district which shows such a high response to similar polls.

This year shows a few marked changes in opinion from past polls. There is an upsurge in favor of Federal aid to school construction, for example: only 35 percent favored it last year; 62.8 percent, this. The division on foreign aid remains nip and tuck, as in the past. One interesting point I have noted in the 1961 returns—citizen confusion on important legislation runs heavier than in the past, with a greater percentage of

questions marked, "No opinion." This I feel is the result of increasingly complicated legislation, often obscured by fuzzy and contradictory statements from political leadership, the press and other news media.

I would like to emphasize, as I have in the past, that results of the poll are not used as political weather vanes for any votes I make in the House of Representatives. I am grateful for the outstanding response, and for the many letters accompanying the questionnaires. All are helpful to me in reaching my final decision on the issues.

Results of the poll follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid to education to provide for—			
(a) School construction?	62.8	31.7	5.5
(b) Teachers' salaries?	32.6	59.5	7.9
(c) Aid to private and parochial schools?	18.9	74.9	6.2
2. Revising the electoral college system?	77.6	14.0	8.4
3. Federal Government assistance in relocating industries?	24.0	58.5	17.5
4. Minimum wage legislation—			
(a) Increasing present hourly rate of \$1—	57.6	32.9	9.5
(b) Extending coverage?	49.7	31.2	19.1
5. A mandatory program of medical care for the aged?	48.9	42.3	8.8
6. More liberal social security benefits?	55.1	35.8	9.1
7. Resuming nuclear testing if we cannot reach an agreement with Russia for adequate inspection?	75.7	14.4	9.9
8. Increasing postal rates to help reduce this year's estimated postal deficit of \$900,000,000?	63.4	30.4	6.2
9. Easing trade restrictions with Iron Curtain countries?	29.7	56.9	13.4
10. Continuing the 1-cent "temporary" Federal gasoline tax to aid our highway construction program?	66.5	28.3	5.2
11. The administration's proposal for Federal aid to "depressed areas"?	55.2	31.7	13.1
12. Continuation of our foreign aid program?	44.4	42.7	12.9
13. Do you think the Peace Corps a good idea?	49.9	33.5	16.6
14. Abolishing the Un-American Activities Committee?	20.9	60.4	18.7

Interior Department Program for Lower Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to inform all the Members of the House of the program announced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall in his approach to the solution of the multiple problems that have been with us along the lower Colorado River ever since the Parker Dam was constructed in the 1930's.

One of the most vexing problems, which has been of continuing concern to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of this body, is the presence of trespassers and squatters whose occu-

pancy precludes development for public purposes. In addition to the loss of revenue to the Government from unauthorized use, law abiding citizens, following authorized procedures, have been denied rights of occupancy and entry on the lands. Those of us interested in respect for law and order therefore supported the move of the United States, in June 1959, to evict trespassers; this having been offered as the only way to restore governmental authority over the area.

Institution of further eviction proceedings has been halted and the Department of the Interior has now moved to try to work out the problems without forcefully evicting unlawful occupants now on the ground. However, regardless of whether proceedings have previously been instituted, occupants will be required to acknowledge Federal ownership and enter into agreements for use of the lands on a rental basis for a 2-year period during which the Department will be establishing permanent land-use patterns. Where proceedings have been started, such arrangements will form the basis for settlement of the litigation by the Department of Justice. In any event, no new occupancy will be permitted unless it is in accordance with the master plan, and new trespassers will be evicted.

I hope that the squatter trespassers agree to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior. If they do, it will reestablish Federal control over the area and provide a peaceful solution to the difficulties that have plagued the area along the lower Colorado River these many years. We will have to wait and see; your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will continue to be watchful of developments.

In the meantime, I congratulate our former colleague, Secretary Udall, on his efforts to find a statesmanlike solution. Under leave to extend my remarks, the complete text of the Department's announcement is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

COLORADO RIVER LAND USE AND TRESPASS PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

The Department of the Interior's plan for settling the troublesome problem of land use along the Colorado River from Davis Dam to the Mexican border was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

Land along the river was withdrawn many years ago for reclamation purposes, but some of these lands have been occupied by unauthorized squatters who have used various lands for agricultural, recreational, business, and residential purposes.

"In formulating this plan," said the Secretary, "the Department has kept three considerations in sharp focus:

"1. The lands constitute property of the United States and Federal ownership must be recognized;

"2. The locations of the lands along the banks of the only great river in the great Southwest require their integration in any master land-use plan; and

"3. The public interest requires that the lands be administered for the benefit of all the people of the Nation."

Udall's announcement was in two parts: First, there will be established in Yuma, Ariz., effective May 1, a land-use office to supervise implementation of the plan, and,

second, details of how the land will be put to use. The latter includes instructions on a transition plan under which the squatters who cooperate can continue to use the lands for a period of at least 2 years while the land-use plan is put into effect.

"Some of the Government-owned land along the Colorado," Udall said, "offers an opportunity to salvage a major national recreational and scenic asset." The land will be classified in four categories:

1. Areas suitable for national recreational development.

2. Areas suitable for national game refuges.

3. Areas suitable for State parks and recreational uses.

4. Areas which should remain under State game and fish agencies as refuges. (Most of the river is bounded by Arizona or California, but to the north, Nevada controls a sizable stretch.)

The Secretary stated that Federal ownership must be acknowledged by the squatters if they are to participate in the transition program.

Udall's plan for present users of the Federal lands—some 20,000 acres of which are devoted to agriculture—includes the following requirements:

1. The squatters will be expected to sign a disclaimer statement acknowledging Federal ownership.

2. Those who do so will be given permits to use the lands they now occupy for approximately 2 years, subject to acreage limitation in case of agricultural use, if they acknowledge Federal ownership and if they agree to pay reasonable rent for past and future use. They will acquire no interest in the land and no preferential treatment will be accorded them in the administration of the program.

"Our program," Udall said, "will restore Federal control and management and at the same time offer the squatters a reasonable course of action to close out their investments. If present unauthorized users refuse to cooperate, we will have no alternative but to commence summary court proceedings to evict and recover full damages for all past use."

Permits for continued occupancy will be offered to persons who were on the land before the date of this announcement (April 20, 1961). Any persons occupying Federal lands along the river subsequently will be evicted and prosecuted for trespass, Udall declared.

The Yuma office will be opened under general supervision of Graham Hollister of Genoa, Nev., Special Assistant to the Secretary. It will administer the permit system, conduct further land use studies, and advise the Secretary in determining the best use, from the public's standpoint, of each parcel of land in the affected area.

Textile Industry Must Be Safeguarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have said in the past that the American textile industry was somewhat in the predicament of a man drowning in a swimming pool. The management has carefully provided lifesaver rings for use in just such an emergency, but the life-guard will not toss one to the distraught victim.

Floods of imported textile goods have had the domestic industry awash for some time. Congress has carefully provided safeguards in the law to help industries in such a condition. But in the past the administration had always declined to use the safeguards we have established.

The section 22 case of a year ago is a case in point. Congress wrote that section into the Agriculture Adjustment Act to provide relief against imports whenever it is found that they tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the agricultural programs of the Federal Government.

We asked the Secretary of Agriculture last year to seek relief under this provision for cotton products. We had a precedent in a 1941 Tariff Commission decision on wheat and flour.

The Secretary looked into it and recommended that the President take some action. But when President Eisenhower requested an investigation, he coupled it with an implication that the Tariff Commission could impose no more than an 8-cent-a-pound fee on the cotton content of imported articles.

This in itself was a misinterpretation of the act passed by Congress. The section in the law was predicated on the assumption that the Tariff Commission would recommend the relief it deemed necessary when it was determined that imports materially interfered with the domestic cotton program. Certainly it was not the intent of Congress to limit the considerations involved in one of these cases, or to do anything prejudicial to full and complete relief where it is indicated.

We recall the results of that appeal. With President Eisenhower's restrictive statement as a guide, the Tariff Commission voted against the textile industry. They chose to wait and see if the drowning man in the swimming pool went under for the third time.

Following these developments last year, I stated that there was something of futility in the repeated efforts of those of us here interested and concerned with the textile import problem to keep providing laws, lifesaver rings, which were not used. I said then that maybe it was time we got a new lifeguard.

The American people, in their wisdom, chose a new leader in the great election of last November. I can tell you that a lot of us from textile areas sent up a mighty cheer when this happened. We did not expect the new President immediately to rearrange all the existing trade agreements to give the textile industry a choice position in the world market, but we did believe that we would finally get off the buckpassing merry-go-round, and be given a full, fair, impartial, and unprejudicial hearing of our problem.

We have not been disappointed in this belief. The new President, who, by the way, has fought this fight in Congress for his native Massachusetts textile mills, put the textile industry's problems right at the top of his work agenda.

He appointed as Secretary of Commerce the Honorable Luther Hodges, a man with a distinguished background in

the textile industry. He was Governor of North Carolina, the largest textile-producing State in the Nation. I can report personally of Secretary Hodges' deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the American textile industry. Last week, I paid a visit to Secretary Hodges, and took with me Mr. Hugh M. Comer, the chairman of the board of Avondale Mills, the great textile industry in my native State. The Secretary was cordial, attentive, and showed that he was well aware of the situation of the textile industry. I notice in the recent issue of U.S. News & World Report that Secretary Hodges believes that American textiles are harder hit by import problems than any other industry in this country at the moment.

President Kennedy further evidenced his immediate concern with the import problem by appointing a Cabinet Textile Committee, chaired by Secretary Hodges. This Committee is due to report very shortly, it is my understanding.

Along with others, I urged Secretary Hodges' committee to make recommendations in line with those of the Pastore Textile Committee in the Senate, calling for a country-by-country, category-by-category quota system. This recommendation reflects the position held by leaders of all segments of the textile industry, regardless of fiber or product. It is the only fair and equitable way for American textiles to compete on the world market and in this country.

We are already grateful for the immediate attention of the new administration to this problem. We desperately hope that we will not be disappointed in the action taken on textile imports.

The domestic textile industry must be delivered from the death blow which continued unfair imports surely will bring. Since 1947, 838 textile mills have been forced to shut down, throwing out of work more than 200,000 employees. We must have protection now for the 925,000 textile workers in this country today, including some 38,000 in my State of Alabama, who realize that their very jobs and the economic welfare of their communities are at stake.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator TALMADGE for many years warned the country about the danger of uncontrolled, low-wage textile imports. The following are excerpts from the Senator's very excellent speech before the Atlanta Rotary Club on April 3:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR HERMAN TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, TO THE ATLANTA ROTARY CLUB AND THE ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON APRIL 3, 1961

As you know, for a period of more than 10 years now, I have been seeking corrective ac-

tion to remedy the plight of the American textile industry.

Defense officials tell us that the textile industry is second only to steel in its importance to the security of our country. Yet, since the conclusion of World War II, we have seen more than 800 textile mills forced out of business in the United States, and more than 400,000 textile workers lose their jobs.

The wage scale in the United States—and in Georgia where we have about 100,000 people employed in the textile industry—is approximately 10 times what it is in Hong Kong, several times what it is in Indonesia and India, and far higher than it is in Portugal, France, and Italy. To compound that situation, a bale of cotton sells anywhere in the world for \$42.50 less than it sells where it is grown in this country.

Now with odds such as that—where the wage scale is 10 to 1, and raw material is 8½ cents a pound cheaper—how can the American textile industry be expected to survive, particularly when we are welcoming the importation of competing products from other countries.

Some 5 years ago the textile industry of this country and allied countries were faced with competition primarily from the Japanese. And, let me say, it was the American taxpayers who rebuilt the Japanese textile industry with new equipment, and made it just as modern as it is anywhere in these United States.

When it became apparent that Congress otherwise would take action, the Japanese textile industry entered into a voluntary quota arrangement to limit the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States.

Since that time, however, competition has developed in Hong Kong, the Philippines, Indonesia, India, Portugal, Italy, and many other cheap-labor countries. It has become so severe that even the Japanese are being undercut. As a result they are now petitioning their government to increase the export quotas to the United States.

In recent years we have gone from a net exporter of textiles to a net importer. As I have noted some 400,000 jobs have been liquidated. There are only 900,000 jobs remaining in that industry in this country.

Senator PASTORE of Rhode Island, ably assisted by Senators THURMOND of South Carolina and CORTON of New Hampshire, served as a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee to investigate this matter. They held hearings throughout the country and have submitted urgent recommendations for action to the Senate.

The only way the textile industry can survive in Georgia and in the United States will be through the imposition of some form of quotas limiting the amounts of all kinds of textile products which can be shipped into this country.

Many people have said that we must have free trade. But I submit that there is no way that we can have free trade when our competitors' wage level is 10 percent of ours and their raw material cost is 8½ cents per pound lower. When Cordell Hull and Franklin D. Roosevelt devised the reciprocal trade policies which have been in existence since that time, it was their view then that we would export products we had in surplus and that we would not import such products. Today's situation is a far cry from that. We are importing more textiles into the United States of America than we are exporting. In many of the department stores here in Atlanta, Ga., you can find textiles imported from many countries and, in most instances, selling at retail cheaper than our own Georgia textile mills can manufacture them.

We have discussed this on the floor of the Senate. A House delegation with Congressman VINSON as chairman called on the President a few days ago and a delegation

from the Senate will meet with him in the not too distant future.

I have discussed this matter on several occasions with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. I have discussed it on two different occasions with the President of the United States. I am hopeful that we can get some affirmative action taken.

If we fall in that regard we will, in my judgment, see the complete liquidation of the textile industry in our country in the not too distant future.

Bacone College Choir Charms Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this body, along with several hundred others who were passing by, enjoyed a rare treat on last Thursday afternoon, April 20. They had the pleasure of hearing Oklahoma's famous Bacone College Choir sing for the "Voice of America" on the Capitol steps.

The choir had not scheduled the "Voice of America" broadcast as a regular part of its annual nationwide tour, but cheerfully performed on very short notice in order to spread the word of the great work being done at Bacone College.

Founded in 1880 before Oklahoma was a State, Bacone was initially known as Indian University, and has always been primarily interested in the education of Indian youths. More than 40 different tribes from every corner of the United States, and from Mexico and Panama as well, are represented in its student body.

An accredited junior college sponsored by the American Baptist Home Mission Societies, Bacone sends its students to senior colleges and universities all over the United States. Its campus, on the outskirts of Muskogee, Okla., is one of the most beautiful in the southwest.

In its current tour, the college choir is singing in Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, in addition to two scheduled appearances already completed in Washington, D.C. Directed by Miss Jeannine Rainwater and accompanied by Mrs. Dick West, the choir features a splendid range of selections, and is aided in its colorful presentation by dances performed by the Wauhillau Indian Club.

Because the list of members of the choir provides a splendid picture of the tribal and State representation in it, I am listing the names of the members who performed in Washington:

Judy Onon Anquoe, Onondaga, New York; Joe Brown Bennett, Seminole-Creek, California; Freeda Blair, Oklahoma; Louie Brown, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Tony Buck, Creek, Oklahoma; John Clements, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Gilbert Cosen, Apache, Arizona; Johnny Edwards, Cherokee, Arkansas; Berna-

dine George, Onondaga, New York; Will Getz, Oklahoma; Jo Ann Gibson, Shoshone, Nevada; William Givens, Creek, Oklahoma; Kelly Haney, Seminole, Oklahoma; Mary Hill, Delaware-Shawnee, Oklahoma; Joanna Ketcher, Cherokee, Oklahoma; Lance Lujan, Kiowa-Taos, Kansas; Jeanette Mandel, Paiute, Nevada; Mary Jane Miles, Nez Perce, Idaho; Thelma Murr, Oklahoma; James Palmer, Seminole-Creek, Oklahoma; Jenelle Poemoceah, Comanche, Oklahoma; Barbara Richards, Oklahoma; Melva Richardson, Cherokee-Sapony-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Patti Richardson, Cherokee-Sapony-Tuskarora, North Carolina; Shari Skenandore, Oneida, Wisconsin; Robert Soontay, Kiowa-Apache, Oklahoma; Telma Thomas, Nez Perce, Idaho; Russell Tsoodle, Kiowa, Oklahoma; Sam Warnock, Oklahoma; Antonwine Warrior, Sac and Fox, Oklahoma; Arch Henry White, Shawnee, California; Clara White Hip, Crow, Montana; Lou Ella Whiteman, Crow, Montana; David Williams, Tonkawa-Kiowa, Oklahoma.

While it is obvious that Indians predominate in the choir, it is also apparent that five choir members are non-Indian students. In its rapidly growing student body of today, Bacone includes many students who belong to no Indian tribe but have been drawn to the beautiful Oklahoma college by its splendid curriculum and its rich tradition.

Almon C. Bacone, who founded the college 81 years ago, summed up its mission in these words:

A Christian school planted in the midst of a people becomes one of the most powerful agencies in the work of civilization.

Bacone College goes about its important job of advancing the work of civilization in this turbulent century, and the choir which it sends across the Nation is a splendid group of ambassadors.

Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 months the Congress has been most fortunate in having Maj. Gen. R. L. Vittrup as Chief of the Army's Office of Legislative Liaison. The outstanding service rendered by General Vittrup have proved invaluable to the individual Members and committees of the House of Representatives in obtaining a clearer understanding of the roles, missions, and requirements of the Army. Also he has been of great assistance in providing answers to inquiries posed by our constituents concerning Army policies, procedures, and operation. I am sincerely sorry to see General Vittrup leave but I am pleased to note that on April 1, 1961, he was designated the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel where his distinctive capabilities will continue to be uti-

lized by the Army and our country. I am also pleased to note that he received a well-deserved promotion to lieutenant general on the same date.

General Vittrup has had a truly outstanding career. He entered the U.S. Military Academy from Texas and graduated with the class of 1929. Prior to World War II, he served as an infantry company officer for 63 months, student and instructor at the infantry and tank school, student at the command and general staff college, and instructor at the U.S. Military Academy.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, General Vittrup was assigned as Assistant Secretary of the Army General Staff. A short time later he became Assistant Secretary to the Joint and Combined Chiefs of Staff where he worked on the overall planning and operations of World War II. He also was the first Secretary of the Joint Strategic Survey Committee. In 1943 he was assigned to the Allied Force Headquarters, first in North Africa, and then in Italy. He participated in the planning and execution of the Allied invasion of Italy, southern France, and Germany during 1944 and 1945.

After the war General Vittrup progressed through a variety of assignments of ever increasing responsibility. In 1945, he was assigned to the Operations Division of the Army General Staff serving first as liaison officer between the War Department and the State Department and then as Chief of the Policy Section of the Strategic and Policy Group. During the latter assignment he traveled about the Far East negotiating disposal of military materiel in the Western Pacific. Upon completion of his studies at the National War College in 1948, General Vittrup served as G3, U.S. Army Caribbean and Command of the 33d Infantry stationed in the Panama Canal Zone. After a tour as instructor at the Army War College he became Chief of the Army Section of the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group in Greece. On his return to the United States, he served as Chief of the Operations Division, G3, Army General Staff from October 1953 to August 1955. In August 1955 he became Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of Military Operations—International Affairs—and concurrently the U.S. Army Delegate to Inter-American Defense Board; the Permanent Joint Board of Defense—United States/Canada; and the Army member of the Mexican-United States Defense Commission and the Brazilian-United States Defense Commission. These duties provided a wealth of experience in worldwide Army operations and in international relations.

In 1956 General Vittrup became Commanding General of the 24th Infantry Division in Korea and subsequently Chief of Staff of the Army Forces Far East, 8th Army. Then in 1957, he was designated Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations for the U.S. Army Pacific. While in this capacity he was sent to Indonesia to negotiate sale and delivery of certain military supplies and equipment to that country. In July 1959, General Vittrup left Hawaii to assume his duties as Chief of the Office

of Legislative Liaison in which capacity he served with such distinction.

I know that all my colleagues in the House will join me in expressing our warm thanks to Lieutenant General Vittrup for his past services in our behalf and to wish him every success in his new assignment.

Increase in Cost of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, neglect of the consumer by various agencies of the Federal Government has become far too common in recent years. This neglect is nowhere more conspicuous than in the manner in which natural gas rates have been permitted to get out of hand. Natural gas prices have risen by more than 40 percent since 1951, during which time the cost of retail goods on the average rose but 14 percent. Even more striking, since January 1958, through September 1960, the price of natural gas to the consumer has gone up 20 percent, whereas in the same period of less than 3 years, consumer prices generally have gone up less than 4 percent.

While a number of factors undoubtedly contribute to this soaring of the price of natural gas to the consumer, a major responsibility must rest on the doorstep of the Federal Power Commission. Its regulatory powers have been exercised in a dilatory fashion, and apparently with a flagrant disregard of the welfare of the ultimate consumer. Testimony before the House Committee on Legislative Oversight last spring revealed constant conferences, meetings, and other negotiations between individual commissioners of the Federal Power Commission and representatives of the various natural gas pipeline companies, but no comparable degree of contact between the commissioners and representatives of consumers of natural gas.

One of the practices of the Federal Power Commission, followed with disconcerting regularity, is that of permitting natural gas pipelines to put into effect a series of so-called temporary rate boosts, prior to final action by the Federal Power Commission. Pipelines which once were required to segregate funds collected as a result of these temporary rate increases and to hold them available for refund to consumers, are now permitted by the Federal Power Commission to use them as capital funds for expansion or similar purposes.

The number of rate increases which the major pipeline companies have promulgated, following one another in rapid succession, is quite impressive. The Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. has increased its rates six times since December 1951 and, in effect, only part of two of these rate increases have been disallowed. Since 1957 its rates have

gone up by over a third. El Paso Natural Gas Co. has instituted three rate increases since the beginning of 1958, totaling about \$67 million a year. United Gas Pipeline has raised its rates six times since April 1956 in an amount of \$46 million annually, subject to final Federal Power Commission approval. Panhandle Eastern has put a rate increase of \$22.4 million annually into effect as of September 1, 1958, which has still not been finally acted upon by the FPC. The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. is collecting rate increases of \$28 million since November 1957, still subject to refund.

These rate increases are being paid by the consumers while the Federal Power Commission is engaged in the lengthy process of deciding whether or not to allow them.

As one step, but, I believe, an important one, that will both tend to curb the number of rate increases and also prod the Federal Power Commission to act in a faster, more responsible manner, I introduced a bill recently, endorsed by the National Association of Railroad & Utility Commissioners, which would prohibit the FPC from allowing any change in rates of a natural gas pipeline company from going into effect while there is already a rate increase pending by such a company which has not been finally approved by the Commission. It is high time that this pyramiding of rate increases by natural gas pipelines is brought to a halt. It is high time that the Federal Power Commission act as a responsible efficient servant of the American consuming public.

Commemoration, Scholarly Effort, and Women of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, during the assembly of the Civil War Centennial Commission at Charleston, S.C., April 10 to 12, I had the distinct honor of being one of the speakers on the fine program which was presented there.

Since that occasion, I have had several requests to make my remarks public. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech I made at the assembly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMMEMORATION, SCHOLARLY EFFORT, AND WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

(By Congressman Fred Schwengel)

I bring you greetings from your own Capital in the District of Columbia—the finest and greatest capital in the world. There are many reasons for this and not the least of which is the fact that our Capitol Building is more of a symbol of freedom and hope for mankind everywhere than any other capital in the world.

Students of history and of our heritage know, also, that this is so because this Capital is the place where more moving and meaningful history has been made by reap-

ing benefits for its people and for all people than any place else in the world.

Nehru, in his simple eloquence, told us in a joint session of Congress, 1949, I quote, "During the last 2 days, I have paid visits to the memorials of the great builders of this Nation—I have done so because they have long been enshrined in my heart and their example has inspired me as it has inspired innumerable countrymen of mine. These memorials are the real temples to which each generation must pay tribute and in doing so catch something of the fire that burnt in the hearts of those who were the torchbearers of freedom not only for this country but for the world. For those who are truly great have a message that cannot be confined within the particular country but is for all the world."

This is a fine admonition and reminds us of our own heritage. It tells us that much can be learned from our own history. Certainly it suggests, too, what can come from a study of our own Civil War period with a proper and adequate commemoration of significant events of that period.

On the north and south entrances of the Archives Building in Washington are some interesting inscriptions. One of them reads, "What is past is prologue." This is true.

Another reads, "Study history." This is good advice.

On the south side one reads, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." A necessary reminder.

On the other side of that entrance it reads, "The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future." This suggests that we revive and relive history.

We need to note these admonitions. I believe that is what we are doing in this commemoration. Let us do it well.

It is hoped that the National Commission can give adequate leadership and inspire, encourage, move, and use the best talents available everywhere. We need to do this in such a way as to assure that all of us on the National Commission and you and the organization you represent will carry out to the fullest the intent of the authors of this idea to commemorate that tragic but significant experience of 100 years ago. Some are suggesting this is a time for celebration. I feel that this is not a time for celebration; but it is a time for commemoration.

The Civil War Centennial Commission, headed by Gen. U. S. Grant III, the grandson of a great general and President, who himself is great, decided at the Commission's first meeting that the Civil War is something for us to commemorate and not to celebrate.

Further, I am sure historians everywhere agree this 4-year nationwide centennial of the Civil War emphatically should not be a celebration.

In my opinion, the events of 100 years ago are far too important to be debased by a carnival spirit or by a string of useless holidays. Just as those events were of supreme importance to our Nation then, so today they deserve to be properly commemorated by us.

But some people ask, What is it that we are commemorating? Sincere and earnest people sometimes ask: Why focus on a bloody war, on an era of bitterness? This is a fair question that deserves a fair answer.

One thing is certain: Those of us who serve on the Federal Civil War Centennial Commission have no thought of reviving the sadness, the anguish, the bitterness of 100 years ago, or of romanticizing a bygone era. The centennial is not a retreat to a shadowy, unreality of the past.

For all of us, and especially we who like to think of ourselves as historians and who, like myself, like to be with historians and for various reasons have a special interest in this, the most tragic experience of our heritage, are certain, too, that we need to read, study, pause, think, and reflect on our

interesting and meaningful past so that we can learn again from the lives and lessons of our history.

This will lead us to testimonials, conclusions and ideas that went into the establishment of this great idea we call American. It will help us understand the problems of the struggling nations of the present in other parts of the world and it can be of immeasurable benefit to us as we seek to help ourselves by helping them with their problems in this difficult time.

If individually and collectively we do this well and thoroughly we will learn again to feel the spirit that carried the people we call our forefathers through grave difficulties in their search and fight for the right.

As we think of the millions who gave the last full measure, and we will be reminded of this often, we should remind ourselves of a thought expressed at Gettysburg 2 years ago by America's most beloved poet, historian, and private citizen—Carl Sandburg. I quote:

"We have heard that the dead hold in their clenched hands only that which they have given away. When men forget, if they ever knew, what is at the heart of that sentiment, and it is terribly sentimental, they are in danger of power being taken over by fantastic fools or beasts of prey or men hollow with echoes and vanities."

A proper commemoration can effectively bring this noble thought to mind in many ways. A celebration can talk about it but commemoration can make us feel this moving truth. We need very much right now to make people note the drama and feel more of our history.

We, the leaders of the free world, indeed lovers of liberty everywhere, need to reflect on and to understand the import of what a son of a Confederate veteran, a present day American statesman, said recently in Washington. The occasion was the reenactment of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. SAM RAYBURN spoke during the introduction of that program and said:

"Prejudice, hate, agitation brought about the Civil War. I have always thought if it had not been for hotheads in the South and the insane and insane agitators of the North that Abraham Lincoln, by his justice, his fairness, his great statesmanship, would have prevented the Civil War which destroyed the flower of our young manhood in this country that at that time was so sorely needed."

"As a son of a Confederate soldier, who did what he thought was right, I say for him and for myself after that was over, he was proud that our great Union was preserved."

"The saddest thing that ever happened to the border States and the Southland was for an insane man to assassinate Lincoln. Lincoln was strong enough in the hearts and minds of the people in the North that he could have prevented, and would have prevented, some terrible things happening in some parts of our beloved country. But North, South, East, and West, we are proud indeed."

I say, Yes, we are happy and proud of our Nation and of the hope that it holds for better things for us and for the world. Commemorations like that reenactment attended by over 20,000 people and seen, heard, and read by many millions more is a moving experience that solemnizes and lauds the worthwhile things that need to be noted and forever remembered by us and by the world. Like an ancient psalmist, Lincoln reminds us: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies."

We will find from commemoration how necessary it is for all of us and not just part of us "to be eternally vigilant" and have deep convictions about the eternal verities of freedom. History tells us that in giving freedom to people we assure freedom for ourselves. In this way we were honored for what we gave and in giving we

assured more security to ourselves. From those who fought and gave the last full measure in the battle 100 years ago we can learn from their example that death is not the worst of life, that defeat is not the worst of failure but that not to have tried to do our best at all times is real failure. Let us note that in their relentless trying to preserve this Union for us and forever they achieved one of the great successes in all recorded time.

Importantly and uppermost in our minds, too, must be the idea that the centennial should be a time of reflection for us. Reflection can be the beginning of wisdom. So let us learn as well as remember. Let the centennial be the occasion for serious study of the war in all its complex phases—not only its technical aspects but its deeper meaning for us today.

To me, its deeper meaning is what it gave us as a Nation. Bitter, bloody, and tragic though it was, it yet made possible our unity today—a unity at once indivisible and marvelous—one that is not static but adaptable—a unity that gives cohesion and at the same time accommodates a vigorous diversity. To me this is the unity of a matured people who can remember the past while seeing the future. This is the unity that demands that we be the leader of the free world.

So, let us study this great chapter in our past and appropriate its wisdom and its heritage to today's problems. It is, after all, a heritage that comes to us from the men and women of both North and South, and one that all Americans proudly honor and cherish; people who possessed the cardinal virtues of true greatness: courage, wisdom, and goodness.

Goodness to love the right, wisdom to know the right, courage to do the right.

What can we do to assist the serious study of the Civil War? Well, we can search for documents, letters, diaries, photographs and newspapers of the period and then deposit these in our State libraries or historical societies. You are saying to yourselves, this is repetition, and I say, yes it is but this needs repeating often all across the United States.

We can establish scholarships and fellowships devoted to special studies by students in every age group where we now teach history and, in the institutions of higher learning, encourage real scholarly efforts in areas that have not been thoroughly researched and written about. Here it must be noted that it has already begun. The press, radio, and TV have started and already made some fine contributions. Catton, Nevins, Wiley are doing a great job but we don't have enough of them.

We can encourage our legislatures to appropriate funds that will enable our State archives departments to arrange, index and microfilm their documents bearing on the war. I was able to help some in Iowa recently. I am sure, by pointing out that the \$40,000 that the commission was asking for this year, compared to the \$225,000 that they approved for monuments at Vicksburg in the late 1800's when Iowa had less than one-eighth the population they now have, is pretty insignificant by comparison.

These are a few of the things all of us can do to help assure that the centennial will yield enduring contributions as well as bad oratory.

WOMEN OF THE CIVIL WAR

Then there is one vast and important area of the Civil War study that I hope will be undertaken which relates to the role of the women in that conflict. With the exception of the noble work done by Florence Nightingale, women never had anything to do in an organized way in a war before. In this war they were real heroines even though very little credit is given to them in the publications, books, and periodicals of this time.

Lincoln once said: "I am not accustomed to the use of language of eulogy. I have never studied the art of paying compliments to women; but I must say, that if all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women were applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during this war. I will close by saying, God bless the women of America."

Judging from the record we can say that Lincoln knew the value of the women's efforts during the war. But, it is very evident that students of that time and since didn't value or appreciate it.

To prove the neglect in this area, I offer, as exhibit A, Mark M. Boatner III's book "The Civil War Dictionary," as evidence to prove my point.

I preface my remarks by saying to you, first of all, that this book is a fine, complete, authoritative dictionary of the Civil War and ought to be available to all serious students and writers. What I have to say is not critical of the book, but rather, critical of the meager written record we have made of and for the women.

The flyleaf of the cover of this book proudly points to the 2,000 succinct biographical sketches in the book. I have recently read it and find that out of the 2,000 sketches, only 35 are about women. Much more evidence akin to this could be presented to prove my point.

May I just underscore this evidence by pointing out that there was a woman from Iowa who started that sanitary commission work there, and who, before the war ended, became one of the best known personalities of the war period. She was the first person in the whole United States to be officially assigned to a commission created by a legislature. She carried forward her responsibilities on the sanitation commission nobly.

She became concerned about the lack of proper diets for soldiers, talked to Stanton, Melgs, and Lincoln about it, and was named head of all the diet kitchens of the hospitals of the North. She was the author of the first book of recipes ever written for any army in history. She saw the great need to take care of orphans and started an orphans asylum association in Iowa in 1864. She talked to Lincoln about that and he endorsed the idea in his second inaugural address. She was a personal friend of many famous people in the District of Columbia, and especially close to the Grants, Julia and U. S.

Grant said she was one of the great heroines, if not the greatest heroine, of the war and, yet, she is not in Boatner's book, and no one except some people in Iowa knows I have been talking about Annie Wittenmyer. You don't know about her because no one ever wrote a good book about her.

And have you ever heard of that wonderful lady who established a home in Springfield, Mo., for orphans of both Confederate and Union veterans? Her name was Mary Whitney Phelps, and she was the wife of Gen. John S. Phelps.

There was another girl, a Richmond resident. She established a hospital on her own after the first battle of Bull Run. Later the Confederate Government took it over, and she was commissioned captain by President Davis, and became the only woman to receive a regular commission in the Confederacy. My, what relief she and her kind brought to thousands. To most of you the name, Sally Tompkins is new, isn't it?

Have you ever heard of Madame Turchin, the immigrant from Russia, symbol of foreign aid, who went with her husband, a colonel in the Union Army, and served as nurse and mother confessor to the regiment. And, once when her husband became ill, she took over and led the regiment into battle with confidence and poise and won the skirmish.

In the books by Ishbell Ross on the lives of Kate Chase, Rose Greenhow, Clara Barton, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis, we find excellent samples of what can be done to reveal the devotion, even though some were by intrigue, and the wholesome and sometimes almost unbelievable and thrilling influence women can have in difficult and challenging times.

In these books she has demonstrated, as others could if they were inspired to study as she has and do the exceptionally skillful job of investigating and fine writing, the spirit of the women. All of this could give us a new insight and a new and different angle from which to view and appreciate the Civil War.

So much more needs to be done for so many other women who have made significant, interesting, and worthwhile contributions in so many ways. People like Elizabeth Waring Duckett of Maryland; just the story of how she got to Lincoln and Stanton and others in behalf of her father and brother who were in prison and was able to get them out.

Then there is the mother of the 1st Tennessee Regiment, Mrs. Betsy Sullivan. We only know about her through searching the records and yet in some ways there was no greater inspiration that any regiment could receive than she furnished by her devotion to the solution of many problems for the average soldier.

The story of the girl who earned the title "The Florence Nightingale of the South," Mrs. Ella Trader, of Arkansas, is a thrilling one, too.

These are just a few examples that suggest areas that need research, study, reviving, and writing about.

A study and review of the life of Mrs. Jeb Stuart could be a very interesting and worthwhile contribution.

Yes, the histories of wars are records of the achievements of men, for the most part. The chroniclers have had to record that women, by their intrigues or their fatal gift of beauty, have been the cause of strife innumerable; and it is confessed that they have inspired heroism and knightly deeds, but they have had small share in the actual conflicts. It has been their portion to suffer in silence at home, and to mourn the dead. For them it has been to hear of sufferings which they could not alleviate, to grieve or rejoice over results to which they had contributed only sympathy and prayers.

But, it was different in our conflict to save the Union. Other wars have furnished here and there a name which the world delights to repeat in terms of affection or admiration, of some woman who has broken through the rigidity of custom and been conspicuous either among armed men, like the Maid of Saragossa, or in the hospitals, like the heroine of Scutari. But, the Civil War furnished hundreds as intrepid as the one, and as philanthropically devoted as the other. Indeed, we may safely say that there was scarcely a loyal woman in the North or South who did not do something in aid of the cause—who did not contribute, of time, or labor, or money, to the comfort of the soldiers. No town was too remote from the scene of war to have its society of relief; and while the women sewed and knit, and made delicacies for the sick, and gathered stores, little girls, scarcely old enough to know what the charitable labor meant, went from house to house, collecting small sums of money, the fruitful energy of all keeping the storehouses and treasury of the sanitary commissions and comparable organizations full, and pouring a steady stream of beneficence down to the troops in the field.

Everywhere there were humble and unknown laborers. But there were others, fine and adventurous spirits, whom the glowing fire of patriotism urged to more noticeable efforts. There were those who followed their

husbands and brothers to the field of battle and who went down into the very edge of the fight, to rescue the wounded, and cheer and comfort the dying with gentle ministrations; who labored in field and city hospitals, and on the dreadful hospital boats, where the severely wounded were received; who penetrated the lines of the enemy on dangerous missions; who organized great charities, and pushed on our sanitary enterprises; who were angels of mercy in a thousand terrible situations.

There are others who have illustrated, by their courage and address in times of danger, by their patience in suffering, and by adventures romantic and daring, some of the best qualities in our nature. Like the soldiers of the armies, they were from every rank in life, and they exhibited a like persistence, endurance, and faith.

There are many hundreds of women whose shining deeds have honored their country and, wherever they are known, the Nation holds them in equal honor with its brave men. But, they are not known.

The story of the war will never be fully or fairly written if the achievements of women in it remain untold. They do not figure in the official reports; they are not gazetted for deeds as gallant as ever were done; the names of thousands are unknown beyond the neighborhood where they live, or the hospitals where they loved to labor; yet there is no feature in the Civil War more creditable to us as a nation, none from its positive newness so well worthy of records of the U.S. Sanitary Commission, U.S. Christian Commission, the various State historical society records, the thousands of references to women's activity found in local publications of the time will make it easy for us to do something in this area that will give the women the credit that is their due.

In assuring this credit we will add to our own heritage and will be building on the gallant spirit of graciousness and tenderness toward women of that time that we know about but which never has been properly recognized in writing.

Now let me summarize very briefly by saying, again, that we must commemorate appropriately, adequately, and as completely as we can. We will do this better if we encourage and engage the very best of our scholarly efforts everywhere. When we do this we will have more, more accurate and more complete, historical literature of this very significant time in our history.

And, I reiterate, we must demonstrate our gallantry toward the gentler sex. This story is a thrilling one and will reflect great credit on the women from both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

In addition, and in conclusion, it may be worthwhile at this point to suggest also that we can learn much from the lives of all the people, great and small, who served the cause of the people as they understood the demands of their time—for my purpose now I should like to refer to two of them.

One became great and immortal before and during the war and one during and after the war. Both left us needed sublime words and thoughts at the close of the tragedy which point to the goal and call us to the task.

Ninety-six years ago last March 4, one of them, Lincoln, left us words and suggestions about malice, charity, firmness, right and the task before us. Told us what to care for, what we should do, achieve and cherish for ourselves and for all nations.

Soon after that Robert E. Lee, seeking to serve against a united nation, left us some unforgettable words and then an incomparable example of unselfish citizenship.

Bruce Catton, in one of his great books, tells us of it in this way:

"Through the sheets of rain that fell on the morning of April 15, 1865, a Baptist minister living on the outskirts of Richmond

caught sight of a man on a gray horse. His steed was bespattered with mud, and his head hung down as if worn by long traveling. The horseman himself sat his horse like a master; his face was ridged with self-respecting grief; his garments were worn in the service and stained with travel * * * Robert E. Lee had returned at last from the wars.

Lee, a paroled prisoner, was indicted for treason but was never brought to trial; and on July 13 he applied for a Federal pardon, which was never granted. Courageous and resolute in war, Lee was never bitter in defeat. "The war being at an end * * *" he wrote in September 1865, "I believe it to be the duty of every one to unite in the restoration of the country, and the establishment of peace and harmony * * *"

That month he became president of Washington College in Lexington, Va., a position which he held for the 5 remaining years of his life. On the morning of October 12, 1870, the old warrior lay dying. His former opponent, Ulysses S. Grant, was in the White House; but Robert E. Lee was once more on the battlefield. "Strike the tent," he murmured as he died.

I'm loath to close but I must because there are others who also have important observations to make but it cannot be wrong for me to suggest that we, like our forefathers, must strive for a greater, more appropriate and devoted patriotism toward the self-same ideals that they gave to us through sacrifice and preserved for us through sacrifice. I know of no better way to develop this patriotic spirit in the hearts and minds of boys and girls and in the hearts and minds of all our citizens and liberty-loving people everywhere than by reviewing, rewriting, reliving and reviving the great American story and its magnificent struggle for freedom.

Good luck as together we do those things that will give assurance for a greater and finer America for ourselves, forever and for everyone.

Hail to Italy and Its Great People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the rebirth of the great and illustrious nation of Italy is an event that will be noted throughout the world with acclaim, enthusiasm, and gratitude.

The proclamation of Turin climaxed the rebirth of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel the Second.

The great Italian philosopher and historian, Croce, observed that this event might more appropriately have been called a birth, because it was the first time in Italian history in which there was an Italian state with all and only its own people and molded by an idea.

Thus, Italy is no longer the Italy of the Romans, or the Italy of the middle ages, but the Italy of the Italians. But it would be quite impossible to try to separate modern Italy, and the Italy of the Italians, from the glorious ages of Italian history where high orders of civilization flourished, where art, literature, science and culture were nurtured, where fundamental principles of government and law were originated and developed.

That the unification of Italy under the Risorgimento brought desirable independence, liberty and unity to this great historic nation cannot be doubted, and this movement and its happy consequences constitute valuable milestones in the progress of man toward self-determination and individual liberty.

It would be a colossal task, however, to try even to outline the glorious, momentous contributions of Italy and the Italian people to the enlightenment and high state of civilization which we of the Western World enjoy today.

It would be equally formidable to try to describe the enduring effects of the great, invaluable contributions in war and peace which leaders and people of Italian blood have made to America and its progress. The American people can be very thankful for the truly monumental contributions of past and present generations of Italian blood, especially those that relate to the building and development of this country, which, in all our States, and in thousands of communities throughout the land, are so patently visible, and evoke the gratitude of our people for the gallantry and spirit of sacrifice in war and the long-sustained loyalty, steadfastness, and enlightened leadership and work in peacetime of Italians and Italo-Americans, to develop the strength and promote the progress of our Nation.

Italy is bound to us by many ties of blood, of kinship, of religion, of common law, and culture. It is a loyal and dedicated ally in the struggle to preserve human freedom, an integral and vital part of the free world, the beloved native land of very many noble, devoted American citizens, whose children, like themselves, are increasingly and influentially a meaningful part of the American dream.

I am very proud indeed, as a Member of this great legislative body who represents here many fine Americans of Italian blood, to join in the tributes that are being paid to Italy on its 100th birthday. My own bonds with the Italian people are deep and very dear. From early boyhood the Italian people have been among my closest and warmest friends and I dearly cherish them. They have sustained and inspired me in ways I could never forget.

I am indeed honored to express my words of congratulations and best wishes to the Italian nation and its wonderful people, on the occasion of Italy's centennial, and I hope and pray that the great Italian nation will continue to grow, prosper, and flower as it has throughout history in the arts, culture, and enlightenment for which it is famous, and in the ways of prosperity and individual liberty so fittingly symbolized by and worthy of its unity and independence.

The Italian people fill an honored place in this Nation and in the world. Their talents, zeal, courage and humane warmth are qualities this Nation and the whole wide world urgently need.

Here in our own land we will continue to hold them close to our hearts, just as they hold others who have won their trust and affection.

I rejoice with Italy and the Italian people on its 100th birthday and pray God that this beautiful, great land and its cherished people may go forward in good health, ever-growing prosperity and happiness and very many happy returns of the day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a recent editorial entitled "Risorgimento Saluted," printed in the Worcester, Mass., Telegram Gazette, in the RECORD.

I thank the distinguished editor who wrote this brilliant piece for his inspiration and ideas:

RISORGIMENTO SALUTED

("If it were possible in political history to speak of masterpieces as we do in dealing with works of art, the process of Italy's independence, liberty and unity would deserve to be called the masterpiece of the liberal-national movements of the 19th century in Europe."—B. Croce, in his *History of Europe of the XIX Century*.)

One hundred years ago, Italy climaxed its "risorgimento," its "rebirth," with the proclamation in Turin, by the first Italian Parliament, of the Kingdom of Italy under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel II.

Croce observed that it might more accurately have been called a sorgimento, a birth, because for the first time in all the ages there was born an Italian state "with all and only its own people, and molded by an idea." Italy, as Victor Emmanuel said, was no longer the Italy of the Romans or the Italy of the Middle Ages, but "the Italy of the Italians."

But whether a risorgimento or a sorgimento, Italy's unification under Victor Emmanuel was part of that same wave of humane enlightenment which swept Europe beginning in the 17th century and had its finest 18th century flowering in the American Revolution.

It is significant in this regard that the book "On Crimes and Punishments," by the Italian humanist Cesare Beccaria was read and annotated by Jefferson, who knew and spoke Italian, and was cited by John Adams in his defense of the English soldiers who were tried for the Boston massacre.

This year, we in America observe the centennial of a war in which our own national unity was preserved. It is therefore all the more fitting that we honor, also, the centennial of Italy's unity. A staunch free world ally—and the country of origin of so many fine Americans—deserves no less.

A Military Code of Ethics and a Step in the Right Direction by Secretary of Defense McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the directive of Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, issued April 14, 1960, No. 1000.8, concerning the acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds, be printed in the RECORD.

I have long sought to see a code of ethics for guidance of officers and em-

ployees of the Department of Defense which would be enforced. As chairman of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, I have conducted many inquiries into this general area.

Congress has been promised time and again that there would be a code of conduct set up; that action would be taken to curtail abuses; that direction would be given; and that there would be restored a standard of ethical values which could be clearly understood and enforced.

The standards contained in this directive reflect the Secretary's own personal high ethical standards. They are a decent set of rules by which the personal integrity and the official responsibility of members of his Department can live.

I am gratified at the spirit which prompts this directive. It follows soon upon the Secretary's assumption of office. I look forward, as I am sure do the Members of Congress and a waiting public, for the cure which it is intended to effect; and for the standard of personal integrity which it will create.

There is little time to be lost. Many excesses, in the past, have gone unchallenged and unpunished because there seemed to be a vacuum which personal standards did not always fill—sometimes at very high level.

Now there is a code of ethics.

I think, however, this code should be considered only as a beginning. Conscientious administration and observance will make it meaningful.

I congratulate the Secretary for this prompt and discerning action:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

(Subject: Acceptance of gifts; use of Government facilities, and use of official representation funds)

I. Purpose:

This directive sets forth standards of conduct for Defense personnel with respect to the acceptance of gifts, the use of Government facilities, property and manpower, and the use of official representation funds. Its provisions apply to all military personnel on active duty and to all civilian personnel.

II. Acceptance of gifts and use of Government property:

(A) Defense personnel shall not—

(1) Accept any gift, favor or hospitality for themselves or their families from any enterprise or person doing business or seeking to do business with the Department of Defense which might reasonably be interpreted by others as being of such nature that it could affect their impartiality;

(2) Personally use or permit the use by others of Government facilities, property, manpower or funds for other than official Government business.

(B) The tender of any gift, favor, or hospitality which might be considered to be in the nature of bribery shall be reported immediately through departmental procedures to the Department of Justice and the General Counsel of the Department of Defense. Any questions concerning what might be construed as bribery shall be resolved in favor of reporting the incident.

(C) Gifts from foreign governments shall be handled in accordance with DOD Directive 1005.3.

III. Official representation funds: Use of official representation funds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, or the Secretaries of the military departments. Funds

are to be utilized only for official entertainment to maintain the standing and prestige of the United States by extending official courtesies to certain officials and dignitaries of the United States and foreign countries.

IV. Use of Government facilities, property, and manpower:

(A) Government facilities, property, and manpower, such as stenographic and typing assistance, mimeograph services, and chauffeur services, shall be used only for official Government business.

(B) Special mission aircraft shall be used only for official purposes and such use shall be approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff, Army and Air Force, the Chief of Naval Operations, or the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(C) Motor vehicles:

(1) Full-time assignment of official vehicles to officials of the Department of Defense at the seat of government shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense or the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Full-time assignments at field installations will be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(2) Defense personnel authorized full-time use of official vehicles shall not use such vehicles for other than the actual performance of official duties. Vehicles authorized on a full-time basis shall not be reassigned to others not entitled to such use.

(3) Other administrative use of motor vehicles shall be authorized only when official transportation is essential to the successful operation of activities of the Government.

(4) Use of motor vehicles, whether authorized on a full-time or trip basis, is not authorized for the official concerned, members of his family, or others, for private business or personal social engagements. Questions with regard to the official nature of a particular use shall be resolved in favor of strict compliance with statutory restrictions.

V. Implementation: Two copies of instructions in implementation of this directive will be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense within 30 days after the effective date of this directive for approval prior to promulgation.

VI. Effective date: The provisions of this directive are effective immediately.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.

Imports on Textiles and Apparels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have stood on this floor and expressed my opinion and the majority opinion of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to seek some relief for the domestic coal and glass producers of Pennsylvania and the rest of the country.

I would now like to speak in behalf of the apparel manufacturers of my district and of the State as a whole. As some of the basic industries of my district have been forced to go out of business due to unfair competition, other industries have come in to help take up the slack. One of these industries is the apparel manufacturing group. My

district enjoys a happy relationship with the Phillips-Van Heusen Shirt Corp. and we hope and are working for a larger employment by this company and for similar companies.

I am no isolationist. I recognize that foreign trade is a positive instrument in the assistance in raising living standards of workers throughout the world. But this does not blind me to the scramble for American markets from countries where wages, including all possible fringe benefits, are only a fraction of American wage rates. We have recently voted an increase in the minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.15. The Senate has voted a similar proposal with escalators to \$1.25 an hour.

One does not have to be a trained economist to understand that the American manufacturer who must pay a minimum of \$1.15 an hour cannot compete with industries in the Orient that pay from 10 to 29 cents per hour.

Let me take a simple mathematical formula carefully prepared by one of the largest apparel manufacturers in the country who buys exclusively from American mills. His actual cost breakdown per dollar of sales is as follows:

Materials.....	\$0.60
Labor and overhead.....	.35
Taxes.....	.03
Profit.....	.02
Total.....	1.00

Foreign apparel manufacturers who operate in low-wage countries pay only a fraction of what the American manufacturer has to pay and that breakdown runs:

Materials.....	\$0.51
Labor and overhead.....	.03
Taxes.....	.02
Profit.....	.02
Total.....	.58

How does this come about? The great discrepancy between the American and oriental costs of labor and overhead are obvious, but this is compounded by the fact that the foreign manufacturer can buy American cotton at a subsidy of from 6 to 8½ cents a pound, depending on quality. This is roughly a subsidy of 25 percent of the total cost of raw material for the foreign manufacturer.

What kind of a policy is this that subsidizes foreign manufacturers at the cost to American taxpayers and in the last analysis, exports jobs that rightfully belong to American workers?

This is no narrow concept. As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have a deep and abiding interest in the National Defense Establishment. It is a matter of record that next to steel, apparel and textiles rank next in importance to national defense. This Nation cannot allow itself to slip into a position where it is dependent on foreign sources of supply for clothing and equipment for our Military Establishment. We know the disasters that befell Germany and Japan because they could not supply their armies with sufficient clothing.

I listened the other day to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], point out that 40

percent of the budget for Camp Lejeune, the base of the 2d Marine Division for the Atlantic Fleet, is for equipment and supplies classified in the category of textiles. Mr. HENDERSON said that this was not just a matter of clothing of all types, but the essentiality of web equipment for such things as cartridge belts, rifle slings, and the hundreds of other military items of which textiles are an essential component.

We must not simply cling to old ideas because at one time or another we thought they were right. They were right at the time we expressed them, but in this rapidly changing world we must be alert to change our ideas with the changing world. I make no plea, nor do the apparel and textile industries of my State make any plea, to ban or prohibit imports. We know this is impossible in the world in which we live, but we are also fully aware that *laissez faire* in foreign trade is no more reliable than *laissez faire* economics in the domestic scene. Adjustments must be made.

Some of us would go further in adjustments in many respects than others, but we should not blink the fact that unless imports of apparel and textiles are controlled on a quota basis, country by country and category by category, we are only increasing the hard core unemployment problem that our country faces.

This is especially true for my State.

We have a hard-core unemployment problem in the bituminous and anthracite coalfields and in glass-producing districts. The specialist on unemployment from the Labor Department said the other day the danger is that hard-core unemployment will increase. He made it clear that the increase in hard-core unemployment came from the unskilled and semiskilled. The vast number of people in the apparel industry would qualify as semiskilled. If they are dumped on the heap of the unemployed because we fail to regulate imports which gobble their jobs, then we have failed in our duty.

Many areas of the country, and this is true in my State, are hard pressed to find tax money to keep our communities running at a high level.

Gentlemen, if we force industries to close and lose the corporate income, and at the same time create unemployment, which loses individual income, where are we heading? It is my opinion that you know.

Let us not be derelict in our duty.

The Dutch Need Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is currently engaged in conversations with President Sukarno, of Indonesia. All of us are aware, I am

sure, that these discussions include the disposition of West New Guinea.

The situation simply is that Dr. Sukarno wants the Netherlands to get out so that Indonesia can move in. Up to this point the United States has remained on the fence. Personally, I think it is about time that we stood by our friends, the Dutch.

The Dutch, we know, fought beside us in World War I and in World War II. And, because the United States was an ally of the Dutch during World War II, Dr. Sukarno has criticized us. He believes that we should have forced the Dutch to yield West New Guinea to Indonesia. Influenced by Marxism, he has also been motivated by the doctrine that a big capitalist power must of necessity be imperialist. However, the record shows that in the case of West New Guinea this is not true.

The Dutch spend \$27 million each year to give West New Guinea its government. Their 10-year program has produced a largely native legislative council. The Dutch, because of this expense, are willing to leave this island, but they desire that the Papuans, the natives of West New Guinea, have a chance to determine their own fate. In fact, the Dutch welcomed a recent Malayan proposal to hand over this possession to a three-nation United Nations trusteeship, but Dr. Sukarno continues to block this move.

Mr. Speaker, I have been using the title "doctor" in my references to Sukarno. Well, he calls himself "doctor" on the strength of a degree in engineering at the University of Bandung. But, his engineering skills have never been in building bridges. It has been in crossing them.

The first major opportunity for Sukarno to cross a political bridge was in March 1943 when the Japanese promised Indonesia independence to gain his support. The Japanese made him president of an appointed council, which they were supposed to consult. Sukarno shortly went to Tokyo to thank Japan for this so-called step toward self-government. Meanwhile, Netherlands soldiers, sailors, and airmen were bitterly engaged in a war of survival against the Japanese. Japan's esteem for this collaborator was shown when it decorated Sukarno with the Order of the Sacred Treasure for his wartime service.

Sukarno is regarded as an Asian uncommitted to either the Western democracies or the Communist bloc. He believes in dealing with both and with getting aid from any source. But, the similarity between Sukarno's conception of government and the Communist pattern has not been lost to observers. In fact, the Communists have performed the function of agitators and propagandists for Sukarno. This is surprising when one considers that he called on his people to put down a Communist revolt in 1948.

Sukarno, Mr. Speaker, stresses that "democracy is not merely government by the people; democracy is also government for the people." Perhaps this is why his government is infiltrated by Communists. Recently he banned four

political parties including the pro-Western nationalist PIR. But, he allowed the Communist PKI and the Communist Murba to exist.

In January of this year, Gen. Abdul Haris Nasution, Indonesia's defense minister, went to Moscow and came back with \$450 million in military aid after U.S.S.R. officials had publicly pledged themselves to help Indonesia take over West New Guinea.

The Netherlands want self-determination for the Papuans, who, by the way, are not Indonesian. The fate of West New Guinea was undecided by the Indonesian Treaty of 1949 because its people and problems are extraordinary. Sukarno claims it on the grounds that Indonesia is the legal heir of all the Dutch Indonesian possessions. This is a dubious claim, and although the Dutch are willing to go to the World Court to settle the dispute, Sukarno refuses this or any other logical solution.

What he wants is to distract the attention of his people away from the failure of his own government.

Mr. Speaker, Sukarno served Japan when we were at war with that country. He has been friendly with the Communists and has openly accepted their aid. He has refused to accept the result of a plebiscite in West New Guinea, probably because he is afraid of the results. As long ago as 1950, two Papuan leaders, Nicolaas Jouwe and Markus Kasieppo, speaking for their countrymen, said they preferred to remain under the Dutch. The dominant attitude of Papuan leaders today—though sometimes critical—is loyal to the Dutch.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that President Kennedy does not encourage Sukarno's pretention and I hope we can be able to take a positive position on behalf of the Dutch. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that Sukarno was not asked to address this Congress, for if he had been asked I, for one, would not have been present.

Senator Keating Delivers Address at 75th Anniversary of Temple Israel in Binghamton, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Temple Israel in Binghamton, N.Y., recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of its founding. On this important occasion the principal address was delivered by New York's junior Senator, Mr. KEATING.

In his remarks, Senator KEATING paid tribute to those who have participated in the wonderful work of the temple and who have helped make it such an important part of the Binghamton community. In addition, he surveyed the situation in the Middle East and pointed out the dangers of American neglect of problems in that area.

Senator KEATING has traveled to Israel and other Near East points frequently in recent years and his remarks, therefore, have special significance. Under unanimous consent, I include them at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, OF NEW YORK, AT 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE ISRAEL, BINGHAMTON, N.Y., APRIL 23, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Hurwitz, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, my pleasure at being with you tonight is the deeper, the greater, because of the very special event that you mark and commemorate this day. The diamond jubilee of the founding of Temple Israel Congregation is indeed a meaningful and heart-lifting anniversary. Each of you must feel a great warmth of pride as you meditate on the significance of this magnificent milestone in the long and distinguished history of your beloved spiritual and religious home. But, in the truest sense, this is a pride, this is an honor, not yours alone. It is shared with the entire community, and with the good people of all faiths who are your neighbors and friends. For this synagogue has not only been in the community for three-quarters of a century, it has been of the community—a vital part of its life and culture, a source of its spiritual strength, an element of the growth and vitality that are the common heritage of citizens of all faiths, of all races, of all walks of life in this fine community.

That is why it is so fitting that the civic leaders of Binghamton should be with us tonight. Their presence symbolizes the recognition of the fact that this congregation—this golden thread that has been woven into the tapestry of community life for 75 years—represents not your pride alone, but the pride of all who have enjoyed the radiation of its influence.

Rabbi Hurwitz, this night is especially rich in meaning for you. I would take this opportunity to wish you many more yearly harvests of the spiritual satisfaction that makes the hardest work seem light.

As we celebrate the 75th anniversary of the founding of Temple Israel, our thoughts turn inevitably to another anniversary that is being celebrated this month, an anniversary that is of deep significance to all free peoples the world over.

I am referring, of course, to the 13th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. April 20 marked the passing of another year of independence, of effort, and of successful striving for Israel.

Conceived in farseeing idealism and born of war and concentration camps, Israel has grown to manhood. The bar mitzvah year has come, and in celebrating it, we all must acknowledge that Israel has taken its place as an adult in the family of nations. The secret behind the progress which has been made in this small state surrounded by enemies lies to a large extent, I believe, in the great spiritual force which has been supplied through the centuries by the Jewish religion. Never losing hope, despite the obstacles and inertia of centuries, never losing faith despite what must have appeared to be the hostility and indifference of the whole world—the Jewish people have been inspired to build a country where freedom will be unchallenged.

For generations, the members of the Jewish religion, although segregated throughout Europe in ghetto-like conditions, have made their tremendous contributions to culture and intellectual development. In the United States, citizens of the Jewish religion have shown in their fellowship and common effort with citizens of all other faiths a determined ambition for civic and national progress. The same spirit which has contributed so much to the intellectual

climate of European nations has carried over first to the United States, and now in similar measure to the new State of Israel.

Politically, the prospects for Israel's survival seemed small indeed in 1948 when it emerged, ravaged and war torn, from an unhappy British mandate. Enemies stood on every side. Its friends were far away and deeply preoccupied with the world problem of containing Communist aggression. It was the supreme accomplishment of the people of Israel, with continuing assistance from the United States, that they passed through the night of despair and turned their attention at once to the new day that dawned for Israel.

At once, with an energy and enterprise that must be the envy of all nations, the people of Israel threw themselves into the tasks that faced them. They held off the surrounding enemy, and they built in the barren desert a fruitful home for their people.

Economically, the obstacles must have seemed well nigh insuperable. A small country, with an even smaller area of arable land, Israel nevertheless threw open its doors to the oppressed of other lands. Regardless of nationality, background, or political views, refugees to Israel were made welcome on the grounds of the common faith which has been shared for generation upon generation. The economic problems were deliberately subordinated to the sense of moral purpose and destiny.

What was the result? Over the last 13 years, the population of Israel has more than tripled, from less than a million in 1948 to over 2 million in 1961. At the same time, per capita income has nearly doubled, the amount of cultivated land has more than doubled, the gross national product has tripled, the acreage under irrigation has been increased fivefold, and agricultural production has increased more than seven times. These are the economic accomplishments of the people of Israel. It is a record to be proud of.

Moreover, the technical skills and energies behind this achievement are being generously shared with other newer nations in Africa which can benefit by the help of Israeli experts.

If it be true indeed that "the Lord helps those who help themselves" there can be no doubt that the State of Israel has merited, many times over, the divine assistance and protection which I believe it has surely enjoyed.

There are undoubtedly limits to what one small country, surrounded by enemies, can do to bring about the peace which we know would benefit not only Israel but the whole Middle East and indeed the whole world.

It behooves the United States above all, as the leader of the free peoples of the world, to press more vigorously for negotiation and settlement of the problems of the Middle East. In general the Government of the United States has been rather remiss in its treatment of Middle Eastern problems recently. There has been no action taken to stop blockades, reprisals and boycotts against American Jews in the Middle East. In fact, we have continued to supply foreign aid, derived from the taxes paid by all American citizens, to these very countries which discriminate against Americans.

Furthermore, we have made no positive steps to stop the Arab boycott of Israel and other cargo ships passing through the Suez Canal, even though such a blockade is in violation of the principles laid down by the United Nations and recognized by all nations. I myself have several times called this whole question to the attention of the State Department, most recently last month. But the reply is always the same and it is always disappointing—the U.S. Government

is always exploring methods by which Arab blockades, boycotts, and other restrictions can be ended, but somehow it never seems to find anything. And it never seems to feel the time is ripe for a more vigorous initiative.

Obviously, at the moment, there are other parts of the world which demand our urgent attention and our most concentrated efforts. But, I can virtually guarantee that if we do wait until a crisis arises once more in the Middle East, it will be too late.

In the meantime, I fear that Middle Eastern problems are being neglected. Just last week, for instance, the United States lost a critical vote in the United Nations Special Political Committee merely because friendly delegations had not been informed of the vote or kept up to date on U.S. policy.

So what was the result? A resolution supported by the Arab States, and the Soviet Union was passed which would urge the General Assembly to safeguard the property rights of the Arab refugees who fled from Israel during the 1948 fighting.

It is certainly ironic to see the Soviet Union trying to look out for property rights of Arab refugees. What about the property rights of Hungarian refugees or Tibetan refugees? In fact, what about the property rights of Russians themselves where the Communist dictatorship has seized all land and vigorously preaches the evils of private property and capitalism. The whole Soviet position on this matter is absurd, but it is most unfortunate that the U.S. delegation to the United Nations was not more on the ball to prevent this propaganda play.

In short, I feel there is a real danger that the Arab-Israeli problem, neglected by our Government today, will emerge as a crisis again at some point in the future.

Then we would have to pay the price of our neglect. Our prestige is suffering today because we neglected until 1952 the whole field of missiles and rockets until then and therefore allowed the Russians to put a man into space ahead of us.

We are at a disadvantage in the Far East because we allowed the Chinese Communists to seize control of China more than 10 years ago. It is clear that mistakes of the past are going to come home to roost. I do not want to see the same thing happening in the Middle East in 1970 because we neglected to handle the problem with proper care and attention in 1961.

Today as we look toward Israel, the most immediate point of interest is the Eichmann trial. It reminds us, more poignantly than we like to admit, of the sad and recurrent theme of man's inhumanity to man. The horrors of the Nazi regime are over, crimes that were committed against the Jewish people and indeed against all mankind are now being revealed in their true horror.

I think the revelations of the Eichmann trial must be not only a reminder of the brutalities of the past, but also a warning for the future.

These brutalities still exist in other parts of the world—in Cuba, where innocent men are sent without trial to the firing squad; in Tibet, where a whole religion is being wiped out by alien dictators; in Eastern Europe, where freedom is quelled with threats and imprisonment; and even in southeast Asia, where Communist terrorists murder their own countrymen at the bidding of Peking and Moscow.

The horrors of the Nazi regime were beyond belief. And in reminding themselves of the past the people of Israel and indeed of all the free world should render thanks unto the Lord that these days are past for them. But murder, brutality, and persecution will continue on the earth as long as Communist and other dictatorships exist. And, to para-

phrase the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, it is rather for us the living—and for us the free—to be here dedicated to that noble cause for which freedom-loving men have ever given the last full measure of devotion—that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Committee on Consumer Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of testifying before the House Rules Committee on behalf of my House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42. I would like to commend to the attention of our colleagues my remarks at that time:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 42, BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, APRIL 25, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear here this morning on behalf of House Concurrent Resolution 15 and House Resolution 42, which I introduced on January 3.

These resolutions are both designed to accomplish the same end, the protection of the interests of the consumer.

House Resolution 42 would provide for the creation of a select committee of the House to be composed of 15 Members appointed by the Speaker. House Concurrent Resolution 15 would provide for a joint committee composed of 7 Members of the House and 7 Members of the Senate. I have introduced measures similar to these in every Congress since the 83d.

A committee such as that proposed by either resolution would be empowered to investigate, conduct studies and report to the Congress on the status of the consumer in the American economy.

Many observers have often thought that strict regulation of the monetary policies affecting our economy would alone achieve economic stability and provide the consumer with adequate protection of his interests. We have seen the sad results of such narrow thinking in the inability of the American business community and the Federal Government to prevent either inflation or deflation. It has become obvious that many other factors must be dealt with to prevent inadequacies and imbalances which periodically occur.

It is generally recognized that the monetary and credit policy instruments of the Federal Reserve System played an important role in the efforts to make the impact of the 1954 recession easier to absorb. Similarly they performed this service in the inflationary movement of the 1955-57 period and in the recession of 1958. They did not, however, prevent these economic crises from occurring, nor did these policies in themselves correct the situations.

It appears clear that a full investigation is urgently needed of wages, prices, employment, and the other factors which affect the consumer if we are to avoid this continuing cycle of inflation-recession that we have experienced in the fifties.

Some of the tasks of a committee such as is called for in my resolution would be the study of classical inflation and deflation caused by decreases in the effective supply of money and credit and an investigation of the effect of monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic practices on prices, production, and employment. We have seen exposed recently an aspect of this latter problem in the conviction for price fixing of officers and directors of some of our largest electrical manufacturing companies.

Other matters we would hope the proposed committee would study are the effect upon prices, profits, production, and employment of increases in wages, of government expenditures, taxation, monetary and debt management policies, and international influences.

From the consumer's viewpoint the prices charged for cost-of-living items such as food, fuel, and clothing, and the availability of these items, are of utmost importance and the special function of the committee would be to attempt to determine the variables which influence these aspects of the consumer interest.

The results of an investigation and study of these problems would immeasurably increase the effectiveness of the Federal Government and the business community in guiding us along a path of continuing prosperity and progress.

I strongly urge this committee to favorably report either House Concurrent Resolution 15 or House Resolution 42, or in the alternative, my resolution, House Resolution 62, which would give to the Banking and Currency Committee jurisdiction over these problems, in which event that committee could conduct the necessary investigations and studies.

Speech by the Honorable William M. Tuck, Representative From the Fifth District of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 23, the Commonwealth of Virginia officially marked the opening of the Civil War Centennial. The Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, who so ably represents the Fifth District of Virginia in the House of Representatives, delivered the address at the opening ceremony at the State capitol in Richmond.

Congressman Tuck has long been identified with those who cherish the ideals, traditions, and heritage of our people and who are endeavoring manfully to impart to the present generation the importance of preserving liberty, freedom, and the rights of our people and to prevent government by men and not by law.

Representative Tuck was introduced by the Honorable Charles T. Moses, president pro tempore of the Senate of Virginia. Senator Moses and I live in the same county and I am proud of the splendid work he is doing to preserve our way of life and the freedoms and privileges of our people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the splendid address of the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK, REPRESENTATIVE, FIFTH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, SUNDAY, APRIL 23, 1961, CEREMONIES MARKING THE OPENING OF THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL IN VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: The late Dr. Edwin Anderson Alderman, president of the University of Virginia, in his matchless address to a joint session of the Congress of the United States commemorating the life and services of Woodrow Wilson, adverted to the comments of an ancient Athenian. This individual had commended the fitness of the Athenian Public Memorial, but doubted the wisdom of any speech on such occasions. He declared that where men's deeds and actions have been great, they should be honored in deed only; that the standing and character should not depend upon the judgment and the words of one; that their virtues should not depend upon whether he spoke well or ill. While I know that what I say has no comparable value to the situation described by Dr. Alderman, nevertheless, I find myself incapable of employing words that would justly and accurately portray the scenes which obtained in Virginia a century ago, or to give appropriate expression to the sentiment which permeates the breast, or the thoughts which crowd upon the mind at this time.

We have met here today to open formally the Virginia Civil War Centennial anniversary. This occasion is a mere milestone on the road of time, a niche in the long corridors of history. But in the deeper sense of noble sentiment and high obligations to our Commonwealth and to our country, we are here to commemorate the soul-wrenching ordeal through which Virginia passed and from which, despite hardships and handicaps, she emerged to take her proud place in the forefront of the sisterhood of American States.

Virginia had furnished much of the leadership which established the Union. Madison was named by the muse of history as the father of the Constitution, just as another great Virginian, George Washington, had been the Father of his Country. And Virginia herself was loved and respected, as she is today. She was then, as now, known as the "mother of States and of statesmen." And so she stood in those sorrowing days entrapped within a national disturbance of complex causes, a commonwealth of powerful prestige whose movement to one side or the other was fatefully awaited by all.

As Virginia waited, there was little hope of escape. Soon the decision must come, and 100 years ago it did come, from within the walls of this very building where we are gathered, from the assembled trustees of the will, the conscience and the power of Virginians everywhere.

To the broad southern mind, the election of Abraham Lincoln meant secession. They saw no happiness in a Union presided over by him. The very waves of the deep southern discontent, and the northern discontent with the ways of the South, profoundly threatened the foundation of the Nation. As these waves beat against this State, Virginia was caught in the vortex of these angry emotions.

To the eternal and everlasting credit of the Virginians of a century ago, they exhausted every resource and explored and employed every honorable device to preserve the peace and save the Union short of fighting against the people of the South. None of the succeeding generations have had cause or reason to blush and no apologies to make. We can stand proudly in the confident

knowledge that, upon the record established, our ancestors took a firm but conciliatory stand. Moral heroism, though less frequent and less acclaimed than physical courage, nevertheless is worthy to excite our highest admiration.

Because of the prominent part Virginia took in the conflict that followed, as well as the fact that so much of the actual warfare occurred on Virginia soil, her name is synonymous with the war. But let us never forget that Virginia did not start that war. At the very hour when Fort Sumter was under fire, an official Virginia committee was in Washington for a conference with Lincoln on his policy toward the South.

At that time Lincoln was not conciliatory, and his reply to the Virginians meant coercion, of which they could not approve. Distinguished historians have pointed out that it was not the firing at Fort Sumter, but it was the Lincoln proclamation calling for 75,000 troops that produced Virginia's ordinance of secession. On many occasions that impeccably honest and irreproachably correct citizen of Rockbridge County, Gov. John Letcher, destined to become Virginia's determined and much-loved war Governor, stated his and the position of Virginia to be that "he would resist the coercion of Virginia and to the adoption of such a policy of coercion whenever the attempt is made by either Northern or Southern States." Governor Letcher furthermore stated his position and that of Virginia which constituted the very crux of why the State adopted the resolution of secession: "I will regard an attempt to pass Federal troops across the territory of Virginia, for purpose of coercing a Southern seceding State, as an act of invasion, which should be met and repelled."

Virginia was in no mood to tear the Union asunder. In 1861, as in 1775, she labored long and ardently for peace and conciliation. She it was who sponsored a resolution in Congress creating a commission of one from each State in the Union to solve the differences.

The Governor of Virginia in November 1860, called a special session of the legislature to deal with the problem facing the Nation. This session of the general assembly passed a resolution calling for a convention, with the understanding that no action taken by the legislators would be binding upon the people of Virginia until they had a chance to vote on it.

The Virginia Legislature on January 19, 1861, passed a resolution calling for a peace convention in Washington. This resolution authorized the commissioners to confer with the President and with representatives from the seceded States in the hope that an atmosphere could be created whereby the seceded States might find it practicable to return to the Union. The aging and beloved ex-President, John Tyler, of Virginia, was commissioned to call on President Buchanan. Another distinguished Virginian, Judge John Robertson, was sent to South Carolina to urge against any action by that State which might result in war pending the peace conference. As a result of President Tyler's visit to President Buchanan, the latter requested Congress to leave the status quo undisturbed until Virginia had run her course in the cause of peace. South Carolina in the meantime agreed to take no action that would precipitate a conflict.

When the Virginia Convention met on February 13, the delegates to that convention put aside the business of passing an ordinance of secession and settled down to explore the possibilities of compromise. These are only a few among many other actions taken by Virginians of that period to avert this gory conflict, and the record of Virginia's attempts to reconcile the difference

and to bring about compromise is long and need not be here repeated. Her efforts along these lines persisted until the very moment of the beginning of hostilities.

The inauguration of President Lincoln and his Executive order calling for troops to invade the South shook Virginia. The country was already at war when Virginia seceded. It was no longer a question of whether the State should go to war; it was simply a question of deciding with whom she would war.

On the 17th of April the secession convention passed an ordinance of secession subject to popular approval. Volunteers were summoned into the State service, and upon the 18th they descended upon the Harpers Ferry arsenal and captured arms, ammunition, and machinery.

Already the long shadow of Robert E. Lee was discernible. This gentleman shared the views of the Virginians of that day that every honorable effort should be made to avoid war. He was a colonel in the Regular Army. He had established a most creditable and distinguished record in the service.

Lee did not know for sure that Virginia had seceded until the morning of April 19, when he went into Alexandria on business and there read the news he had hoped he would never see: "Virginia had seceded." To his mind that meant the wreck of the Nation, the beginning of sorrows, the opening of a war that was certain to be long and full of horrors.

When other hopes had failed before this time, Lee told himself that secession could not become an accomplished fact until the voters of Virginia had passed on the ordinance of secession, as they had specifically reserved the right to do, but now Lee's judgment told him that war would not wait on a referendum. Virginia would certainly consider that her safety required the seizure of Federal depots within her borders. The Federal Government, on its part, would certainly take prompt action since the State just across the river from its Capital had left the Union.

As one of the senior field officers in Washington, he might be summoned at any hour to defend Washington by invading Virginia—which he could not do. Duty was plain. There could be no holding back. The time had come. All the Lees had been Americans, but they had been Virginians first.

Deeply as Lee loved the Union, anxious as he was to see it preserved, he could not bear arms against Virginia, which had seceded and doubtless would join the South. Her action controlled his own. He could not wait for the uncertain vote of the people when war was upon him. So after midnight on the 19th he sat down and wrote this letter, not more than 15 hours after he had received positive information that Virginia had joined the ranks of the seceded States:

ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA
(WASHINGTON CITY P.O.),
20 April 1861.

Hon. SIMON CAMERON,
Sec'y of War.

SIR: I have the honor to tender the resignation of my commission as Colonel of the 1st Regt. of Cavalry.

Very resptly your obt servt,

R. E. LEE,
Col. 1st Cavly.

Lee sent in his resignation to General Scott on the 20th. In it he said: "Save in defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword." That same day he received a communication from Judge John Robertson requesting an interview. It was set for the 21st. On the evening of the 21st a messenger arrived at Arlington mansion with a letter from Robertson. He apologized for his delay and—this was the important item—invited Lee, in the name of the Governor, to repair to Richmond for conference with the chief executive.

Lee realized, of course, that this meant participation in the defense of Virginia, but he did not hesitate a moment. In a few words he notified the Governor's representative that he would join him in Alexandria the next day in time to take the train for Richmond.

Dressed in civilian clothes and silk hat, Robert E. Lee departed from Arlington on the morning of April 22, never again to enter its friendly portals. If he heard a tall clock chime as he left the mansion door of his beloved Arlington, it was but to strike the beginning of his hour of growing greatness and glory.

No one knew better than Robert E. Lee, the trained soldier and the veteran of Mexico, the agonies that war would bring, although it is to be hoped that he was spared the prescience to know of the sorrows that would like sea billows roll during those 8 April days, as he passed along the road leading from Petersburg to Appomattox.

He was a man of simplicity and of superb dignity. He rode on before the crowd to the Spottwood Hotel at Eighth and Main Streets. A few hours later he was in conference with the Governor, who informed him that the general assembly had authorized the appointment of a commander of the military and naval forces of Virginia with the rank of major general.

The appointment was proffered, and that very night the convention unanimously approved the choice in an historic display of good commonsense. That night Lee carried to his hotel the heaviest burden borne by any man since George Washington, and next day he went to work at a simple office on Main Street—without so much as a clerk to help him.

On that same day 100 years ago and just before the noon hour struck, Lee climbed the hill leading to the capitol. He was escorted by a committee from the convention and walked between the massive columns of the south portico of the capitol to the old hall of the house of delegates. Along the way he paused in the rotunda of the capitol and gazed momentarily at Houdon's famous marble statue of Washington.

A few minutes later the doors opened and Lee stepped forward onto the convention floor, amid a hush of silence, before a multitude of admiring eyes. His father and other ancestors had been there many times before him.

The convention rose ecstatically to its feet. An escort by his side spoke out: "Mr. President, I have the honor to present to you and to the convention Major General Lee."

The members sat down. In measured tone, the chairman addressed the general at considerable length, formally apprising him of the actions of the convention. Faith and confidence were expressed in him as seldom they are in any individual in this doubting world. He was handed a scroll of faith and a commission of honor so demanding that it was obvious he would be expected to respond.

What he said was this: "Mr. President and gentleman of the convention:

"Profoundly impressed with the solemnity of the occasion, for which I must say I was not prepared, I accept the position assigned me by your partiality. I would have much preferred had your choice fallen on an abler man. Trusting in Almighty God, an approving conscience, and the aid of my fellow citizens, I devote myself to the service of my native State, in whose behalf alone will I ever again draw my sword."

We are here today to relive those precious memories of a century ago. We are here today because, thank God, we are not unmindful of the unexcelled heroism and valor of the men and women of the South on and off the battlefield. We cannot forget the sacrifices of our forefathers. We do not want to forget them. We shall prize and appreciate them as long as patriotism and

love of country linger in the human breast. We must not fail to remember that history is prolog, that as the great Virginia patriot, Patrick Henry, said, we have no way of judging the future but by the past. The Civil War was an object lesson to us, a tragic reminder of the horrendous results which occur when men are driven to employ force as a means of solving their problems. We must look upon our tests today with the same spirit of sacrifice shown by our forefathers a century ago.

Today we hear of depressions and recessions. What we had in the South after the close of the Civil War was devastation. A mere depression or recession would have looked like a high form of relief. Hundreds of thousands of our men were killed or wounded, or otherwise incapacitated. Our manpower was thus depleted. Our homes, our cities, and our towns were in ashes. Our lands lay in waste, and our fields were impoverished. Our livestock was consumed or carried away. We were without tools and instruments with which to labor.

Our money was valueless. Our smoke-houses were empty. Little children were starving. Vituperation and malediction laid like a pall over all the land. All that we had left and that was much, was the character of our people and the marrow in their bones. They did not subscribe to the something-for-nothing doctrine, so familiar to us today. They knew that worthy achievement comes only from service and sacrifice.

Without complaint, the returning Confederate soldier began to lay the foundations of a new order and a new civilization. Although Virginia lay prostrate and had been swept by a besom of desolation and destruction, the fields which ran red with the blood of our people in the spring were ripe with a teeming harvest in the fall.

They had no government to which to look, save the whim of martial tyrants. There was no Marshall plan. There were no Federal lending agencies, no Government relief programs, no veterans' benefits. The only Federal agency operating in the South was the Freedmen's Bureau, a rapacious corps of human vultures, with an eye on property that might be picked up at a fraction of its true value, or for no price at all. Though these facts and others not here related are to be deprecated, these statements are made in no tone of bitterness, for there were many in the North who wanted it otherwise, but who were powerless to mollify the wrath of the radicals. The situation presents a contrast in study between the attitude of the American Government toward its defeated enemies of World War II and the attitude of the same Government toward defeated fellow Americans after the Civil War.

But it was from these ruins that Virginia and the other Southern States, without assistance, have grown to greatness. Today the eyes of the Nation and of the world are turning toward the South, which now definitely become economic opportunity No. 1. In the last decade the white population of the South rose by 22 percent. Factory employment jumped 31 percent, more than four times as fast as in other States. Cars and trucks, a sign of wealth and industry, increased by 68 percent, while the rest of the United States had a gain of only 47 percent. Personal income in the South increased 58 percent during the last 10 years, whereas the income in other States advanced by only 49 percent. The Virginia figures taken alone present even a better picture. This economic development and improvement has done much to enhance the cultural, educational, and civic status of our people.

We are not refigting the Civil War; we are restudying it. We hope to engage in this worthy endeavor with eyes undimmed by emotion and minds unclouded by prejudice or by passion. We hope to derive from

this study inspiration left by the heroic men and women of the past, to bind ourselves in an undestructible unity through understanding of one another, and by so doing to form a united country that can face with confidence the constantly arising problems created by the new scientific and rapidly developing world. We are here today because we want to rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom. We are doing so in order that we may show a devotion to the sound doctrines of government that safely guided the destinies of the Nation throughout its long and glorious history.

Many of the problems with which we are now confronted could easily be solved if only the country had leadership of the type provided the people of the South by Robert E. Lee during the tragic era that followed the war. The people of that generation would have frowned upon the faithless and perfidious promises so characteristic of some of the leaders of the present generation. They would have scorned men who promise one thing today and do another tomorrow. They would have looked with disdain upon the wastrels and squanderers who are as careless with our rights as with our money, and who swarm like locusts around our Nation's Capital, and who consistently advocate spending more each year until the country is hanging on the cliff or financial irresponsibility.

If we could revive that spirit of patriotism, of self-reliance, of self-denial which existed during the days of the Civil War and the years that followed, we could restore fiscal sanity and sound government, and speedily discharge the national debt.

What is it that we want to gain from the Civil War and the great men like Robert E. Lee who participated in it? We want to gain

freedom for ourselves and for our children from the harsh restrictions of a central government which have been needlessly and recklessly imposed. We need to gain self-reliance and to indulge in the practice of self-denial, the outstanding and inspiring examples, which Lee gave to his followers in the South during the terrible years of reconstruction.

After the war, Lee was the uncrowned leader of his people. He was disfranchised. He held no office, no commission. His strength lay in his character, his faith and courage, the confidence of the South and the hope for his people that still lingered in his Christian heart. He consistently refused offers of worldly gain and preferred instead to share the miseries of his people. Like the gentleman and patriot he was, he clung to Virginia in her fallen fortunes. The life he lived is worthy of emulation on the part of us all.

In addition to the fact that he ranks among the foremost soldiers of all ages and all nations, he possessed remarkable private virtues. His life taught the futility of vain regret; that human virtue is superior to human calamity.

He was the champion of reason rather than passion. He pleaded for silence and patience as the true antidote to excitement and passion. He knew that hate could thrive only on ignorance. If there was an attempt to besmirch his name, he covered it with a cloak of charity.

He exemplified in the highest degree the virtues of modesty and simplicity and was always sustained by the strength of his religious faith.

Notoriety and applause were not only distasteful but even painful to him.

In every relation of life, he set the example of a devoutly religious man. It has

been said that "he was as devout as Stonewall Jackson, with an added note of sweetness and light."

No man in all American history has had such a profound influence and control over the hearts and minds of man as did Lee during the harsh and trying years of reconstruction.

The illustrious historian, Dr. Freeman, in the last chapter of the last volume of his matchless "R. E. Lee," describes the tour Lee took through parts of the South in 1870 just before his passing. Throngs came out at every point causing him embarrassment over the profuse attention heaped upon him. At one of such stops, a tall, 13-year-old boy was seen to maneuver himself quietly through the crowds until at last he gained a place by the side of the great southern chieftain where he could look into his noble countenance. The name of that 13-year-old boy was Woodrow Wilson.

In conclusion, if there is one incident in the life of Robert E. Lee that should be selected to serve as a message to the young southerners and to succeeding generations whose parents stood in hushed awe with heads bowed at every hearthstone on that bleak day in October 1870, when his blameless life ebbed out, it was one that occurred on his last trip to northern Virginia, which he loved so dearly. So great was the admiration of the people for the southern leader that he was almost deified. A young mother handed her babe over to the arms of the great general and asked him to bless the child. He took the child before he realized the nature of the request, and then with some embarrassment, he returned it to the mother's arms with these words which come ringing down to us through the centuries past: "Teach him to deny himself. That is all."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Revelation 19: 6-7: *The Lord God omnipotent reigneth; let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to Him.*

O Thou whose divine sovereignty and authority we cannot doubt or deny and whose overtures and appeals of love we cannot silence, grant that we may seek Thy counsel and companionship as we strive to grapple victoriously with the hard facts and experiences of life.

May all the leaders and members of the various branches of our Government have that serene inner confidence and courage which will guide them through the bewildering confusion of our times and make them equal to every emergency.

Give them a clear perception of their responsibilities and inspire them with the devotion of our forefathers whose character and conduct enshrined our country's noblest ideals and traditions.

Help us to cultivate a lofty conception of the sanctity of Thy laws and cling with increasing tenacity of faith to the eternal truth that Thou reigneth and righteousness shall prevail whatever may be the posture and peril of the days in which we are living.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

CVII—425

THE JOURNAL

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

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF TUNISIA ON THURSDAY, MAY 4

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, May 4, 1961, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of Tunisia.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE VERY REVEREND ROBERT J. SLAVIN, O.P., S.T.D.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death last Monday of the Very Reverend Robert J. Slavin, O.P., S.T.D., president of Providence College, Providence, R.I., takes from our midst a great priest, an outstanding leader in the field of education, and a dedicated American.

There are few persons anywhere in the world who more clearly understood the

evil mind of the Communist, or the dastardly intent of this destructive world conspiracy, than Father Slavin.

Father Slavin, or Father "Joe" as Mrs. McCormack and I fondly called him, was near and dear to us and considered by us as an immediate member of our family.

It was only last Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday while attending meetings in Washington of a committee discussing problems concerning pending legislation in the field of education, that he stayed with Mrs. McCormack and myself.

In 1926, Father Slavin entered the Order of Preachers, which is popularly known as the Dominican Order, and was ordained a priest in 1934.

A recognized authority on Thomistic philosophy—St. Thomas of Aquinas, the great philosopher of the Christian era—Father Slavin was professor of philosophy at Catholic University from 1936 to 1947.

In 1947 he was appointed as president of Providence College, which position he continuously occupied until his unexpected death last Monday.

A doctor of philosophy, master of sacred theology, Father Slavin was the recipient of many degrees and other honors. He was universally respected by persons of all creeds.

Father Slavin was truly a great priest, possessing an understanding mind, who broadened areas of agreement, and lessened, thereby, areas of tension and disagreement.