

Some American industries produce certain products at a unit cost that enables them to sell anywhere in the world; but many, including a large portion of those who have already opened oversea branches, cannot compete with foreign products produced at a fraction of the cost involved in U.S. manufacturing.

The Bush-Curtis statement includes a listing of the hourly wage scales paid by the industrialized nations which speak meaningfully for themselves. In 1960 U.S. manufacturing industries paid an average of \$2.29

an hour in contrast with 90 cents an hour in England, 60 cents an hour in West Germany, 43 cents an hour in France, 37 cents an hour in Italy, and 29 cents an hour in Japan.

There is a limit to the degree of efficiency American industries can reach. And with a \$2-an-hour differential with a nation like Japan, reaching comparable costs through efficiency is improbable.

Particularly inasmuch as industries in Japan and Western Europe enjoy tax policies and depreciation allowances that enable

them to approach an efficiency sufficient to compete with American production.

It has been argued that foreign wages are due to rise and that production costs will be somewhat leveled. But it must not be forgotten that U.S. labor costs are rising and in spite of President Kennedy's call for wage and price restraint, U.S. labor, as pledged by the recent AFL-CIO convention, is going to fight for higher pay and shorter hours. A lowering of the protective tariff barriers in order to gain a better competitive position may prove illusory.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Proverbs 9: 10: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*

Most merciful and gracious God, at this noon hour of a new day, we are humbly and reverently turning our thoughts unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer.

Grant that we may always acknowledge our absolute dependence upon Thee lest we become guilty of the sacrilege of surrendering to the arrogant and supercilious feeling that we are quite sufficient unto ourselves in wisdom and strength.

Gird us with unity of spirit as we highly resolve to achieve for suffering and struggling humanity a new birth of freedom and a larger hope for peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, January 15, 1962, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

### ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the democratic caucus, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 507

Resolved, That CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michi-

gan, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Sixth Semi-annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 16, 1962.

### THE LATE HONORABLE OWEN BREWSTER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I notify the House of the passing of a former Member, Hon. Ralph Owen Brewster, of Maine.

It was indeed a sad hour for the State of Maine when on Christmas Day, 1961, death claimed the former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine.

Senator Brewster was never one of those persons to stand by and watch the current of life swirl by him. Instead, he flung himself into it with a passion and was carried along in a stream of fast-moving and dynamic events.

On February 22, 1888, Mr. Brewster was born in Dexter, Penobscot County, Maine.

He attended the public schools, and was graduated from Bowdoin College, Maine, in 1909, and from the law school of Harvard University, Mass., in 1913. Service in the Maine State House of Representatives was his in 1917 and 1918, but he resigned from this legisla-

tive area to enter the military service where he served honorably and successively as private, second lieutenant, captain, and regimental adjutant of the Maine National Guard 3d Infantry.

For the 1921 to 1923 period he again returned to the Maine State House of Representatives, and from 1923 to 1925 he served in the Maine State Senate.

In 1925 Owen Brewster became Governor of the State of Maine, serving in this executive capacity until 1929.

He was elected as a Republican in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses, January 3, 1935 to January 3, 1941. In 1940, he was elected to the U.S. Senate for the term commencing January 3, 1941, and he was reelected in 1946 for the term ending January 3, 1953.

As is immediately evident from Senator Brewster's background, he was a man dedicated to public service in the interests of his State of Maine. In his passing from the scene of life, he will not be forgotten by his State, for he has done so many of those good and fine things for which men are always remembered.

Great is the grief that now visits with Senator Brewster's wife, his son, and other members of the family, and Mrs. McIntire and I want to extend our sympathy to them in this lonely hour of sadness.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession several editorials and other materials extracted from Maine newspapers, all treating of tribute to the late Senator Brewster. Under unanimous consent I insert these materials into the RECORD as an extension of my remarks.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 28, 1961]

### DEATH ENDS NOTABLE CAREER

Few men have served the State of Maine as long or as industriously as the late former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, of Dexter, who died suddenly in Boston on Christmas Day.

His public career began in 1915, when he was elected to the Portland School Board, and ended when he lost the GOP nomination to Frederick G. Payne in 1952, after serving two terms in the U.S. Senate. In between, he had served in the Maine Legislature, was in the Governor's office for two terms, and was in the U.S. House.

Among programs which he championed as Governor was the promotion of Maine's recreational attractions. He brought about the establishment of the Maine Development Commission—later succeeded by the present Department of Economic Development—in this connection.

He encountered several setbacks in the course of his career and was often in the center of controversies. But he remained active and influential in public affairs.

He was pursuing various community affairs and interesting himself in the State's aviation problems at the time of his death. He had a hand in organizing the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action after his retirement from the Senate.

The Dexter native was a man of varied accomplishments. He was a teacher for a time and was busy in the field of law. He was prominent in Christian Science activities and for a period served as president of the Church of Christian Science in Boston.

The State and the Nation have lost an industrious public servant and civic leader.

[From the Eastern Gazette, Dec. 28, 1961]

#### OWEN BREWSTER, DEXTER'S FIRST CITIZEN

One of the ablest men in Maine, who devoted a lifetime of service to his State and Nation, has gone to rest.

His zest in battle for things he believed in kept Owen Brewster constantly in the limelight of controversy throughout his long political career.

The more recent years of retirement from official duties did not give such sharp play to his rare combination of brilliant mind and eloquent tongue. But in these later years, perhaps, he made his greatest public contributions.

He was unsparing of time, talent, and energy in promoting the progress of his home town of Dexter. He continued to aid actively in supporting his political party and the fundamental principles of government he stood for. And he played a major part in furthering numerous statewide and regional programs.

Dexter is proud to have been the home of such a man and suffers a great and unique loss in the passing of Owen Brewster.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, Dec. 26, 1961]

#### OWEN BREWSTER

Maine has lost one of her most able and articulate public figures.

The death of Owen Brewster takes from the political scene a man who never feared controversy and was always ready to battle for the things in which he believed.

His career as Governor, Representative to Congress, U.S. Senator, and as elder statesman was flecked with controversy. He never feared it and those who crossed swords with him needed sharp blades if they hoped to win their point.

One did not always agree with Owen Brewster. He didn't expect it. He saw debate and controversy as important in shaping policy. He had great intellectual powers and expected those who opposed him to bring equal powers to bear in support of their positions.

And, whether one agreed with Owen Brewster or not, one was glad that Maine and the Nation had such as Owen Brewster in public life.

The State and the Nation are richer because he spent most of his years in public service and because he didn't withdraw from public life when the fortunes of politics retired him from the U.S. Senate.

"Those who held different views found their mettle tested to the full in any contest with him," said U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the man who succeeded him in the Senate.

"Few men in Maine's history have had a more illustrious career than Owen Brewster," said Gov. John H. Reed, upon learning of his death.

His talents will be sorely missed.

[From the Houlton Pioneer Time, Dec. 28, 1961]

#### OWEN BREWSTER

In the sudden and unexpected death of former Governor and U.S. Senator Owen

Brewster, of Dexter, the State of Maine has lost one of its most loyal and devoted servants.

His long career in public life began inconspicuously as a school committeeman soon after his graduation from Harvard Law School. From this small beginning he progressed, not always smoothly and without controversy, to the position of U.S. Senator from this State.

He was an exceptionally able and articulate statesman. Throughout his long career as Governor of Maine for two terms, Representative in Congress from the 3d Maine district for three terms, and U.S. Senator for two terms, he showed steadfast dedication to his State, to his country, and to the people he represented.

It can truly be said that he devoted a lifetime of service to his native State because, even though he was living in semi-retirement, he found time to staunchly support constructive efforts aimed at the welfare of Maine.

He was never afraid of controversy, thrived on vigorous partisan debate, and reveled in the game of politics to which he was devoted and at which he was extremely adept.

Tributes to this distinguished son of Maine have come from men and women in every walk of life and from highly placed members of both political parties who recognized his ability as a coworker and respected his talents as an adversary. Truly, Maine mourns for one of its outstanding senior citizens.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 29, 1961]

#### FINAL HOMAGE PAID EX-SENATOR BREWSTER

DEXTER.—Final homage to former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, Maine's distinguished statesman and a longtime leader in the State's Republican Party, was expressed at Christian Science funeral services at the First Universalist Church here Thursday afternoon.

Prominent State and National Republicans were present at the services which were conducted by Mrs. Mildred Booth Lord of Bangor, former first reader and president of the Bangor Christian Science Church.

#### DIGNITARIES ATTEND

Among those attending were Gov. John H. Reed with David A. Nichols of Lincolnville, State GOP chairman, and William F. Muscenden of Bath, chairman of the GOP finance committee; Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Representative and Mrs. Clifford G. McIntire of the Third District, former Gov. and Mrs. Horace Hildreth of Cumberland, Gen. and Mrs. Frank E. Lowe of Harrison.

Philip S. Wilder, assistant to the president of Bowdoin College, John L. Baxter and Brig. Gen. Boyd W. Bartlett, members of the board of overseers at the college, were present. Bowdoin president James S. Coles was unable to be present due to illness.

Prominent senators and representatives of the State legislature, members of the Maine Bar Association and other organizations were seated in reserved sections of the church.

#### RELATIVES ATTEND

Members of the immediate family present included Mrs. Owen Brewster, her son and family, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Brewster, Miss Betsey Anne Brewster, Whitmore F. Brewster of Bangor; Charles S. Brewster of Dexter, brother of the deceased; Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Brewster of Bethel, Mr. and Mrs. Harley Jordan of Boston.

Other relatives attending were Mr. and Mrs. Paul Carver of Sedgwick, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Tescaner of Newton, Mass., Mr. and Mrs. William Brewster of Auburn, Mrs. Dorian V. McGraw of Milbridge, Mrs. Helen Ayer of Dexter, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Foss of Falmouth, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Foss of Portland, Mrs. Edmund Hoctor of Shrewsbury, Mass., Mr. and Mrs. Clifton Foss of Cape

Elizabeth, Peter Foss of Portland, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Libby, Sr., of Portland, Miss Margaret Chenery of South Portland, Mrs. Henry Thompson of Portland, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Swanton of Dexter.

#### USHERS, BEARERS LISTED

Ushers were Clarence W. Crosby, chief usher, James F. Cox, Bartolo M. Siciliano, Thomas N. Tillson of Dexter, Frank Fellows of Bucksport, Dorian McGraw of Milbridge, Francis Allen of Bangor.

Honorary bearers were Nathan C. Bucknam, Bert L. Call, Millard G. Otto, Clarence Crosby, Charles Dustin, Jere Abbott of Dexter, and Henry T. Gerrish of Dover-Foxcroft.

Active bearers were Halford Davis of Washington, D.C., Dennis Lombardi of Bangor, Harold M. Wolff, K. Stanford Blake, Delphis Higgins, and Earl Fanjoy of Dexter.

#### ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

Representatives of the following Dexter organizations were seated in a reserved section: American Legion, Dexter Club, Dexter Development Association, Grange, Lion's Club, Masonic Lodge, Odd Fellows, Republican Town Committee, American Legion Auxiliary, Eastern Star, Rebekah Lodge, Women's Literary Club, Daughters of the American Revolution, Christian Science Society of Newport.

Organist at the rites was Mrs. Claire Wilkins of Dexter. The Reverend E. King Hempel, church pastor, was host minister.

The remains were entombed in the Dexter vault to await spring burial in Mount Pleasant Cemetery at Dexter.

[From the Bangor Daily News, Dec. 26, 1961]

#### EX-SENATOR BREWSTER DIES UNEXPECTEDLY

DEXTER.—Former U.S. Senator Owen Brewster, 73, died unexpectedly Monday morning at Boston where accompanied by Mrs. Brewster he had been visiting during the Christmas season.

Senator Brewster's son, Charles F. Brewster, of Bangor, said Monday afternoon that his father's death was totally unexpected, and added that the former Senator had been slightly ill with a virus infection but that his general health appeared to be good.

Senator Brewster had been active in community affairs, since retirement from political life and was associated with his son in practicing law at Bangor.

Christian Science services will be conducted Thursday at 2:30 p.m. at the First Universalist Church in Dexter.

Maine political figures joined in mourning Monday the death of Brewster.

#### GOVERNOR REED

Governor John H. Reed, spending the Christmas holiday in Fort Fairfield at the home of his parents, said Brewster's passing "removes from the scene one of Maine's greatest statesmen. He devoted a lifetime of service to his native State.

"As Governor, Representative to Congress, and U.S. Senator, he brought great credit to Maine. Few men in Maine's history have had a more illustrious career than Owen Brewster. I join with thousands of friends in mourning the passing of a truly great public servant."

Reed ordered flags at the State House flown at half staff until after the funeral services.

#### SENATOR MUSKIE

In Washington, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE said Brewster "was an able, articulate, and aggressive fighter for the principles in which he believed. He enjoyed vigorous partisan debate and saw it as a useful instrument for shaping sound national policies. Those who held different views found their mettle tested to the full in any contest with him.

"To the last, he was not afraid of controversy in pressing his views as to how Maine's interests might best be served. His voice is stilled but not forgotten.

"Mrs. Muskle joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Brewster and the family.

#### GOVERNOR BAXTER

Former Gov. Percival Baxter, who preceded Brewster as the State's chief executive, said in Portland that Brewster "was a man of marked ability.

"He became a national figure in the Halls of Congress where he served faithfully his State and Nation. He was recognized as a leader of men and his presence and advice will be sorely missed in these difficult times."

#### REPRESENTATIVE GARLAND

In Saco, Representative PETER A. GARLAND, Republican of Maine, said the State "has indeed suffered a tragic loss" in Brewster's death. "He was a tireless worker for the State of Maine," GARLAND added.

#### NICHOLS

David A. Nichols, Lincolnville, chairman of the Maine Republican State Committee, commented: "With the passing of Governor Brewster the Republican Party has lost one of its most vigorous leaders. For him, retirement from public office did not mark the end of active service to his party; to the day of his death he served notably as county finance chairman and as an effective precinct worker. We shall not soon look upon his like again."

#### REPRESENTATIVE M'INTIRE

Representative CLIFFORD G. M'INTIRE, reached in Massachusetts where he was spending Christmas with relatives, said Brewster's passing "is a deep loss to our State and Nation and to those privileged to know him as a friend.

"His distinguished service as Governor, Congressman, Senator, and outstanding Maine citizen is a record of dedicated citizenship that has covered nearly four decades. I shall always treasure the memory of his many kindnesses and counsel as we often discussed issues important to the State and Nation. Mrs. McIntire joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Brewster and family."

#### SCRIBNER

Former Under Secretary of the Treasury Fred C. Scribner, Jr., Portland, declared: "I am surprised and shocked at this unhappy news. Maine has lost one of its outstanding senior citizens.

"Few men have been as highly honored by this State. He in turn loved Maine and was deeply devoted to his native State, as he was to his church and his party. Owen Brewster will be remembered for the devotion and strength which he gave to the causes which gained his support.

"In politics he fought always for those who supported principles in which he believed, but once the party's candidates were chosen, no one worked harder or with greater singleness of purpose for their success.

"His wife and son have my sincere sympathy at this time."

Scribner is a former state GOP chairman and is now counsel for the National Republican Committee.

#### COLES

President James S. Coles, of Bowdoin College Monday night mourned Brewster's death.

"In the loss of Owen Brewster, we have lost a servant of great ability," Coles said. "Just as in his many years of public service, in his 20 years as an overseer of Bowdoin College, he always brought his intellectual power to the problem at hand, and his wit and charm to his many friends."

Coles said the flag on the Brunswick campus will fly at half staff Tuesday in memory of Brewster.

Surviving are his widow, Dorothy (Foss) of Dexter; one son, Charles of Bangor; a brother, Charles S. of Dexter; two grand-

children, and several nieces and nephews. Another son, Owen, died in the 1930's while in high school.

Funeral arrangements are being handled by the Crosby Funeral Home in Dexter.

Brewster worked his way up the political ladder by easy stages from school committeeman to U.S. Senator. Along the route he served in both houses of the Maine Legislature, twice as Governor of his native State and for 6 years as a member of the National House of Representatives.

But his career was not without its rough spots. His primary opponent in his first race for the gubernatorial nomination was declared the winner at the outset. Brewster brought charges of fraud and irregularities. The original award of the certificate of nomination was reversed subsequently.

After two terms in the Senate, Brewster was defeated in the 1952 Republican primary for renomination.

While a Senator, he figured in 1947 in a stormy hearing at which he and Howard Hughes, millionaire Hollywood plane and tool manufacturer and moviemaker, engaged in a personal feud.

Brewster at the time was chairman of a Senate war investigating committee. A subcommittee of that body was investigating Hughes' World War II airplane contracts.

#### TESTIFIED BEFORE OWN COMMITTEE

Hughes claimed that Brewster had offered to sidetrack the inquiry if Hughes would merge his Trans World Airline with Pan-American Airways. In an unprecedented procedure, Brewster, voluntarily dropping his rights as a Senator, appeared as a witness before his own committee to deny the accusation under oath. Hughes was equally vehement, demanding the right to cross-examine Brewster personally.

The Maine Senator was a member of a 10-man Senate-House committee that, in 1946, investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster of December 7, 1941. The majority laid sole responsibility on military men in both Hawaii and Washington for the failures that contributed to the disaster. They declared that President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Cabinet "discharged their responsibility with distinction, ability and foresight."

Brewster was one of the two Republican Senators who dissented. In a minority report, these two asserted that Roosevelt "was responsible for the failure to enforce continuous efficient and appropriate cooperation" in Washington "in evaluating information and dispatching clear and positive orders to the Hawaiian commanders."

Brewster had no liking for the New Deal. A particular target was the reciprocal trade program. He called it "Alice-in-Wonderland economics."

#### SUPPORTED F.D.R. IN WAR

But he fully supported the President in the war. He was the man behind the platform adopted by the Maine Republican Convention in 1942 that pledged unqualified support to Roosevelt as Commander in Chief.

"Up in Maine we have been brought up on the sea," he commented, "and when the ship gets out of sight of land we recognize that the captain is boss \* \* \* I did not vote for the captain, but \* \* \* if I am compelled to a choice between Roosevelt and Hitler, I choose Roosevelt."

Brewster unsuccessfully sought the U.S. Senate nomination twice and the nomination as Representative once before he won election to the House in 1934. There he strongly supported the Townsend old-age pension plan.

In 1940 he was nominated for the Senate after a spirited contest with Gov. Lewis O. Barrows, a former political associate. In the election he defeated former Gov. Louis J. Brann, the strongest Maine Democrat in many years.

He served as a member of the watchdog committee headed by Senator Harry S. Truman that investigated defense and then war costs. In that capacity Brewster and four other Senators made a world tour in 1943, visiting battlefronts in every major theater except Russia. The group represented the military committee as well as the Truman committee and wore Army uniforms.

In 1947 Senator Brewster became chairman of the Special Senate War Investigating Committee.

#### OF MAYFLOWER DESCENT

A direct descendant of William Brewster of the *Mayflower*, Brewster was born at Dexter, February 22, 1888, the son of William E. and Carrie (Bridges) Brewster. He was educated in the Dexter public schools and at Bowdoin College and Harvard Law School. For a year between Bowdoin and Harvard he served as a high school principal.

At Harvard, where he waited on tables to help pay expenses, Brewster was a member of the editorial board of the Harvard Law Review, working with Robert A. Taft, later a Republican Senator from Ohio. In 1948 and 1952 Brewster supported the Ohioan's unsuccessful candidacy for the presidential nomination.

During his 4 years at Bowdoin and for 2 years at Harvard, Brewster roomed with Harold H. Burton, later Republican Senator from Ohio and subsequently an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Another classmate was James P. Kem of Kansas City, who became a Republican Senator from Missouri.

Brewster started the practice of law in Portland in 1913. His first public service was as a member of the Portland school committee, from 1915 to 1923. It was during that period that he was elected to the Maine Legislature.

He was renominated for a second term in the house, but resigned to enter military service in World War I. When the armistice ended that conflict, he was in a field artillery officers training school at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky.

#### CHAMPIONED PROHIBITION

Returning to Portland, he was elected to another term in the Maine house, and in 1923 went to the State senate. Then in 1924 he moved to the Governor's chair, where he served two 2-year terms before going to Congress for three terms in the House and two in the Senate.

As Governor, he championed prohibition, emphasized the value of advertising Maine's recreational attractions—he originated the Maine Development Commission—and vetoed a bill favored by power interests to permit transmission of Maine electricity out of the State.

An avid aviation enthusiast, Brewster represented this country at various aviation conferences at home and abroad.

While he attended his share of Washington cocktail parties, Brewster was a teetotaler. To be sociable, he would accept a glass but hold it in his hand throughout the affair. In religion, he was a Christian Scientist. He served for a time as president of the mother church of Christian Science in Boston.

#### NOTED AS SPEAKER

Although he had been known for years as Ralph O. Brewster, Brewster decided in 1943 that the first name had little meaning while his middle name, Owen, was an honored one in his family. So he adopted the form of Owen Brewster.

Brewster was in great demand as a speaker while a Senator. He had a large vocabulary, a flowing style and a nasal twang that to many was typical of his down-east constituency. The Republicans

used him frequently as a political campaigner. In 1944 he was vice chairman of the Republican Senate campaign committee. He was chairman in 1946, when the GOP won control of the Senate, and was chairman again in 1949-50.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the late Owen Brewster of Dexter, Maine, a former distinguished Member of this body, was a man who devoted his life to politics and causes which he believed were just.

Perhaps he will be best remembered in our State of Maine for his eloquence and his unswerving loyalty to his State, county and political party.

He was honored with every major office his State could give him—serving as Governor, Congressman, and U.S. Senator. Not always successful in his quests for office, in defeat he exemplified the finest type of sportsmanship.

His many community endeavors attested to the man's fine Christian spirit. One example was his life-long work with the Boy Scouts of America.

It was a privilege to count this man among my personal friends; my sympathy goes out to Mrs. Brewster and Charles Brewster, their son.

Maine has lost a learned, patriotic and devoted citizen.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GARLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues from Maine in paying tribute to one of Maine's most loyal sons, the late Ralph Owen Brewster. He was a man who rose to great heights in his too-short 73 years. In the annals of Maine, and the entire country, I find it difficult to name one who served the public and his country so well and so unselfishly for 46 years. During these years, he was to know fame, honor, and deep personal tragedy grief that only a father can realize—the loss of a son.

Ralph Owen Brewster came from the little town of Dexter, Maine, to serve his State as a representative and senator to its legislature, then as its Governor. From there, he came to know the rigors of the national political battle, serving first in the House of Representatives and then in the U.S. Senate until his retirement in 1952.

Always a fighter of evil, he also fought for that which is right and just.

Serving my first year in this House of Representatives, I was fortunate to have the counsel and wisdom of this friend. He was always there to assist with a guiding hand.

To Mrs. Brewster and Charles I offer my deep and sincere condolences in this dark moment of their loss. They have lost a husband and father, and the State of Maine and the Nation a true friend.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Ralph Owen Brewster, the country and the Republican Party lost one of its dedicated servants. Owen Brewster, as a Congressman, a Governor of Maine, and as a U.S. Senator, served with devotion and with distinction.

It was my privilege to know Owen Brewster intimately for over 25 years. I admired the zeal and enthusiasm he put into his work whether it was in a party service or a public position. His loyalty to a cause could not help but evoke universal commendation.

Born in Maine, educated at Bowdoin and Harvard, he came naturally by his republicanism. He gave generously of his time and money for the promotion of his party. He was one of its most eloquent voices, and his campaigning called him many times into all parts of the country.

His contributions to the public service as Congressman, Governor, and U.S. Senator were outstanding. In his death, Maine has lost one of its most distinguished citizens, and I have lost a faithful friend. To his good wife, I extend my deepest sympathy in her hour of sorrow.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, Owen Brewster contributed much to the welfare of our country during his service in the Congress as a Representative and later Senator from the State of Maine. He was active in debate, logical and forceful in his arguments and highly respected by everyone who came in contact with him. He served the Republican Party with unselfish zeal and it was my privilege to have an opportunity to witness his work for his colleagues.

Senator Brewster was one of the first men I met when I came to Congress and he gave me much good advice which I always treasured. He was not one who would hesitate to meet a question head-on and reach a conclusion because of his agile mind.

I extend to his widow and loved ones my most sincere sympathy at their great loss.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Ralph Owen Brewster.

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

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

SIR: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very truly yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARK W. THOMPSON OF TEXAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, last fall it was my pleasure to make a speech in Galveston, Tex., at the request of my old friend the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON]. Galveston is his hometown and the occasion was an observance of Know Your America Week. The audience consisted of the combined luncheon clubs of Galveston County. I accepted the invitation and traveled half way across the continent to Texas largely because of my great admiration for Mr. THOMPSON. I have watched his work in this body for many years. In my work on the House Un-American Activities Committee I have observed his wise and effective efforts in our fight against communism. I believe my admiration for Mr. THOMPSON is shared by a great many in this body and wherever he is known and with that in mind, it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by a feature writer of the Galveston News, Miss Kitty Kendall. It appeared on December 24, last:

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVEN YEAR OLD STANDARDS SEEM TO DIRECT CLARK THOMPSON

(By Kitty Kendall)

The directives in a speech made 187 years ago seem epitomized in Galveston's Congressman CLARK W. THOMPSON.

The speech was made to Bristol electors November 3, 1774, and the activities observed in a typical day at the local office of THOMPSON seem to parallel the almost-two-centuries-old principles:

"It ought to be the happiness and glory of a Representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. \* \* \* It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own."

LAST PLACE

Following a strenuous first session of the 87th Congress, a busy, private office rightfully

seems the last place you'd expect to find a Congressman.

Nevertheless, THOMPSON can be found in his office at 501 Post Office Building daily, except Saturday and Sunday (unless he's making calls in the various counties), amidst ringing telephones, busy secretaries, a hodgepodge of farmers, city, and county officials, newspaper reporters and men-on-the-street awaiting their turns to talk with the Government official, plus an appointment book of future engagements filled up-to-here.

The office scene is unchanged, it remains a beehive of activity, though THOMPSON might be on a bus en route to help a farmer in some other county solve his problems; making a speech at Rotary; meeting with the Galveston Chamber of Commerce; giving a talk to a high school group or ILA local; attending a luncheon at the request of the League of Women Voters in Lake Jackson, or perhaps on the other side of Colorado County discussing soil conservation.

#### WEEKLY COLUMN

On the other hand, THOMPSON might have to excuse himself during an interview to dictate his weekly newspaper column that is bound to a deadline, or to prepare notes for a radio or television broadcast.

The busy Congressman's Galveston office staff is comprised of two secretaries—Miss Julie Burlen and Miss Mildred Baxley—as well as Bob Stafford of Galveston. Bob Miller, keeps THOMPSON's Washington office open during congressional recesses.

The Galveston staff accompanies THOMPSON to Washington and the office here is closed during sessions of Congress.

What is the explanation of the busy life the Congressman leads in Texas at the close of congressional sessions?

#### BRINGS WASHINGTON

"Well, now, I'll tell you," THOMPSON said as he asked Miss Julie to hold his telephone calls, "I believe in the Government being accessible to the people. With that in mind, I have found all the farmers and other folk can't come to Washington with their problems, so I try to bring Washington to them."

His statement was convincing because of his sincerity. One secretly reproached oneself for not having come earlier to get better acquainted with this man who apparently has a big hand in shaping the destiny of the farming communities in 15 Texas counties.

As Congressman from the Ninth District, THOMPSON serves just under a half million people. Galveston is one of the district's 15 counties; the other counties are Austin, Brazoria, Calhoun, Chambers, Fort Bend, Fayette, Lavaca, Matagorda, Victoria, Waller, Wharton, Colorado, Goliad, and Jackson.

#### VERY KIND TO ME

"The people are very kind to me," the affable official said. Observing the accomplishments of the Ninth Congressional District Representative over a period of almost 25 years (including active duty in the Marine Corps), indications are that THOMPSON is kind and generous to the people he represents.

It's the Congressman's belief that he can accomplish more for the people if he familiarizes himself with the everyday facets of their lives. He travels by bus on many occasions to visit farming communities; at other times he uses aircraft, private car, and trains.

In addition to his duties as a Congressman, the seemingly tireless THOMPSON serves as chairman of two subcommittees: rice and family farms.

#### FROM ALL WALKS

During an interview in the Congressman's Galveston office, people from all walks of life poured into the office seeking help and advice. Many of the problems, it was ap-

parent, had nothing to do with Congress, legislation or farming.

Though burdened with a demanding schedule, the Congressman seems to remain calm and apparently takes to heart the problems of our people.

"You can't handle this sort of job," THOMPSON said calmly, "if you get all lathered up."

#### TAKES PHONE CALLS

It was 9 a.m. and the Congressman advised Miss Julie he would take his phone calls. The first one of 12 that came through in the next 40 minutes was from Clear Creek on the subject of flood control.

Others concerned a job with the Peace Corps; a report on social security complications; a storm of protest from a veteran regarding the closing of the local Veterans' Administration office scheduled December 29; information regarding visas for immigration purposes; brief comments on a comprehensive report from the U.S. Corps of Engineers on proposed hurricane protection of Galveston and other cities and towns; a matter concerning the rice industry; the flood control program on San Bernard River through Brazoria, Wharton, Fort Bend, and Colorado Counties; a matter of the hug-the-coast highway; road and highway problems, and others.

#### TRUE TO TRADITION

The Congressman, true to the tradition of most successful men, wanted to credit his wife for a generous measure of his achievements.

"Libbie has always been my good right hand. She's followed me, you might say, through two dismal wars, and being the wife of a politician requires both patience and fortitude," THOMPSON said as he picked up a thick brochure titled "Sam Rayburn" (who was a close friend of the THOMPSONS).

It was learned that Mrs. Thompson often accompanies the Congressman on his trips through the 15 counties, and is called upon to speak before high school assemblies. She recently talked to 900 high school students in a nearby county.

#### COLLEGE GRADUATE

The Congressman, a graduate of the University of Oregon who in his earliest manhood planned to become a merchant, has an extensive vocabulary and is in great demand for talks before civic organizations, professional clubs, etc.

In fact, the interview had to end to allow the Congressman time to drive to West Columbia to speak at a Rotary luncheon. But enough time had been given to confirm the belief that THOMPSON adheres closely to the principles outlined in the speech made in 1974:

"It is (to paraphrase slightly) his happiness and glory to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs, and above all to prefer the interests of the people to his own."

#### THE LATE MRS. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I sadly report to the House that the beloved wife of our colleague, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, passed away suddenly last night.

Sophie Van Pelt was a gracious lady, a loving mother, and faithful companion.

Her untimely death will be an irreparable loss, of course, for her family, and those of us who knew her share in the deep sorrow so suddenly visited upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiment of the House when I express our profound sympathy to our colleague, BILL VAN PELT, and his two fine children in their tragic hour of sorrow.

#### TELECASTING, BROADCASTING, AND PHOTOGRAPHY OF PUBLIC HEARINGS OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. May committees of the House of Representatives, in their discretion, permit telecasting, broadcasting, and photography of their public hearings?

Mr. Speaker, by way of background, let me say that I have discussed this matter informally with the Speaker and also have corresponded with him. Last Friday I handed him a brief reviewing the precedents and discussing the proper interpretation of the Rules of the House. This correspondence and the brief can be found on pages 223-224 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Since preparing the brief, two additional matters have been called to my attention which, in my judgment, are relevant to consideration of this question.

First, I have in my hand a memorandum on the stationery of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Gallery, signed by Robert H. Fleming, chairman, dated January 10, 1962, containing rules governing radio, television, and photographic coverage of the opening session of the House on that day. The memorandum contains 14 items of the order of business and recites that coverage was permitted of all items except Nos. 3, 5, and 8, and that there would be no television, radio or film coverage of quorum or rollcalls. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this memorandum be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

(The memorandum referred to follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
RADIO-TELEVISION  
CORRESPONDENTS' GALLERIES,  
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1962.

#### MEMORANDUM ON OPENING OF THE HOUSE— 12 NOON

Through the cooperation of Mr. McCormack and Mr. Deschler, the ceremonies opening the House session may be covered, with certain limitations. The Executive Committee of the Radio-TV Gallery has accepted these as a common obligation and agreed there will be no television, radio or film coverage of quorum or rollcalls.

The order of business follows. Coverage is permitted except in Nos. 3, 5, and 8.

1. (Twelve noon) Clerk calls House to order.
2. Clerk reads announcement of Speaker Rayburn's death.

3. Quorum call shall not be covered. (Lights and mults will be turned off.)
4. Nominations for Speaker.
5. Rollcall (if demanded) shall not be covered. (Lights and mults turned off.)
6. Clerk announces result of vote.
7. Committee named to escort new Speaker to chair.
8. Committee departs to escort new Speaker. (Lights and mults will be turned off until committee is ready to return.)
9. Speaker is escorted into Chamber.
10. Introduction of Speaker.
11. Remarks by Speaker.
12. Oath is administered to new Speaker.
13. Speaker asks Chaplain to offer prayer.
14. When the Speaker says: "The Chair lays before the House the following." Everyone starts fading out pictures and audio (lights and mults off).

Television, radio and reel coverage will end at this point. Lights and mults will be turned off. The House will remain in session, so all equipment must be obviously out of action.

The responsibility for maintaining the agreement with the officers of the House rest with the Gallery Committee. All concerned are advised that the committee will meet that responsibility.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, this memorandum seems to be significant because it appears to record formal permission for television, radio, and photographic coverage of a session of the House of Representatives in the Chamber of the House and to authorize coverage of some portions of the House proceedings and prohibit coverage of others.

If the rules of the House authorize television, radio, and photographic coverage of House proceedings or portions thereof in the discretion of the Speaker, it can be argued that the rules of the House, since they are made the rules of committees so far as applicable, likewise authorize television, radio, and photographic coverage of public committee hearings in the discretion of the committee.

The second matter which has been called to my attention since I presented my brief to the Speaker is that the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, held public hearings in Boston, Mass., November 21 and 22, 1961, on laws relating to obscene matter in the mails. I am informed that the following members of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] were present: Representatives DULSKI, ADDABBO, and DANIELS. I am also informed that also present at the committee hearings or at least a part of them were the Acting Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK, and Representatives O'NEILL and BURKE.

It is my understanding that a request was made to permit the coverage of this public hearing by photography and television, and that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mrs. GRANAHAN, called attention to the presence of the Acting Speaker at the hearing and suggested that this request should be passed upon by him. The Acting Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK, refused, saying that the chairman of the subcommittee was in charge of the hearing and declined to pass upon the request, whereupon the chairman, Mrs. GRANAHAN, stated that if it was up

to her, she would allow such coverage and did, in fact, do so.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Michigan will permit me to interrupt him for the record, the present occupant of the chair was not Acting Speaker at the time. I think that should be shown in the RECORD. I simply wanted the RECORD to show that fact. I know my friend from Michigan appreciates it.

Mr. MEADER. Because of the familiarity of the Speaker with my views as set forth in the brief and contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, I do not wish to discuss the public interest or the applicable rules of the House or precedents at length. I only wish to urge that the last 7 years have witnessed developments, notably the adoption of the Doyle resolution governing the conduct of public committee hearings and a vast increase in the use of television and radio for news coverage of governmental activities and to express the hope that the Speaker, under these circumstances, will be able to interpret the rules of the House so as to allow the American public the use of these marvelous new media of communication in informing themselves about the public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] was kind enough to inform me by letter that he proposed to propound a parliamentary inquiry concerning the rights of committees to permit broadcasting, telecasting, and photographing of their sessions.

Members of the House are aware that on two previous occasions parliamentary inquiries were addressed to Mr. Speaker Rayburn concerning this same subject.

On February 25, 1952, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader at that time, first raised by way of a parliamentary inquiry the question which the gentleman from Michigan now propounds.

Again, on January 24, 1955, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] brought up the matter for further clarification of Speaker Rayburn's first opinion.

Mr. Speaker Rayburn's two opinions may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, page 1334, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 628.

In substance, what the then Speaker decided was that there was no rule of the House that authorized or permitted the committees to have their sessions broadcast, telecast, or photographed.

What happened in the subcommittee in Boston is certainly no precedent, because I was neither Acting Speaker nor Speaker pro tempore then. I was, with pleasure, sitting in with a subcommittee of one of the committees of this House to listen to the witnesses and to show by my presence my interest in the hearings they were holding in Boston at that time.

Certainly, I am sure that everyone will realize there was no authority on my part to act at that time. What took place then was a matter coming within the purview of what might be termed the vacuum caused by the death of our late beloved Speaker.

In both opinions Mr. Speaker Rayburn pointed out that it was a matter for the House itself to determine by an amendment of its rules if it intended to permit such procedure.

For the benefit of the Members who have not read Mr. Speaker Rayburn's remarks on this subject, the Chair will include herewith those opinions of our former beloved Speaker:

#### TELEVISION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Remarks of Speaker Rayburn in response to a parliamentary inquiry made by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, on February 25, 1952 [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 98, pt. 1, pp. 1334, 1335])

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Committee on Un-American Activities called a meeting to be held in Detroit and, I understand, voted to have those hearings televised.

I now understand that the televising of the hearings has been canceled. I understand further that the Speaker, in whom we all have great confidence, has taken the position he has the authority under the rules of the House to call off the televising of the hearings.

I also understand that the Speaker justifies his decision on the ground that the Committee on Un-American Activities operates under the general rules of the House, which of course is true. The general rules of the House give the Speaker the right or privilege of passing upon television, radio, or anything photographic, as far as the House is concerned. But I question, Mr. Speaker, whether this authority would apply to a hearing held in Detroit.

I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that under section 319, Secrecy of Committee Procedure, there is the following quotation: "It is for the committee to determine, in its discretion, whether the proceedings of the committee shall be open or not."

From that provision under section 319 it is clearly implied that the committee shall be the judge of what publicity it might desire. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is more of an authority than the Speaker could assume under the general rules of the House.

I note also under the rule, under which, as I understand it, the order to prevent the Detroit television was given, it is stated that—

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

I believe it would be stretching authority considerably to say that because of this rule the Speaker has the right to interpose his own power over a committee as to its own publicity. It could, I am afraid to admit, be well argued that the chairman of the committee acting as head might have the authority.

May I also call attention that television was used by the subcommittee investigating the tax scandals; the Madden select committee investigating the atrocities relative to the Katyn massacre; the Hébert subcommittee investigating the armed services procurements, and the Un-American Activities Committee itself in investigating the Reds in Hollywood. In the Senate there has been the Kefauver committee, the Atomic Energy Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Russell committee. All those decisions to televise were made by the committees themselves.

Mr. Speaker, for clarification of the rules and so that we may understand what may be expected from now on, I submit my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, as always, has been kind enough to inform the Chair that he was going to submit this parliamentary inquiry.

It is true that some committees and some subcommittees of the House have begun the practice of having their hearings and their meetings televised; but in each and every instance when the Chair has called attention to the fact that he did not think the rules of the House authorized this, each and every chairman of a committee or subcommittee has ceased doing so at that moment, as far as the Chair understands at this time.

The Chair is operating under the rules of the House. One of the rules reads as follows:

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

There is no authority, and as far as the Chair knows, there is no rule granting the privilege of television of the House of Representatives, and the Chair interprets that as applying to these committees or subcommittees, whether they sit in Washington or elsewhere. As the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the Chair, whoever is the Speaker, has control of this end of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings. There being no rule with reference to television or radio, the Chair interprets that the rules of the House shall apply to the committees whether they sit in Washington or outside of Washington. The Chair might indulge in a slight amount of histrionics in saying that if committees all wanted to be televised, and they were not allowed to be televised under the rules of the House in the Capitol or in the House Office Buildings, why they would probably move out of town and think that they would escape the rule, or make a rule in that fashion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment, have some definite rule established. I want to say, too, in fairness to the Speaker that there have been instances—not this particular one—that called for his disapproval of broadcasting. In other words the decision did not come just upon the Detroit broadcast.

The SPEAKER. In every instance the Chair has held exactly like he has regarding this proposed hearing in Detroit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think television and broadcasting are here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

The SPEAKER. If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it, like he does all of the rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to do that we would have to amend the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

#### TELEVISION AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(Remarks of Speaker Rayburn in response to a parliamentary inquiry made by Mr. MEADER, of Michigan, on January 24, 1955 [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 1, pp. 628-629])

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

Mr. MEADER. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or

permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings; whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] February 25, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The SPEAKER. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a

committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware, from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the Committee on Rules, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress had under consideration House Resolution 173, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. This resolution proposed an amendment of the rules of the House to permit each committee to determine whether its proceedings should be broadcast, telecast, or photographed. It was reported in debate on the floor of the House that the Committee on Rules had taken adverse action on reporting out that resolution.

The present occupant of the chair thinks that he should follow precedent and give due consideration to opinions of former Speakers. The Chair thinks that Mr. Speaker Rayburn's opinions were well considered and the Chair intends to follow those opinions until such time as the House, by its own action in amending its rules, provides for a different method of proceeding.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my unpleasant duty to announce to the House the passing away of our dearly beloved friend and colleague Louis C. RABAUT of the 14th District of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I stand here today in the well of the House to eulogize the one who was my closest friend in Congress, Louis C. RABAUT. In all sincerity I wish it were not so and this unpleasant task not placed upon me. Although I recognize that death is something we all have to face at one time or another, I would rather remember the individual as I knew him and would think of him as just being away. Of course, if you believe in the hereafter, this is so.

I knew Mr. RABAUT for many years prior to my being in Congress. He was a close friend and associate of my father. They had mutual understanding and traveled many times together by car between Detroit and Washington. That was when travel was a lot harder than it is today, for there were no modern expressways at that time.

As with my late father, Congressman RABAUT and I struck up a warm friendship in spite of our difference in age. The reason may have been the similarity in our philosophy on matters pertaining

to the welfare of the American people, although, as the RECORD shows, we did not always agree when it came to a roll-call vote.

He was always helpful to new Members of Congress, readily giving them the benefit of his experience and knowledge of the House.

He was a man admired by his people, loved by his family, and respected by his political enemies. He had no real enemies, for it was impossible to be disrespectful to this gentleman amongst gentlemen, for that he was; and anyone who came in contact with his warmth immediately lost any displeasure that may have existed.

I knew Louis to be a pious man. He went to mass every morning, and it is my understanding that he received the sacrament every day. His piety did not, however, blind him to the greed of others; and, as he executed his duties in Congress, he was always fair. This was possible only because of his intense desire to know all the ramifications of a problem and to act to the best interest of all concerned.

His past experience as a builder of homes taught him the importance of values realized through one's efforts. He was many times miffed by those politicians who are continuously attempting to belittle the role of a Congressman, for he knew that under our type of government the people of this country have recourse through their elected officials.

I shall miss my dearly beloved colleague, for, although to me he may be just away, his absence will be felt by all of us who learned to respect him for the many qualities that made him a great man, a good father, and an admired and respected Representative in Congress.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD Mr. RABAUT's official biography and the text of the address by the Reverend Marshall L. Lochbiler, rector of the University of Detroit, after the solemn requiem mass for Mr. RABAUT in SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, November 16, 1961:

LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, Democrat (lawyer), of Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.; was born in Detroit, Mich., December 5, 1886, son of Louis A. and Clara Lenau (Reid) Rabaut; attended a parochial school; A.B. degree 1909, Detroit College; LL.B. degree 1912, Detroit College of Law; M.A. degree 1912, University of Detroit; admitted to the bar, 1912; married Stella M. Petz, of Detroit, and they have three sons and six daughters—Rev. Francis Dermott (S.J.), Marie Celeste (Sister Mary Palmyre, I.H.M.), Louis III, Mary Jane (Mrs. August Amato), Vincent, Carolyn Marie (Mrs. Jules DePorre), Joan Marie (Mrs. John Barrett), Stella Marie (Sister Stella Maris, I.H.M.), and Martha Mary (Sister Martha Marie, I.H.M.); 1935, guest of the Philippine Government at the inauguration of the Commonwealth; 1936, received a special citation from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Michigan Department, for service as chairman of the Michigan congressional committee which obtained the establishment of veterans' facilities in Michigan; 1939, delegate to the Interparliamentary Union at Oslo, Norway, and inspected the U.S. Foreign Service offices in the Scandinavian countries; 1941, chairman of the first official congressional committee to South and Central America in-

specting Foreign Service offices and studying effects of the cultural relations program in 17 countries, seeking the unification of the countries of the Western Hemisphere prior to the entrance of the United States in World War II; 1944, received annual award of the International Economic Council for outstanding devotion to world trade; 1945, at the invitation of the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., headed a congressional group on an inspection of the Foreign Service establishments and other Federal activities in Great Britain and certain countries of Europe; 1948 to 1952, one of six members of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion (reconstruction of the White House); 1954, author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America; conducted ceremonies paying tribute to the American flag for the first time in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when the song, "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," was born under the Capitol dome; successfully advocated the acceptance by Congress of funds from ASCAP to press the record for the music and song of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" for distribution by Congress to the communication outlets of the Nation; author of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace" for which in 1956 he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan, "in recognition of unswerving devotion to God and country," and from the Daughters of the American Revolution the Award of Merit: "In grateful acknowledgment and sincere appreciation of outstanding services and worthy accomplishments for the protection of our constitutional Republic"; and in 1957 the George Washington Honor Medal from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge with inscription "for outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life"; elected to the 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th Congresses; member of the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESS AT THE FUNERAL MASS OF THE HONORABLE LOUIS C. RABAUT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

We have come to Saints Peter and Paul's this morning, the venerable church in which Congressman RABAUT worshipped for so many years, in which he was married, in whose choir he so often sang, and in which, just a few months ago, he observed the 50th anniversary of his very happy marriage, to pay a final tribute of honor to a man we knew and loved, a distinguished citizen and an esteemed Member of Congress. With his family, his numerous friends and associates, we deeply mourn his loss. On this sad occasion, we extend our sincere and prayerful sympathy to his bereaved wife, his devoted sons and daughters, and the members of his family. In the presence of death, the events that circumscribe our daily lives lose their compelling and preemptive interest, and we begin to explore unsounded levels of personal identity, fundamental levels of deeply purposeful reality. We ask ourselves; what is life? What is its ultimate purpose? Whether is the ceaseless activity of our lives carrying us. Unless we know and understand the meaning of life, its ultimate purpose, we cannot map out for ourselves a program of life, chart our course through life correctly, employ our energies and use our time wisely.

For some, life has no meaning. Like Macbeth, "life is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and furry, signifying nothing." Often enough, they are people whose past conduct gives them reason for dreading the judgment of a life after death. For others, the meaning of life, its ultimate purpose, is the attainment of wealth, i.e., material possessions. For others, it is prestige, excellence

in some field of human endeavor, either physical, intellectual, or artistic. For still others, the all-absorbing purpose of life is something lower in the scale of human values: some form of sense-gratification. Men and women who look for the fulfillment of their dreams in these material goals find only partial or incomplete fulfillment, often enough utter disillusionment. Under the impact of death and in the light of that wisdom which the shocking experience of death uncovers, such goals, as the final purpose of life, are meaningless.

Man's true goal, his master value, to which he relates and subordinates, all material goals, must take into account his true nature, the faculties that distinguish him and set him apart from all other things, animate and inanimate, namely his intellect and will. His intellect is made for the attainment of truth, and his will for the attainment of goodness. They will find their perfection, their fulfillment only in the attainment of perfect and absolute truth and goodness. But perfect and absolute truth and goodness are found only in God. Man, therefore, will find the perfection of his being only in God. Man will find the meaning of life and its ultimate purpose in his return to God.

It was this true concept of the meaning of life and its ultimate purpose, and the full realization and the practical working out of this truth in his life, that gave to Congressman RABAUT's life its finest distinction, that made it possible for him to accomplish so much good and of such permanent value in the best interest of his family, his church, and in the Nation at large. It gave correct direction and sound motivation to his boundless energy and surpassing talents. It implemented his tremendous enthusiasm. It influenced the convictions he so firmly held and the opinions he so forthrightly and fearlessly expressed, both in private and in public life. Like interwoven strands of gold, it highlighted his labors and activities, enriched his complex and diversified human relationships, strengthened his commitment to make this world a better, finer, and happier place in which to live, especially in his repeated and determined efforts to alleviate poverty and human misery, so often induced by man's inhumanity to man. It made him a man of unswerving principle, one who never could be influenced by expediency nor swayed by the shifting winds of public opinion. Above all, it made him a man of unquestioned integrity.

This purposeful concept of the meaning of life was born of right reason illumined by faith: a faith that was confirmed in content and buttressed in sanction through the fulfilling revelation of God in Christ, a faith that divinely oriented men's lives through immutable and objective principles of human conduct.

Renown and distinction came to Congressman RABAUT in generous measure throughout a long and useful life, but in reaching for these legitimate honors he never betrayed God's master plan, careful, as he was, always to subordinate his desires, his plans and ambitions to the greatest achievement of life: the salvation of his soul and the souls of those who came within the ambit of his influence and responsibility. He knew that one day he would be called upon to give an exact accounting of his stewardship.

Congressman RABAUT bequeathed the clear vision and full vigor of his faith and his confidence in God's plan to posterity, especially to the members of his family all of whom he loved so dearly. The richness of this inheritance is reflected in their lives, more apparently, perhaps, in the lives of those of his children who embraced the religious life, one of whom, a Jesuit priest, is officiating this morning at his father's funeral Mass. Through these dedicated lives, the spirit of Congressman RABAUT will live on, be perpetuated in the purposeful living

and God-centered lives of countless other souls touched by their influence and ministrations.

Congressman RABAUT accomplished so much and of such permanent value in this life because he kept his vision of eternity clear and certain, always in perfect focus. As a devout Christian, he saw in the truth of Christ's resurrection a symbol and a promise of his own immortality—that death was not the end of the road but the gateway to eternal life. There was hope in his heart and a ready song on his lips because he was certain that the Son of God would keep His promise, the promise that is repeated in every requiem Mass, that was repeated in the funeral Mass this morning: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, even though he be dead, shall live; and all who live and believe in Me shall not experience death forever."

Congressman RABAUT has passed through the somber shadows of death, to glimpse the brightness of eternal day. Faith has yielded to knowledge. The happiness that his good deeds have merited, the grandeur and richness of the reward awaiting him, is overpowering, beyond human reckoning or description. Saint Paul said of his swift and fleeting vision of heaven: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the mind of man to conceive what God has prepared for those who love Him." In the spirit of the church in which Congressman RABAUT worshiped and to whose truths he so completely and loyally subscribed, may I suggest a prayerful remembrance of his soul, that, if perchance in the judgment of God his soul has need of further purification, through our prayers and suffrages, he may more quickly come into the full possession of his inheritance, his divine and eternal living with Christ in God.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert in the RECORD the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. NORRELL].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the death of our good friend, LOUIS RABAUT, this House lost one of its ablest and most dedicated Members. His death was undoubtedly hastened because of his keen devotion and arduous work for his district, the State of Michigan, and the Nation. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he gave unstintingly of his fine talents to advance the work of the Congress. He never avoided any task, no matter how much effort it required. This characteristic was amply demonstrated by the great amount of time and effort he devoted to the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia.

He was a real patriot and much of his great talents and endeavors were devoted to patriotic causes. He was also a deeply religious man and will be remembered for his successful crusade to add the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

LOUIS RABAUT was a kind and considerate friend. He was an outstanding Member of this body. Those of us who had the privilege of serving with him over a long span of years feel his death as a real personal loss.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his fine family.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, geographically, Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.—the place of residence of the late beloved LOUIS C. RABAUT—and Monroe, La.—my own place of residence—are many miles apart. Economically and politically, as well as in numerous other respects, the 14th Congressional District of Michigan, which LOUIS RABAUT served with distinction through a full quarter century, and the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have had the honor and privilege of representing in the Congress since January of 1947, differ vastly. But I would say on this occasion that, despite these diverse interests, throughout the past 15 years I enjoyed no friendlier personal relationship, and no more productive working association in the Congress, than it was my good fortune to have experienced with LOUIS RABAUT. Particularly, this outstanding patriot and statesman, who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, was especially understanding of the problems of flood control and related matters in the lower Mississippi River Valley—which is the drainageway to the sea of almost half of the whole of America—and his contributions in solving many of these problems, as well as in endeavoring to deal as effectively as possible with all of them, were of immense value to this great area and to the Nation as a whole. For these efforts and accomplishments on the part of LOUIS RABAUT, I, myself, have an enduring debt of gratitude.

I wish also to note at this time, Mr. Speaker, that a limited few of us indeed succeed so worthily and so well as did our late colleague—to whose memory we join today in paying tribute—in fulfilling his responsibilities and discharging his duties to God and country. Our Nation, his State and district, and the individuals who were associated with him along the way, have been the richer, fuller, better because of him.

I am incapable of words to express adequately the measure and depth of my respect and esteem for our late friend and his great works, or my sense of personal loss at his passing. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks here by conveying my heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved family of this faithful and devoted husband, father, and grandfather. May they be sustained by the cherished memory of his good and useful life and by their deep and abiding Christian faith that his immortal soul is at peace with his God.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we in Congress pay tribute today to LOUIS C. RABAUT, who served his people and his Nation ably and patriotically as a Member of Congress for a quarter of a century.

The good which he has rendered, the benefits which he has bestowed, the ideals which he has nurtured will live on as an undying memory in our minds and in our hearts. As a friend, he was faithful; as a colleague, he was conscientious; we could not ask for more.

It was my pleasure to work with him on matters which showed his undying devotion to the national well-being. As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee,

he was always willing to look for a way to make this a better nation by improving where improvements were needed. His service to this Nation and its people, and to his district and its people, can make us proud of our representative form of government.

In losing LOUIS C. RABAUT, this House has lost a friend and benefactor. But now he serves in a higher House, and peace be with him. To his family, let it be known that his was a fruitful and productive life for which they may be very proud. I extend to them every sympathy in their loss.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, the Honorable LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT leaves us sad and depressed. We will miss him.

LOU was a kind and considerate man. He was a hard worker and a real fighter for fairness and justice. He was an able and efficient public servant and during his many years as a Member of the House of Representatives he left an imprint that will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it was on November 12, 1961, when I was called upon to make a speech at a banquet honoring our former colleague, who served 11 years in Congress, and one of my best friends, now a Federal judge, Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, to an overflow crowd of over 1,000 people at Hamtramck, Mich., that I said we were very happy and proud our prayers made it possible that with us that night we had the dean of the Michigan delegation in Congress, LOU RABAUT who had served 25 years in Congress representing the 16th District of Michigan.

Ten minutes after concluding my remarks, LOU was called on by the master of ceremonies and he started by saying: "Reverend Fathers, honored guests, as dean of the Democratic delegation of Michigan—" and then he hesitated, stopped, and fell to the floor. He was rushed to the hospital where he died.

LOU RABAUT was the author of amendment inserting the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America. He conducted ceremonies paying tribute to the American flag for the first time in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when the song "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" was born under the Capitol Dome, and he brought about the acceptance by Congress of funds from ASCAP to press the record for the music and song of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag." He also had caused the distribution by Congress of the new allegiance oath to the communication outlets of the Nation. He was author of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace," for which, in 1956, he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan, in recognition of unswerving devotion to God and country; and from the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Award of Merit.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this world is better because LOU RABAUT lived with and amongst us.

To his devoted wife and family, Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our sincere sympathy and we pray the Lord that

Lou will rest in peace and that those who are dear to him may have the strength to bear their great loss.

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the memory of our colleague, LOUIS RABAUT.

It was with sorrow that I learned of his death. For many years he and my husband, the late Congressman W. F. Norrell, had worked together on the Appropriations Committee, and they shared a warm friendship in their dedication to duty as servants of the people. I know that LOUIS' colleagues on the committee will feel deeply the loss of his counsel, and that all of us will cherish the memory of his fellowship with us.

My understanding sympathy is extended to his widow and children.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying the last sad tribute of respect to our beloved friend, LOUIS RABAUT. He was a genial soul who loved his fellowman. Never did he let an opportunity pass by to help a fellow Member. With joy in his heart and a smile on his face he graced practically every social occasion with a song. He loved to sing and audiences welcomed his voice.

It was by no means all song and laughter, however, with this lighthearted bard. Having served with him on the Appropriations Committee, I can attest his devotion to duty and his dedication to public service. He represented his district, State and Nation well. His long and distinguished record have earned for him the encomium "Well done thou good and faithful servant" and to him we give praise and honor today while expressing to the family, which he so dearly loved, our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling of tremendous loss felt by Members of this House and particularly those of us from the State of Michigan upon the death of our beloved colleague, LOUIS RABAUT.

LOUIS RABAUT was a good friend, an able and dedicated legislator, a devoted husband and father, and an outstanding citizen.

As a newer Member of the Congress, I have been immeasurably helped by his encouragement, support and wise counsel.

LOUIS RABAUT took a deep and sincere interest in the needs and problems of his fellow man, whether he be friend, colleague, constituent, or indeed, any citizen, even if unknown to him, who sought his help or whose life was touched by his kindness and charity.

Mr. Speaker, I shall miss LOUIS RABAUT very much. All those who knew him or his work must share our sense of loss.

I extend my deep sympathy to LOUIS RABAUT's family, his friends and his constituents.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic Chamber; it is crowded with the memories of great men and great deeds—the arbitrament of great issues.

It is crowded with the memories of great friendships. Our late colleague from Michigan, LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, had his part in both. He was for more than a quarter of a century the friend of every man here.

In an ancient manuscript, after an enumeration of the virtues, we are told that the greatest of all is love. LOUIS RABAUT's life was an exemplification of the truth of that admonition.

He loved people. He loved the House and the Members of the House. He loved his work. He loved the children of the District of Columbia. His heart was always touched by the thought that the committee under his jurisdiction, of which he was chairman, administering the affairs of the District of Columbia, might not provide for the children.

He rendered many notable services which went unobserved. When we had the first meeting of the Commission to rebuild the White House, Mr. RABAUT who was a builder, and whose familiarity with the many problems involved, was obviously superior to many of the architects and engineers who were consulted that he was immediately made a member of the Commission and had more to do with the rebuilding of the White House than any one connected with it. His name is inscribed in the bronze and granite of this great building belonging to the people, and so intimately connected with every President who has lived there since Adams and who will be associated with it, we trust, for all time to come.

LOUIS RABAUT was a deeply religious man. His daily life was a quiet unobtrusive advocacy of his faith. He was an everliving and convincing emissary of his Lord. He gave to the Sisterhoods of his Church three wonderful daughters. He gave to the priesthood of the Church a stalwart son, and he gave to the world 30 grandchildren who were his pride and joy.

The night is not forever.

The sun goes down to rise upon a new and more glorious day.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I knew LOUIS RABAUT intimately for over 13 years. Our association for the last 11 years on the Committee on Appropriations was one that I shall never forget. The first 2 years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I served on a subcommittee under the acting chairmanship of LOUIS RABAUT. It was the committee that then had jurisdiction over all appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers and some related agencies. This was during the Korean war, and under LOUIS RABAUT's wise and firm guidance that committee did an excellent job. Those of us who were new to the committee will forever be grateful for his helpful cooperation and assistance. I learned tremendously from LOUIS on how to approach appropriation problems; the intricacies and ramifications of the Federal budget. I am cer-

tain that if our former colleague, Glen Davis of Wisconsin, were here, he would reemphasize what I have said about the 2 years that we spent on that subcommittee, as a colleague of LOUIS RABAUT.

In addition, may I say that those of us from Michigan who served with LOUIS have always respected his judgment and his views. He was a cooperative member of our Michigan delegation. I firmly believe the Members of this body have lost a wonderful and valuable friend. Those of us on the Committee on Appropriations will badly miss him in the months and years ahead. The citizens of Michigan, in the passing of LOUIS RABAUT, have lost a fine, good, and constructive citizen. We must accept the fact that LOUIS is gone, but his memory will live forever.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our esteemed colleague, Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, who represented the 14th Congressional District of Michigan so ably over the years, was a saddening blow to his friends and colleagues who held him so high in their esteem.

Sham, false pride, and deceit were abhorrent to him; humility, sincerity and understanding of the little man's problems were his native endowments. He underwent trying and confining illnesses with courage, and triumphed over them; and in the fleeting seconds when he must have recognized the approach of death, we can visualize that he met death fearlessly and with confidence in the Hereafter for which he struggled on this earth.

To his widow and his family—many of whom are deep in religious vocations—we offer our sympathy, and we know that the spirit of LOUIS C. RABAUT will abide in our hearts to help us and guide us in our congressional deliberations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sympathy to the family of LOUIS RABAUT at his passing, but I would like to turn from this sadness to speak of LOUIS RABAUT in a different vein. LOUIS RABAUT was not only a kind man, a good Congressman and a religious man; LOUIS RABAUT was a joyous man. He lived in joy all the days of his life and he died praising his fellow men. It was a pleasure for me to come to this Congress and to have LOUIS RABAUT give me advice on how to be a Congresswoman. I appreciated it. I appreciated all the days I sat beside him on this floor and listened to his counsel. I appreciated the fact that he explained to me the parliamentary maneuvers, and I am grateful to him for the little jokes he told me about his family; for the pleasure with which he spoke of his grandchildren; for the great tributes he paid to Mrs. RabaUT; for the kindness with which he spoke of every person who was in this House.

Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to know a man so devoted to his family, so devoted to his friends, and so devoted to his religion. If it could be said of any man that he was an ornament to his religion, Louis was such a man.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that I knew LOUIS. I know that LOUIS lived and died in joy as he wanted to. I know that we who are in this House this year, who knew him well, will greatly miss him.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the warmth of Congressman RABAUT's friendship was gentle and kind and always at hand when sorrow touched any of us, or when good fortune or happiness came our way. He will long be remembered for his many legislative accomplishments of an enduring nature; he will be best remembered by us who served with him, however, for the beautiful character he exemplified.

He was fun to be with—he had a wealth of anecdotes to illustrate and illuminate even the most serious subject, just as Abraham Lincoln could use humor instructively. But, like Lincoln, Congressman RABAUT was fundamentally a serious-minded, deep-feeling, dedicated man who worked throughout his long public career for the benefit of the public rather than narrow interest groups.

I want to express to our beloved friend's wonderful family—of which he was so tremendously proud—my deepest sympathy for the loss which they have experienced, a loss which everyone who knew LOUIS RABAUT cannot help but share.

While such decisions, of course, are beyond our ken, I think all of us here are convinced in our own minds and hearts that if any mortal among us deserved to achieve the Kingdom of Heaven, LOUIS C. RABAUT lived the kind of life which should earn for him eternal rest.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RABAUT came to this body 2 years before I did and, like you, I had the privilege and pleasure of working with him continuously for some 27 years.

Mr. Speaker, a book could be written—and one should be written—extolling his many fine qualities and the outstanding work that he did in this House for the Nation as a whole and for that great district that he so ably represented in the great State of Michigan for 10, these many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those fine, human, gentle qualities, back of all of it was a brilliant mind, a man of character, stability and understanding. But of all of those many outstanding virtues that he possessed one struck me above all of them, and that was his practical realism. Louis was an idealist, but he tempered that idealism with that old, practical realism. He accepted the world in which he lived, and he loved it. He recognized its shortcomings, but in his

quiet, inimitable manner he tried to improve it. At the same time he had that good old sense of understanding and that great wisdom and judgment that kept him on an even keel rather than trying to overturn and reform this great world in 1 day or 1 week or 1 year.

He had brains, character and stability. He knew how to effectively use all of those grand qualities. I join all my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his lovely family and to his host of friends for their great loss.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the House in paying deserved tribute to the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. I only wish I could speak on a more personal plane of the many fine accomplishments and services contributed by Congressman RABAUT who, for 25 years, served with great distinction for the 14th District of Michigan, his State, and our Nation in the House of Representatives. As a freshman Member of this great body, which is certain to miss the ability and service of one of its finest senior Members, I sincerely regret that time did not permit a closer personal relationship between us. But his work, his dedication, and his sincere efforts in the betterment of mankind presented me a keen insight of the character and integrity of a truly outstanding Representative. His devotion and accomplishments completely overshadow my words. He will be sorely missed by this House.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House has indeed sustained an irreparable loss in the death of my friend, LOUIS C. RABAUT of Michigan.

It was a great privilege for me to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with LOUIS C. RABAUT and this applies especially to my service on the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations. He stood for the finest as a gentleman and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, industrious, conscientious, and courageous.

Particularly will I always remember the numerous occasions when he would talk with me about his family—his pride, thoroughly justified, was always clearly reflected in his happy countenance as he spoke with love and devotion of his children and grandchildren. He was truly a living example of one who had an abiding faith in the strength that comes from close family ties and he never ceased to espouse the need for this country to adhere to the unity that stems from happy devoted families.

LOUIS RABAUT was a man of stability and endurance and this Nation and the State of Michigan can ill afford to lose such a champion of democracy. He fully earned the confidence and respect in which he was held by the entire membership of the House and his passing has indeed left a tremendous void.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

LOUIS RABAUT—WITH GOD AND UNDER GOD

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, to know LOUIS RABAUT was to love him, and I knew him well. For 3 years I served with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of the District of Columbia. As chairman of the subcommittee, he had the burden and responsibility to move the program forward. We spent many hours together on details of the District of Columbia budget. Failing health and a weak heart did not restrain him in his assiduous duties. His sacrifice to his duties was great.

LOUIS RABAUT was a deeply religious man. His belief in God and in the dignity of man permeated his whole life and found vessels in the form of three daughters who became nuns, one son who became a priest and five children who married and became parents. Little wonder then that he successfully sponsored the measure to insert the words "under God" in our "Pledge of Allegiance." This bill was his greatest comfort and pride and his words "under God" will be repeated by all Americans while our Nation lives in freedom. His words in our "Pledge of Allegiance" are his guarantee of eternal fame.

On November 12, 1961, peace came suddenly to LOUIS RABAUT. As he was about to praise his former colleague, Thaddeus Machrowicz, LOUIS RABAUT collapsed and was gathered into the arms of his Saviour. We mourn his loss. Here was a man, a father, and a friend. No person knew the District of Columbia better—knew its needs and its wants. He was intolerant of waste, sympathetic to need and sensitive to our Government's obligations. His experience as a father of nine children made him responsive and understanding. When witnesses and representatives of special interests sought to curtail relief to children born out of wedlock, he declared in no uncertain words that he would not permit innocent children to suffer for the sins of their parents. He refused to permit the sins of the indiscreet to be visited on their children.

He encouraged the chase after parents who abandoned their offspring and left the jurisdiction. He called these people the "galloping pappies" who must be bridled.

He realized that education was the backbone of our democracy and he was generous in his appropriations for schools, facilities and for teachers' salaries. On one occasion I recall that although an appropriation was not requested, he authorized the use of available unused funds so that the children could have the books to read and the tools with which to expand their education.

He was quick to prevent harm and discomfort. When families were being dislocated in areas of land not developed for an undue length of time, he moved into action and saw to it that no more families were evicted from their homes until the redevelopment of vacant land

began taking place and there was provision for relocation of dislocated families.

The concern of 800,000 residents in the District was his. While some people clamored for more funds without apparent justification, he was not stampeded, but would approve only after justification was forthcoming. His sense of justice was high. When general legislation saddled the District of Columbia with additional burdens and expenditures, he recommended that the Federal contribution be increased to provide funds to meet the additional burdens.

LOUIS RABAUT possessed a buoyant spirit—a "joie de vivre"—a joy of living. At work he toiled happily and long; after work he sang on every possible occasion, bringing cheer to his companions and friends. He exuded happiness and radiated friendship wherever he went. He was proud, as he might well be, of his 9 children, his wife, and his 29 grandchildren. Frequently, we exchanged stories about my five children and his nine children and grandchildren.

He was an adviser, a friend, and a confidant. He encouraged me to participate in the hearings which sometimes seemed interminable. He bragged that in his committee there were no leaks, although interest was high after a markup of a bill and reporters sought scoops.

All that one can take from this world is character and a philosophy of life. His philosophy can be summed up in the words of an anonymous author:

I shall pass this way but once  
Any good that I can do  
Or any kindnesses that I may show  
Let me not defer it or neglect it  
But let me do it now  
For I shall not pass this way again.

LOUIS RABAUT passed this way to the Great Beyond. Because on the way he touched me, I am richer in experience, wiser in judgment and happier in thought. All who met him on his journey through the corridor called life share this feeling and sentiment. I extend my condolences to his wonderful family and assure them that their memories are priceless and that LOUIS RABAUT shall forever live in the minds and hearts of his friends and Americans.

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to our distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our late friend and dear colleague, LOUIS RABAUT, the House has lost one of its most valuable and highly esteemed Members. Elected to this body in 1934, he served continuously with the exception of one term. Possessed of great ability, a dedicated legislator, his fine qualities were early recognized by the assignment of LOUIS RABAUT to the important Committee on Appropriations of the House. His forward looking outlook was evidenced by consistently voting for progressive legislation. As chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations he performed his duties and his trust in such manner that the people of the District will always remember LOUIS RABAUT and the great work he did in their behalf.

He was a man of deep faith and religious convictions. His family life was

exemplary, an example for all of us to follow. Blessed with nine children, three sons and six daughters, he and Mrs. Rabaut gave their children a family atmosphere of love, parental discipline, and deep religious faith and devotion. One son is now a priest of the Society of Jesus, and three daughters are nuns, dedicating their lives to God, mankind, and to country.

LOUIS RABAUT will long be remembered in America as the author of the public law that inserted the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag of the United States of America, a matter which has been referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. This legislation most effectively portrays the spirit that was the foundation of the life of LOUIS RABAUT, not only the foundation, but also the character of life of LOUIS RABAUT, intense love of God and of country.

He was also the author of legislation that placed on our mail the cancellation mark using the words "pray for peace."

To Mrs. Rabaut and her fine sons and daughters, and to her grandchildren, I extend—and Mrs. McCormack joins with me—our heartfelt sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

LOUIS RABAUT has left to Mrs. Rabaut and to his loved ones a proud record for God and country, a memory that will always live.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, from the time LOUIS RABAUT came to Congress many years ago he has sat on committees with me giving his heart to all his work and to all of the important matters that came before the committee. I used to meet him after committee sessions, and very often we spent time visiting with each other. I regarded him as a real friend, one who would do his best to help his fellow man.

I extend to Mrs. Rabaut and her children my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of the death of LOUIS RABAUT. The Congress has lost one of its highly respected, hard-working, and able legislators. The State of Michigan and the country has lost one of its outstanding citizens.

LOUIS RABAUT was forthright, fair, and steadfast when it came to matters of principle, yet he was willing to hear fully the merits of proposals and exercise his judgment accordingly. Above all, his patriotism to his country came first and his unselfish devotion to the welfare of his country was shown by his enviable record as a member of the Appropriations Committee and in the Congress.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family. May LOUIS RABAUT find rest and peace in his eternal reward.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the Michigan delegation, and the other Members of the House, in this tribute to the late LOUIS RABAUT. I am sure LOUIS RABAUT needs no encomiums of mine. His life and words will be amply documented on the pages of the history of this great body.

The monuments that are his, the monuments erected through and by his magnificent services in the House of Representatives, are now built into the very fabric of this great country of ours. He loved this place with a great devotion. This was so because he loved public service. He had a profound affection for his colleagues, regardless of party, race, religion, or national origin.

He devoted himself to God. He understood the meaning of goodness and morality, and the place of religion in our system of government.

One of our colleagues who was present when the fatal attack occurred reports that he passed from this life with a smile on his face. This must have been so, for he went to his eternal reward doing precisely what he wanted to do, paying tribute to one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, now a distinguished member of the U.S. judiciary.

I was honored and privileged to represent the Committee on Appropriations at his funeral services in Detroit. It was one of the finest and most impressive funeral services I have ever attended, conducted by his own son, a Jesuit priest, and there was present his three daughters who are nuns, and the remaining children. His funeral was attended by hundreds and hundreds from all walks of life in the Detroit area, the State of Michigan, and the country.

I extend to his devoted wife and family my deepest sympathy.

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

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I knew the late LOUIS RABAUT very well. There were two things he enjoyed in life, to sing and to be nice to people. He could do both. If it was within Louis' power to bestow a favor upon his fellow man, he made every effort to see that it was granted. He had faith and piety—and was always eager and willing to lend his helping hand. He was charitable, generous, and kind. He worshiped God—and he worshiped his family.

My memories will perhaps be deeper because he did something for me. When World War II was declared, President Franklin Roosevelt said that there would not be a dam or reservoir built in the United States until it was over. LOUIS RABAUT was chairman of the Deficiency Committee of Appropriations and put in funds for a dam and reservoir in my congressional district. It was the only project that was built in the United States, and provided sufficient water to manufacture the materials and steel needed for the emergency.

His memory shall always be deeply cherished. I fervently pray that God will continue to shower His choicest blessing—good health—upon his fine

wife and family. God bless them in their saddened grief and sorrow.

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

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to my dear and beloved friend, LOU RABAUT, whose passing brought sorrow to us. Our tributes to LOU are not for the worldly wealth he accumulated, not for anything he inherited, but for his good fiber and good name, for his zealous and steadfast devotion to his high principles and ideals.

LOU was my steadfast friend—he was our friend because the warmth of his personality spread to all of us and his kind and cheerful manner ingratiated him to everyone. LOU was truly a gentle soul, kind, considerate, and always helpful whenever and wherever possible. LOU epitomized the true concept of a good Christian. His life was indeed an exemplary one. He was devoted to his gracious wife, children, and grandchildren. LOU was a deeply religious man. His example at home must have influenced the choice of four of his children to join the religious orders—his son a Jesuit priest and three daughters becoming nuns.

LOU was a zealous and diligent worker, yet he had a jovial spirit and keen sense of humor that made it a pleasure to be in his company.

LOU lived a full useful, rich, and active life. His passing from this world was sudden, but this manner of passing was a Godsend to LOU because by living his clean, wholesome, Christian life he had prepared himself for his eternal reward which he now enjoys.

To his children and grandchildren LOU left a priceless heritage. They have my sympathy in their loss. To Mrs. Rabaut, whose rich legacy is their children and grandchildren, the memory of many happy, golden years of perfect companionship with one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan. He and I were first elected to Congress in 1934. More than 100 freshman Congressmen were elected that year. When the 74th Congress convened, the freshman Members organized into a group and LOUIS RABAUT and I were among the officers of the organization. We were good friends from the beginning.

LOUIS RABAUT will long be remembered by those who knew him as a dedicated and devoted public servant. He stood tall and strong for the things in which he believed. He was absolutely fearless. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, he did a wonderful job through the years.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the memory of a great friend, and express sympathy to members of the fine family left behind.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a bright light that shone so long in this Chamber has gone out. A great soul has gone to a higher reward. A wonderful friend of all of us has said "goodby."

It is with deep sadness and full understanding of the loss to this body and the Nation that I rise in tribute to our respected and revered colleague, the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], and others have offered eloquent tributes to his memory. I can add little to what they have said.

For a quarter of a century, LOUIS RABAUT was the spokesman of the people of Michigan's 14th Congressional District. His national service is reflected by the multitude of awards presented to him by service groups throughout our country.

As a public servant, he devoted his energies tirelessly to the needs of his district and his Nation. As a Democrat, he worked unstintingly for the growth and progress of his party. As a man, he gave of himself—his abilities, his warmth and humanity, his personal devotion to the ideals which we strive to make reality—and he earned the respect and affection of all who knew him.

LOUIS served on one of the most important committees and some of the most important subcommittees in this House. In those capacities he assisted many Members many times and performed outstanding service for his country. LOUIS RABAUT was a man of deep religious convictions. One of the things he did in this House in which he took great pride was his authorship of the amendment to the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag which inserted the words "under God." How significant is that fact in an age in which our principal concern is with the spread of atheistic communism.

LOUIS was a devoted husband, the father of a large, devoted, and wonderful family. To them we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues from Michigan, my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, and others, in paying tribute to the life and achievements of LOUIS RABAUT, and in extending our sympathy to his wonderful family.

LOUIS RABAUT had a zest for living. He had loyalty; he had friendliness and helpfulness.

All of us from Michigan, not only those who serve in the Halls of Congress, but others from Michigan, and not just from Detroit, remember the contributions that LOUIS RABAUT made to our gatherings here of the Michigan State Society and of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce in their annual trek to Washington when he and Harry McDonald, another Michigander, would lead us in song and contribute to the spirit of the occasion.

I say he was loyal. He was loyal to his party; he was loyal to his State.

He did all he could for anyone associated with him.

I wish to mention just one instance of LOUIS RABAUT's helpfulness. Less than 2 years ago, the University of Michigan was anxious to obtain a new cyclotron, at a cost of \$1.8 million. I see my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] a member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee here, who will recall the active interest that LOUIS RABAUT took in providing this marvelous machine for studying the nuclei of the heavier elements. He was helpful, but he had to be convinced of the justice of a cause before he gave that help.

Mr. Speaker, I also was privileged to attend the funeral of Mr. RABAUT in Detroit, and concur with the description which has been given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] as to the beauty of that service and the spirit of the people of Detroit who turned out in great numbers to pay tribute to a great servant of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, all of us will miss him. His memory will be preserved and his family will realize that his colleagues in the House of Representatives had a very high appraisal of his work here.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. Although my acquaintance with him was not as lengthy and as deep as that of many who eulogize him today, I feel that I, too, was touched by his life and his goodness. For many years I knew of his reputation as a man deeply religious, a devoted father and family man, a man humane by instinct and practice, the last of those Michigan Democratic Congressmen of the New Deal era who helped enact the historic social legislation of the 1930's.

The untimely death of LOUIS C. RABAUT tempers my entry into this esteemed body. As a new Congressman I regret the loss of opportunity to work with this veteran of worthy causes and benefit from his counsel and guidance. A few days before his death, Mr. RABAUT had called me to offer his assistance in my assumption of the duties of Congressman. Several days later, while speaking at a testimonial dinner for my esteemed predecessor, Judge Thaddeus Machrowicz, he was stricken with a fatal attack. In a sense, he died with his boots on, in a manner strikingly similar to that in which the late, great Alben Barkley passed on.

LOUIS C. RABAUT's constituents honored him by repeatedly reelecting him, and he honored them, the Congress, and the Nation with a high sense of purpose which will continue to be a source of inspiration to us all. I extend my sympathy to the late Mr. RABAUT's wife and family.

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

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great Congressman and a man who has helped and befriended me, LOUIS RABAUT, of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the qualities of this fine, wonderful man, I should like to relate an incident which occurred recently. On two occasions I have brought my little daughter to the floor of the House. On the second occasion she said to me, "Where is that nice man who told us about the 'Pledge of Allegiance'?"

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates that Mr. RABAUT, who was so kind a man, and had such a strong belief in God and in his country, would take time from his congressional duties to explain the "Pledge of Allegiance" to a little girl.

Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Rabaut and to the members of his family I extend my deepest and most profound sympathy.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my colleague the late Congressman LOUIS RABAUT. The State of Michigan and the entire Nation has lost one of its most valued citizens in the passing of Mr. RABAUT. He was always eager and willing to assist all persons in all walks of life in solving their problems.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with the late Mr. RABAUT for a number of years when he served as chairman of the House District Appropriations Subcommittee as I am chairman of the House District Legislation Committee. I always found Mr. RABAUT to be sound thinking, patient, and tolerant in connection with all the problems confronting the Nation's Capital. He spent hours and hours of valuable time and effort to make our Nation's Capital the most beautiful city in the world and a safe place for the residents of the District of Columbia to live and make the city safe for the people throughout the United States when they visit the Nation's Capital.

Very few people in our decade lived a happier life than Mr. and Mrs. Rabaut and all of their lovely children. I had the pleasure of serving 23 years in the Congress of the United States with Congressman RABAUT, and I am certain that he was an inspiration to all new Members of Congress as he always had time to discuss any problem any Congressman had in connection with the House District Appropriations Committee.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Rabaut and their fine children.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished dean for taking the time today so that the House might pay an appropriate tribute to one of its great and beloved Members. I am, as are all my colleagues, saddened by the death of LOUIS RABAUT. I was present at the affair held in honor of our former colleague, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, who has now become a Federal judge, when our good friend,

the late LOUIS RABAUT, passed on. LOUIS died doing what he liked to do and when our beloved friend had the privilege of visiting LOUIS RABAUT's wife and family to express both his condolences and his personal sadness over what had happened at this dinner held in honor of Judge Machrowicz, Mrs. Rabaut expressed instead her gratitude that God had permitted LOUIS RABAUT to be present at the dinner in spite of his very much weakened health, to pay an appropriate tribute to a friend and to participate in an affair held in his honor. I think that is the measure of both Mrs. Rabaut and their family.

All who knew Lou are well aware of the gentle and humane character of the man and of the rock-like integrity and courage with which he faced legislative problems in the Congress and with which he faced political problems at home.

We are aware, indeed, of the good works which he has done and of the affection and regard in which he held his colleagues and in which his colleagues so well held him.

We are also aware that the membership of the House owes a great collective debt of gratitude to Lou for the assistance which he richly and warmly extended all of us. We are all aware of the fact that this country is dotted with real monuments to Lou's legislative efforts; and I refer to the various public works around the country built as a result of his efforts, as mentioned by one of our distinguished colleagues—the dams and the river projects, and so forth, which we have. We in the State of Michigan recognize the good work which he did for us in the Food and Drug Administration new building there, in the improvements to our Federal buildings and in the new Federal buildings which were constructed throughout the State. These are a very real tribute to the man. I am sure all of us here recognize that the greatest measure of LOUIS RABAUT was the love which he carried with him for his fellow man, both within and without the Congress of the United States. LOUIS rendered a very thankless task with enthusiasm, with dignity and with courage. Not infrequently he was treated right in the public press of the city of Washington for his efforts to serve the taxpayers in the conduct of affairs of the District of Columbia, and his concern over the problems of wise administration in the District of Columbia. He rarely received the credit which he deserved for his efforts on behalf of the poor, on behalf of the hungry, on behalf of the needy and of the destitute of this city.

It was in this that LOUIS took his greatest pride, that he was responsible—repeatedly without credit—for the school lunch program of the city of Washington; for the improvement of ADC; for the improvement of all welfare programs which he regarded as essential to the basic dignity of the people who looked to him as the principal source of help through, perhaps, their most difficult hours.

So the House today bids an affectionate farewell to one of its great and distinguished Members. I join my colleagues in expressing to the beloved widow of

LOUIS RABAUT our deepest sympathy and our affection for him. I join his colleagues and mine in the knowledge that the name of LOUIS RABAUT and the affection in which he was held not only in the State of Michigan and the city of Detroit but here in this Chamber of the House of Representatives will continue for as long as any of us are present.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this moment to pass without expressing my wholehearted agreement in the magnificent statements that have been made about our late colleague, LOUIS RABAUT. I think LOUIS RABAUT died as he would have wanted to—he died in harness, working at his job to which he was devoted. LOUIS RABAUT loved the House of Representatives. He had the capacity to make and to keep friends. It seems to me that I came to know LOUIS RABAUT almost the minute I came here and I was one of those, among a great many, who numbered him among my friends. His devotion to his family and to his religion and to his convictions will remain as a monument to his memory and as an example to all of us.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members of the House have the privilege of extending their remarks in the Record for our late colleague, LOUIS C. RABAUT.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in all that has been said in praise of our deceased friend and colleague, the Honorable LOUIS RABAUT, one of the grandest men I have ever known, every inch a gentleman of the highest order, a devout Christian who practiced being kind to his fellow man, an able legislator, and a wonderfully good husband and father. I served with this great and good man on the Appropriations Committee for many years during which time I learned to know his heartbeats. I shall miss his smiles and his friendship. God rest his soul.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to our beloved colleague and friend, the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. He was truly a patriot—one who felt that we Americans should give greater expression to our love of country, lest we begin to take this Nation for granted.

These feelings led him to appropriately revise our "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag to emphasize that ours is a nation "under God." He further dramatized the "Pledge of Allegiance" and reawakened Americans to its use by presenting music to its words.

I am sure that above all his other accomplishments, great as they were, LOUIS RABAUT would like to remain in our minds as an effective patriot who fought for the preservation of his country's traditional way of life. For this he will long be remembered and revered. If every American would work to be as devoted in behalf of his Nation, our security and purpose would be stronger and clearer.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Michigan in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory and life and service of our

late colleague and friend, **LOUIS C. RABAUT**, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

For more than a quarter of a century **LOUIS RABAUT** served the people of his district and the State of Michigan and the Nation, and he served them all with distinction and dedication.

It has been my privilege to be closely associated with **LOUIS RABAUT** for several years as we each served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We served together on the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations. Congressman **RABAUT** was always a hard worker, a determined member of the committee and a most effective Representative. He had a great capacity for bringing about harmony and a spirit of forbearance at a time of tense emotions by asking at times for a brief cooling off period, and sometimes he would sing a song to break or ease the tension.

He was a deeply religious man and a man who lived by the principles he professed. **LOUIS RABAUT** will be missed from the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an expression of sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. **GAVIN**. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, **LOUIS C. RABAUT**. Of **LOUIS**, as we all knew him, it can be said that he was one of Michigan's outstanding Representatives in Congress.

He was a humble man who had a kindness of heart and the highest concept of citizenship. In all his actions he moved with such ease and courtesy that it may be said without exaggeration that wherever he moved he seemed to radiate vitality and friendship. He was always calm, strong, and self-confident, and he respected in others the qualities he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

His lines of friendship encircled friends of all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the civic, social, and spiritual life of the area in which he lived and the district and State he represented. **LOUIS** was a humble man with goodness of soul and kindness of heart and a man who rejoiced mightily when any act or deed of his added to the enrichment of our lives.

I cannot attempt to grasp or sum up the aggregate of his service in public life in a few words, and it is needless.

His life comprised a term of some years and produced a performance which I might say genuinely has been by his toil and stimulated by his love for his State and Nation—a record that won for him the great commendation and respect of all our people.

He was a firm believer in our American way of life. His great faith in the principles and ideals of government was not the outcome of any vigorous enthusiasm but the deep-rooted growth of many years.

In all things it can be said that he was a great American. His one great ambition in life was to hand on to posterity and the generation of tomorrow a greater and finer America than was handed to him.

**LOUIS** will be greatly missed by his colleagues and by the people he was proud and honored to represent. So today we mourn his loss and extend to his family our deepest heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. **LIBONATI**. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, **LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT**, of Michigan, was imbued with a strong lively spirit of friendliness toward humankind. He was filled with an abundance of true happiness of soul. He loved to sing the old melodies and tunes.

As a Congressman no one was more serious in his attention to duty. It can be said that he was one of the powerful members of the intellectual group of the House of Representatives.

He was always a true gentleman, as well as a devout Christian. His great love for his family was the shining light of his career. Four of his talented children entered the religious orders of the Catholic Church. His service in the House was marked by many patriotic ceremonies and services, together with interpretations of historical subjects.

His high sense of patriotism will always be remembered in the history of our Nation as in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag inserting the words "under God" by legislative act.

The exemplary life led by this gentle and understanding leader set moral standards of human conduct that few men could ever attain.

The Nation, State of Michigan, and the House of Representatives have lost a great political leader and statesman who by example reached the heights of legislative accomplishment and human behavior.

We, his colleagues from the State of Illinois, with great sadness extend our sympathies to his dear wife, Stella, and loving children.

Mr. **BURKE** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is as much a privilege today as ever before, to praise the name of the Honorable **LOUIS C. RABAUT** of the Michigan 14th District. Yet in so doing today, we are obliged to add a note of deep regret, in deference to the absence of Mr. **RABAUT** from the seat he so long distinguished through service in this House.

As the Representative of Detroit's East Side, **LOUIS C. RABAUT** brought with him to Washington the pioneer spirit of the Old Northwest. With this at his command, he soon became known as one of the most diligent, effective, friendly, and talented Members of the House; a specialist in many fields, with marked abilities too numerous to record here in full.

He will, however, be best remembered for a few specific acts, one of which was his authorship of the amendment inserting the words "under God," in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the American flag. Another: authorship of the legislation placing a cancellation mark on mail using the words "pray for peace," for which he received an award from the Catholic War Veterans, Department of Michigan.

During his time in Washington, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, **LOUIS C. RABAUT** supervised the spending of billions. On one

occasion he saved the taxpayers \$535 million by inserting 13 words in an appropriation bill. And on all occasions, he was alert to the needs of his people: those of Detroit, of Michigan, and of the Nation at large. All of them shall miss him in the days ahead, as shall we, his colleagues in this House. For there was a man of brilliance and of wit, and one to whom public service appeared the noblest cause of all. We were all, I believe, benefited in the knowing of such a man—as were all his many friends and acquaintances, throughout the country and throughout the world.

Mr. **HORAN**. Mr. Speaker, **LOUIS RABAUT** loved life and his fellow men. We all will miss him greatly.

For over a quarter of a century **LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT** served with distinction in the House of Representatives. He was diligent in that service.

To those of us who served with him on the Appropriations Committee, his image is indeed clear. He had a keen sense of humor. He was honest in his convictions and fought valiantly to support them. The record will disclose the great value of **LOUIS RABAUT** to the purpose and the work of the House Committee on Appropriations.

He and Mrs. Rabaut raised a wonderful family of nine children. That four of them have volunteered for unselfish devotion to their church for life is indeed a tribute to the house and home he headed.

I wish to join with my colleagues in extending our sincere sympathies to his widow and to the entire family.

Mr. **WEAVER**. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great personal sadness that I learned on last November 12 of the passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable **LOUIS C. RABAUT**. I had grown to know and admire **LOUIS RABAUT** through our association on the Committee on Appropriations and to share the general esteem with which he was held by his colleagues in the House.

For a time I served with Mr. **RABAUT** on the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations and during this period of service I was able to see at firsthand how this fine, gentle person was able to handle extremely difficult, often emotion-packed situations. Unfailingly I found him to be calm, dignified, and completely fair and just in all of his dealings. Although a member of the minority on that subcommittee I could find no reason to complain about the honorable and just manner in which he conducted hearings and executive sessions.

Mr. Speaker, **LOUIS RABAUT** was a man gifted beyond most of his fellow men with a genuine although often subtle sense of humor. It was perhaps this fine sense of humor that enabled him to carry on with such quiet dignity during some very trying times when others would have thrown up their hands in dismay.

I would like to recall for my colleagues, if I may, a brief vignette which points up this ability of his to survive even the most harassing times and difficult situations without at any point becoming curt or discourteous.

It was at the close of the hearings on the public works appropriations bill for

1960 that this particular event took place. As one of the ranking majority members of that subcommittee Mr. RABAUT had been frequently asked by the chairman to conduct the hearings for him. The hearings had been long, technical and involved. A thousand witnesses had paraded before the subcommittee, each with a different problem, each with a complex situation to discuss. Many of these problems and situations were extremely knotty ones.

It was my privilege to bring before the subcommittee a group of constituents on the last day of the hearings and to be present during the closing moments of those hearings. As the last witness had said his piece and left the room, LOUIS RABAUT leaned back in his chair. It was obvious that he and other members of the committee were tired. But Mr. RABAUT at once began to joke with his colleagues on the committee and those of us still in the room.

One colleague recalled that LOUIS had a fine tenor voice and had, upon occasion, entertained his colleagues and guests. He was called upon to close the hearing with a song. He protested—but it was obvious that the protest was not from his heart and he finally consented to sing for us. I have seldom heard a finer rendition of an old Irish ballad than he gave us that spring afternoon. It was, indeed, one of the most pleasant memories I have of the Congress.

And it typifies the man, LOUIS RABAUT. Although tired and worn from months of hard, strenuous work, he was, nevertheless, still full of fun, still full of life and vigor.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said that one of his great assets was his love of life, his love of his fellow men and his unflinching sense of humor. The public has lost a fine, dedicated public servant. I feel that I have, personally, lost a good and true friend.

Mrs. Weaver joins me in expressing to his family our sincerest sympathy upon their loss.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS RABAUT was one of the most respected Members of the House. I knew him best because of our common interest in the development of natural resources. He was one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and few men in the Congress contributed more to the realization of this great project.

LOUIS RABAUT was not provincial in his support of waterway development, however. He was able to see the needs of such programs throughout the country. In the Mississippi Valley, we knew him as one of our outstanding friends and supporters.

All of us in the House of Representatives and in the country at large have sustained a great loss in the passing of LOUIS RABAUT.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow and a feeling of personal loss that I learned of the passing of our beloved colleague, LOUIS C. RABAUT. For the last 3 years I have been ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Committee on Appropriations. LOUIS RABAUT

during that time was, and for many years before had been, chairman of that subcommittee. I have worked closely with him, and can say that we have never had a minute's disagreement during the time we served together. As ranking minority member, I received every consideration which could possibly be expected from Chairman RABAUT. In fact, it can be safely said that under the chairmanship of LOUIS RABAUT there were no parties in the District of Columbia Subcommittee—we were all working for the same goals and working shoulder to shoulder.

Although he could be a hard man over a wasted dollar, LOUIS RABAUT always erred on the side of generosity where people were concerned. He was proud of many of the institutions of the District of Columbia which had been established at his suggestion or under his tutelage, but he was especially proud of the cooperative houses for mothers of dependent children and their families. These houses were established at Mr. RABAUT's suggestion, and their success was a source of deep personal satisfaction to him.

The blithe spirit of LOUIS RABAUT was best portrayed on the numerous occasions when he would burst into song. His rich voice and his extensive memory of the words and music of many pieces helped shake the doldrums from any dull evening. In fact, LOUIS RABAUT often used a song to dispel a tense moment in much the same manner as some people use stories.

LOUIS RABAUT was devoted to the family—not only to his own beloved family, but to the American family as an institution. In fact, it can be said that he was a good man, a good American, and a fine Congressman.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement. They have suffered a loss which I am sure is staggering to each of them, but to assuage this loss is the solemn pride which they must feel in being part of a life which was so well lived.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked when I learned this fall of the sudden passing of our friend and colleague, the greatly admired and beloved gentleman from Michigan, LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT. His death was a loss to his district and the Nation.

Everyone who had the privilege of associating with LOUIS RABAUT, as he was affectionately called, was aware of those personal qualities which he possessed in such full measure which made him one of the most popular men who ever came to Congress. LOUIS RABAUT was a Member of Congress when I first came to the House of Representatives. He was always helpful to new Members. As was the case with many other new Members, I benefited from his advice and counsel. He had a host of friends throughout the country.

As we all know, in his long service in the House and on the Appropriations Committee, he has sponsored and managed a great deal of legislation in the public interest, and his work here will indeed be a heritage of which his friends and loved ones can always be proud.

I extend to his surviving family my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of LOUIS RABAUT will reverberate through the Halls of Congress where he won respectful affection from his colleagues.

Mr. RABAUT was a good Congressman, one who learned his job conscientiously, performed its duties with diligence, and maintained an excellent record.

LOUIS RABAUT loved people and he was always looking for ways in which he could be helpful. To him friendship was very important and there was not anything he would not do to aid a friend.

Congressman RABAUT was the type of legislator who is so greatly needed in our country today. A real American, he was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative. His achievements and success were his own. I feel that in his years in Congress he found much self-satisfaction in a job well done.

LOUIS RABAUT was truly a religious man in every sense of the word. His loss will be felt not only by the members of his own faith but by all who knew him regardless of their method of devotion.

Our friend has gone to his reward, but his memory will always remain with everyone who ever had the pleasure of knowing him and of sitting with him in this Chamber.

God grant him eternal peace.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most rewarding thing in the life of a Member of Congress is the associations with some of the great men who come here to be Members of this body. Certainly, I know that my life has been greatly enriched by this experience and that in the front line of those who have helped me most and who most greatly inspired me was LOUIS RABAUT. The warm and human heart of friendship was there for me whenever I called for it; and his able and sage judgment was a constant support. His family life was an inspiration to all, as was his religious life. By placing the phrase "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag, he did one of those simple but great things that was characteristic of the noble man that he was.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late distinguished Representative from Michigan, LOUIS RABAUT. He was a beloved and highly esteemed friend, and we shall all miss him sorely.

I remember that when I first came to Washington as a Member of the 81st Congress, Congressman RABAUT was already well experienced in the ways of our National Legislature. Although I did not represent a district in his own State, he never denied me either his time or his help. He was a thoughtful, kind and patient man, whose advice has served me in good stead on many occasions, and whose wonderfully human stories—especially about his lovely family of nine children—brightened many a moment in these halls.

During his quarter of a century of service in the House of Representatives, Congressman RABAUT compiled an imposing list of legislative achievements.

I know that one of them was especially dear to his heart. It was his proposal to include the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance" to the flag. Many of us joined with him in sponsoring similar resolutions. I know that he was very, very pleased when the Congress approved this change.

Congressman RABAUT was an able and accomplished legislator, an outstanding representative of his district, and a true friend. He served his God through his family and his work, and his fellow men through his legislative and charitable endeavors. He has left an indelible imprint on the record of the Congress, and on all those who came in contact with him.

I am confident that his widow and his family will derive some consolation from the knowledge that the good Lord has chosen him to be among His very own, and that their sorrow is shared by a legion of his friends.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House who knew LOUIS RABAUT, I know, learned of his passing with deep regret. He had served in the Congress for 13 terms. His many fine qualities were recognized by all his colleagues and he was a kind and clever gentleman with a disposition that endeared him to them. He was a dedicated public servant who used his influence and his vote for what he always believed was in the interest of his country and the constituency he represented. He was a loyal citizen who supported and defended our form of government from all enemies, foreign, and domestic. He rendered conspicuous service on the Appropriations Committee for many years and had attained a place on that committee of great influence. I know his faithful service will be missed by that hard working committee. During his long service he received many public recognitions of his contributions to the welfare of his country.

The sweetness of his voice was evidence of the sweetness of his disposition. I remember hearing him sing a simple little song in Radio City years ago where there were also nationally known performers. He captured the show and the audience.

His life and his character will be an inspiration to those who knew him and he will long have a place in the hearts of his many friends. We will all miss LOUIS RABAUT and will remember him with affection. To his family, I wish to express my deep sympathy.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in LOUIS RABAUT's death the House has lost a vivid character and one of the most conscientious men I have ever met. During debate he was incisive and those who questioned his statements or arguments soon found out that he knew his facts and he was well aware of what he was talking about.

As a personal friend he was a most lovable character with a keen sense of humor, a heart of loyalty and one who was always ready to be of help in any way possible. He was a religious man, and his devotion to his high standards of christianity were only matched by his loyalty and love for our country.

He will be greatly missed by his colleagues and there is no doubt in my mind that the people he represented in the Congress so faithfully and well will have a hard time finding a man of his unusual qualifications to take his place. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his widow and his family and may their grief be lightened by their knowledge of the glory of his service and the beauty of his life.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the passing of my good friend, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan. His untimely death on November 12, 1961, was a shock to all of us.

Our mutual interest in music helped bring us together during my early days in the Congress. I remember that LOUIS was responsible for ceremonies conducted on the floor of the House on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when for the first time a choral group—the Singing Sergeants of the U.S. Air Force Symphony Orchestra—was brought to the floor.

LOUIS RABAUT will be greatly missed by his country, his friends, and his constituents whom he served so well.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has not often received the privilege of paying tribute to a man of such high moral principle and personal honor as LOUIS RABAUT. The many honors and tributes which he has received, not only from his own State but from the Nation as well, have honored him as a patriot, as a statesman and most importantly, as a man of great personal and public devotion. His service in the Congress has been long in years, wide in experience and varied in concern.

To this Chamber and to the people of the Nation he has brought his own sense of moral principle and high ideals. He made us all aware that this country is "one Nation under God." Each time we pledge allegiance to the flag, we are reminded that the basic foundation of our Nation is a faith and trust in God and in His desire for a world of justice and brotherhood. These same words of the Pledge of Allegiance are oral reminders and silent tribute to the memory of our colleague. His Nation and this Chamber owe a debt to LOUIS RABAUT for recalling to us the basic ideals of this democracy.

LOUIS RABAUT saw that these were not only the ideals of our Nation, but were the basic hopes, ideals and basis of faith that are shared by all peoples. "Pray for Peace" as a cancellation mark on the mails of the United States has been a constant reminder to our Nation and to the nations of the world that the American people have an alternative to nuclear war and ancient savagery. The alternative is a return to the principles of morality and honor to which all men are bound.

Our former colleague was an honor to himself, his State, his Nation and the world. It is an honor for me to pay tribute to our former colleague today. His words and his works have done much to lead our Nation toward a course guided by morality and principle in a

world which so often lacks these qualities and for this we are thankful.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives has suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, of Michigan. LOUIS RABAUT was one of my close friends and I have always enjoyed our friendship and have always had great respect for him as a man and as a national legislator. Had it not been for LOUIS RABAUT I would not have succeeded to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Federal judiciary, and related agencies. It was at his suggestion that I was named to this subcommittee by Chairman CLARENCE CANNON in 1946.

His charming widow and fine family have my deepest sympathy and prayers in LOUIS's passing.

On November 14 last, the editorial page of the Washington Post, in a tribute to LOUIS RABAUT, had this to say about him:

Representative LOUIS C. RABAUT had 9 children and 25 grandchildren and, as his last official biography observed, he knew "family problems." In the years that he was the chief congressional influence on the District's budget, he was a warmhearted defender of this city's children. When, last June, a witness before his House Appropriations Subcommittee attacked the local program for aid to dependent children, Mr. RABAUT replied: "It's easy enough to find fault. I'm looking for solutions. What are we going to do with the children?" When another witness suggested cutting back aid in cases of illegitimacy, Mr. RABAUT declared: "You aren't going to hurt those children."

He was interested in public health, and his investigations 4 years ago led to a sharp improvement in conditions at District of Columbia General Hospital. He was interested in education, and sometimes held his school budget hearings at night so that parents could appear. His definition of liberalism included the staunch defense of individuals whom he considered wronged by a big city government. When this newspaper objected last year to his urban renewal bill, commenting that it gave too much weight to the complaints of individual property owners in one project area, Mr. RABAUT wrote back: "Nowhere in this country do citizens have less recourse in grievances of such a local nature than they have in this city. Do you want me to turn a deaf ear?" His reductions in budgets, and particularly his reluctance to increase the Federal payment, often seemed excessive. Yet he was respected at the District Building as a technician whose decisions were rarely arbitrary.

Mr. RABAUT died Sunday at a testimonial dinner in Detroit, near his 14th Congressional District. The monument he leaves behind him is here, where he dealt in good faith with this city and its people.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations has recently suffered the loss of two of its most respected members. I refer of course to the passing from this earthly scene of JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina, and LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan. I will pay my tribute to JOHN RILEY later but now wish to join our colleagues from Michigan and elsewhere in expressing profound sorrow over the passing of LOUIS RABAUT.

Mr. RABAUT was a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations when

I came to Congress in January of 1953 and was assigned to that committee. During the intervening 10 years I had an opportunity to become closely associated with him on that committee. I found him to be a hard worker and conscientious in the discharge of his responsibilities. He entertained strong convictions and never hesitated to express them or fight for them. He enjoyed the respect of all members of the committee, as well as the House, and has left his mark on the committee and House records.

In the passing of LOUIS RABAUT, the Committee on Appropriations has lost a valuable member, the House of Representatives an effective legislator, the 14th District of Michigan an able Representative, and his family a loving and devoted husband and father. My profound sympathy is extended to them in their bereavement.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in remarking on the commendable life and character of our late friend, LOUIS RABAUT. It was my good fortune to have had his friendship and confidence during my many years of service in the House of Representatives. I know his membership in this House will be sorely missed by the people of the district which he represented so long and faithfully and also by the country at large for the many valuable contributions he made toward the enactment of helpful and constructive legislation.

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to all of the members of his fine family. Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness of heart that I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late LOUIS C. RABAUT who so ably served his State and his Nation in these Halls.

LOUIS RABAUT was a statesman of great ability and high ideals. He was a loyal American and his patriotism and love of his country were of primary consideration in his every action. His devotion to the principles which have made our Republic great and his untiring efforts to perpetuate these great principles will long be remembered. Even prior to his passing his achievements in these fields were recognized by a number of patriotic organizations which paid him tribute.

He was truly a Christian gentleman. He wished to leave no question that in our country we have our foundations of faith based on the word of a Supreme Being. To the credit of LOUIS RABAUT is the amendment providing for the insertion of the words "under God" in our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

It was my privilege not only to be associated with our late colleague on the floor of the House but also as a member of the Michigan delegation and as a member with him on the House Appropriations Committee for many years. During these associations I came to know him and admire him as a dedicated man.

I join my colleagues today in extending members of his family my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues in paying tribute to a good and great man. His

loyalty to the Michigan delegation, to his State and the Nation marks his passing as a great loss.

Our loss is deeply felt not only because of the character and high qualities of our colleague but more important, the fact that in this era in our history the qualities he possessed are most needed.

History will record that LOUIS RABAUT devoted his entire life to these principles and to him alone can be attributed the addition to the pledge of allegiance of the words "under God." He was also responsible for the pledge of allegiance being set to music.

To me, personally, his death was a great loss. His counsel, advice and analysis of bills reported to the floor was sought by all of us.

The time LOUIS RABAUT spent on the Appropriations Committee in his endeavor to make the city of Washington the most outstanding Capital of the world was a beginning which we all must continue to carry out. We deeply mourn his untimely passing.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words in honor of our late colleague from my home State of Michigan, Representative LOUIS C. RABAUT.

During his many years in the House of Representatives, Congressman RABAUT served his Nation faithfully, efficiently and with boundless energy and courage.

At the time of his death, Congressman RABAUT was on his way to praise a friend, a former colleague of ours here in the House who was appointed a Federal judge.

Praise of his friends came easy to Representative RABAUT, and these friends numbered in the hundreds. He had the ability to resolve disputes, to turn away harsh words with a jest, but when matters of basic principle and belief were involved, he would not and could not be moved from that which he believed was right and honorable.

Congressman RABAUT loved this Nation and its people, and this love was exceeded only by his love of God. He was author of an amendment here in these halls in which the words "under God" were inserted in our Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Under the eyes of God, Congressman RABAUT saw our Nation flourish and prosper, and under the eyes of God he lived a full, rich life with compassion and understanding of his fellow human beings.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to a great American and distinguished former Member of this body—the late LOUIS C. RABAUT.

We, who have had the privilege of serving with him in the Congress, knew him to be devoted and loyal to his friends. He was a true public servant; he served his Nation and the people he represented, with honor and distinction. As a Member of the House of Representatives for 25 years he was admired and respected by all who knew him; he was an able legislator who rendered invaluable service to his country, his

constituents, the Congress, and the important Appropriations Committee, of which he was a member.

LOUIS RABAUT is sorely missed by us; we shall always remember his devotion to his ideals and his duty. I express my deepest sympathy to his dear wife and family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, ringing melodiously in the ears of Members is the song so often we have heard LOU RABAUT sing:

He made the night a little brighter wherever  
he would go—

The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

His snowy hair was so much whiter beneath  
the candle glow—

The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

You'd hear the patter of his feet as he came  
trodding down the street,

His smile would hide a lonely heart you see.  
If there were lovers in the park he'd pass a  
lamp and leave it dark.

Remembering the days that used to be.

For he recalled when dreams were new,  
He loved someone who loved him too,

Who walks with him in memory.

He made the night a little brighter wherever  
he would go,

The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

That was LOU RABAUT. He made the world a little brighter, wherever he would go. He sang many songs, and he loved to sing because of the music in a soul where all was at peace, because it was his mission wherever he would go to make the night a little brighter. Once when he and TOM O'BRIEN were in Ireland, and the great JOHN MCCORMACK was grievously ill and near the end, they were invited to visit the stricken McCormack, who at this stage of his illness had lost his voice, the golden voice that had enraptured millions. At McCormack's bidding LOU RABAUT sang for him one of McCormack's favorite songs, and then on urging another and another until an hour had passed, McCormack applauding from his sickbed and reliving in LOU RABAUT's singing the glory of the years of his own singing.

Yes, LOU RABAUT sang many, many songs, sang them as few singers could in any land or at any time, but the "Old Lamplighter" was his theme song. I heard it first in my freshman year, so tenderly embellished in memory with the sweet charm of Lou Rabaut, when Lou Rabaut, Murphy of New York, Lichtenwaller of Pennsylvania, Morton of Kentucky, Franklin Roosevelt, all gifted with good voices and a love of singing, occasionally with some others, would gather of an evening at the Congressional Hotel. All the old favorites were sung, the repertoire of all the Congressman artists being all inclusive, but always the highlight was "The Old Lamplighter."

He made the night a little brighter wherever  
he would go—

The Old Lamplighter of long, long ago.

That was LOU RABAUT. He made a little brighter the lives of all his colleagues. He spread sunshine in the nooks of our legislative routine. He was a legislator of the finest quality. His accomplishments were many and of lasting impact upon his country and its future. His place in the history of the Congress of the United States is secure.

But, over and above all, LOU RABAUT was a man who lived his life by faith in his God and made the night a little brighter wherever he would go. His friendship has enriched my life. I shall miss him, sorely miss him, but his presence, even though not discernible to human eyes, I shall never cease to sense.

To his beloved wife, his children, his grandchildren, and the other family members I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, it has been a real privilege for me to be associated with LOUIS RABAUT. He had a philosophy of life and a dedication to duty that was not surpassed. Always cheerful, always ready with counsel, and always willing to lend a helping hand, he was a true friend. He will be greatly missed by all of us. To his family, we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is with humbleness that I join my colleagues in the House at this time in paying tribute to the late Congressman LOUIS RABAUT, of Michigan.

He was a man big of heart and of mind. His warm, gracious countenance, which touched the lives so many Members of the House, is deeply missed by myself and others. For, even in his latter years, he displayed a zest and understanding for life which were a tribute to the agelessness of the human spirit.

We all remember Mr. RABAUT for his major contributions to the American scene—his pioneer efforts during the New Deal for social security and other legislation, his work in appropriations, his activities on behalf of world understanding, and particularly the good neighbor program with our friends to the south.

Mr. RABAUT was already a distinguished veteran of the House when I first came to Cong. ess. I remember well his courtesies and his enlightening counsel. He was a deeply religious man, and it was through his leadership that the traditional salute to the flag, repeated in classrooms and in ceremonies daily throughout the land, was changed to include, "under God." For this, he will always be remembered.

And, there were the little things—the small events which make up daily living—by which he showed his stature. In the closing hours of each session, when the House was in recess awaiting legislation from the Senate side, I fondly remember Mr. RABAUT going to the microphone in the well of the House and leading the Members in congenial folk singing. He had a beautiful tenor voice, and the singing was just the spiritual lift that the tired Members needed to carry on with full vigor when the House was once again rapped to order by the Speaker. During these recesses, my late husband, Jack, used to join us on the floor and his bass voice blended splendidly with that of Mr. RABAUT. It was a precious and warm bit of congeniality which many of us came to cherish and expect at the close of each session.

Mr. RABAUT lived his life ever actively. Even during his final term, shortly before

his death last November 12, he remained one of the hardest working Members of the Congress. I am reminded of the lines written by Poet Byron, who had in mind the kind of man Mr. RABAUT was, when he wrote:

His was "a spirit that on this life's rough sea  
Loves t' have sails fill'd with a lusty wind  
Even till his sail-yards tremble, his masts  
crack,

And his rapt ship run on her side so low  
That she drinks water, and her keel plows  
air".

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, LOUIS RABAUT. He served this Nation and the cause of freedom with honor and distinction. He was truly a great American. His unselfish devotion to this Nation has been an inspiration and an example to each of us. He really knew no north, south, east, or west. He was an American whose every effort was dedicated to the preservation of this Republic.

Mrs. Dorn and the family join in expressing to his wonderful family our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join in the expressions of the Members here in tribute to our late and revered colleague from Michigan, Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT.

Representative RABAUT served in this body during 13 Congresses. His multitudinous and remarkable achievements and distinctions have already been recited here.

His diligence in legislative study was a byword in these Halls and his appeals for approval of the legislation he believed in were forceful and persuasive.

However, he was perhaps known, and endeared himself most to us, by the qualities of his great heart. He was a kind and thoughtful man and, in the midst of his heavy duties, he always had time to give wise counsel, encouraging words and generous assistance to junior Members. He was a person of great good nature and genial disposition.

He was one of the most learned and effective national legislators in modern times. He exemplified in the highest degree the true spirit of faith in God, in country, and in his fellow man. His extraordinary record of patriotic service to this Nation and his State will forever brighten the pages of congressional legislative history.

The learning and geniality of LOUIS RABAUT will be solely missed in this body, but his patriotic service will remain forever as an inspiring example for those who come after him.

We extend our sincere sympathy to his gracious wife, Mrs. Rabaut, and his children in their great sorrow.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, to the younger members of the Michigan delegation, LOUIS RABAUT was more than our dean. He was like a father to us.

Every Member of Congress, no matter what his background of experience, if it has been in Government or outside it, when he first arrives on the Washington scene he walks into the House Chamber nervous and unsure of himself. One of the first Members at my side when I arrived was LOUIS RABAUT who put his strong right arm upon my shoulder and

said reassuring things which helped me adjust to this great responsibility and to develop self-confidence more quickly than would have been probable otherwise. Having been a Member of the House for a long time, he was always full of anecdotes about debates on various issues and little known facts about certain individual Members which were always helpful in understanding the workings of the House and the philosophy of the Members. This is valuable in sizing up situations.

LOUIS RABAUT was always fair in his dealings with all of us, never condescending although he outranked us both in years and service, respecting our judgment both individually and collectively, even though on some occasions it might have differed from his. He was both a wise counselor and a good friend. Held in high esteem by other Members of Congress, the very fact that he was a Member of our Michigan delegation increased the prestige of our delegation.

Although the family and his circle of friends will miss him dearly, we all have the consolation of knowing that he has rendered his country great service and therein left a legacy that all of us could well emulate.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late LOUIS C. RABAUT. The gentleman from Michigan was an outstanding Member of the House. I have never known a Member who was as devoted to his duties and worked as hard as he did in discharging the responsibilities which this House imposed upon him. His diligence to duty, his capacity for hard work and his devotion to the House of Representatives and to the Nation can serve as an inspiration for all of us.

I know of no more able Member of this House than our late, beloved colleague. I want to extend my utmost sympathy to members of his family. I am proud that I had an opportunity to serve with him.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS RABAUT was not of my religious or political faith.

But I honor him most for his piety and his patriotism.

I would only hope to serve the same God and country with equal sincerity and devotion.

One's remembrances of a man are perhaps the truest measure of his imprint—and his character.

I shall recall the memory of LOUIS RABAUT each time I repeat the words, "under God," in the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag."

I shall recall his memory—and his personal friendliness and courtesies extended to a delegation from my hometown—whenever I drive past the river diversion project in Battle Creek which he, as an Appropriations subcommittee chairman, helped make possible.

But perhaps my most vivid remembrance will be because of a member of the family in which LOUIS RABAUT took such deep and justifiable pride—the son who, as a priest of his church, with singular display of faith and courage, officiated at the requiem mass for his own father.

I think that is the remembrance which would please LOUIS RABAUT most of all.

For what little it can add to the treasured memories and comforting faith of his loved ones, Mrs. Johansen and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a final tribute to our distinguished friend, the late LOUIS C. RABAUT.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, LOUIS became one of my first personal friends, and over the years we developed a warm and cordial friendship.

For 25 years, LOUIS served his constituents well. He was truly a representative of people everywhere who cherish the goals of progressive and humanitarian legislation. The Nation is indebted to him for the very important part he played in the progress that has been made in our country.

To his beloved wife and other members of his family, I express profound sympathy.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by Members of the House of Representatives form many friendships. Most of these might be called casual. We each have a warm regard for the other. If our paths cross in matters of legislation we may become more or less intimate with each other. As I look back on my own service I can think of many who would exchange with me the title of "friend." However, there are in my mind always a few who are outstanding and who have from time to time demonstrated for me a warmth and an affection and a helpfulness that sets them apart and in my mind and heart, places them on a pedestal. Such a one was LOUIS RABAUT. I cannot remember just when it was that he took me under his wing and began to give me his help in many things, particularly those which I presented to the Appropriations Committee. I can think of many times when his words of wisdom probably meant the difference between success and failure of some project of mine. His death grieves me sorely. I shall miss him, and I shall miss his good counsel. I hope that the things he has taught me will guide me in the years to come.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of LOUIS C. RABAUT, the House of Representatives lost a wise and dedicated Member, and many of us who have served long years with him feel that we have just lost a dear friend. LOUIS RABAUT's excellences were not of the flamboyant and spectacular kind. His manner of speech was characterized by gruff practicality rather than by smoothness or eloquence. Most of his work in Congress was silent, grinding work in committee, on the vital but unglamorous matter of the expenditure of funds.

LOUIS RABAUT had served in the House since the 74th Congress, being reelected to each succeeding Congress except the 80th. During the 25 years of his service, he won the respect and gratitude of each Member who had an opportunity to work with him in the Appropriations Committee, or to observe the care and fairness with which he approached his decisions.

It is gratifying that the record of a man of such high moral qualities is marked by his memorable achievement of the sponsorship of the bill adding the phrase, "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance. To his credit, also, is the bill he sponsored, by which the phrase "Pray for Peace" is used in our post office cancellations.

In his official life as a legislator, and in his private life as a family man, LOUIS RABAUT was a person of warmly human sympathies, and of strong religious feeling. It has long been well known that, in his position as chairman of the Subcommittee on District Affairs of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. RABAUT could be counted upon to support projects looking to the welfare of the sick, the poor, or children, so long as the need was soundly demonstrated, and the means of meeting it shown to be efficient. His concern for the needs and the education of children is reflected also in the family life he shared with his wife, the former Stella M. Petz, and their nine children. The depth of religious feeling the two instilled in their children is indicated by the fact that one of their three sons is a priest, Father Francis Dermott, S.J., and three of their six daughters are nuns, in the order of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Sister Mary Palmyre, Sister Stella Maris, and Sister Martha Marie. Similarly, their depth of family feeling is reflected in the fact that their married children have presented Mr. and Mrs. Rabaut with the glorious total of 25 grandchildren—a fact of which LOUIS RABAUT used often to boast. He will long be held in grateful remembrance by those who appreciate how well he served God, his country, and his fellow man.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when the name of LOUIS C. RABAUT was called, there was no answer.

His familiar face and voice have vanished from this national forum where he served the people of the 14th Michigan District and the people of the 50 States for a quarter of a century.

From the mid-1930's until 1961, with the exception of the years 1946-47, he participated in the shaping of legislation that lifted the United States from a demoralizing depression to its present position as the powerful and responsible leader of the free world.

The older Members of this House have seen many colleagues come and go. Some were with us such a brief time before the fortunes of politics or the accidents of life took them from us that our memory of them dims.

Others, with that extra quality of the born legislator that their constituents appreciate, are endorsed again and again by the folks back home.

They are the veterans who carry forward the traditions and the standards of this House.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of these dependable men.

Above and beyond his ability, and his experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee, was the faith that illuminated and inspired his every thought and action.

His special interest was the Foreign Service of the United States, and he

made many official trips to inspect and study the work of our diplomatic and consular representatives abroad. He knew that the future of freedom itself would succeed or fail in ratio to our respect, understanding, and assistance to the legitimate objectives of other national communities.

In his personal life, he was an exemplary husband and father, and a devout communicant of his church.

LOUIS RABAUT was proud of his American heritage.

He saw that the great human values liberated in our open society were guided from the beginning by the American people's reverence for their Divine Creator.

That is why our departed colleague had immortal confidence in freemen and in their future.

As the author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America," he made us aware, as never before, that our rights and responsibilities and aspirations must work together in living testament to the Father of us all.

By his achievements as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, our late colleague and friend LOUIS C. RABAUT encouraged and strengthened us to meet the obligations ahead.

His presence is gone, but his spirit will be ever with us.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS RABAUT is no longer with us. For 25 years he represented the 14th District of his native State of Michigan. For 25 years he graced this Chamber with his presence and his wisdom, benefiting all of us with the thinking of his keen legal mind.

LOUIS RABAUT was a kind, good man—a man that one was proud to call a friend. Today we rise to pay tribute to our departed colleague and friend with the realization that his resonant voice, his wit and friendly smile will no longer greet us when we come into this Chamber.

His accomplishments during his quarter century in this body would fill a large testament of good works. There were few important events which did not involve the energetic, good-humored LOUIS RABAUT. He was, however, a man whose love and respect for the people he represented was exceeded only by that for his family. His acceptance of life was serious but he never allowed that to prevent him from enjoying it. Words are inadequate to describe this man's deep love of his fellow man. A love which always expressed itself in his willingness to assist anyone at any time. He was a man dedicated to the common good of our country and who tried all his life to live up to the admonition "Love thy neighbor." Those of us who worked with him here knew that he succeeded. My deepest sympathy goes out to LOUIS RABAUT's bereaved family.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Congressman RABAUT came as a great shock to me, as I am sure it did to the rest of the Members of the House, for, despite illnesses he appeared to us to be an indestructible rock who could always be counted on to overcome any setback and come back to his duties here

and carry them out courageously and with great compassion.

I enjoyed his friendship and treasured his advice and guidance. He was never too busy to help a new Member to become familiar with the work of the House, and as the new Member began to achieve experience here, he was always ready to suggest new ideas for meeting new problems.

Patriotism, piety, love of family, and a deep and sincere sense of friendship dominated his life. He was in the literal sense a good man. I want to take this opportunity to express to Mrs. Rabaut and her fine children my deepest sympathy. He has left a wonderful heritage of integrity and decency, both in the life he led and in the laws he was instrumental in writing as a Member of Congress.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was serving on active duty in the Navy in the Mediterranean last fall when I got the word that my great friend and our beloved colleague, LOUIS RABAUT, had passed into the Great Beyond. It was a sad day for me.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the first Members of this body with whom I became acquainted as a freshman Congressman. In that first year in the House I had the privilege of serving with him on the Board of Visitors to West Point. It was then that I came to know of his great capacity for friendship, his warm understanding, his deep love for young people, and the sound wisdom and commonsense bred from a lifetime of experience that have meant so much over the years to all the deliberations of this House. I was indebted to LOUIS RABAUT for the advice and encouragement he gave to me as a new Member.

LOUIS RABAUT will be remembered for many, many years for his service as a Member of Congress. He will be remembered for what he did in including a reference to the Pledge in our pledge of allegiance—"this Nation under God"—one of his proudest accomplishments. But he will also be remembered as one who always had the time and the willingness to help anyone in need. His staff was devoted to him. His friends were legion. Here was a great man, and a good man.

This House will be the less for his passing from our scene. To his widow and his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their loss.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, others have expressed here with sincere eloquence our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of the 14th Michigan Congressional District—a true man of good will. I cannot forbear to add, however, a brief but heartfelt notation of my own sadness at the realization that this cheerful spirit, this bright intellect, this energetic and faithful man, has gone to rest.

Through a quarter century of our service here, my admiration and respect for LOUIS RABAUT grew. He was a superb example of the dedicated public servant. He wore proudly the badges of faith and patriotism. It was evident that he had before him always the realization that,

as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the expenditure of each day. It was plain, too, that he regarded a hard day's work in their interest as his recurring daily debt to the people of the United States and, particularly, the citizens of his district in Michigan.

LOUIS RABAUT loved and respected his church and his Nation. He was a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness. He was conscientious, earnest, and resourceful as a legislator, and the lawmaking of this Nation gained from his efforts over many years.

His was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of public service; 50 years of happy marriage; 9 fine children, 4 of whom dedicated their lives to their church. Surely, when our beloved colleague presented himself at the eternal gates his credentials were not found wanting.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague from Michigan, LOUIS C. RABAUT. His death has greatly saddened his many friends and associates in Congress and elsewhere and brings a tremendous loss to Michigan and the Nation.

As a fellow member of the Michigan delegation, I knew him as a true gentleman, an able legislator, and a devoted patriot. A member of the important Appropriations Committee, he was always helpful to the people of the Sixth District and always most kind and considerate to me personally. His interest in the welfare of Michigan was never hemmed in by party lines. But aside from the times when heavily burdened by legislative work, I remember "Uncle Louie," as I called him, as a lighthearted, fun-loving man who took great joy in getting a group together to sing around a piano.

Congressman RABAUT served his State and his country for a quarter of a century in a dedicated manner, taking a genuine interest in the problems of all his fellow men. Though his legislative accomplishments were many and he shared the responsibility for the prudent spending of billions of dollars as a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was most proud of legislation he sponsored to include the words "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance. His deep religious and patriotic feelings which prompted him to introduce this meaningful revision in the pledge will live after him. And his adherence to the noble ideals of this Republic will serve as an inspiration to all who follow him.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to serve with him and I want to extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heard expressed for the past few days our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan, a true citizen of good will and a longtime personal friend of mine.

Having served with Mr. RABAUT on the Appropriations Committee and having served with him as chairman and ranking minority member on the Subcom-

mittee on the District of Columbia, I cannot but add a personal footnote to the grief that has been expressed here since his passing.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the kindest men I have ever known. He was a warm-hearted person, a conscientious legislator, a true Samaritan with an interest in his fellow man. At the same time, he was a man of cheerful spirit, bright intellect and abounding energy—but, above all, he was faithful to his God, his country, and to his colleagues.

Through almost 20 years' service with LOUIS RABAUT my admiration and respect grew. I came to know him as a superb example of a public servant. He carried proudly the banners of faith and service and patriotism and it was always readily apparent that he applied a rule to his every act. This rule was his own realization that, as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the way in which he used each day.

It was just as obvious that he regarded a hard day's work in the interest of his constituents as his recurring daily debt to them.

LOUIS RABAUT loved and respected his home, his State, his church, and his Nation. He was, at all times, a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness.

His was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of service to the public; 50 years of happy marriage; nine fine children, four of whom turned their lives to the church.

It can truly be said that when LOUIS C. RABAUT presented his credentials at the gates of Heaven, they were found to be in excellent order and he now sits near the throne of God.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by news of the passing of my dear and valued friend and esteemed colleague for many years, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of the great State of Michigan.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the most distinguished, beloved men ever to serve in this great body. He was unique in his lovable, personal qualities, outstanding in his ability, and the wide sweep of his interests and his effective service to his district, State, and Nation.

LOUIS RABAUT was a great humanist and his humane feelings for his fellow man could not be excelled. He labored tirelessly throughout the many years of his distinguished public service for the betterment of human relations and for the advancement and improvement of human standards, for the elevation of the lot of the average citizen.

Warm and genial of nature, he had a host of close friends in this body and wherever he was known; his beaming, magnetic personality was felt in every gathering of which he was a part. A talented singer, he was always very happy to lend his great gifts in this regard to every occasion when he was called upon to do so, and he not only sang beautifully and impressively, at formal and solemn occasions on the floor of the House and elsewhere but he also took special pleasure in singing for his friends at social gatherings and impromptu entertainments.

He was a most valuable member of the great House Appropriations Committee and enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues and the leadership of the House. He was clearly and indelibly marked as a great leader in the Congress and the country.

LOUIE performed many special services and supported and advanced many meaningful pieces of legislation. Among these, I have the feeling that he was especially proud of the measure he steered through Congress officially designating Rev. Francis Bellamy's famed "Pledge of Allegiance," with the addition of the compelling and meaningful words "under God," as our national pledge.

He put real heart service into this effort and not only secured the enactment of Public Law 287, 79th Congress, signed into law as House Joint Resolution 243, on Flag Day, June 14, 1954, by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which made the Pledge of Allegiance official, but he also arranged with one of America's most beloved and distinguished composers, Mr. Irving Caesar, to write appropriate and very impressive music for the pledge.

In addition, LOUIE also arranged to have this historic work sung for the first time on the floor of the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, by the official Air Force choral group, the "Singing Sergeants," under the direction of Capt. Robert L. Landers, AFRES, in special Flag Day ceremonies.

To the end of time, this immortal pledge will be recited and sung by millions and millions of people and little children in every hamlet, village, town and city in this great country, an enduring, perpetual recollection of one of Michigan's greatest sons, our beloved friend, LOUIS RABAUT.

LOUIE was very dear to me during the years I have been in the Congress and I esteemed and cherished him profoundly. He was one of our greatest leaders and one of our dearest friends. He was beloved, respected and admired wherever he was known, and the warmth of his heart, the radiance of his personality, the compassion and generosity of his impulse have been everlastingly impressed upon the annals of this great body and in the hearts of all those of us who were privileged to know and to love this noble soul.

LOUIS RABAUT's family was part of his very being and he was indescribably proud of his devoted wife, his loving sons and daughters, of whom he often spoke in such a way that made it clear to all that his wonderful family was enshrined and forever locked in his heart.

He was proud of all his children, but I thought he was especially grateful for those who gave their lives in the religion to the service of the Living God, because LOUIS was a man of profound, religious faith who always worked and lived by the precepts of the Divine Master.

In his passing, a giant oak has fallen in the forest and a noble soul has gone to rejoin his Creator. With very heavy heart, I extend to his beloved and grieving family, his gracious helpmate and wife of many years, and his wonderful

children—my most heartfelt sympathy for the truly irreparable loss which has come to them, to the House of Representatives, to the Nation and to all of us who dearly loved this great American and gracious, Christian gentleman.

I join his dear ones in mourning his passing, and sad of heart, pay tribute to his noble character and illustrious achievements. I pray that they will find that solace and comfort in their faith, as their dear, departed one would have them do, that will bring them reconciliation to the divine will.

The loving memory of this good and dear man will remain in my heart to the end of my days; it will dwell here in the historic precincts of this House, for very many years to come, inspiring and guiding the House toward noble goals, exalted ends and warm human fellowships, for such are the treasured bequests of the courtly gentleman from Michigan, Hon. LOUIS RABAUT.

May the good Lord smile graciously upon our beloved friend and colleague and grant him eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank my colleagues for the contributions they have made on behalf of our deceased friend and colleague, Congressman RABAUT. He, indeed, will be missed by all of us. But may his guiding spirit remain with us forever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and services of our late colleague, Mr. RABAUT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'HARA of Michigan). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. RILEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of the late Congressman JOHN RILEY who has represented South Carolina's Second Congressional District for the past 15 years. Congressman RILEY was loved by every person in South Carolina and I am certain every Member of Congress who was privileged with his acquaintance.

He was a gentleman under all conditions and at all times regardless of the pressure, trials and tribulations he was called on to bear during hearings when some of the largest appropriation bills ever enacted by the Congress of the United States were being considered. Congressman RILEY was firm in his convictions, quiet, deliberate and a deep thinker. He enjoyed a wonderful reputation in the business world as well as in the legislative field.

I have had the pleasure and privilege of meeting hundreds of Congressmen and Senators in the 23 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and I have never met a more genial Christian gentleman than JOHN RILEY. He and his wonderful wife, Corinne, and two children were very close in their family ties.

JOHN, as he was affectionately known by all his colleagues, was when his health permitted regular in his attendance at committee meetings and was always on the floor of the House when legislation was under consideration.

The world is certainly a better place for all of us to live in because of JOHN RILEY's having lived among us for 66 years. I shall personally miss him as a friend and a person with whom I could discuss my most intimate problems at all times.

The Second Congressional District, South Carolina and the Nation have suffered a great loss because of the passing of JOHN RILEY as his shoes will be hard to fill on the House Appropriation Committee and in the National House of Representatives.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Riley and her two fine children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, those of us who knew JOHN RILEY loved him. JOHN RILEY was a good Christian, an effective legislator, a soft-spoken and dedicated American. He loved to help people, and people loved to help him. I guess nobody in the history of the district which our late colleague represented had ever been more loved than was JOHN RILEY.

He worked hard in the American Legion and in his beloved South Carolina among the youth of his constituency; long before he came to Congress, he was one of the organizers of the Little League and American Legion Junior League baseball. He discovered the baseball player whose name is known to many of you, Bobby Richardson of the New York Yankees.

JOHN RILEY was a great American, and the day of his passing was a sad day for us all. He will long be remembered because of his character. He was too busy with the everyday tenor of life to think of himself.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,

Too full for sound and foam,

When that which drew from out the boundless deep

Turns again home.

He is gone. JOHN RILEY has met his Maker; no one will be more fondly remembered because the life he lived and the things he did qualified him to meet his Maker. We will miss him because JOHN RILEY will be missed by everybody. To his loved ones I extend my sympathy and my hope they may be consoled by the knowledge that the Nation grieves with them.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss that I join in this last tribute to my good friend and beloved colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina. I say personal not only because he was a close friend of mine but because he represented the district in which my wife was born and reared. Many of her relatives knew him by his first name. He was a great South Carolinian and a great American. He

was a Christian gentleman and an outstanding Member of this House.

JOHN RILEY brought to his work in the House of Representatives a background ranging from teaching to varied business interests. He used this experience to the Nation's advantage in his distinguished service on the House Committee on Appropriations, gaining a reputation as a knowledgeable and competent legislator.

All those who knew him respected and admired him for his ability and his devotion to public service. He worked constantly in behalf of his district, his party, and his Nation, never failing to offer his best to this service which meant so much to him.

Our Nation has lost a tireless worker in the cause of justice and freedom. The people of South Carolina's Second District have lost an able and influential representative. We, his colleagues, have lost a wise and trusted comrade and a good friend. I know I speak for us all when I offer to the Riley family our heartfelt sympathies for their loss, the loss of a kind and good man, and a great colleague and an outstanding American.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I join the South Carolina delegation in paying tribute to my good friend JOHN RILEY.

He was a man of many talents and contributed immeasurably to the work of the committee and the House, and he assisted in national defense to an extent few realized.

He died as he would have liked to die—dramatically in full possession of all his exceptional powers on his way back to participate in the opening of the session.

I once heard a very wise man say that no man was truly educated—regardless of how many degrees and academic honors he received—until he had taught himself. Certainly, judged by that criterion, JOHN RILEY was a learned and erudite man. He taught in the local schools and was a college professor. And most notable of all he taught the Boy Scouts—one of the greatest community services that can be rendered—in his post of the American Legion.

It will be difficult to fill his place on the committee. And it will be impossible to fill his place in the hearts of those who knew him.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as we begin a new session, we who served with him are saddened by the sudden death a few weeks ago of our valued friend, JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina.

JOHN RILEY for many years served with outstanding distinction the people of his district in the Halls of Congress. The sincere, dedicated service he rendered reflected great credit upon his family and his district.

JOHN RILEY intensely loved America. He showed this on many occasions, particularly as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, where he was a bulwark of strength in maintaining a powerful national defense, and on the do-

mestic level in the field of public works in particular, many of which were directed to the national defense of our country.

We who served with him will always remember JOHN RILEY for his gentleness and his kindness, for he was always a gentleman. A legislator of determined spirit in the performance of his duties, but in connection with his fellow men he was humble, kind, and considerate. These qualities, and his nobility of character, endeared JOHN RILEY to all of his colleagues.

JOHN RILEY and I were close friends. I valued very much the friendship that existed between us. His service in this body and the noble-minded qualities JOHN RILEY possessed leave to his loved ones a great source of consolation in their bereavement.

I extend to Mrs. Riley and her son and daughter my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY came here in the height of the depression. He took hold immediately with the work of this committee, and in the Committee on Appropriations he was devoted to his work. He was one of those Members who worked hard enough at the job so that he knew what they had been holding hearings on, and he took part in those hearings in a very intelligent and effective manner. He was the type of man who could not be bulldozed; he could not be led astray when he made up his mind as to what was the right thing to do. He was a quiet man, a gentleman; at the same time he had the absolute courage of his convictions and did a real good, effective job on the floor of the House. I wish to extend to Mrs. Riley and the family my sincere and deep sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the tributes which have been paid to our former colleague, JOHN RILEY. It was my good fortune to serve with him many years ago on the Committee on Banking and Currency before he assumed his position on the Committee on Appropriations. He served on that committee at a difficult time during the war years, and immediately subsequent thereto, when legislation of great controversy was being considered. I, under those circumstances, got to know JOHN RILEY very well. He impressed me as being a man of great courage, a man of principle, to which he subscribed, and which he lived up to. He was also a reasonable man. This was a committee where one was subject to persuasion when he became acquainted with the economic facts which were presented to the committee. JOHN RILEY was a man who was open to reason and logical in his approach to problems. I think this House will miss his wise counsel and his devotion to duty, and I personally shall miss his warm friendship and affection. I, too, join in extending sympathies to his wife and to his family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of JOHN J. RILEY in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing.

I subscribe to every tribute which has been paid him by the Members of the House and especially by the members of our Committee on Appropriations.

JOHN J. RILEY represented the finest as a gentleman and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, able, industrious, sincere, and courageous. The State of South Carolina suffered a great loss in the death of this outstanding Representative.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from South Carolina in expressing sorrow in the passing of our colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, JOHN J. RILEY.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the Members of the House, especially those on the Appropriations Committee, in regard to his contributions to the welfare of our country and to the defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN J. RILEY was a gentleman. He was always pleasant and friendly. He truly represented the fine qualities of a gentleman and statesman.

Mr. Speaker, he has rendered a great service to his constituents, his State, and his Nation. The State of South Carolina has suffered a grievous loss in the death of this outstanding representative. Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and the members of his family and his many friends throughout the country.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our departed colleague, JOHN RILEY. I express my sincere sympathy to my colleagues from South Carolina in this great loss which they have sustained, and which we share with them.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the untimely passing of JOHN RILEY. I had a high regard and great affection for him. It was a great privilege to have JOHN RILEY as a friend, and he always had a pleasant greeting when we met. He was an outstanding Member of this House, able, conscientious, sincere, and devoted to his duties.

The passing of JOHN RILEY is a great loss, not alone to his district and the State of South Carolina, but to the entire Nation. We need more men like him in public life today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deep personal sympathy to the widow and the other members of the family.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the deep sense of sorrow expressed by the South Carolina delegation over the death of our beloved colleague, Congressman JOHN RILEY, is shared by all who knew him or who came in contact with him.

Mr. Speaker, since I knew him intimately, the grief of his friends is my grief. I served with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the Subcommittee on Public Works. He was quiet, tremendously efficient, and tirelessly devoted to his committee work. He personified to the fullest and finest that symbol of cordiality and gentleness that is the hallmark of people from the South.

Mr. Speaker, he was an able legislator; he was a good and great man who has now passed from our midst. I know he has left an indelible impression upon this Chamber and the hearts and minds of all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I join with his colleagues from South Carolina and all the Members of this Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of knowing Congressman JOHN JACOB RILEY very long or very intimately; however I recall so pleasantly his cordiality to me, a freshman Member of the House. He was eager to help and put at ease a new Member in every way. He was a fine and seasoned Representative, and I held him in very high regard. His presence will be missed in the House, and his many friends and colleagues will mourn his passing. As one who was the grateful recipient of his consistent kindness and cordiality, I should like to join in conveying to his family my deepest sympathy and regret over his passing.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY was a noble soul. He made a great record in the Congress.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee, and I found him to be an exceptionally able and distinguished legislator. He possessed wisdom, judgment, and courage, which made him an outstanding Representative of his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join the many friends of JOHN RILEY on the floor of the House today in paying to him the well-deserved tribute which has been voiced here and I extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a colleague is always a sad occasion. At this time as we take note

of the loss of JOHN J. RILEY I feel particularly moved because he was one of the finest gentlemen with whom it had been my pleasure to associate.

JOHN J. RILEY possessed the personal attributes which mark a man as a leader. He was of strong Christian character, outstanding ability, and dedicated to the fundamental principles which have made America strong. His quality of mind and his strength of character were recognized and appreciated by all who knew him. His quiet manner was attractive and pleasing but was never mistaken for weakness or lack of aggressiveness in his advocacy of the principles in which he believed.

Just a few weeks before his passing I was privileged to be with him in Columbia, S.C., where I had been invited to speak to one of the outstanding civic clubs. Our late colleague had come from his home in Sumter to be present at this meeting to introduce me to his friends and constituents with whom we were meeting. The graciousness of his welcome and the warmth of the reception which I received because of his presence at this gathering will be indelibly carved upon my memory. I shall always remember this occasion because it was the last opportunity that I had to spend some time with this great man whom I admired so much.

JOHN RILEY had served the people of his community, State, and Nation in many capacities. In each capacity he served them well. As a teacher and athletic coach in the public schools of South Carolina he made a great contribution to the young people who were privileged to receive his instruction. As a member of the U.S. Navy during World War I he made an outstanding record during time of military conflict. Following World War I and until his untimely passing he had been interested and active in veterans' affairs because of his desire to serve those with whom he had fought. His activity in the American Legion and the 40 & 8 brought many honors to him in recognition of his untiring interest in his fellow veterans. It was in the American Legion activities that he maintained a continuing interest in young people and because of this interest was one of the leading Legionnaires in South Carolina in promoting the American Legion junior baseball program.

JOHN RILEY served his community in other civic endeavors, including his work as president of the chamber of commerce of his city and of the Rotary Club of Sumter.

As a graduate of one of the outstanding educational institutions of the South, Wofford College, he reflected great credit upon that institution where he had earned his bachelor's and master's degrees. His interest in the advancement of the college continued throughout his life, and it is said that his service as president of the alumni association of the college was one of the brightest years that the association has enjoyed.

This wonderful man was also interested in the religious life of his community. His devotion to the affairs of his church, and to Christian activities generally, fully measured up to the out-

standing performance that he gave to every worthwhile activity. His devotion to God was such that I know that as he experienced illness a few months ago he was able to have the feeling that he loved today and could face tomorrow unafraid.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more devoted family than we saw in the Riley family. His wonderful wife of 45 years, affectionately known as Miss Corinne, and the two fine children born of that union have sustained a great loss which evokes from each of us deepest sentiments of sympathy. However, the deep sense of loss which they must feel should be infinitesimal when compared to the great sense of pride which they must have in the life and works of their departed husband and father.

I express to the family and innumerable friends of our distinguished departed colleague, JOHN J. RILEY, the most profound sympathy of my family in the sad experience which they are now having.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, JOHN RILEY. JOHN RILEY was one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. I knew JOHN RILEY before I ever came to this body. As a leader of the American Legion in North Carolina, I came in contact with my great friend, JOHN RILEY, there.

It should be stated, I think, that the American Legion Stadium in his home city of Sumter, S.C., was named for JOHN RILEY while he was still living—one of the highest tributes, I think, that can be paid to any man. To know JOHN RILEY was to love him. When I first came to the Congress, JOHN RILEY was one of the Members who impressed me as being most helpful to a new Member of this great body. JOHN RILEY possessed all of the great characteristics and that nobility of character that make a great man. He was humble, quiet, considerate, and wise. I had an office very near his in the New House Office Building and on many occasions would go and sit and talk with my good friend, JOHN RILEY, in regard to problems which we mutually had. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I came to know how courageous JOHN RILEY was. At all times, I never knew him to vote anything but his conviction on any issue regardless of the pressure that was brought to bear upon him. JOHN RILEY rendered great service, not only service to the youth of our land in the American Legion programs, but service to his community, to his State, and to the Nation. Certainly, I am going to miss him as our other colleagues have said they, too, will miss him. I join in all the tributes that have been made to him and to express to his wife and other members of his immediate family, my sincere grief at their great loss.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I join the dean of our delegation and our other colleagues here in paying tribute to a

wonderful friend and a great South Carolinian, JOHN JACOB RILEY, a statesman, citizen, leader, and friend. I suppose we could use different phraseology to characterize his service and the magnificent impact of his life. I think of such words as dedicated—serious—tolerant—democratic—beloved—soul of integrity—learned. I could use many more; suffice it to say he was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the words.

JOHN RILEY never talked about his religion—he lived his religion. One had only to know him to know that he was a Christian and that Christian principles guided his life. He lived a life of love, which is the noblest of purposes and there come to my mind all the things that JOHN RILEY exhibited by the life he led—love for his God and for his country—love for his wonderful family—love and affection for his friends, love for his work, love for the youth with whom and for whom he worked so hard—love of sports of every kind—love of a fight and love of the right.

In business, JOHN RILEY was a successful businessman and, no doubt, had he continued in his business career instead of coming to the Congress of the United States, he could have accumulated great wealth and could have been one of the most successful businessmen in the State. Instead, he gave his time and his talent for his Nation, his State and his people. How fortunate we are that he was a man of such purpose and such integrity.

At his funeral in his hometown of Sumter, the great and the small gathered to pay tribute to him and to do honor to a great life and to a great and good man. The Governor and the Lieutenant Governor and other State officials were present. Four past Governors, including two U.S. Senators and our entire congressional delegation, as well as State legislative delegations from each of the counties he represented, were present. Townspeople and friends from far and near were there. They all came to do him honor because he had done honor and exemplified honor to all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, a great and good man has walked among us. Let us all be thankful for his life and let us be grateful that we knew him.

I know he has passed from the vale of mortal life, but I like to think of him as living and existing among us because of the influence he had on the lives of all who knew him. I am reminded of a short poem by James Whitcomb Riley entitled "He Is Not Dead":

#### HE IS NOT DEAD

I cannot say, and I will not say  
That he is dead. He is just away.  
With a cheery smile, and a wave of the hand,  
He has wandered into an unknown land,  
And left us dreaming how very fair  
It needs must be, since he lingers there.  
And you—oh, you, who the wildest yearn  
For an old-time step, and the glad return,  
Think of him faring on, as dear  
In the love of There as the love of Here.  
Think of him still as the same, I say,  
He is not dead—he is just away.

The world is a better place to live in because JOHN RILEY lived. May others

like him rise to inspire succeeding generations.

To his beloved wife, who toiled nobly beside him here, and elsewhere, to his family he loved so much, to his legion of friends, our continuing sympathy.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to serve for many years with our colleague JOHN RILEY. I have never known a more devoted or conscientious public servant. He was interested in the welfare of his people and in the general welfare of the Nation. He was especially interested in the defense of our country and in the preservation of our liberties and traditions. His work on the Defense Sub-Committee on appropriations was outstanding. It was an honor and privilege to work on the same team with this great man, this Christian gentleman.

It was a great shock to all of us to lose JOHN RILEY. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory and in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Riley and the other members of the family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY was one of the very finest men that it has ever been my privilege to know. He was a true gentleman. In all the years that I knew JOHN RILEY, I cannot recall one instance where he lost his temper or was in the least bit impatient or irritable. He was remarkably balanced. His patience and consideration was radiated to those around him and those of us who knew him intimately. I will remember the time JOHN RILEY left a subcommittee meeting of the Appropriations Committee and came up to the floor of this House to ask me about a matter pertaining to my district. He said the subcommittee would follow his recommendation and he wanted to know how I felt and then he went immediately back to the waiting subcommittee. This was typical of the consideration, kindness, courtesy, and good manners exemplified by JOHN RILEY. He thought of others. His life was dedicated to others. From the time of his youth he was always doing things for the betterment of his community, county, State, and Nation.

JOHN RILEY worked quietly but effectively in the defense of our great country. He believed in a strong national defense. He believed that the best way to preserve peace and to prevent war was to be strong. He was truly a statesman who gave his country his utmost during a time of critical need. The whole Nation can be grateful for his stance, unostentatious service on the great Appropriations Committee. Yes, indeed, the entire free world can be thankful for his successful efforts to make the United States truly the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom everywhere.

JOHN RILEY fought for States rights, local government, and individual liberty in the tradition of the early Founding Fathers of this Republic. JOHN RILEY

had confidence in the citizen. He believed the citizen could govern best at the local and State level with a minimum of Federal interference. JOHN RILEY believed in a sound dollar, a balanced budget, and fiscal responsibility. The overwhelming majority of the people of South Carolina and of his congressional district stood behind him in his defense of those principles and ideals that made him great.

JOHN RILEY was a man of great moral character. His moral character and ideals were based and founded upon his devotion to Christianity. JOHN RILEY was a devout Christian. I feel that this House is a better House because JOHN RILEY served here. I know that I am a better American because I knew and associated with JOHN RILEY. He will be greatly missed but his spirit and example will live on in the lives of all of us.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to his lovely widow and his two splendid, outstanding children.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of JOHN JACOB RILEY marks the passing of a true gentleman and effective legislator. His strict attention to his duties made him a most valuable Member of the Congress. He gave great strength to the South Carolina delegation and added prestige to the dignity of our body.

He was deeply interested as a veteran in veteran affairs. As a civic leader he spearheaded many programs at the local level.

He enjoyed the friendship of everyone and wielded great influence in party matters.

The people of the Nation and South Carolina have lost a loyal, patriotic and dedicated public servant. We have lost a revered colleague and friend. We of the Illinois delegation extend to his dear wife, Corinne and children, our heartfelt condolences.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, all of us who serve in the House were, I know, greatly distressed and shocked by the news of the passing of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina.

I had grown to know and respect JOHN RILEY during my service with him on the Committee on Appropriations and more particularly through our service together on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Those who have served with him on this subcommittee know of the long hours of hard and dedicated work which JOHN RILEY put in.

I can say from personal experience and observation that he was a most knowledgeable Member of the House. That he understood the problems faced by our Nation in preparing and building its defense forces against communism. He had a grasp of the immediate and pressing problems of each of the armed services which enabled him to penetrate below the surface and come at once to the heart of any problem under discussion.

Mr. RILEY began his adult career as a schoolteacher in his native South Carolina but this career was broken off by the advent of World War I. He served during that first world conflict in the U.S. Navy.

After the war Mr. RILEY became a Sumter businessman and developed quickly into a leading figure in the business community of that city. He played a leading role, as well, in civic affairs and it was only natural for his fellow citizens to turn to him for election to the Congress.

Since coming to the Congress Mr. RILEY had served without fanfare but with distinction and great dedication.

A good and fine man has been taken from our midst and the people of South Carolina and the Nation have lost a well-balanced, able and effective public servant. Those of us who have served with him here have lost a good friend.

Mrs. Weaver joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to his wife and family at their great and unexpected loss.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege of serving on the House Appropriations Committee with JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina, I am in a position to say most sincerely that no one ever served closely with him who did not have high regard and warm affection for him, and who was not impressed with the genuineness of his dedication to duty. His service to his district and State, and to our Nation was of enduring and outstanding quality. He will be greatly missed, not only in the Committee on Appropriations, but in the overall work and deliberations of the Congress.

I join with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to the memory of JOHN RILEY, a man of great devotion to his country and his constituency, who could not be swayed from his high ideals. My deepest sympathy goes to his family in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when a man of JOHN JACOB RILEY'S stamp and purpose leaves us.

To those of us who had the privilege to work with and to affectionately know JOHN RILEY there is no replacement.

A perusal of his biography is enough to acquaint us with the fact that JOHN'S was the honest life, the useful life, the unselfish life, cleansed by devotion to an ideal.

JOHN RILEY came to Congress after an outstanding career in his own community. His work in his church, his fraternal life, and as head of boy's work in the Sumter Post of the American Legion is only part of his record, a legacy beyond price to those in his family he leaves here. I wish to join my colleagues in extending our sincere sympathies to Mrs. Riley, his son and his daughter.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN J. RILEY served in the 79th and 80th Congresses as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was a diligent, capable, and hard-working member of that committee and he had the respect, the confidence and the friendship of all its members. We missed his fine service and his good judgment when he was subsequently assigned to the Committee on Appropriations on which committee he has been a distinguished and influential member for many years. JOHN RILEY was a genial, a kind, and clever gentleman. He was a devoted

public servant. He had a high concept of his duty to his constituents, to his State, and to his country. He was held in respect and confidence by his constituents and I am confident he could have remained in Congress as long as he desired. It was a pleasure and a privilege to be associated with him. His many good qualities and faithful service will long remain as an inspiration to his colleagues.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in all that has been said about our deceased friend and colleague, the Hon. JOHN RILEY.

JOHN was one of the most kindly gentlemen I have ever known.

To know JOHN RILEY was to love and respect him. His soft-spoken manner was almost like music. He practiced being a friend to man. An able legislator, a patriotic American of the highest order. JOHN RILEY was indeed one of God's noblemen.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad experience to return to this second session of the 87th Congress to find that so many of our good and respected colleagues have been called to their eternal reward during the few months that we were away from these hallowed Halls.

Of all of those who have gone on to be numbered among the constituency of the best I find that the loss of JOHN RILEY strikes closest to home since our friendship—and it was a warm one—dated back to almost the day that I came to Congress in 1947. Perhaps it was our close affiliation in the matter of conservative legislation that brought us together although I am inclined to believe that it was our late colleague's uniformly sunny disposition and unflinching gentlemanly conduct that drew me to him. In any event, he was a steady and sturdy defender of what he considered to be fair and equitable and I know from conversations with admiring constituents of his that they considered themselves most ably represented by this dedicated legislator.

In the extracurricular phase of our relationship we had a great deal in common through our active participation in the work of the American Legion. A veteran of the First World War, JOHN RILEY carried into his peacetime avocations the same devoted sense of duty that impelled him throughout his tour of duty with the Navy and which marked that period as preparation for the congressional assignment just relinquished to answer that higher call that must come to all of us.

As we mourn the absence of this genial colleague and comrade from his accustomed place we shall also earnestly petition the Almighty, in whose presence he now stands, to undergird the members of this bereaved family with His everlasting arms.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost a very useful and valuable Member in the passing of JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina, and the fine people of his State and district have lost one who placed their welfare and the welfare of his country above his party.

JOHN was gentle, kind and I had great admiration for his honesty, his sincerity

and his utter lack of pretense. He had a charitable approach in all transactions with his colleagues and was a great American. We shall cherish his memory and permanently be conscious of his loss.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his wife, son, and daughter in this their greatest loss.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is in deep sadness that we today recognize the great loss this House has experienced in the passing of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN RILEY from South Carolina.

I treasured an acquaintance since I first became a Member of this legislative body. His quiet effective service is a model to all who would seek an example of one devoted to the service of his fellowman.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the passing of our dear friend and colleague JOHN RILEY, of South Carolina. His untimely death saddened and shocked me as it did everyone.

I deem it a great privilege to have known JOHN RILEY for many years, and I can say without reservation that I know of no Member of Congress who was more diligent or conscientious with respect to his duties in representing his district and his Nation than was JOHN RILEY.

Through his long service in the Congress and as a member of the Appropriations Committee JOHN RILEY made great contributions with respect to the legislation before his committee and before the Congress.

I have always had great admiration for JOHN RILEY. The House of Representatives has lost a stalwart Member.

I join all of my colleagues in expressing to his surviving family and friends my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues from South Carolina and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to my friend and colleague the late Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, whose untimely death was saddening to us all.

JOHN RILEY was a fine gentleman, a true friend, an able legislator, and one who served the people of his district and his home State of South Carolina with dedication and conviction. I was privileged to work with Congressman RILEY on the Appropriations Committee for several years and found him to be a man of keen insight and determination.

He was a man of honor and one could always depend on his word. He was reliable, responsible, and trustworthy and served as a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress. We shall all miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an expression of sincere sympathy to Mrs. Riley and the members of his family.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most beloved and valuable Members in the passing of the Honorable JOHN RILEY, of South Carolina. Those of us who served on the Appropriations Committee with him know of his intense devotion to duty and his fine understanding of the problems of the

Government. Any Member who knew him was aware of the fine sense of ideals, the sterling character, and the wonderful disposition which caused him to be respected and admired by us all.

I join my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his family. Their sense of loss must be lighter realizing that it is shared by so many of us.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, JOHN RILEY was a quiet and courteous Member of the House who was highly respected by every Member. He rarely took the floor, but when he did speak, he was listened to because all the Members knew that he was speaking with great sincerity and from strong beliefs.

I think that JOHN RILEY's last speech on the floor was in behalf of the Peace Corps and the idealistic young men and women who make up its membership. I am sure that if he could have determined in advance what his last speech would be, it would have been one in support of hope and idealism for the future.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow on this sad occasion.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join our colleagues from South Carolina and elsewhere in paying a tribute of respect to the memory of our departed friend, JOHN J. RILEY. The news of his untimely passing, just a few days before he and Mrs. Riley were to return to Washington for the new session of Congress, came as a profound shock. I had been looking forward to working with him again in the Committee on Appropriations, as we had worked together for nearly 10 years, and it is difficult for me to realize that we will not have the benefit of his judgment and wise counsel in the future.

Service on the Committee on Appropriations is a full-time job for any Member of Congress. Hearings begin early in the year and continue until nearly the end of every session. JOHN RILEY was a faithful attendant at committee sessions and always carried a full share of the work. This necessarily kept him from participating as actively as I am sure he would like to have done in the debates that transpired on the floor from day to day. It was only when he had something to say to his colleagues, or when some bill was under consideration in which he had a special interest, that he took the floor to share his views with the Members of the House. But whenever he did participate in debate, he was heard with interest and profit because he enjoyed the respect and confidence of the membership.

Our Nation can ill afford to lose men of his stature and ability and his passing from the earthly scene will be a great loss to the people of his district, to the State of South Carolina, and to our country.

Mrs. Jonas joins me in extending sincere condolences to Mrs. Riley in her loss of a kind, considerate, and devoted husband.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the sorrow we experience in the passing of our friends is often difficult to endure. Such sorrow is measured by our affection for them, and when I learned that the Great Master had called our kind-hearted, generous, distinguished, able

and beloved colleague, JOHN RILEY, from his labors on this earth, I was stricken with sincere grief.

Every Member of this body loved JOHN RILEY, because he was above all else a Christian gentleman and a true and trustworthy friend. It is difficult for me to find appropriate words to express myself about one so beloved and respected, so devoted to the performance of his official duties, and so determined to serve his constituency and his fellow man. JOHN RILEY was a true nobleman, noble in thought, in purpose, and in action, and appreciated these qualities in other people. His conception of nobility has been clearly expressed in these words:

How'er it be, it seems to me,  
'Tis only noble to be good,  
Kind hearts are more than coronets,  
And simple faith than Norman blood.

I did not have the privilege of knowing JOHN RILEY, except by reputation, until I was sworn in as a Member of this body in June 1953. As the years passed I was drawn closer to him by ties of association and friendship. He was a man who gave the most careful thought and consideration to every piece of legislation. He received a real joy from the service he rendered his country. It was his sincere desire and purpose to cast an intelligent and conscientious vote on every occasion, and when he determined what was best for his country he was not to be deterred by pressure groups or any other self-seeking interest. He had the courage and the willpower to do what he believed to be best at all times, irrespective of political consequences.

This distinguished and patriotic South Carolinian served on the House Committee on Appropriations with outstanding ability for many years. JOHN RILEY was a sound and practical businessman whose judgment and wisdom were of incalculable value to his colleagues of the Committee on Appropriations and the entire House membership. His wise counsel and clear thinking no doubt saved large sums of money for the taxpayers of this country. He was temperate in all things, and never an extremist. He practiced this philosophy at all times and under all circumstances. He possessed many fine traits of character, but his absolute honesty and dependability endeared him to all men.

JOHN RILEY was not only a man experienced in the business world but he was also a former professor at Clemson College, South Carolina. It has been many years since he taught school but he never lost his love for young people. He was always an active Legionnaire and gave much of his time and talent to the American Legion junior baseball program. He had great success while in charge of this program in the State of South Carolina. It was near the end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress when this fine American made a great speech on the floor of the House in support of the Peace Corps. Many Members who felt impelled to vote against the creation of the Peace Corps were constrained to admit that his speech in behalf of the young men and women of this country was one of the strongest and most forceful arguments made during

the first session of this Congress. His remarks were convincing because they gave sincere expression to his abiding faith in America's young men and women.

As a father, teacher, businessman, legislator, and Christian gentleman, JOHN RILEY had a tremendous influence on people in all walks of life. His family and loved ones can take solace in the fact that he died in the service of his country and that he was one of those—

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;  
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;  
Men who possess opinions, and a will;  
Men who have honor, who will not lie.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to join in the eulogies for our distinguished friend, the late gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RILEY, who passed away early this month. I had the privilege of serving with JOHN RILEY on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years and found him to be a fine gentleman, a great American, and a highly competent legislator.

I know we all will miss JOHN RILEY. His fine widow, his daughter, and his son have my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for almost 5 years as a Member of Congress, I was privileged to have across the hall from me a gentleman, a man of honor and of integrity.

Now that gentleman, the Honorable JOHN JACOB RILEY, of South Carolina, is no longer with us. Death has come to him, as it must to all of us.

Congressman RILEY will be sorely missed. I am certain that his native State of South Carolina, which he loved so dearly, will particularly feel the loss of one who dedicated his life to making its cities, its towns, its countryside a better place in which to live.

The good neighbor policy is one which too often is easy to achieve at a distance, but difficult to achieve at short range. But Congressman RILEY showed me and my staff what it means to be a good neighbor, a gracious neighbor, one who was willing to answer a question, fill a request, lend a helping hand cheerfully, efficiently, and then take the extra step of doing a little more than was necessary to make life a little better for those who first were getting their feet wet in Washington.

He was a man I was proud to know, one who performed his duties quietly and without fanfare. He had profound concern for his fellow human beings, and he turned this concern into positive action for betterment in his own community and his own State.

Few will come close to his compassion for his fellow man. In the House of Representatives where words are spoken which would be better left unsaid, where tempers have a habit of rising in the heat of debate and consideration, Congressman RILEY had the ability to remain calm and cool, to demonstrate southern hospitality at its best to his fellow Members of the House of Representatives.

Congressman RILEY was a good neighbor in every sense of the word. His door was always open to any and all who wanted to see him. He could disagree

sharply on issues, but he always left you smiling after you had seen him. He was willing to do anything in his power for another human being, no matter what his station in life, no matter how difficult or complex his problem might be.

I cannot help feeling that if there were more Congressmen RILEYS in this world, that many of the things we now regard as *major problems* would simply dissolve. He had the perspective to realize that charity does begin at home, not in just the dollars-and-cents sense of giving, but in the ability to give of oneself to another human being of his understanding and his wisdom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office when, chancing to look out of the window, I noticed the flag at half-mast. We all have had that experience, and when we are telephoning for information there runs through our minds the thought of whom of our colleagues has gone beyond the human realm. When I learned that the flag at half-mast was a tribute to the memory of JOHN RILEY there fell upon me a sense of deep personal grief.

My colleague came from South Carolina and I from Illinois. We had never served on the same committee and in the discharge of our respective legislative duties our paths had seldom crossed. Yet, I felt for JOHN RILEY a deep personal affection. To me he personified in the highest measure, sweetness and gentleness. I cannot imagine that ever in his life he was guilty of an unkind act or that ever a word passed through his lips that was not sweetened with compassion and human understanding.

Once I had gone to see JOHN RILEY. I had received a letter from one of the Democratic ward committeemen in my district, the Honorable Claude W. B. Holman, alderman in the City Council of Chicago as well as committeeman for the fourth ward, who was interested in the doing of some small service to one who resided in Congressman RILEY'S district. I can never forget that 10 or 15 minutes in JOHN RILEY'S office. He received me as one brother would receive another. It was not a large matter, merely one of those times in the lives of all of us when we need an understanding and a friendly hand, and that hand JOHN RILEY extended.

JOHN RILEY was deep in my heart, and in his gentleness and in his sweetness I envisioned a man seeking while on earth to walk with his God.

My district is far in the north and the district that JOHN RILEY so ably and so conscientiously represented is far in the Southland, but I would say to the members of his family, to whom humbly but most sincerely I extend my sympathy, that the grief of the Second District of South Carolina is shared in the Second District of Illinois. His life glorified the attributes of nobility that are the common heritage of all Americans, north and south, east and west.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late beloved gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN RILEY. He was indeed a very fine gentleman—quiet and reserved—but a deep thinker. We served

on the Appropriations Committee together for many years. He was a loyal public servant. Just to be left with the pleasant and cherished memories of JOHN RILEY, makes any man's life richer and fuller.

My deep heartfelt sympathy is extended to his good wife and children in their bereavement.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the death of my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN J. RILEY. Ever since he first came to Congress we seemed to hit it off together, and when he served on the Banking and Currency Committee we became close friends. He was one of the greatest men I have known, quiet but extremely sound and patriotic. I shall miss him and extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we of the Appropriations Committee knew and respected the outstanding qualifications of JOHN RILEY by his day-to-day work. We had the privilege and pleasure of working with our distinguished colleague through many years. His level head, his common honesty, and his sterling character endeared him to all of us. His advice and clear thinking enabled this country to build our present national defense strength which the whole Nation now enjoys and stands secure.

His worth to the Nation and his great district was immeasurable. The imprint he made on the membership of the Congress will long endure. I join his family and host of friends and membership of the Congress in mourning his passing.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, share the loss of my colleagues in the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, JOHN JACOB RILEY. I know this man is mourned by all who were privileged to know him. He was a man of Christian character, strong religious principles, and compassion for his fellow man.

With his passing, South Carolina has lost one of her noblest sons, the United States has lost one of her greatest citizens and servants, and we of the Congress have lost one of our most respected and most effective legislators.

JOHN RILEY loved our country and the institutions which have made us a great Nation. He fought diligently to protect our constitutional Government and to preserve our States rights.

Special tribute should be paid to the friendship he gave to new Members of the Congress for he was a personal friend and counselor to the inexperienced. I am deeply indebted to him for the many kindnesses and courtesies he extended to me since my own arrival in the Congress in 1952. I highly valued his friendship, I respected his convictions, and I admired his dedication to sound principles of government. I shall miss him.

To his widow, his daughter, and his son, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina. After becoming a Member of Congress 9 years ago, it was natural for me to feel a kinship with all of my colleagues from South Carolina, since my father was a

native of that great State, and in my youth I had visited there at his old home area around Florence.

JOHN RILEY was typical of a true southern gentleman. He was able: effective in a quiet, dignified manner; gracious and attentive to the many duties that were his. He was one of the most friendly men I have ever known, and was never too busy to talk with one and to give encouragement to those seeking his advice and help.

We shall miss our dear friend, JOHN RILEY, and I wish to extend to his loved ones my heartfelt expression of deepest sympathy and to pray that the blessings of divine providence may be with them, and guide and sustain them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who established our cherished liberty and our Government have long been gone from the scene of their labors. The great trust has descended to us through countless hands. Some of these hands—Members of this House and this generation's keepers of the trust—are almost daily dropping from among us.

One of those who carried his share of this burden stanchly and well was my good friend, the late House Member, JOHN J. RILEY, from South Carolina's Second District. On January 2, at the age of 66, he was fatally stricken by a heart attack.

As longevity is reckoned today, JOHN RILEY should have been with us for many more productive years. But who can tell when the sands of time shall run out for any man? It is hard for his family, friends, and colleagues to accept the fact of JOHN RILEY'S passing. But I think JOHN would like us to consider these words of Plutarch in our remembrance here today:

The measure of a man's life is the well spending of it, and not the length.

I know that JOHN RILEY subscribed to this philosophy, for he lived it fully in the span of his allotted years.

JOHN RILEY served eight terms in Congress. He was first elected to the 79th Congress in 1945 to succeed the late H. P. Fulmer. He was a conservative in the best tradition of southern Democrats. He wanted a strong country which will endure. He wanted a balanced budget. He wanted a nation which will lead wisely and well. He wanted to contribute to the making of these and he did so in full measure.

JOHN RILEY possessed a full measure of humility, described by Tennyson as "the highest virtue, mother of them all." He brought to this House a forthright spirit and what Virgil called "the noblest motive \* \* \* the public good." As a teacher in the public schools of Orangeburg, S.C., and at Clemson College, he epitomized the criterion of a scholar's utility described by Coleridge as "the number and value of the truths he has circulated, and the minds he has awakened." The deliberations of this House and the committees on which he served have often benefited from his judicious and scholarly contributions. No wide-eyed dreamer was he. His experience and success in real estate and the building and loan business gave him a knowledgeable and practical approach to this

Nation's economic and social problems. His dedication and espousal of an adequate military posture for this country was forged in the crucible of World War I in which he served in the U.S. Navy.

We shall miss JOHN RILEY's loyal friendship, his wise counsel, his many personal kindnesses, his clear vision and vigorous support of the great institutions, interests, and traditions of America. I shall mourn this good man, for I was close to him and I knew him for the sterling qualities that he possessed. He was sound. He was strong. He was good for the Nation. I share the grief which is felt in overwhelming measure by his widow and family.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to thank all the Members for their contributions paying tribute to this great and just friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our late colleague, and that those who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do I understand that the statement sent over by Senator THURMOND cannot go in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It cannot be done in this body; it will have to be done in the other body.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE STYLES BRIDGES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the Nation was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely passing of Senator STYLES BRIDGES last November. My own State of New Hampshire and the entire country have suffered a tremendous loss. Senator BRIDGES served in the U.S. Senate continuously from 1937 to the time of his death.

Prior to his election to the Senate, Senator BRIDGES was Governor of New Hampshire during 1935 and 1936. In 1936, he was elected to the Senate and was reelected for his fifth term on November 8, 1960. This period of service spreading over a quarter of a century is a monument to his memory of which we are all proud. During the 2d session of the 82d Congress he was the Republican leader in the Senate, and was President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate during the 83d Congress. He was chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses and was a ranking Republican member on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator BRIDGES served on many committees and was chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate. With all of these important assignments, his influence was extensive, constructive,

and most helpful to the Nation. During his 25 years of service, he made an imperishable record as a leader and statesman.

The career of Senator BRIDGES is without parallel. The Nation is proud of his great contribution to our national life during some of the most trying and difficult years in our history. Through the Senator's efforts, our Nation has been greatly strengthened and his leadership had a telling impact in the formulation of national policy.

Senator BRIDGES was a man of great courage and deep understanding. His accomplishments were possible because of his extraordinary ability and because of his undying devotion to the many tasks confronting him. His work will stand as a telling testimony to the many contributions which he made to our national welfare.

Senator BRIDGES was much beloved by his host of friends throughout the country. My friendship with Senator BRIDGES over the years was a most enriching experience and I am happy to have had the opportunity of having served with him in the Congress of the United States. In his passing, I, as many others, have suffered a deep personal loss. I join with his multitude of friends throughout the Nation in extending to the members of his family deep and heartfelt sympathy. He will always be remembered as a great American, a most able leader and statesman with a deep and abiding concern for the welfare of his State and country which he served so unselfishly with marked distinction.

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

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from New Hampshire in paying tribute to the late Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire. The State of Maine shares with New Hampshire pride in this great citizen and his distinguished career in the service of his country.

Senator BRIDGES was born in a community in the Third Congressional District of the State of Maine. I have always cherished his friendship. I knew his brother, the late Ronald Bridges, very well. It has been my privilege also to be personally acquainted with his sister, Doris Bridges, as well as his mother. Through this acquaintanceship with the family I am conversant with the Senator's background, and with his hard work and devotion as a very, very young man carrying the burdens as the man of the house after losing his father.

He made a great effort to acquire an education. He was graduated from the University of Maine and served in the Agricultural Extension Service in the County of Hancock, Maine, which is also in the Third District.

From this assignment he went to New Hampshire, where he distinguished himself in the service of that great State.

Surely the State of his birth, his adopted State of New Hampshire, and our country at large, have had great leadership in this distinguished man.

I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to him and in expressing to Mrs. Bridges, his mother, and his sister our deep sympathies.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator STYLES BRIDGES takes from our midst a great American and an outstanding legislator. He was also my close, personal friend—a friendship that I valued very much. I attended his funeral services, and on that occasion the distinguished minority leader of the other branch and I delivered eulogies on our dear friend, STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. Speaker, STYLES BRIDGES stood for strength and national defense. He stood for a firm foreign policy. He was a bulwark of strength during his years of service in the Halls of Congress during this trying period of the world's history. His contributions were many. His memory will long remain. As I said on the occasion of his general services, he was not only a great man, but a good man. The light from the candle of life of a good person shines on for a long while. The light from the candle of life of a great man and a good man, such as STYLES BRIDGES was, never dies. On that occasion I met his dear mother, a sweet lady. She and STYLES BRIDGES' wife bore their great loss in a sweet, religious philosophical manner.

To Mrs. Bridges, the wife, and to Mrs. Bridges, the mother, and to the other loved ones left behind, I extend my deep and profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my tribute to the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. It was my privilege to know him long before I became a Member of this body. I would like to place in the RECORD the fact that in the 79th Congress Senator BRIDGES was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and also of the Committee on Appropriations and the second ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. When the 80th Congress convened, a Republican-controlled Congress, it was necessary for him to drop one of these committees. He dropped the committee on which he was second in rank, the Committee on Foreign Relations. Soon thereafter the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the great Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, died. His death was followed by a deterioration in the bipartisan foreign policy which he had done so much to create. Then-President Harry Truman called in the senior ranking Republican of the U.S. Senate with the request that he do everything in his power to re-create a bipartisan foreign policy approach. Having resigned prior to that time from the Committee on Foreign Relations he was not in a position to do then what he so wanted to do and what the President of the United States thought was in the best interests of the Nation. Nevertheless, he did me the honor of asking me to come down to the

Senate and act as liaison with the White House in re-creating bipartisan foreign policy. In the meeting with John Foster Dulles, who was then serving Dean Acheson, and as a result of meetings in the Senate, it was finally determined that the job of re-creating bipartisan foreign policy could not rest on the shoulders of a man who was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say this with a degree of sadness because, in looking back, it seems to me that this was the one thing he most wished to do. Nonetheless, he went on to contribute as much as he could toward building bipartisan foreign policy. Often he would say to those of us who knew him that he was the first "Republican internationalist Senator."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the well-chosen words spoken here today paying high tribute to a valiant servant of the Nation, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of the great Senator from the State of New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES, was a severe blow to the cause of republicanism. His brilliant and spirited defense of party principle and policy marked him as a leader in all of its activities.

His strength of purpose in unifying the loyal opposition of his party in the Senate contributed much to shaping public opinion in its understanding of the Republican stand on important issues.

His great loss can best be measured by the greatness of his advocacy of strict conservatism in the handling of our foreign policy.

This great leader will be difficult to replace.

He was an honorable and dedicated public servant.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation, extend our heartfelt condolences to his loving wife, Doloris, and family. The Nation has lost a great leader and the State of New Hampshire one of its most noble sons.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of the untimely passing of Senator BRIDGES. I considered him one of the outstanding statesmen of our time, and his passing is an irreparable loss to our Nation.

I first met Senator BRIDGES early in 1940, before I came to Congress. I was Republican State chairman of Colorado at that time, and he was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. He came to Colorado in his campaign for the nomination and I was happy to arrange several meetings for him. I found him a very gracious and affable person, and our association developed into a fine friendship, which has continued over the years. While Senator BRIDGES was unsuccessful in obtaining the nomination in 1940, he did make many friends in Colorado and had some support from Colorado in the convention.

I was a great admirer of Senator BRIDGES, and always enjoyed a visit with him. His passing comes at a most unfortunate time and just when he was needed the most. His long experience in

legislative affairs will be sadly missed in the days ahead.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Bridges and the other members of the family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the entire world was saddened by the passing of the late STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire. I had the privilege and pleasure of working with Senator BRIDGES on several occasions when we had mutual problems. I always considered Senator BRIDGES a sound thinker and one of the Nation's ablest legislators.

The State of New Hampshire and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of Senator BRIDGES. He was a tower of strength in the U.S. Senate and it is my sincere opinion that the world would be in further financial difficulty today if it had not been for the good work of Senator BRIDGES and a number of other Senators who have the same philosophy of sound government as the late Senator BRIDGES expressed during his entire term of service in the U.S. Senate.

I shall miss him as a friend. I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting in his home soon after I first became a Member of Congress and also had lunch with him in the Senate only a few weeks before the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned. The late Senator BRIDGES believed in a solvent government and believed in preserving the provisions of the Constitution.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Bridges and her entire family.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men it was ever my privilege to know in the membership of the other body was the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES. I came to know STYLES quite well as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and sat with him at the conference table in the conferences between the House and the Senate on innumerable occasions.

The State of New Hampshire has lost one of its finest public servants, and the people of this country one of its most capable and fair legislators. His lovely widow, Doloris, has suffered a great loss in the passing of my friend, STYLES BRIDGES.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, just as the Congress was about to assemble again, STYLES BRIDGES, who had been ill, and had quite a bit of hospitalization and confinement to his home, passed away.

He had been in the Senate for 24 years and had been right along one of its most distinguished Members. It had been my privilege to work with him on appropriations bills, and in the conferences between the House and the Senate to frame the most critical bits of appropriation language for a large number of years. I have known him to come into a conference where the conferees were all at swords' points, and to bring about an agreement practically on his own. This made him one of the ablest and most forceful men in the Senate, and for many years he was in that position.

I doubt if there will be anyone to take his place so effectively and so strongly as STYLES BRIDGES. I wish to extend to his

widow and his mother and the rest of his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in tribute to the late Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire.

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

There was no objection.

#### FUND FREEZING WOULD JEOPARDIZE SHIP CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, according to persistent reports circulating throughout the shipbuilding industry, the Bureau of the Budget is considering the freezing of ship construction funds previously appropriated for the balance of fiscal 1962. This would delay the award of construction contracts for 18 ships scheduled for bid during this period.

Both labor and management in the ship construction industry are very much disturbed with regard to these persistent reports, because if true they would adversely affect the livelihood of 10,000 families presently engaged in shipbuilding and ship repair on the Pacific coast of the United States alone.

To my personal knowledge, several Members of Congress, as well as representatives of labor and management in the shipbuilding industry, have written both the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Commerce, requesting a verification or denial of these rumors. Without exception, the answers received have been vague which certainly lends credence to the reliability of the report.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that Congress and the executive branch of the Government in 1957 embarked on a long-range fleet replacement program for the purpose of replacing obsolete World War II ships at a minimum rate of 30 ships a year. As a result of this program, thousands of families, many related small businesses, and numerous large shipbuilding yards have made heavy financial commitments which are in serious jeopardy unless this program goes forward on the basis of the minimum schedule of 30 ships a year.

Further evidence as to the reliability of the report is a published "revised bid dates" which appeared in the "Weekly Outlook Letter" for January 6, 1962, published by Simon Boardman Publishing Corp., and attributed to the Federal Maritime Administration. As a result of these revised dates, the bid opening for a total of 18 ships has been delayed approximately 3 months in each instance, with the new contract award dates all falling beyond July 1, 1962, and well into fiscal 1963.

Unless these 18 ships are rescheduled back to the original timetable, only 7

ships will be contracted for in fiscal 1962 as against 31 in the previous fiscal year. Obviously, there is serious concern over the work gap of approximately 6 months which would be devastating to the economy of the entire industry.

With increased emphasis on the build-up of our military posture and with the American merchant marine admittedly our fourth arm of defense, it is inconceivable to me that any such action by the Administration is contemplated. Nevertheless, if the rumor is correct, then it is logical that the Administration will request no funds whatsoever for shipbuilding in fiscal 1963. In other words, the 6-month work gap and the freezing of \$120 million of the 1962 appropriations would make this amount available in fiscal 1963. That is to say no extra funds would be requested for fiscal 1963 to make up for the 6-month contract moratorium in 1962.

With the President's budget message scheduled for Thursday of this week, I take this occasion to point up the urgency of sufficient funds in the budget to maintain the fleet replacement program with a minimum construction of 30 ships per year, as was agreed upon in 1957. In this connection, I would hope that necessary steps will be immediately undertaken which would permit the Maritime Administration to reinstate contract award dates for the 18 ships previously mentioned as originally scheduled. If this is not done, it will result in wide-scale unemployment and chaotic conditions generally within the entire shipbuilding industry.

#### THE UNITED STATES MUST NOT SLOW DOWN ITS SHIP REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], for bringing to the attention of the House the rumored slowdown in our ship replacement program. It is a matter of great concern to all of us who are convinced that our Nation must have a merchant marine adequate to meet our needs in times of both war and peace. That view has been shared by our military authorities who have termed our domestic fleet the "fourth arm of defense." It is the basic policy of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act which has been supported by Congress throughout the years. That policy of national defense has included the need for maintaining shipyards on all coasts staffed by skilled shipbuilders. A slowdown of our ship replacement program would run contrary to our basic policy. It would also be damaging to our economy.

About 4 years ago the Maritime Administration announced the beginning of a ship replacement program which was designed to replace about 300 ships of our domestic fleet. The program in-

involved the expenditure of approximately \$3.5 billion in new ship construction of which the Government and the shipping industry would share in the costs. The program envisioned the construction of 30 ships per year over a period of 10 years, thus replacing our war-built ships which are rapidly becoming obsolescent and incapable of competing successfully with the modern vessels being constructed by foreign nations.

Some time after the program was announced, the Maritime Administration decided that it would stretch out the construction work over a period of 12 to 14 years. The yearly number of ships to be built would then be reduced from 30 ships to about 20 to 25 ships.

But in the first year of construction, the Budget asked funds only for 14 ships and Congress appropriated money only for that number. The same was true in the following year. The next year—fiscal year 1962—funds for 18 ships were appropriated.

Now we are reliably informed that some ship construction contract dates have been extended so that only seven ships will be constructed in fiscal 1962. If this action reflects a new ship construction policy of the Maritime Administrator, then not only we who are concerned about maintaining our merchant marine are disturbed, but so are our shipyards who have not had sufficient work even under the first few years of the replacement program.

If we do not replace our old ships at a faster rate than 7, or even 14, ships per year, many of the vessels of our domestic fleet will be ready for the graveyard before they are replaced at all. And the United States will soon find itself in the same position it was prior to World Wars I and II when it did not have sufficient ships to meet the needs of either war or our commerce. We paid dearly for that unpreparedness. One would think that we had learned our lesson, but apparently we have not.

Unless we speed up our ship replacement program to 20 or more ships per year, several of the Nation's shipyards must close. Thousands of shipyard workers will be thrown out of jobs. They must of necessity find employment elsewhere. Their shipbuilding skills will be lost to the industry, for they will be reluctant ever again to return to shipbuilding with its uncertainties and its peaks and valleys experience of employment.

I sincerely trust that the Administration will not abandon the policy of the Merchant Marine Act. The maritime nations of the world know from experience the value of an adequate merchant marine. The Russians learned from the experiences of World War II and are now engaged in an extensive shipbuilding program. If they proceed as rapidly in the last 5 years of their 7-year program as they did in the first 2 they will have the largest merchant marine in the world, and could eventually control the commerce of the seas. We cannot permit that to happen not only in the interests of our national defense but in the interests of our international trade. History has taught us

that we cannot depend upon the ships of foreign nations to carry our cargoes either in times of peace or war.

#### PRESIDENT KENNEDY SPEAKS DIFFERENTLY THAN CANDIDATE KENNEDY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable change has occurred in the outlook of our former colleague who addressed us last Thursday.

In 1960 while campaigning for the highest office in the land, he proclaimed that the Reciprocal Trade Act was a sound policy that could be used to expand trade and protect domestic industry if we had a bold new President who was willing to do the job.

I assumed that he referred to himself. Last Thursday, he informed us that the Reciprocal Trade Act is outmoded and "we need a new law—a wholly new approach—a bold new instrument of American trade policy."

Is it possible then, that we did not get a bold new President, and that his reference was to the former Vice President?

This is not the reason given for requiring a new approach, however. Instead, he refers to the European Common Market as the great challenge that requires new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about the Common Market. It was formed in Rome in 1957 and its phenomenal success as a European protectionist organization was just as obvious a year ago as it is today.

How then do we explain the difference between the statement of last Thursday and the remarks of Senator John F. Kennedy at New York City on October 12, 1960, when he said:

I believe that we can protect our domestic industry within present laws, with Presidential leadership, with a knowledge of the problem, with effective workings between the President and the State Department and countries abroad, and with the provisions in the present reciprocal trade laws if vigorously, effectively, and responsibly administered.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE U.S. SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Bass] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to a great man such as my late colleague from New Hampshire STYLES BRIDGES is a difficult

task. To pay proper tribute to my good friend of many years is a more difficult task. A close friend of the Bass family since he first served as my father's secretary in the early 1920's, the death of Senator BRIDGES is for me a very personal loss.

His death has been a severe shock to the people of my home State of New Hampshire. They knew him as a sincere and loyal friend, constantly working in the best interests of the State. He was steadfast and firmly committed to his beliefs, yet always possessive of human understanding.

In 1934, STYLES BRIDGES was elected Governor of New Hampshire, the youngest in the Nation at the age of 36. Two years later he was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was reelected to his fifth term in November 1960.

During his first year in the Senate, he was mentioned as a possible vice-presidential candidate with Alf Landon, and later as a possible presidential nominee. His leadership in the Senate has been impressive—Republican leader, 82d Congress; President pro tempore, 83d Congress; chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses. During this past session, he was ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, member of the Armed Services and Space Committees, and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

The Nation has lost a great patriot. Ever striving to preserve the American way, STYLES BRIDGES expended his energies with equal fervor whether as a legislator or as one of the foremost leaders of the Republican Party. I have campaigned with STYLES and worked with him as a member of the New Hampshire delegation for 7 years. I was personally aware of his untiring efforts for the people he served.

STYLES BRIDGES will be sorely missed on Capitol Hill, in the Nation and in New Hampshire. The United States has lost an outstanding American citizen. To his family, Mrs. Bass and I convey our deepest sympathy.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all during the last congressional session, I joined my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Unfortunately, the obstructionism of the State Department was largely responsible for the failure to approve one of the numerous resolutions that were introduced in the House by Members of both political parties. I am hopeful now that during this session of Congress one of the resolutions will be approved by the Rules Committee for discussion on the floor in order that we may proceed with

the organization of this vitally important committee.

One of the basic weaknesses of the Soviet Union is the discontent of the peoples of the so-called satellite nations and the discontent of the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union itself. Recent events in Albania indicate the great amount of unrest that exists even within the Communist Party proper.

As I have indicated previously on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, through the creation of this important committee we can accumulate truth and facts pertaining to the enslaved conditions of the subjugated nations within the Soviet Union and those classified as satellites. We can thoroughly expose the slave conditions within the Soviet Union and thus generate a tremendous counteroffensive for the free world.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the creation of this special House Committee on Captive Nations at this particular time would serve in a most effective manner to combat Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism and would be a most vigorous instrument which is badly needed to strengthen considerably our foreign policy.

It is generally known that the letter sent by Secretary of State Rusk to the able chairman of the Rules Committee befogged the issues upon which the proposal for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations rests. It unnecessarily delayed favorable consideration of the many resolutions pending in that committee on this vital measure. What is not widely appreciated at this time is the glaring fact that much of the content of the Secretary's letter last August has been contradicted by the stand expressed in Ambassador Stevenson's letter in the United Nations last November. In sharp contrast to the Rusk letter, the Stevenson communication of November 25 to the President of the United Nations Assembly attacks Moscow's colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union, emphasizes the independence and freedom aspirations of numerous captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, and calls for a concentration of American and world attention on Moscow's colonial empire.

My intention at this time is not to stress these contradictions. It is, instead, to show again the utter necessity for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, a necessity reinforced by these contradictions. We have maintained right along that such a committee would serve not only the interests of the American people but also those of our executive departments.

Mr. Speaker, in urging an early reconsideration of this basic measure by the Rules Committee, I believe it is fitting to present again the statement of policy issued on this proposal by the Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives:

#### STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives urges the adoption of House Resolution 267 providing for the creation of a bipartisan congressional committee to be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

1. The primary issue of our times is the struggle between atheistic, totalitarian, imperialist Communist slavery and the libertarian governments of the free world.

2. The nature of this struggle is primarily psychopolitical and the Soviet Union depends heavily upon propaganda as it wages its campaign of subversion and aggression. This propaganda is based upon the demonstrably false promise that world communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism.

3. This fallacious promise can be effectively countered by the assembling and forthright utilization of all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, mainland China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other subjugated nations.

4. The Soviet Union has displayed to all the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in its brutal suppression of the people of these captive nations.

5. The captive nations constitute a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by the Soviet and Chinese Reds as well as a positive means for the advancement of world freedom in this psychopolitical struggle.

6. The President and the Department of State will draw needed strength in this struggle from a continuing exposé of Soviet imperialism.

Events of the past several months have already substantiated the validity of this statement. Moreover, as further indications of the persistent interest in the captive nations and in a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, I insert the following material to be appended to my remarks: An editorial on "Hungary's Victory for Freedom" in the November 13, 1961, issue of the Miami Herald:

#### HUNGARY'S VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

We were surprised to receive a booklet calling the "Hungarian Revolution" 5 years ago this month "the greatest victory which the free world has known since the Berlin airlift."

It seemed a disaster at the time. Two hundred thousand Soviet troops with 2,500 tanks and armored cars rolled like a juggernaut over the bodies of freedom fighters. The young rebels trying to cast off the Red yoke fought gallantly but hopelessly with rocks and home-made Molotov cocktails.

Then nearly 200,000 Hungarians risked their lives to escape from their native land. Almost 40,000 of them found asylum in the United States.

Other thousands were deported as the Soviets clamped their manacles tight again on the prostrate nation.

Moscow ignored 12 resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly condemning these acts. The Soviet slavemasters wouldn't even admit U.N. observers to Hungary. Their Chinese henchman, Chou En-lai, later boasted that "the noise subsided slowly."

Why is Hungary's 1956 revolution now called a victory?

We shall cite the reasoning in a manifesto for the fifth anniversary published by the American Friends of the Captive Nations:

The freedom fighters, many of them boys in their teens, forced the Red army to withdraw from Hungary. They were not defeated by the Soviet soldiers who had been policing them since 1948. The Kremlin discovered it could not rely on those men or on the puppet Hungarian army, which defected wholesale to the revolution.

"Khrushchev's worst fear is of another Hungary which, this time, might spread to other captive countries. His primary aim is to convince the world that the Communist empire is stable, and that Hungary can never recur.

"But he is wrong. The situation in Eastern Europe is not stable. It is not stable in East Germany, as last summer's stampede of refugees to West Berlin showed.

"It is because of the instability of his empire that Khrushchev must act. He must either advance or retreat; he cannot stand still. Therefore, if he cannot advance his aims in East Germany and Berlin, he ultimately will be forced to retreat—and retreat not only from East Germany, but from the other captive nations as well \* \* \*

"That's why, on the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution, we, the undersigned, urge our governments to stand proudly by their commitments to the free people of West Berlin and never to retreat."

Signers of the manifesto number 48 well known persons such as Novelist Thornton Wilder, Symphony Conductor Bruno Walter and six U.S. Senators from both parties. We think they have a point about the "victory" in Hungary in 1956.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. VAN PELT (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin) on account of death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on Monday, January 22, 1962, on the subject of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on February 15, 1962, on Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BARRY), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 18, 1962.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 1 hour, on Monday, January 22, 1962.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, on Thursday, January 25, 1962.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. BEERMANN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 18, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1546. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a plan relating to the reorganization of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1547. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States as of March 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report, pursuant to House Resolution 56, 87th Congress, 1st session, on Refugee Problem in Hong Kong (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9684. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the national security would not be endangered, issue licenses for the operation of an amateur station to certain aliens for any temporary period, not in excess of 3 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 9685. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala., and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9686. A bill to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia with respect to public exhibitions, shows, performances, plays, or broadcasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9687. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the national cemetery at Hampton, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9688. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9689. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjust-

ment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9690. A bill to amend the International Peace and Security Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment and support of a Western Hemisphere police force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 9691. A bill to permit the exchange between farms of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9692. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9693. A bill to establish a minimum reward for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of violators of the Federal narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9694. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Pennsylvania among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9695. A bill providing for the regulation of rates for all forms of casualty insurance including fidelity, surety, and guarantee bonds and for all forms of fire, marine, and inland marine insurance, except as herein provided, and of rating and advisory organizations within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 9696. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 9697. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 9698. A bill to authorize the extension of conservation reserve contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 9699. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9700. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain motor vessels known as towboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9701. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 9702. A bill to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9703. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9704. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

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

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

God of our fathers, in our common faith in Thee that binds us all together and makes us one in the source of our strength to do and to endure, in all the commotion and confusion of the baffling present with its imperative demands, we would turn aside for this beginning moment to lift the fret and fever of our daily lives into the quietness of Thy presence.

As from this Chamber of legislation the lines go out to the homes of the Nation where the final strength of the Republic and its future is stored and nurtured, we beseech Thee, O God, that it may please Thee to purify and exalt the domestic life of the people, to deepen the sense of the worth and sacredness of home, so that the families of our land may be schools of noble discipline and the nurseries of strong character and of true religion.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, and PHILIP A. HART, a Senator from the State of Michigan, attended the session of the Senate today.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 15, 1962, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF MINERAL RESERVES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Sixth Semianual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its

Territories and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 16, 1962.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT ON STATUS OF TRAINING OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the reserve components, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## SALE OF CERTAIN LAND BY COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING ACTIVITIES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing activities at Department headquarters and at the New York and Richmond offices, Post Office Department, March 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Commission in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Board in grades GS-16, GS-17, and

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9705. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9706. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9707. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 9708. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 9709. A bill to provide that the lake formed and to be formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River, Ala. and Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Roanoke; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and the Gaza Strip; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.J. Res. 599. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9710. A bill for the relief of Murdell Maude Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Anna Carbone Masiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9712. A bill to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Michalina Adela Chudziak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Hutzell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Yehuda Licht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Katsutoshi Fujii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Marica Margetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

224. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of 462 persons in 13 States urging Congress to immediately stop the Red mail subsidy, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

GS-18, for the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic revolution has resulted in dramatic, far-reaching changes, directions and trends in our way of life.

Among other things, there has been a shift of population. Once, we were an agricultural nation; now, about 70 percent of our people live in urban areas.

As a result, there has been a tremendous increase in demands for public service—including water, sanitation, transportation, and others—upon the urban communities.

Unfortunately, there has not always been an adequate source of financing for such programs.

To help meet this problem, we recall that there has been special exemption of interest on municipal bonds from Federal taxation.

As I understand it, the Treasury Department is now considering this policy, with a possible view to advocating repeal of exemptions. In addition, a bill is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee for such a purpose.

Personally, I feel that Congress will want to weigh very carefully any proposal that will make it more difficult for municipalities to meet their financing problems.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mayor W. P. Atkinson, of South Milwaukee, Wis., a resolution adopted by the common council.

The resolution opposes repeal of the tax exemption on municipal bonds.

Believing this deserves the consideration of Congress, I request unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION OPPOSING FEDERAL TAXATION OF MUNICIPAL BOND INTEREST

Whereas the exemption of municipal bond interest from Federal taxation has traditionally been one of the principal features of such bonds which has contributed to the maintenance of a low interest; and

Whereas proposals are now being advanced which would result in the taxation of financial institutions because of their holdings of municipal bonds; and

Whereas it is vital to municipalities throughout the country that their obligations maintain a tax free status in order to keep interest rates at reasonable levels: There be it

*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of South Milwaukee, That it does hereby register its firm opposition to any proposal which would cause municipal bonds to lose their present status of Federal tax exemption; and be it further*

*Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY and the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIER, U.S. Senators from Wisconsin, the Honorable CLEMENT*

J. ZABLOCKI, Fourth District Congressman, the U.S. Senate Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, so that they may be aware of the position of the city of South Milwaukee regarding this matter.  
Adopted December 19, 1961.

LOUIS J. MOSAKOWSKI,  
City Clerk.

Approved December 20, 1961.

W. P. ATKINSON,  
Mayor.

#### QUEENS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION ANNOUNCES NEW JUDICIAL SELECTION PLAN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the unprecedented number of vacancies in the Federal judiciary has served to center unusual attention on the difficult problem of judicial selection.

Lifetime Federal judgeships cannot simply be doled out as rewards for political service, without doing grave damage to the judiciary. Our objective must be to find the best qualified men and women available for service, if we are to maintain confidence in our courts and the highest standards of justice for our citizens.

Last year my colleague, Senator JAVITS, and I requested the help of the bar associations in New York to screen potential candidates and to recommend on a wholly nonpartisan basis the best qualified lawyers for vacancies in their respective Federal courts. The response to this request was overwhelmingly favorable; and in the course of the year we were able to transmit to the Attorney General, for his guidance, the names of dozens of potential nominees with the requisite qualifications. I continue to believe that the bar associations should be called upon to play a very active part in the process of judicial selection, as a safeguard against the appointment of any incompetents to the bench.

The Queens County Bar Association last week released the details of a plan for the selection of judges, which could be an important step in improving the procedures for staffing our judiciary. I know the plan has been under consideration for many months, and is the result of a very thorough study of existing practices. Its purpose is to assure that only persons of unquestioned integrity, moral courage, judicial temperament, and legal ability are appointed or elected to the courts. If successfully implemented, it could well serve as a model to other bar associations and as a spur to wider consultations with bar groups in the appointment of all judges.

Mr. President, I know this plan will be of interest to other Members who are concerned with the status of our courts and the caliber of our judges. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the rules and regulations adopted for implementation of this plan be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks. I also ask that the rules and regulations be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the rules and regulations were referred to the

Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE QUEENS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION GOVERNING THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY ANENT JUDICIAL CANDIDATES AND CAMPAIGNS

(Effective on and after March 15, 1962)

(When used herein "association" means the Queens County Bar Association; "committee" means the committee on judiciary of the Queens County Bar Association; "president" means the president of the Queens County Bar Association; and "chairman" means the chairman of the committee on judiciary.)

##### ARTICLE I. ORGANIZATION

1. The committee on judiciary shall be the committee to administer the rules and regulations hereinafter set forth.

2. The committee, subject to confirmation by the board of managers, shall select and employ a campaign manager who need not be a member of the committee or a member of the bar. He shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the committee or its chairman.

3. The committee may create such subcommittees with such functions, within the scope of the duties of the committee, as it shall determine. The members of such subcommittees shall be appointed by the chairman subject to confirmation by the committee.

##### ARTICLE II. PURPOSES AND GENERAL OBJECTIVES

1. It shall be the purpose of the committee to create and promote within the electorate a true sense of the importance of electing honest and able judges; to encourage and enlist the candidacies of persons who are highly qualified for judicial office; and to carry out impartially the procedure provided herein regarding candidates for judicial offices. The committee shall conduct an active campaign for the election of the endorsed candidates of the association and for the defeat of candidates who are not qualified for judicial office.

2. The association, in the manner hereinafter prescribed, shall ascertain by questionnaire the composite opinion of the members of the Queens County Bar Association as to the fitness and qualifications of the candidates for judicial offices, with jurisdiction in Queens County, whether elective or appointive, and for such other offices connected with the administration of justice as may be determined upon by the board of managers, and shall endorse candidates for such offices.

3. The association shall endorse only those candidates who are found to possess all the essential qualifications for judicial office, as hereinafter set forth, and shall refuse to endorse and strive to defeat candidates who are clearly not qualified for judicial office.

##### ARTICLE III. FINANCES

1. The committee shall determine each year the amount of its budget, which shall be subject to review and modification by the board of managers.

2. The committee shall not, without prior approval of the board of managers, obligate the association for any expenditures in excess of the amount of its budget as approved by the board of managers.

3. All disbursements of funds allocated to the committee by the board of managers shall be made by the treasurer of the association upon the order of the committee approved in writing by its chairman or in his absence by the vice chairman. The committee may authorize the campaign manager to issue such orders on its behalf.

ARTICLE IV. AGREEMENT OF CANDIDATES

From each candidate for judicial office, the committee shall, prior to the submission of any questionnaire affecting him, request an agreement in the form hereto attached and marked "exhibit A." If any candidate fails or refuses to execute such agreement, the committee shall take such action as it deems proper.

ARTICLE V. BIOGRAPHIES OF CANDIDATES

Prior to the submission of any such questionnaire the committee shall also request from the candidate such biographical information as, in the opinion of the committee, shall be desirable and necessary. If any candidate fails or refuses to supply such information, the committee itself may obtain such information and publish the same, or it may state the fact of such failure or refusal in the questionnaire. The committee, in submitting biographical information, shall not be limited to, nor precluded by the information supplied by the candidate.

ARTICLE VI. QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The questionnaires on candidates shall in every instance be submitted to the members of the association and (except as provided in article VII prescribing procedure relating to incumbents) shall contain the questions set forth in section 2 of this article.

2. In tabulating answers to such questionnaire, the committee shall give to each question the weight in points as shown by the following schedule, said points to be scored for each candidate in the proportion that the number of favorable answers to each such question bears to the total number of answers to each such question:

Question:	Points
1. Have you confidence in his integrity and moral courage?.....	25
2. Has he judicial temperament?.....	25
3. Has he adequate legal ability?.....	25
4. Has he above-average legal experience?.....	10
5. Is he courteous and considerate?.....	5
6. Would he be industrious and prompt in the performance of his duties?.....	10
<b>Total points.....</b>	<b>100</b>

3. The form of the questionnaire and the weight in points given to each question may be changed from time to time by vote of a majority of all the members of the committee present at a regularly called meeting, subject to approval by the board of managers.

ARTICLE VII. PROCEDURE RELATING TO INCUMBENTS

1. (a) Not less than 90 days prior to resignation, primary, judicial convention, expiration of an appointive term dates, as the case may be, the biographical information and questionnaire in the form prescribed in this article shall be submitted with respect to all incumbent judges who have not publicly and unequivocally declared that they will not seek reelection. An incumbent judge is one seeking reelection or reappointment to the same judicial office after having served at least 1 year in that same office prior to the expiration or termination of his present term.

(b) The questionnaire shall be in the following form: "In your opinion, is this judge entitled on his record to immediate endorsement for reelection or reappointment?"

2. Immediately after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire, the answers thereto shall be tabulated under the direction of the committee by an independent firm of certified public accountants.

3. Based on the tabulation of the answers to the questionnaire, upon approval by the board of managers, the committee shall:

(a) Immediately endorse for election or reappointment each incumbent judge who

has received not less than 80 percent favorable answers on the question;

(b) Take no formal action at the time with respect to those incumbent judges who have not been endorsed.

The base for the determination of the percentages of favorable and unfavorable answers to the question shall be the sum of the yes and no answers.

4. Not later than 15 days after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire, the action taken by the committee pursuant to section 3(a) hereof, upon approval by the board of managers, shall be publicly announced.

ARTICLE VIII. PROCEDURE RELATING TO OTHER CANDIDATES

1. The chairman, by procedure he deems appropriate, shall fix the date for the submission by candidates of the agreement and biographies provided for in articles IV and V.

2. Promptly thereafter, the committee shall submit the questionnaire prescribed in article VI, section 2, with respect to all non-incumbent candidates and all incumbent candidates who have not been endorsed under article VII, provided, however, that no questionnaire shall be submitted in a field in which the incumbent has already been endorsed.

3. Immediately after the date fixed for return of the questionnaire, the answers thereto shall be tabulated by an independent firm of certified public accountants, under direction of the committee, in accordance with article VI, section 2.

4. The committee shall thereupon endorse the candidate receiving the highest number of points for each judicial office for which no endorsement has been previously made, provided such candidate receives a total of 70 points on all questions and receives 70 percent favorable answers to the question on legal ability and 80 percent favorable answers to the question on integrity. If the answers to the questionnaire indicate that a candidate is so little known to members of the bar that an adequate appraisal of his qualifications cannot be made, then the committee, with the approval of the board of managers, may decline to give further consideration to such candidate.

5. No candidate shall be considered for endorsement unless his name shall have been submitted in the questionnaire.

6. Only one candidate shall be endorsed for each judicial office, except that when two or more candidates for the same office are shown to be clearly entitled to endorsement, the committee, upon the approval of the board of managers, may endorse all of such candidates.

7. Endorsements made pursuant to this article shall be publicly announced not later than 30 days after the date fixed for the return of the questionnaire.

ARTICLE IX. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. All information contained in the questionnaire shall be held in confidence by members of the committee, by members of the board of managers, by officers of the association, and by persons employed to tabulate answers to the questionnaire.

2. The information contained in answers to the questionnaire as to any particular candidate may be disclosed to him personally at his request and may be made public if a candidate shall openly challenge the accuracy or fairness of the report of the committee founded on the questionnaire.

3. If the committee at any time shall determine that an endorsed candidate has given false information upon a matter which, in the opinion of the committee, is material, or if the committee shall determine that an endorsed candidate is not complying fully with his agreement with the association, then the endorsement of the association may be revoked by an affirmative vote of a majority of the committee present at a meet-

ing called for such purpose, provided, however, that such revocation shall be subject to approval, modification or reversal by the board of managers.

4. The committee is empowered to employ such means as it may deem necessary and proper to carry out the intent and purpose of these rules and regulations and to take such action as it may deem necessary and proper to effect the election of qualified candidates for judicial office.

5. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE X. ESSENTIAL MINIMUM QUALIFICATION FACTORS FOR JUDGES

Essential minimum qualification factors for judges are herein enumerated to serve as guideposts to the association, its board of managers and its judiciary committee in assessing prospective judicial candidates, as follows:

1. Experience: (Any candidate should have at least 10 years of active legal practice or equivalent experience for appointment to any judicial office. Years of actual former bench service shall be considered as part of active legal practice.)

Minimum experience in actual law practice:	Years
Magistrate's court.....	10
Special sessions court.....	10
Domestic relations court.....	10
Municipal and city court.....	10
County court.....	15
Surrogate's court.....	15
Supreme court and court of claims.....	15
Appellate courts.....	20
Federal district courts.....	15
Federal circuit courts.....	20

(NOTE.—If court reform consolidation is approved, then the qualifications for nomination to the general court would also be for 10 years of active legal practice, and if the domestic relations court function is placed in the supreme court under consolidation, then 15 years of active legal practice should be the minimum qualification in this event.)

2. Other qualification factors: (a) Legal ability, (b) demonstrated courage, (c) honesty, (d) character, (e) integrity, (f) industry, (g) judicial temperament (patience, general courtesy and dignity), (h) scholarship and above-average experience.

The committee was in unanimous agreement that no minimum or maximum age qualifications be set for judicial office and that, in any event, the recommendations for judicial qualification, once established and adopted by the bar association, should not be inflexible, but should serve as recommended guideposts in the future selection and nomination of judges.

EXHIBIT A TO THE RULES AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY ANENT JUDICIAL CANDIDATES AND CAMPAIGNS To the Queens County Bar Association and Its Committee on Judiciary:

AGREEMENT

As a condition of having my name submitted by the Queens County Bar Association to its members, I solemnly agree, irrespective of whether I receive the endorsement of said association, as follows:

1. I will not solicit or knowingly accept funds, directly or indirectly, from any lawyer.

2. I will not permit a lawyer to serve on my campaign committee.

3. I will submit to the committee on judiciary of the Queens County Bar Association an accurate list of the members of my campaign committee not later than 30 days before election day.

4. I will submit to said committee on judiciary an accurate list of contributors and pledgors to my campaign fund, with address, business connection, and the amount

of the contribution of each contributor or pledgor 1 week before election day.

5. If elected, I will not hear contested cases in which a member of my campaign committee or contributor or pledgor to my campaign fund is interested as a party, except upon full disclosure of this relationship and with the consent of all parties to the litigation.

6. I will conduct my campaign with due regard to the dignity and importance of the office for which I am a candidate and will not permit or tolerate the publication of any unfair or misleading advertising in support of my candidacy.

7. I desire from the members of the bar a free and frank expression of opinion as to my qualifications for judicial office and I will not personally, or through my committee, directly or indirectly seek to influence the opinion of any members of the bar by solicitation or otherwise.

8. If elected, I will appoint only a lawyer to serve as my secretary, or clerk to the justices (supreme court), or clerk to the county judges, as the case may be.

9. Irrespective of whether I receive the endorsement of the Queens County Association, I pledge myself unreservedly to comply fully with the provision of this voluntary agreement.

-----  
Date

-----  
Signature

#### STUDIES AS TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1962 through January 31, 1963, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government, and that:

Sec. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof be further authorized from February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have

been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1963, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected

shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$400,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2683. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2684. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe, and Ramon Jacobe; and

S. 2685. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pandelis Salvaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2686. A bill for the relief of Stepanida Losowskaja; and

S. 2687. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2688. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to permit under certain circumstances flaxseed to be raised on acreage diverted from the production of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2689. A bill to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the "John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### RESOLUTIONS

#### STUDIES AS TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

#### INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 251); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee

thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) interstate commerce generally;
- (2) foreign commerce generally;
- (3) maritime matters;
- (4) interoceanic canals;
- (5) transportation policy;
- (6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
- (7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
- (8) Federal power matters;
- (9) civil aeronautics;
- (10) fisheries and wildlife;
- (11) marine sciences; and
- (12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$\_\_\_\_\_ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURNS OF CAPITAL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the anti-trust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### DESIGNATION OF COLUMBUS DAY AS A LEGAL HOLIDAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on September 12 of last year I introduced on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], Senate bill 2531, to designate Columbus Day as a legal holiday.

At the request of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I ask unanimous consent that at the next

printing of this bill, the name of the Senator from Connecticut appears as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD L. BOUTIN TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the nomination of Mr. Bernard L. Boutin to be Administrator of General Services, on Thursday, January 25, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone who may wish to appear at the hearing at that time, either in support or in opposition to confirmation of the nomination, should notify the clerk of the committee.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, to the faculty and student body of Salem College, October 30, 1961, entitled "The Citizen and International Affairs."

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts of his statement on U.S. export trade.

#### FEDERAL SPENDING IMPACT IS GREATER THAN BUDGET TOTALS INDICATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry summaries of the study prepared by Dr. Roy E. Moor, of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, on "The Federal Budget as an Economic Document." The study was prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

Dr. Moor's study shows that the present Federal budget significantly conceals the economic impact of Government. His careful, comprehensive analysis, containing much material not previously available in published form, should provide a sound basis for reform of the budget document, to make it more useful for evaluating the economic consequences of different policies.

A striking fact about Federal fiscal bookkeeping disclosed in this study is the extent to which the budget understates the actual receipts and expenditures of the Government. In 1960, for example, when the conventional budget showed expenditures of about \$79 billion and receipts of over \$78 billion, the Federal Government actually took in \$127 billion and spent \$130 billion. The actual deficit of Federal expenditures over receipts was significantly greater in that year than the conventional budget totals would indicate.

This occurs because a number of important accounts are left out of the budget entirely—such as social security, unemployment compensation, and rail-

road retirement—because they are self-financing, by earmarked taxes, and do not affect the general tax fund. But this does not reduce the economic impact of these flows of funds to and from the Government. Other Government activities, such as those of the Post Office Department, are represented in the budget only as a net deficit or surplus. Yet the actual fiscal effects of their operations are many times greater than these sometimes small sums would suggest.

An article by Bernard Nossiter, published today in the Washington Post, provides a useful summary of Roy Moor's study. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Times of this morning also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

REPORT SAYS U.S. BUDGET FORM FALLS SHORT, MAY BE MISLEADING

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Congress has been told that the big budget it will get on Thursday tells too much about too little.

A study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee says the document's format yields only minor economic information and may be misleading to those who use the totals.

The report urges many reforms so that the budget will show how the Government's real spending and tax take affect the economy and what the true costs and benefits of each new policy will be.

The 189-page study was written by Roy E. Moor, an economist on the joint committee's staff. He served as a fiscal economist with the Treasury from 1953 to 1958. In recent years, he taught at Williams College and held a research professorship at the Brookings Institution.

Most economists agree with Moor's critique. They complain that the budget is largely designed to serve the needs of congressional appropriations committees and not analysts of public policy.

Moor observed, however, that the Budget Bureau is taking steps to make its too voluminous document more meaningful. Among these, he said, are the inclusion of an income accounting that translates the Government's fiscal actions into national income accounts, long-range forecasts, and a new format this year that separates material needed by the appropriations committees from data the public wants.

The major weaknesses of the conventional budget account, Moor said, are that it lumps together different estimates, includes a lot of transactions that cancel out, and excludes many others that have important economic consequences.

For example, the report noted, the Federal Government took in nearly \$127 billion in 1960 and spent about \$130 billion—figures much larger than those published in the budget or any other Government source.

Among the things a reformed budget should show, Moor said are:

The economic assumptions underlying revenue estimates, including alternative revenue estimates for different assumptions.

A spotlight on the present and future costs of new proposals, including actions the administration takes on its own and those for which it must get congressional assent.

A summary of the expected impact on jobs, resources and incomes of each agency's programs, plus a summary of the Government's impact as a whole.

A quarterly review of changed estimates. A distinction between current operating costs and expenditures for capital projects like highways and dams.

In addition, Moor said, the budget should have a longer perspective. It should spell out the current costs of a new program and the expected future costs over the project's life. At the same time, he said, the budget should also estimate the benefits expected over the life program.

To make it clear why one program is chosen over another, Moor proposed that the budget spell out the costs and benefits of alternative measures.

Many of these analyses are made now by Government agencies, Moor observed, and it would not require much more effort to make them public.

"A budget without relevant analysis," he said, "is merely a meaningless and sterile collection of figures."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1962]  
U.S. BUDGET HIT AS SPENDING GUIDE—REPORT TO JOINT UNIT CITES FEDERAL SUMS NOT INCLUDED

WASHINGTON, January 15.—Congress was told today that the annual Presidential budget was a poor guide to the Government's impact on the economy because it did not reflect the full range of Federal spending.

Dr. Roy E. Moor reached this conclusion in a book-length report prepared for the Joint Senate-House Economics Committee on whose staff he serves. The bulky budget for the fiscal year 1963 will be sent to Congress Thursday.

Dr. Moor recommended that changes be made so that the budget would be a more accurate and useful economic gage.

Estimating that in 1960 the Government had actual cash receipts of nearly \$127 billion and expenditures of about \$130 billion, Dr. Moor said the published budget amounts were \$78 billion receipts and \$77 billion expenditures.

Not only are the operations of such things as the social security insurance system handled outside the budget, Dr. Moor said, but it omits wholly or partly the gross receipts and expenditures of the Post Office and other Government enterprises and lending agencies, receipts and expenditures of foreign currencies and many monetary and banking transactions.

"The conventional budget totals as presently constructed give only minor economic information and may be misleading," he said.

One way in which the budget may mislead students of the economy, he said, is by summing up at a single point economic occurrences that spread out over a considerable time, like taxes collected monthly and tax refunds that actually take the form of credits against future taxes. Moreover, he said, many Government contracts have had their effect on the national economy, because of payments by the contractor, before the contractor is paid by the Government.

Dr. Moor said changes being made by the present administration in the budget document were useful, but he proposed a series of further changes designed to make the budget more comprehensive and to give clues to the future effect of Government policies.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in a statement accompanying the report that it "should provide a starting point for needed reform" and meanwhile could serve as "a useful primer for understanding and analyzing the 1963 budget."

#### PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RESPONSE TO THE RUSSIAN SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a résumé

of the report released by the National Science Foundation on Soviet Russia's successful and massive increase in the number of graduating engineers and scientists. The National Science Foundation suggests the serious implications for our Nation's military defense in the growing Russian advantage.

Mr. President, in an age when military power depends overwhelmingly on superiority in scientific technology, the safety of our Nation and the future of freedom will hinge on whether we can and will meet this Soviet challenge in scientific education.

For this reason, I was greatly heartened by the recognition of the importance of this increasing Soviet scientific advantage in President Kennedy's press conference of yesterday. His one announcement at that press conference was the citation of the National Science Foundation study of Russian education, to which the President added some chilling statistics on the sharp decline in the quantity of scientific education in this country in the last decade.

The decline in the number of United States scientific graduates is particularly alarming since it runs counter to the sharp rise in population and the tremendous increase in the demand for skilled and trained scientists. The President said that he was calling on his Science Advisory Committee for prompt recommendations to meet this challenge.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's announcement in this regard at his press conference of yesterday be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT. I have just one announcement. I am sure you are all familiar with the story in the morning paper of the documentation on the study of comparisons of those in our schools and universities and the kind of subjects which they study which was published by the National Science Foundation. This had been a matter of some concern to me for some time because one of the most critical problems facing this Nation is the inadequacy of the supply of scientific and technical manpower to satisfy the expanding requirements of this country's research and development efforts in the near future.

In 1951, our universities graduated 19,600 students in the physical sciences. In 1960, in spite of the substantial increase in our population, during the last 10 years, and in spite of the fact that the demand for people of skill in this field has tremendously increased with our efforts in defense and space industrial research, and all of the rest, in 1930, the number had fallen from 19,600 to 17,100. In 1951 there were 22,500 studying in the biological sciences. In 1960, there were only 16,700. In the field of engineering, enrollment rose from 232,000 to 269,000, in the period 1951 to 1957. Since 1957, there has been a continual decline in enrollment. Last year the figure was down to 240,000.

#### A MATTER OF GROWING CONCERN

This is a matter of growing concern. It is more than a matching of numerical supply to anticipate a demand, for this alone would be difficult. Because of the seriousness of this problem for the long-range future of the United States, I have asked my Science Advisory Committee, in cooperation with the Federal Council for Science and Technology, to review available studies and other perti-

nent information, and to report to me as quickly as possible on the specific measures that can be taken within and without the Government to develop the necessary and well-qualified scientists and engineers and technicians to meet our society's complex needs—governmental, educational and industrial.

In undertaking this task, the Committee will draw on the advice and assistance of individuals and agencies, including the National Academy of Sciences, which will shortly begin, at my request, a new study of scientific and technical manpower utilization.

To all those who may be within the sound of my voice or who may follow your stories in the papers, I want to emphasize the great new and exciting field of the sciences and while we wish to emphasize always the liberal arts, I do believe that these figures indicate a need on the national level and also a great opportunity for talented young men and women. I hope that their teachers and their school boards, and they, themselves, and their families, will give this matter consideration in developing their careers.

#### ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning in the departmental auditorium there was the ceremony for the annual awards program of the Civil Service Commission, and there was special recognition of the 79th anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act, which was signed on January 16, 1883. That was the formal establishment of the merit concept of Federal civil service employment.

For 79 years the civil service has based its merit program on the basic elements of confidence, stability, and equal opportunity. Equality of opportunity in the civil service is clearly defined as a right of all citizens of the United States, regardless of politics, religious belief, race, color, or creed. All are entitled to compete for such employment on the basis of their ability. It is this principle which makes our civil service representative of all the people in our country.

Mr. President, at this morning's ceremony, many of the outstanding Federal workers and civil service employees were presented with outstanding service awards, with pins in recognition of their service, which in some cases has extended for as long as 40 years. A very excellent program was arranged by the Commission.

The distinguished Vice President of the United States was the speaker on that occasion. He made a splendid address concerning the importance of the civil service system and the dependence of our Nation on these employees. I wish to read at this time several excerpts from his speech:

Certainly one of the great milestones in the development of our Government was the birth and growth of the civil service system.

Teddy Roosevelt was one of the earliest and most instrumental in making the system work. Maybe it was fitting that it took a Rough Rider to do it.

But Roosevelt knew that a civil service system was the heart of clean government. He said, "The merit system of making appointments is, in its essence, as democratic and American as the common school system itself."

Mr. President, the Vice President made some very excellent comments in regard to the work of our Civil Service employees. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, together with the forward in the program by the Civil Service Commission and the program itself.

There being no objection, the program and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY, THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, 1962

FOREWORD

To the Employees of the Civil Service Commission, 1962:

On the occasion of the 10th Annual Awards Ceremony, it is again our privilege to give public recognition to the achievements of the people who are the Civil Service Commission.

Since 1952, we have used the anniversary of the signing of the act which created the Commission and the Federal merit system, not only to honor those who have served the Commission and the Government in an outstanding and loyal manner, but also to rededicate ourselves to the tasks ahead. We are entering a period in our history that presents both unparalleled challenges and opportunities. We in the Commission are responsible for leading a most potent force, the Federal career service, to meet the challenges and to grasp the opportunities of the "sixties."

We express to you our heartfelt thanks for past accomplishments and urge your rededication to the tasks ahead.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,

Chairman.

FREDERICK J. LAWTON,

Commissioner.

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,

Commissioner.

PROGRAM

Tuesday, January 16, 1962, 10 a.m., the departmental auditorium

Master of ceremonies: Warren B. Irons, executive director.

Presentation of the colors: Color Guard, U.S. Marine Corps.

The national anthem: U.S. Marine Corps Band.

Greetings: John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman. Speaker: The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States.

Musical selection: U.S. Marine Corps Band, Lt. Col., Albert F. Schoepper, director.

Presentation of honor awards

Length of service: Executive Director Irons.

Special awards: Chairman Macy, Commissioner Lawton, Commissioner Hampton.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON DELIVERED AT THE CIVIL SERVICE AWARDS CEREMONY, 10 A.M. TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1962

It is a special pleasure for me to come down here and help you celebrate the 79th birthday of the Civil Service Act.

This is my first opportunity to visit you since my rating went up. Of course, it wasn't the rating that I'd applied for—but this is a common complaint which you in the service can understand.

You who have a front row seat on the "ins" and "outs" of government can appreciate the pitfalls of public service perhaps better than anyone else.

Recently during the State Department shakeup, I'm told that the standard instructions when you went out to lunch were: "If my boss calls while I'm out, be sure to get his name."

Certainly one of the great milestones in the development of our Government was the birth and growth of the civil service system.

Teddy Roosevelt was one of the earliest and most instrumental in making the system work. Maybe it was fitting that it took a rough rider to do it.

But Roosevelt knew that a civil service system was the heart of clean government. He said, "The merit system of making appointments is, in its essence, as democratic and American as the common school system itself."

I know that you get as annoyed as I do at those who make it a daily habit to complain about the bureaucrats. A distinguished diplomat once observed to me that a close investigation reveals it is the plutocrats who talk the most about the bureaucrats.

During the past year I have visited many lands. I have been in cities that were ancient even before the birth of Christ and in countries so new there has not been time to put them in a standard atlas.

And among the many things that stood out was the inescapable fact that in the modern world, no nation—new or old—can have unity and prosperity without a trained civil service.

To Americans, a trained and competent civil service has become a commonplace. We may grumble and grouse over reports about bureaucrats and inefficiency. We may growl over reports and rumors of allegedly plush-lined government jobs.

But in our heart of hearts, we know that our affairs are in good hands. We know that mistakes are ridiculously few in comparison to the tremendous job that is being done.

Therefore, it comes as something of a shock to visit a country where trained civil servants are virtually nonexistent.

A nation's people cannot be safeguarded against disease without trained public health officials. A nation's homes cannot be safeguarded against crime without trained civilian police. A nation's finances cannot be safeguarded against inflation or bankruptcy without trained clerks and economists.

And yet, there are nations in this world today who cannot find enough trained people to make even a beginning in the struggle to solve these problems.

In the past few years, many new nations have come into being. They have shaken off the shackles of the past and established their right to be treated with respect as independent countries.

Their independence was long overdue from a moral standpoint—and moral considerations must govern. But there would be nothing moral about closing our eyes to the fact that independence—to survive—requires the services of trained, professional administrators.

In many instances, the birth of these new nations was attended by struggle and turmoil. Some of these struggles are continuing. No one can be positive as to where or how they will end.

But we do know that a nation cannot sustain unity unless it meets its obligations to its own citizens. And this is the task of the professional administrator—the man or the woman who can make decisions on the merits and carry them out.

I am convinced that this is a factor which will have to play a larger role in our foreign aid programs. We must ship not just the materials that will raise their living standards and the technicians who know how to use them but the professional administrators who can help the governments set up a professional civil service.

This is not an easy matter to handle. In most of the underdeveloped nations, there is a suspicion of such actions which is understandable, however mistaken. It will

take years of patient work to erase that suspicion.

We have, of course, made many efforts to help other nations with their problems of day-to-day administration. But I believe those efforts will have to increase. And in the years that lie ahead, our trained civil service may become one of the most potent of our implements of foreign policy.

We are facing an exciting year. It will be a year of tremendous importance for Americans.

There are before us challenges and opportunities fantastic in size and complexity.

We must reshape our trade patterns so we can continue to compete in a world which is readying itself for a new economic giant—the European Common Market.

We must redouble our efforts to put on that extra burst of speed which will determine our standing in outer space.

We must be ready at all times for any new and unexpected challenges that may be hurled at us by world communism.

We must dedicate ourselves to maintaining—even at a sacrifice—the world organization which, however imperfect, holds forth the only hope for an orderly globe.

We must continue our attack upon the killing and crippling diseases with the hope that eventually we can eradicate these scourges of mankind.

We must devise new means to handle the periodic recessions which have weakened our economy.

And above all, we must continue our never-ending search for peace—honorable peace in which freemen can be secure.

None of these goals can be attained without you—the dedicated men and women of the civil service.

To you, all Americans owe their unity, their strength and their ability to maintain freedom in a world where freedom is gravely challenged. On behalf of all Americans, I thank you for your daily efforts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM—SUCCESS OR FAILURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the December 1, 1961, issue of Successful Farming published an article under the caption "Feed Grain Program: Success or Failure."

Mr. Richard R. Newberg and Marshall Burkes, of Ohio State University, went to the records and to the farmers of seven States for the answers.

All factors were objectively considered. The results are revealing.

Of particular interest is that part of the article dealing with "Intentions for Next Year," meaning the crop year of 1962. This article merits careful study, for it may be assumed that Congress will be dealing with the farm problem during the present session.

Hence I ask unanimous consent that the article in its entirety be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

## FEED GRAIN PROGRAM; SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

(By Richard R. Newberg and Marshall Burkes)

What happened in 1961: Corn production down 371 million bushels, grain sorghum production down 128 million. Program costs of reduction: \$1.50 per bushel. Farmers report costs down a little on participating farms, but returns are down more than cost reduction. Result, somewhat lower income. More fertilizer used on feed grains and heavier planting increased yields on farms: Major reasons for 1961 participation—to help surplus problem and fact that soil was too wet to plant corn on time.

What's ahead in 1962: Corn planting intentions up 6 to 8 million acres. Signers plan to retire 37 percent less acreage; 1961 nonparticipants do not intend to sign up for 1962. More fertilizer will be used. If crop year is normal, even with the program, production may be up 300 million bushels over 1961—and probably will equal or exceed 1960 output. Little change planned from this year's record soybean acreage. But, extremely low corn prices this year, high payments, or another wet spring could increase sign-up.

The 1961 emergency feed grain program's objectives were to: Reverse the rapid build-up of stocks, and to reduce Government costs. Now, at the end of the crop year, we have answers to two important questions: (1) What has been the effect on production and Government costs, and (2) what is likely to be the effect in 1962?

USDA crop reports show: First, under the 1961 program, payment was made for retirement of approximately 26 million acres from corn and grain sorghum production. However, the planted acreage of corn and grain sorghum actually is down only 17.5 million acres—that's a reduction in acreage of 20 percent.

The estimated reduction in corn production is 371 million bushels, a 9.5 percent decline from last year. The reduction in grain sorghum is 128 million bushels—a 21 percent production cut and an acreage reduction of 29 percent.

Here are acreage and production figures:

	Acreage planted (millions of acres)			Production (millions of bushels)		
	1960	1961	Change	1960	1961	Change
Corn.....	71.4	58.3	-13.1	3,891	3,520	-371
Grain sorghum.....	15.3	10.9	-4.4	608	480	-128
Oats.....	26.6	24.3	-2.3	1,151	994	-157
Barley.....	13.8	13.2	-.6	427	380	-47
Soybeans.....	18.0	23.6	+5.6	559	720	+161

Analysis: The higher price supports on soybeans were a major factor in the shift of land from feed grains, particularly oats, to soybean production. Result: An increase of 161 million bushels of soybeans.

Farmers reduced acreage of oats and barley—in addition, yields were down from last year. So output of these two crops was cut a total of about 13 percent. This cut combined with the 13.2 million ton (10 percent) reduction in grain sorghum and corn gives a total reduction of approximately 17 million tons—or 11 percent in all feed grains.

However, when you add the increased soybean meal production, the total cut in feed output is only about 13 million tons. And the real reduction is somewhat less because soybean meal has more feed value per pound than barley, oats, corn, or grain sorghum.

What about cost? Figuring the feed grain crop at \$40 per ton and soybeans at \$2.25 a bushel, the value of the total reduction of corn is \$416 million; of grain sorghum \$128 million. The value of the reduction of barley and oats is \$144 million.

However, partly offsetting this reduction is an increase of \$362 million in soybean pro-

duction (much of which is likely to end up in Government storage bins).

Thus, the total U.S. net reduction in these important Corn Belt crops which are directly affected by the emergency feed grain program is approximately \$326 million. The estimated Government costs of the program is \$750 million. For corn and grain sorghum alone, this is a cost of almost \$1.50 for each dollar reduction in output. When barley, oats, and soybeans are included, it is a cost of over \$2 for each \$1 cut in output.

What farmers told us: Why did production remain so large despite the Government's paying for retirement of 26 million acres? We went to farmers for answers—interviews were made in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Ohio. Both people who signed up in the program and those who didn't were checked. We collected information on acreages planted to principal crops, fertilizer application, planting rates, and other factors affecting yields. Reasons for going into the program and future prospects also were determined both for farmers who participated and for those who did not.

Results show: Among farmers who signed up, the reduction in corn acreage from last year averaged about 80 percent as much as the amount of land put into the program.

A large number of the farmers participating had a corn or sorghum base considerably higher than last year's planted acreage. Of course, there were some farmers with allotments lower than 1960 production. But the acreage on which payments were made under the program was considerably higher than the actual reduction in planted acres from last year. This was true even though many farmers reduced acreage well below the amount they signed up either because of their rotation pattern, or because the land was too wet to plant this spring. Of course, a lot of farmers indicated they went into the program because it was difficult to get into their fields this spring.

We found that many farmers who didn't sign up in the program actually reduced corn acreage from last year. Often these acres were put into soil-conserving uses and the farmers could have qualified for payment but, as a matter of principle, refused to accept the payments.

On the average, nonparticipating farmers increased their acreage of corn over last year—increase in corn acreage averaged 8.4 percent for those interviewed. A common reason for increasing corn acreage was the uncertainty of corn supplies and prices of livestock feed this fall.

Average corn yields are up—approximately 6 bushels over 1960, according to Government crop reports. The good growing weather, particularly late last summer, is credited with being the major factor.

To determine how much of the difference was due to the weather—and how much was due to improved production practices encouraged by acreage limitations and higher supports—farmers were asked what changes they had made. The results show that almost all of the farmers had made some yield-increasing production changes.

Increase in fertilizer application was most common. The average increase was much above annual increases in past years. Fertilizer on corn was up approximately 17 pounds per acre, with nitrogen increased most. Nonparticipating farmers used slightly more fertilizer than participating farmers. Based on expected yield responses, the effect of the greater rate of fertilizer use was to increase yields between 3 and 4 bushels per acre.

Other practices: In addition, many farmers increased their planting rates and improved their methods of working their corn land.

Relative quality of land retired and land put into corn was compared. The average

difference in land quality of retired acreage and land planted to corn was determined to be slightly over 4 bushels per acre, although many farmers said the yield would be about the same on the land retired as on land planted to corn.

Thus, adding the effects of increased fertilizer, increased planting rate, and the retirement of poor land, the total effect was to increase the yield of corn on land in the program by slightly over 5 bushels per acre. For nonparticipants, the average increase in yield attributed to more fertilizer and some increase in planting rate is slightly over 4 bushels per acre.

The emergency feed grain program has not achieved administration goals. The program has tended to stimulate adoption of yield-increasing practices which will be continued and even expanded next year. This situation, along with the expected reduction in participation for next year, promises to result in another huge corn crop. We must look for alternatives for solving this problem.

Intentions for next year are even more significant. Once farmers establish an improved practice—such as additional fertilizer—which brings better yields, they do not go back to old methods. Farmers interviewed indicated they intend to continue the yield-increasing practices—and they intend to step up the fertilizer applications next year. In a few cases, farmers who had never used fertilizer before used it this year and plan to use more next year with heavier planting rates.

Acreage changes planned for next year are most significant. Nonparticipants plan a 2-percent increase in acreage for next year. Participants plan a 20-percent increase in corn acreage.

Given the same program with the same payment rates, very few of the farmers who didn't sign up this year intend to do so next year. But, quite a few of the farmers who signed up this year do not intend to next year. Further, many farmers who put maximum acreage in the program intend to put in much lesser amounts next year.

Only a very few of the farmers interviewed indicated they would put in more than the minimum of 20 percent to qualify for price supports.

Therefore, it is indicated that there will be 35-40 percent less acreage retired if the same program is provided in 1962. Thus, we can expect an increase of 6 to 8 million acres of corn over this year with a total production of approximately 3.9 billion bushels, providing the crop year is about as good as in 1960 and not quite as good as in 1961. This is slightly more than the 1960 output.

With a corn year similar to this year, the expected effect would be an increase in production of about 400 million bushels over 1961. Indications are that farmers will plant more grain sorghum but about the same acreage of soybeans, oats, and barley next year.

Farmers were asked what they want. They were asked why they went into the program this year and what changes they think should be made in 1962. The most common reason for participation was to help with the surplus problem or to reduce the high cost of Government storage. Second in importance was the weather or inability to get into the fields. Third was expected reductions in costs of farm operation.

When asked what effect the program has had on their income for this year, most of the farmers said that it had no effect or that it had decreased their income—because they had not managed to achieve the reduction in cost which they had anticipated or that they could have made more from their land by cropping it.

For the next year, most of the farmers want higher payments on their land specifically, or they feel that there is need for

greater equity both in terms of the allotment for corn acreage basis and in payment rates.

Of course, a large number of farmers who have not participated recommended that the program be done away with entirely and that we return to the free market.

Some farmers want complete control over all phases of agricultural production, a view which the USDA officials appear to share. Others want a complete return to the free market and abandonment of any form of government control or supports. However, the majority of farmers appear to prefer something other than either of these extremes.

### THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since the canalization of the Illinois River by widening and deepening, so as to admit barge traffic, there has been a steady growth in travel on the Illinois River over a period of time. An estimate has been made that as of 1961 total barge tonnage was more than 26 million. It is estimated also that in calendar year 1962 that tonnage will be exceeded.

In this connection, Mr. President, a rather interesting article was published in the Daily Republican Times of Ottawa, Ill., dated December 30, 1961, under the caption "Waterway Is Major Artery." I believe this article merits wider circulation, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM STEEL TO PEANUTS—WATERWAY IS MAJOR ARTERY—TONNAGE HITS 26 MILLION—SEE RECORD DURING 1962

Do you like peanuts? As many as 500 tons per week, maybe? Peanuts in that quantity were one of the many cargoes shipped through La Salle County in 1961 via one of the Midwest's greatest commercial routes, the Illinois Waterway.

Altogether, more than 26 million tons of coal, petroleum products, grain, sand and gravel, sulfur, iron, and other products passed through this important link between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River in 1961.

Waterway officials report that tonnage for the year was down from 3 to 5 percent from the total shipped in 1960, but predict that shipping in 1962 may rise to a new record of 27 million tons.

The waterway is a key factor in the economy of both Illinois and La Salle County.

Manufacturers in the county receive many of their raw materials via the waterway, and much of the grain harvested here is shipped via the river. For thousands of private citizens, the waterway is a recreational area for the operation of a growing number of pleasure boats.

Two of the seven locks of the Illinois Waterway system, which maintain the river at navigable depths with their dams, are located in La Salle County—at Marseilles and Starved Rock. Other locks of the system are at Lockport, Brandon, Dresden Island, Peoria and La Grange.

The beginnings of the present waterway system go back to 1900 when a navigable canal was constructed along the northeast end of the former Illinois-Michigan Canal to provide sanitary drainage for Chicago.

In 1908 the people of the State voted a \$20 million bond issue to complete canalization of the waterway from the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal to Utica, and the Federal Government assumed jurisdiction of the partially completed improvements in 1930.

Since the waterway was completed in 1933, it has been operated and maintained by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. The Peoria and La Grange locks and dams were added from 1936 to 1938, to replace four outmoded locks in that section of the river.

A traffic on the 327-mile water route continues to grow, new locks will be needed in the future. It is estimated the Lockport and Brandon Roads locks will reach their practical capacity by 1968, Marseilles by 1970, Dresden Island by 1972 and Starved Rock, Peoria and La Grange by 1977. Congress has authorized the project of building additional locks at the present sites as the need arises, and a cost estimate of \$115 million has been set.

Most of the cargo coming upriver goes to industrial plants and services in the Chicago area, but waterway officials report an increasing amount of industry is "springing up" all along the river.

In La Salle County, production cutbacks at Libbey-Owens-Ford (shipment of coal down to 1,200 tons per week) and some other firms have largely been offset by waterway shipments of raw materials to such new plants as the National Phosphate Co. near Marseilles.

At present Libbey-Owens-Ford is using about 85,000 tons of coal and 10,800 tons of soda ash per year, and plant officials foresee no increase in the coming year. The company formerly used about twice the above amount of raw materials, according to Assistant Plant Manager Al Guthrie.

Officials at National Phosphate report that when their plant is in full operation, it will require raw materials (phosphate rock from the South and liquid sulfur from the Texas gulf) totaling approximately 1,500 tons per day.

Coal, sand and gravel, sulfur, fuel oil, and salt, are the major waterway imports of the county, and its major export is grain.

Although shipments of corn and soybeans from the county have shown a steady growth, they were down slightly in 1961 due to poor harvesting conditions. Grain elevator operators report that most grain is shipped in October and November and at the beginning of each new tax year.

While most soybeans are now being shipped to Chicago for processing or shipments overseas via the St. Lawrence Seaway, corn goes both north and south. Large shipments are made annually to New Orleans and Vicksburg, Miss.

At the peak of the harvest season, each of the grain elevators located along the river may ship one to three 50,000-bushel barges per week. Much of the corn is presently going to cattle and poultry feeders in Southern States, they report.

In November of 1961, 74,900 tons of grain passed north through the Starved Rock lock.

As commercial shipping grows, the number of private pleasure boats on the river is also growing. Because many of the boats remain in one stretch of the river, their traffic accounts for only about 7 percent of more than 6,300 lockages each made during 1961 at the Marseilles and Starved Rock locks.

Registration of private boats for the State is incomplete, but officials estimate that about 130,000 are presently in use in State lakes and streams. Numbers of the larger boats pass through La Salle County en route to the Mississippi, headed south for the winter. Sale of private boats in the county is a thriving business, although 1961 was economically a slack year in the county.

Forty-eight employees maintain and operate the county's two locks and dams.

Lockmasters report that the number of lockages in 1961 didn't differ much from the previous year, but that tugs were pushing larger tows of an additional three or four barges.

This growth requires double lockages due to the limited length of the locks and re-

quires more time than a straight lockage or jackknife lockage. A double lockage may require 1½ hours to pass the tug and all barges through.

Traffic up and downstream is controlled by the lockmaster via radio, which all tugs and many private boats now have.

The most recent improvement in the lock system in La Salle County is at Starved Rock where a row of four new protection piers keep tows away from the dam and help guide them into the lock. In the unending task of keeping traffic channels open to a minimum depth of 9 feet, the Corps of Engineers also spent 2 months dredging the river through the county in 1961.

Some 200 tugs ply the river each year, pushing tows which range through coal, iron ore, imported goods, heavy manufactured goods and many other items. About 35 companies have tugs in regular operation on the waterway throughout the year.

Traffic churns through the waterway in all seasons and weather. Although it isn't much of a problem on the open river, ice formed in extremely cold periods may cut the locks effectiveness in half for a few weeks, permitting passages only one barge wide. Although ice doesn't stop the tows, it may slow their speed considerably at times, lockmasters report.

An average of 80 barges pass through each of the locks in La Salle county daily. Some of these are empty of cargo, as 75 percent of the total cargo load goes upriver to Chicago or Indiana ports (via the Calumet-Sag Channel).

Although many cargoes are seasonal, others such as coal are year round. Coal is the most prominent cargo, coming from mines in southern Illinois. For the Marseilles-Starved Rock locks during the past year, cargoes in order of prominence were coal, petroleum products, miscellaneous cargoes, grain, iron and steel manufactures, sulphur, sand and gravel and scrap iron and steel.

Liquid sulphur is a newcomer to the waterway scene, and of growing importance. It must be shipped in special heated barges. Another new cargo coming into prominence is high grade iron ore shipped from deposits in South America to northern steel mills.

As population and commerce along the waterway continue to grow, the value of cargo shipped on the Illinois Waterway is approaching the half-billion-dollar mark, and that ain't (according to the new Webster) peanuts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

### STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the anti-trust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, prior to any discussion on the bill before the Senate, I discussed with the distinguished majority leader the question of the recess in the Lincoln period, and he has come to some conclusion thereon in which I concur. I believe if he made a statement on it now it would be helpful to all Senators in making up their calendars for February.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, and following the usual custom, precedent, and tradition covering the birthday of one of our great Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, I wish to announce to the Senate that there will be no votes from the 9th to the 13th of February inclusive, and, if at all possible—but this is not a firm commitment—we shall try to see to it that there will be no votes on either the 8th or 14th of February. However, Senators should be on notice that there may be votes on the 8th or 14th of February. So far as the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of February are concerned, Senators are at liberty to fulfill Lincoln Day commitments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further question to address to the distinguished majority leader.

I understand that probably this morning a conference was held—I may be in error on that—to make a further determination as to major proposed legislation which will be coming before the Senate after we dispose of the unfinished business. I thought perhaps the majority leader might at this time wish to make an observation in that regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is not much I can say as yet, because there will be a meeting of the Policy Committee shortly. Tentatively it is the leadership's suggestion that on the 29th of this month the higher education bill be considered.

It is anticipated that the Du Pont bill, now before the Senate, will consume some days of debate still, and that following, between then and the calling up of the higher education bill, we shall attend to other items on the Calendar, on which individual Senators have asked that they be notified and on which there may well be a degree of debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader. I suggest that perhaps later in the day, if there are any further observations he can make for the guidance of the Senate, we should appreciate it manifestly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall do my best.

## STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the anti-trust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the big question involved in the Du Pont tax bill is not how much taxes will be paid, or which particular taxpayers will pay them, but whether the Du Pont control of General Motors and its monopoly control of General Motors purchases of fabrics and finishes, found by the Supreme Court to be a violation of the antitrust law, will be broken or will be continued. Though the tax consequences of the pending bill are important—and I shall discuss them in due course—I wish first to define the antimonopoly issue which I think looms in paramount importance.

With the disturbing number of mergers and the increasing instances of big corporations acquiring the assets of one competitor after another, our attention has perhaps been diverted from another form of external corporate expansion which, from an economic point of view, and effective monopolistic practices, is of equal and, in some cases, perhaps of even greater significance. I refer to the buying of a minority, though substantial, stock interest in other large concerns by one particularly large and powerful corporation, together with affiliated and interlocked corporate entities, persons and personal holding companies. When such a cohesive interest group reaches the importance and power of the Du Pont corporate complex, the economic consequences are compounded.

In studies and investigations conducted by the U.S. Government in 1947, 1948, and 1949, the Du Pont Co. and its interlocked structure of giant corporations, stock holdings, affiliates and affinities, was found to constitute such a complex.

Thereupon, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department under the Truman administration filed an antitrust action against the Du Pont Co., the Christiana Corp., Delaware Realty Corp., and other corporate entities and persons. The prosecution of the suit was continued for 8 years by the Eisenhower administration and two Supreme Court decisions holding Du Pont to be in violation of the Antitrust Act were won. This, in my view, was the most important antitrust court victory in the history of our country. Initiated, as I said, in the Truman administration, it was prosecuted successfully during the Eisenhower administration.

But now I am apprehensive that it is about to be aborted by this bill during the first year of the Kennedy administration.

I think this would be a sorry political story. But politics is not the most important question, no more than the tax consequence is the most important question. The great importance of this issue lies in the success or failure of the anti-monopoly action.

The Federal Trade Commission conducted a study of intercorporate relationships. A report was made to the Federal Trade Commission, and it was printed by the Federal Trade Commission. I have tried repeatedly, but thus far unsuccessfully, to obtain public release of the report. The report is entitled "The Du Pont Complex." I have written the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission two letters. I have talked with him by telephone. I visited with him twice. My staff assistants have talked with him several times. Yet the report which has been given to me, marked "confidential," has not yet been released. The latest letter I have from Mr. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, is dated January 15, 1962. In that letter he quotes the law which he and the Commission believe restricts the publication of the report. I read the concluding paragraphs of the letter:

Under the circumstances, the Commission in its meeting this morning concluded that it could not take the responsibility for divulging names of customers from this report at this time.

It was the decision of the Commission, however, that you could make any use of the report that you saw fit so long as you did not make public the names of the customers contained in the report.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Respectfully,

PAUL RAND DIXON,  
Chairman.

I shall comply with that injunction. At first I was tempted to use the rules of the Senate, which provide a way for a Senator to discuss with his colleagues confidential information. However, since Mr. Dixon has gone so far as to make it possible for me to use this report in any way I see fit, other than to disclose the names of the customers, which in this case are customers of the Du Pont Co. and its affiliates, I shall not go so far as to move that the galleries be cleared and the doors closed.

I should like to say, however, that the identity of these customers, the trade relationships, the contractual relationships, and practices, whether evidenced by written contracts or not, constitute an important part of the study entitled "The Du Pont Complex."

I should like to read briefly from a portion of the report which does not divulge the names of customers, I read:

In two recent reports the Federal Trade Commission has examined the problem of the external expansion of business—the buying up by one company of the stock or assets of another. In these reports attention was focused upon those forms of external expansion which result in the complete, or virtually complete, disappearance of the company whose stock or assets were acquired. With few exceptions these reports dealt with cases in which a majority control of stock was acquired or all of the assets were merged.

There are, however, other forms of external expansion. One of the most significant

of these, from an economic point of view, is the form in which one large company buys a minority, though substantial, interest in another large concern. The importance of the problem becomes compounded when the acquiring firm obtains such interests in a number of large corporations, binding them together into a loosely held but nonetheless cohesive interest group or complex of corporate power.

Mr. President, I call attention to the following sentence, because it has particular bearing upon the bill pending before the Senate:

The firm of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., constitutes the center of such a complex, and thus provides an excellent opportunity to study this form of external expansion.

This report presents an analysis of the Du Pont complex.

I digress again to express regret that the Federal Trade Commission has not found a way to make public this very significant report on the Du Pont complex. I continue to read:

In this complex are to be found some of the largest corporations in American industry, representing a tremendous aggregation of economic power. The complex evolved as a dominant factor in the period between World Wars I and II and during those years it became not only a great power in U.S. industry but also an important participant in international cartel affairs. The genesis of the complex and its corporate composition are examined. The economic ties which unite the complex are explored. And finally, the impact of this complex upon competitive markets is studied.

Briefly, the report reveals the existence of a system of preempted, closed markets of significance to all business units seeking to engage in the manufacture and sale of the same or competing products.

It reveals the apparent existence of a division of markets between large sellers and large buyers for a number of important products. The report points out that such preemption and division of markets weakens the competitive position and the investment potential of the smaller independent concern. And finally, it describes the way in which other large firms outside of the complex, whose activities impinge upon a member of the group, accommodate themselves to the power of the complex.

I believe that the following two sentences are particularly important and deserve emphasis. Therefore, I will read them, and then reread them:

Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group" or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

For emphasis, I reread this paragraph:

Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group," or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free competitive economy is to be maintained.

This Federal Trade Commission report entitled "The Du Pont Complex" goes to the very heart of the principal issue involved in the pending bill. That issue, let me repeat, is not how much taxes will be paid, or which particular taxpayers will pay them, important as these questions are, but rather whether the monopoly control of the Du Pont complex over

General Motors and its purchases of automobile finishes and fabrics will be broken or will be continued.

I think I may say, without divulging the names of companies or customers, that the report reveals that the Du Pont complex has exercised control over purchases by General Motors of the glass for the windshields and doors of General Motors automobiles, and of the tires for General Motors cars. Indeed, because another corporation which Du Pont controls manufactures a certain element which makes gasoline allegedly more high powered and antiknock, we find that General Motors automobiles are made to use gasoline which has an additive of tetraethyl lead. This product is furnished by a particular company which constitutes a part of the Du Pont complex.

I wish that all Members of the Senate could take the time to come by my desk and read this report. It has been in existence quite a long while, and the studies concurrent with it form the foundation of the antitrust suit which was filed against Du Pont and other defendants previously identified.

Because the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] have entered the Chamber since I read from the report entitled "The Du Pont Complex," I should like to reread, for their benefit, the last paragraph which I read to the Senate with emphasis:

Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the "interest group" or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

I have proposed to show that the purpose and the effect of the pending bill is expected to be, and I fear will be, a continuation of this monopoly control by a small group of people over this giant industrial complex, a problem the solution of which the Federal Trade Commission says is important if a free competitive economy is to be maintained.

I believe in free enterprise. I believe in our competitive capitalistic system. Let me say to my friends, the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Delaware, who I believe are the two principal proponents of the bill in the Senate, that one of the great dangers to our free enterprise system—indeed, the greatest danger, in my opinion—is the monopolistic concentration of power in the hands of a few, the big and the mighty, thereby stifling and choking the energies of the many, the small, the new, and the ambitious, setting underway emotions and sentiments which might rise to such a tide that they would be irresistible.

I suggest to Senators that they, as I have done, write to the Federal Trade Commission and secure for themselves a copy of the report "The Du Pont Complex."

A few moments ago I said that this study was made concurrently with and perhaps as a part of the governmental studies and investigations which led to the filing of the antitrust monopoly action against the Du Pont Co., Christi-

ana Corp., and other corporate entities and persons. I should like to read from the original bill of complaint filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. I read from page 10, item 18, of the complaint:

18. Du Pont Co., General Motors, and U.S. Rubber together constitute the largest combination of manufacturing enterprises in the United States. For the year 1947, the assets, sales volume and net income after taxes of the defendant manufacturers were as follows:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Assets	Sales (round numbers)	Net income after taxes (round numbers)
Du Pont.....	1,438	783	120
General Motors.....	2,473	3,815	288
U.S. Rubber.....	348	581	21
Total.....	4,259	5,189	429

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now read a portion of article 20:

The Du Pont Co. produces many products which are used in the operations of other defendant manufacturers. General Motors and U.S. Rubber constitute a substantial market for many of such products produced by Du Pont Co.

ART. 24. There are numerous manufacturers, other than the defendant manufacturers, located in various parts of the United States, which manufacture and sell products of substantially the same type, kind, and quality as the products manufactured and sold by the defendant manufacturers, and but for the combination and conspiracy alleged hereinafter these other manufacturers would be able to offer their products competitively to the manufacturing defendants having need for them. In addition, the potential market in which these other manufacturing companies may compete generally has been restricted substantially by the nature and the magnitude of the growth of the defendant manufacturers, and the ability of said other manufacturing companies to compete effectively has been substantially impaired by the illegal means hereinafter alleged.

I read now briefly from article 30:

The aforesaid combination and conspiracy to restrain interstate trade and commerce and to monopolize a substantial part thereof, has consisted of a continuing agreement and concert of action among the defendants, the substantial terms of which have been that defendants:

(a) Agree to acquire, hold and perpetuate control by the defendant individuals and class defendants of the directors, executives, and corporate policy of each of the corporate defendants:

(1) By establishing Christiana and Delaware as personal holding companies, a majority of the outstanding voting stock of which would be held by the defendant individuals and class defendants and their families in perpetuity and voted by them;

Mr. President, I digress from reading the text of the original complaint, to say that yesterday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that the antitrust issue had been settled, all that remained was the passage of a tax bill. But, Mr.

President, nothing could be farther from the truth. I am confident that my friends and colleagues so understand it, or else they would not have so stated it; but that does not comport with the facts. Indeed, a lawyer for the Du Pont Co. was quoted yesterday, in Chicago, in appearing before the district court, as saying—and that statement was read into the RECORD, yesterday—that the one remaining issue was the ordered action of the Christiana Corp., whether the divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont to Christiana is to be ordered; and if that is ordered, whether Christiana shall be required to divest; and, if so, by sale or by pass-through to Christiana's shareholders.

Mr. President, that is the antitrust issue; it is the antimonopoly issue. An attempt to arrive at a legislative solution of that issue, is, in my humble opinion, the principal motivation for this bill—not perhaps by my two colleagues in the Senate, neither of whom wrote this bill, in my opinion; not by the staff of the Senate Finance Committee, which in my opinion did not write this bill; not by the Government of the United States, which so far as I know did not submit this bill.

Who wrote the bill? Devious and technical as its terms are, I cannot provide the answer, nor has the answer been given on the floor of the Senate.

Ah, Mr. President, the antimonopoly question has not been settled. It is pending now in the court in Chicago. Yet we are asked to provide today, here in the Senate, a solution, by means of legislation.

Mr. President, the statements made by some of my colleagues; namely, that the antimonopoly question had been settled, that the antitrust issue had been settled—are not the only such statements which have been made. In a brochure sent by the Du Pont Co. to newspaper editors and reporters across the country, I find the following statement:

Since the Supreme Court has directed Du Pont to divest its 63 million shares, the basic antitrust aspects of the litigation are settled.

Mr. President, that is not a correct statement—as my colleague, the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asserted yesterday, and knows perfectly well, and as the lawyers for the Du Pont Co. said yesterday before the court in Chicago—if the statement read into the RECORD of the Senate's proceedings yesterday was correct. The remaining issue is the important antitrust issue involved in this entire question, which has been before the courts for 13 years, and for which, so the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday said, this bill will provide an "equitable solution."

Why should Congress legislate a Du Pont Co. victory? The Du Pont Co. has lost the case in the courts, and now comes to the Congress, in an attempt to win it. Mr. President, this is the next to the last foxhole. If the Senate were to pass the bill, only one more step would be necessary; namely, approval of the bill by the President.

I have said before that the Du Pont Co. has conducted a campaign of misinformation and deception. I read now a statement issued to all the editors of the newspapers of our country; namely, that "the basic antitrust aspects of the litigation are settled." But, Mr. President, what is the contest now before the court in Chicago about? What is it that is unsettled out there? It is not a question of a tax rate. That question is not before the court. It is not a question of legislative enactment that is before the court—at least not officially. The question is enforcement of the antitrust law. The question is whether the order of the trial court to which this issue has been remanded by the Supreme Court, for entry of an appropriate order to effectuate the order and decree of the Supreme Court, shall require sale of General Motors stock before it reaches Christiana Corp., or, if it reaches Christiana Corp., whether it shall require divestiture by Christiana Corp., and if so, whether by sale or distribution to stockholders.

Mr. President, I was complimented yesterday as being capable of lucidity in statement. I appreciate that generosity. I hope the statement I have just made is lucid. I am confident that it is correct. And this goes to the heart of the issue, not only before the courts, but the issue for which this bill, it is said, will provide an "equitable solution."

Yes, not only has an attempt been made to mislead the thousands of stockholders, many of whom have written Senators because they have been misled, but here I have read a patent attempt to mislead the newspaper editors of the country.

I should like to return now to read further from the original complaint with respect to the Christiana Corp. I am reading now from page 16 of the original complaint before the Federal district court in Chicago:

(2) By utilizing Christiana and Delaware to acquire sufficient of the common stock of Du Pont Co. to control it, and to hold such stock in perpetuity, and to vote it;

(3) By causing Du Pont Co. to acquire sufficient of the common stock of General Motors to control it, to hold such stock in perpetuity, and to vote it;

(4) By causing the defendant individuals and certain of the class defendants to acquire sufficient of the common stock of U.S. Rubber to control it, to hold such stock in perpetuity for themselves and their families, and to vote it;

(b) Agree to utilize control of the defendant manufacturers to enhance the size, power, and market control of each of them at the expense of its competitors:

(1) By causing each defendant manufacturer which uses products produced by one or more of the other defendant manufacturers to purchase substantially all of its requirements of such products from such other defendant manufacturers, and to exclude competitors of such other defendant manufacturers from the opportunity of competing freely for such business;

(2) By causing Du Pont Co. to expand its production facilities, through acquisitions and otherwise, so as to enable it to produce the types and quantities of products in the chemical and related fields which are used in substantial quantities by the other defendant manufacturers;

(3) By causing General Motors and U.S. Rubber to expand in their respective exist-

ing fields, and into new fields, through acquisitions and otherwise, so as to enlarge the closed and noncompetitive market available to Du Pont Co. for products sold by it to General Motors and U.S. Rubber, and to increase the profits available to Du Pont Co. from its ownership of General Motors stock;

(4) By subsidizing the expansion of Du Pont Co. by using for such purpose the profits derived by it from the sale of its products on a closed market basis to General Motors and U.S. Rubber, as well as the profits derived by Du Pont Co. from its ownership of General Motors stock;

(5) By subsidizing the expansion of General Motors by causing Du Pont Co. and U.S. Rubber to grant General Motors systematic secret rebates and preferential prices on certain of the products sold to General Motors on a closed market basis by Du Pont Co. and U.S. Rubber, and selling such products at higher prices to customers of Du Pont and U.S. Rubber other than General Motors;

(6) By subsidizing the expansion of U.S. Rubber by using for such purpose the profits derived by it from the sale of its products on a closed market basis to General Motors and Du Pont Co.;

(7) By inducing suppliers of each defendant manufacturer to purchase products on a basis of reciprocity from one or more of the other defendant manufacturers, and to refrain from purchasing such products from competitors of such other defendant manufacturers;

I digress to say, Mr. President, that this is a very strong complaint. The Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice has been fortunate to have some brilliant young attorneys, dedicated to the public welfare. This was true during the administrations of former President Truman and former President Eisenhower, and it is true now.

I should like to read further from the original complaint. I am reading now from page 18:

(8) By causing each defendant manufacturer to make patents, technical data, and trade information obtained by any one defendant manufacturer, available to the other defendant manufacturers on an exclusive or preferential basis;

Mr. President, this is a graphic description of how the whole Du Pont complex is controlled by a few. Control of the Du Pont Co. is vested in the Christiana Corp., which in turn is controlled through 80-percent ownership by a relatively few members of the Du Pont family. Thus we see that the heart and core of this antitrust problem rests with the treatment of the General Motors stock as and after it is divested by the Du Pont Co.

Will a large block of it go to Christiana, which has been the mainspring in this monopoly? If so, will this large block then go to the few members of the Du Pont family, the seat of the control of this entire monopoly?

In fact, according to the most recent records I have been able to obtain, the Du Pont family rather than the Du Pont Co. exercises control of United States Rubber, yet this bill would pave the way for a pass-through of General Motors stock to the Du Pont family, which controls United States Rubber. If such a pass-through is made possible or comes about as a result of enactment of the pending bill, we have the statement of Mr. Robert Kennedy, Attorney General

of the United States, that this would enable the Du Pont family to exercise effective control of both General Motors and the Du Pont corporation.

How would this bring about an equitable solution to the judicial proceedings? Where are the interests of the people in such a solution? Where are those who are concerned about small business? Where are those who make Fourth of July speeches about the octopus of monopoly controls? I urge them to come to the floor of the Senate and to defend the rights of the people, to protect the free enterprise system from the biggest monopolistic complex in the world today.

I read again from the original complaint:

(c) Agree to utilize control of the defendant manufacturers to eliminate competition among themselves:

(1) By causing General Motors to refrain from entering into chemical manufacturing fields, including the manufacture of paints, varnishes, and related products, and to grant Du Pont Co. exclusive production rights in chemical discoveries made by General Motors;

(2) By causing General Motors to refrain from manufacturing tires and tubes;

(3) By causing United States Rubber to refrain from expanding its operations into chemical and related fields in which Du Pont Co. operates, or into fields in which General Motors operates.

31. During the period of time covered by this complaint and for the purpose of forming and effectuating the aforesaid combination and conspiracy, the defendants by agreement and concerted action have done the things which, as hereinbefore alleged, they conspired to do, and more particularly, have done, among others, the following acts and things.

Then there follows in this complaint, Mr. President, a long list of acts, some of which the Supreme Court finally held constituted a violation of the antitrust laws.

In that connection, a great deal has been said about everybody being innocent in this whole proceeding. One would gather from the propaganda which the Du Pont Co. has disseminated that everybody has been innocent in this; that nobody had intended to set up a monopoly; that this all happened by accident, by some peculiar quirk of fate; that the Du Pont complex came into being perhaps with a flash of lightning, with no intent involved, with no intent to restrain trade, with no covert deals made to segregate markets or to squelch competition.

I shall read what the Supreme Court said:

The fact that sticks out—

Mr. President, that is rather unusual language for the Supreme Court to use, it seems to me, but it is graphic.

The fact that sticks out in this voluminous record is that the bulk of Du Pont's production has always supplied the largest part of the requirements of the one customer in the automobile industry connected to Du Pont by a stock interest. The inference is overwhelming that Du Pont's commanding position was promoted by its stock interest and was not gained solely on competitive merit.

Where are those Senators who are always making good speeches at chamber of commerce meetings about our great

American competitive system? Why are they not here trying to protect that American free enterprise system? Perhaps they will be before the debate ends, because I intend to do everything within my power, everything of which I am capable, to drive home to the Senate and to the country the central issue involved in the bill, which is whether this monopoly of the Du Pont complex will be broken or will be continued.

Then let us take a vote, and the American people can see and read and know, not only this year but also in years to come, who is on the side of this giant corporate complex which has been held by the Supreme Court to have violated the antitrust laws and who is on the side of the free enterprise system, the American system, which I think has brought the greatest measure of blessing to and offers the greatest hope for the American people.

I agree with the statement in the report of the Federal Trade Commission:

Of all the problems involved in the concentration of economic power, none is more difficult of solution than this problem of the interest group or complex of giant corporations. Yet none is more important of solution if a free, competitive economy is to be maintained.

I wish to read further from the Supreme Court decision:

We agree with the trial court that considerations of price, quality, and service were not overlooked by either Du Pont or General Motors. Pride in its products and its high financial stake in General Motors' success would naturally lead Du Pont to try to supply the best. But the wisdom of this business judgment cannot obscure the fact, plainly revealed by the record, that Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

So the Supreme Court does not say that this happened by accident. The Supreme Court does not agree with those who say that this great corporate complex came as manna fallen from heaven. The Supreme Court said:

Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as a primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

The report of the Federal Trade Commission to which I have referred shows in detail how the company has done the same thing with relation to glass and tires.

In addition, the other day I read some statistics that showed that, at least at the time those statistics were printed, the Du Pont Co. was the largest stockholder of one of our large oil companies. Though some may think that the action by which the Du Pont Co. was created was taken for investment purposes only, I, along with members of my staff, have taken pains to inquire a little deeper into the subject. Two brilliant young men of my staff, William G. Allen and Andrew G. Lynch, spent a good portion of several months, and I have spent a good portion of several months digging into the issue before the Senate, an issue which is so blandly dismissed as an "equitable solution,"

legislatively ordered, of an antitrust problem that has been fought in the court for 13 years.

I have found a statement of the treasurer of the Du Pont Co. made at the time Du Pont decided to purchase General Motors stock:

The recommendation to make an investment in the motor industry may come as quite a shock to many of our directors at first, due to lack of full understanding of the opportunity offered and its relation to other opportunities that may present themselves from time to time.

A comment of Mr. Irene du Pont on acquisition was as follows:

This investment was made on the invitation of Mr. W. C. Durant, founder of the General Motors Corp., and a condition imposed and agreed to by the Du Pont Co. was that the Du Pont Co. would assume responsibility for the financial policies of the General Motors Corp. and that Mr. Durant would assume responsibility for operations. Accordingly, the board of directors of the General Motors Corp. created a finance committee composed chiefly of Du Pont men and Mr. Durant and this committee was placed in complete charge of the financial affairs of the corporation. An executive committee was also created with Mr. Durant as chairman and this committee was placed in entire charge of the operating policies of the corporation.

I read another statement by the treasurer of the Du Pont Co.:

Our interest in the General Motors Co. will undoubtedly secure for us the entire Fabrikoid, Pyralin, paint, and varnish business of those companies, which is a substantial factor.

As I understand the record, Du Pont was in the process of acquiring the two companies named, together with five additional companies.

Also, the treasurer said that Du Pont would "share in the profits of the industry to an extent equal to 120 percent of our investment, and will receive 14 percent in annual dividends thereon."

I must say that a 120 percent profit is a rather healthy profit—rather, a heavy profit; I would not say it is healthy. This was by design. This was by arrangement. General Motors Corp. was in difficulty, in great difficulty. Du Pont moved in, not to acquire a majority of the stock, but to acquire enough to fasten its tentacles upon the throat of this promising corporation. Du Pont has controlled General Motors ever since. It controls it now. That is true not only of General Motors; the tentacles of Du Pont have spread and spread and multiplied. Finally, the Government won a decision in the Supreme Court. Du Pont lost. However, Du Pont will win on the floor of the Senate if we pass this pending bill, providing for a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to the Du Pont family.

Although unable to quote company names and customers from the Federal Trade Commission report, I do have a report of the Temporary National Economic Committee of 1940, which I am privileged to quote. I am reading now from the report under the subhead of "Du Pont's Sphere of Influence":

The total value of the identified holdings of members of the Du Pont family in the 200

corporations aggregated about \$565 million, of which \$553 million was represented by holdings in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (direct family holdings and proportionate interest through Christiana Securities Co.), \$8 million by holdings in U.S. Rubber Co., and about \$4 million by holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. This entire vast amount was in common stocks with the exception only of \$9 million of 6 percent debenture stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and \$2 million of preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. The Du Pont holdings represent the largest aggregation of wealth encountered in the study of the ownership of the 200 corporations. Their market value amounted to about 2 percent of that of all stock outstanding of the 200 corporations and to over 6 percent of the value of the stock included in the 20 largest shareholdings. The total assets of the three corporations under control of the Du Pont family (E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Corp.; U.S. Rubber Co.) aggregated about \$2,100 million and represented 3 percent of the aggregate assets of the 200 corporations and nearly 1½ percent of those of all nonfinancial corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that those figures are only for the latter part of the 1930's?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As of today the value would be many multiples of that figure. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. Not only would the value of the stock involved have multiplied, but the tentacles of the Du Pont complex have been greatly extended. Many more corporations have been brought into the complex, under the influence, and into the combine. I have heard many stories, read many facts, and seen many statistics to illustrate this fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Last fall, in the concluding hours of the session, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the holdings of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. as given by Moody's Manual. Those are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21358-21362. That, of course, shows an extraordinary range of companies, as the Senator from Tennessee has said. It includes not only General Motors, but also large holdings in Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and in Phillips Petroleum Co., and in Remington Arms Co., many firms manufacturing paints, powder, chemicals, synthetics and textiles.

The salaries and wages alone paid out by the company and consolidated subsidiaries in 1960 amounted to \$635 million—that is, wages and salaries alone—and, of course, the amount of the capital involved was many times that figure.

Mr. GORE. In addition, to that we must add the holdings of the members of the family, who in turn control the Du Pont corporation, which in turn has the holdings to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is the case with respect to U.S. Rubber. That is held by the family, rather than by the Du Pont corporation.

Mr. GORE. Yes; I understand that to be the case. Moreover, if this pass-through is permitted of General Motors stock to the relatively few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, that family, according to the Attorney General of the United States, will hold effective control of General Motors, just as they now hold effective control of U.S. Rubber.

So the key here is the pass-through, the pass-through of General Motors stock now held by the Du Pont Co., without payment of taxes by Du Pont to the Christiana Corp., and then through the Christiana Corp., with only nominal taxes, to the members of the Du Pont family, some of whom would pay substantial taxes, while other stockholders would pay very little, if anything.

That is the central issue; that is the question—pass-through. The bill paves the way, let me repeat, for a pass-through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table and explanatory material which appears beginning on page 119 of the TNEC report. Even though the table is old, it is still quite revealing.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE DU PONT SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

The total value of the identified holdings of members of the Du Pont family in the 200 corporations aggregated about \$565 million, of which \$553 million was represented by holdings in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (direct family holdings and proportionate interest through Christiana Securities Co.), \$8 million by holdings in U.S. Rubber Co., and about \$4 million by holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. This entire vast amount was in common stocks with the exception only of \$9 million of 6 percent debenture stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and \$2 million of preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. The Du Pont holdings represent the largest aggregation of wealth encountered in the study of the ownership of the 200 corporations. Their market value amounted to about 2 percent of that of all stock outstanding of the 200 corporations and to over 6 percent of the value of the stock included in the 20 largest shareholdings. The total assets of the three corporations under control of the Du Pont family (E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Corp.; U.S. Rubber Co.) aggregated about \$2,100 million and represented 3 percent of the aggregate assets of the 200 corporations and nearly 1½ percent of those of all nonfinancial corporations.

From the point of view of control the Du Pont empire centers in the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Members of the Du Pont family owned directly or indirectly 43.9 percent of the voting stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. This block, if acting in unison represents unassailable control, since it would be practically impossible for any other interest group to acquire a larger block in a corporation so heavily capitalized. Family control goes back to the foundation in 1802 of the direct predecessors of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. The company, however, began to expand on a large scale only after 1914, and at that time the now dominant branch of the family acquired control from Coleman du Pont, then the largest shareholder.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., in turn, owned 23 percent of the common stock of General Motors Corp., acquired shortly after its formation. This was by far the largest

block in existence, the next largest being one of 6 percent held by the officers of the corporation through the General Motors Management Corp. and the General Motors Securities Corp., class A stock. In view of the very heavy capitalization of the company and the wide diffusion of its stock, this block appears to carry safe working control. (Members of the Du Pont family owned another 0.62 percent of the common stock of General Motors Corp.)

The Du Pont family owned 15.7 percent of the common and 6.5 percent of the preferred stock (both voting issues) of U.S. Rubber Co., the largest block known to exist. As the remainder of the stock is widely distributed, U.S. Rubber Co. may be regarded as being under working control by the Du Pont family.

Holdings of the Du Pont family in Phillips Petroleum Co. amounted to 2.2 percent of the common stock, with a market value of less than \$4 million. This was not the largest known block in existence and apparently did not carry a decisive influence on the management.

Originally no close industrial relationship appears to have existed between E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. and General Motors Corp. The acquisition by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. rather seems to have been the result of the desire for profitable investment of the large undistributed profits which E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. had accumulated during the World War. The control over U.S. Rubber Co., one of the largest tire producers, on the other hand, might be regarded as industrially related to the indirect control of the Du Pont family over General Motors Corp. The holdings of the Du Pont family in Phillips Petroleum Co. appear to be incidental and do not carry control.

The instrumentalities used by the Du Pont family in controlling its sphere of influence are of considerable interest because of the great number of the individuals participating in the ownership of the family block and the complex machinery built up to keep control concentrated, notwithstanding the diffusion of ownership. All in all, about 75 family members of 3 generations own beneficially some of the family holdings. There are probably other family members who owned stock in the family-controlled corporations but did not show up in the study, and some family members most likely owned more stock in one or more of the family enterprises than they were credited with on the record. So far as the records go, no single individuals owned directly more than 0.70 percent of the common stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. or not much over 1½ percent of the total family holdings.

The cornerstone in the sphere of influence of the Delaware branch of the Du Pont family is the Christiana Securities Co., originally a family holding company and now a public investment company though still safely controlled by the family through majority ownership. Christiana Securities Co. alone owned 27.6 percent of the common stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., practically all of which it has held since 1915. This is the largest single block in existence and alone would probably suffice for working control of the corporation. In addition, individual members of the Delaware branch owned about 4 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. directly, 4 percent through trust funds and 2¼ percent through a family holding company. This brought the total holdings of the Delaware branch to 37 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., undoubtedly sufficient for safe control of the corporation. Interestingly enough the dominating position in the key corporation—Christiana Securities Co.—is not scattered among individual owners, but occupied by a family holding company (Delaware Realty & Investment Co.) which owned 32.7 percent

of the common and 29.3 percent of the preferred stock of Christiana Securities Co. The stock of the Delaware Realty & Investment Co., finally, was held mainly by about a dozen nephews and nieces of Pierre S. du Pont and their children, to a considerable part not directly but through trust funds. Other members of the Delaware branch (including Pierre S. du Pont himself) owned somewhat over 40 percent of the common stock and 29 percent of the preferred stock of Christiana Securities Co.—of which 8 percent of the common and 10 percent of the preferred stock were held through family trust funds.

*Holdings of the Du Pont family in equity securities of the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations*  
[Percent of total stock outstanding]

Company	Individuals	Trusts and estates	Personal and family holding companies	Du Pont dominated corporations	Total
American Sugar Refining Co., The	0.19				0.19
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	3.76	3.96	30.76		38.48
General Motors Corp.	.01	.29	.23	19.78	20.31
Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp.			.46		.46
Phillips Petroleum Co.	1.25		.93		2.18
United Fruit Co.	.27				.27
United States Rubber Co.	7.52		3.99		11.51

*Record holders and holders having legal and beneficial ownership in such holdings*

UNITED STATES RUBBER CO.

[Size rank: 105. 8 percent noncumulative 1st preferred (voting) as of Apr. 11, 1938. Shares outstanding as of Apr. 11, 1938: 651,091. Price as of December 1937: \$46½]

HOLDERS OF RECORD

Name of record holder	Holdings			Name of record holder	Holdings		
	Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding		Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding
1. Laidlaw & Co.	19,863	\$923,630	3.05	7. Laird, Bissell & Meeds, etc.—Continued			
2. Shearson Hammill & Co.	17,821	828,676	2.74	Shares registered in name of			
3. St. Lawrence Sugar Refineries, Ltd.	17,525	814,912	2.69	Laird, Bissell & Meeds but not			
4. Wilmington Trust Co.	16,951	788,222	2.60	in their possession as of this			
5. Irénée du Pont	12,113	563,254	1.86	date			
6. Rubber Securities Co. (a holding company for the Du Pont family)	11,876	552,234	1.82	510			
7. Laird, Bissell & Meeds, held for—				Total	9,420	\$438,030	1.44
Renappi Corp.	1,500			8. Carl M. Loeb & Co.	8,150	378,975	1.25
Ethel H. du Pont	2,000			9. Thomson & McKinnon	7,652	355,818	1.18
H. B. du Pont	1,300			10. Pierre S. du Pont	6,644	308,946	1.02
Nemours Corp.	2,850			11. Cudd & Co (nominee for Chase National Bank; beneficiaries not disclosed)	4,212	195,858	.65
Jean R. Davis	200			12. Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.	3,885	180,652	.60
Richard E. Riegel	100			13. Lazard Freres	3,859	179,444	.59
Edith du P. Riegel	100			14. E. F. Hutton & Co.	3,747	174,236	.58
Andrew W. Edmonds	100			15. F. B. Davis, Jr.	3,700	172,050	.57
George P. Edmonds	100			16. H. Hentz & Co.	3,522	163,773	.54
Lamont du Pont III	100			17. Francis I. du Pont & Co.	3,410	158,565	.52
P. S. du Pont IV	100			18. Dean & Co.	3,400	158,100	.52
William A. Worth	100			19. A. Felix du Pont	3,346	155,589	.51
Pamela C. Copeland	100			20. Dominick & Dominick	3,227	152,846	.50
6 others	280			Total	164,383	7,643,810	25.23
Total	8,910						

LEGAL AND BENEFICIAL HOLDERS

Type and name of holder	Holdings			Type and name of holder	Holdings		
	Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding		Number of shares	Value	Percent of shares outstanding
<b>INDIVIDUALS, PERSONAL AND FAMILY HOLDING COMPANIES, TRUSTS AND ESTATES</b>				<b>OTHER CORPORATIONS, NONFINANCIAL</b>			
Irénée du Pont	12,113	\$563,254	1.86	St. Lawrence Sugar Refineries, Ltd.	17,525	\$814,912	2.69
Pierre S. du Pont	6,644	308,946	1.02	<b>BANKS, BROKERS, ETC.; BENEFICIARIES NOT DISCLOSED</b>			
P. S. du Pont IV	100	4,650	.01	Wilmington Trust Co.	16,951	788,222	2.60
Ethel H. du Pont	2,000	93,000	.32	Chase National Bank	4,212	195,858	.65
A. Felix du Pont	3,346	155,589	.51	Laidlaw & Co.	19,863	923,630	3.05
H. B. du Pont	1,300	60,450	.21	Shearson Hammill & Co.	17,821	828,676	2.74
Lamont du Pont III	100	4,650	.01	Carl M. Loeb & Co.	8,150	378,975	1.25
Nemours Corp., a holding company, the stock of which is owned by—				Thomson & McKinnon	7,652	355,818	1.18
Paulina du Pont Dean	79.96			Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.	3,885	180,652	.60
J. Simpson Dean	20.04			Lazard Freres	3,859	179,444	.59
Total	100.00	2,850	.44	Dominick & Dominick	3,227	152,846	.50
Renappi Corp., a holding company, the stock of which is owned by—				E. F. Hutton & Co.	3,747	174,236	.58
Wilhelmina du Pont Ross	89.86			H. Hentz & Co.	3,522	163,773	.54
Donald P. Ross	.06			Francis I. du Pont & Co.	3,410	158,565	.52
Wilmington Trust Co., trustee	10.08			Dean & Co.	3,400	158,100	.52
Total	100.00	1,500	.23	Subtotal	163,313	7,594,055	25.07
Edith du P. Riegel	100	4,650	.01	Total record holdings not included above	1,070	49,755	.16
Richard E. Riegel	100	4,650	.01	Total	164,383	7,643,810	25.23
Pamela C. Copeland	100	4,650	.01				
Rubber Securities Co. (a holding company for du Pont family; for details see information given under common stock, supra)	11,876	552,234	1.82				
F. B. Davis, Jr.	3,700	172,050	.57				
Jean R. Davis	200	9,300	.03				

The Florida branch of the Du Pont family held about 5 percent of the stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., mostly through Aloums Securities, Inc., dissolved after the death of Alfred du Pont. At that time the holdings of Aloums Securities, Inc., were distributed to the descendants of Alfred du Pont, over three-fourths of the total going into one family trust fund.

The same tendency to put a large proportion of the family block in holding companies and trust funds is evident in the Du Pont holdings of U.S. Rubber Co. and Phillips Petroleum Co. stock. About 5 percent of the common stock and 2 percent of the preferred stock of U.S. Rubber Corp. was held by Rubber Securities Co. (of which Lamot du Pont owned 73.3 percent and Irénée S. du Pont, 24.5 percent), but about 10½ percent of the common and another 4 percent of the preferred stock was owned directly by other members of the Delaware branch of the Du Pont family. Of the family holdings in Phillips Petroleum Co. about one-half was owned by Christiana Realty & Investment Co., a family holding company, 88 percent of whose stock was in the hands of family trust funds, and the other half directly, mostly by Lamot and Irénée du Pont.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since the studies undertaken more than a decade ago and the initiation of the suit against Du Pont, the Du Pont complex has been greatly expanded, as I have said, its cohesiveness tightened, its effectiveness multiplied. Today, the Du Pont Co. and General Motors are the axis of a giant corporate complex that is competitively irresistible. It is from this threat and danger to our free competitive enterprise system that the Government, through three administrations, has sought relief in the courts.

The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has done a magnificent job from the beginning through the filing of its most recent brief before the Federal district court in Chicago on December 29, 1961, a copy of which I have obtained. In this brief, the Justice Department insists that only a complete divestiture of its General Motors stock by both the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Corp. will be sufficient "for effective relief."

Specifically, the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department has opposed with all its vigor, not only in its recent pleadings, but in petitions and briefs presented repeatedly through the Eisenhower administration, a pass-through of General Motors stock to a comparatively few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has been insisting and, by its most recent brief, vigorously asserted that such a pass-through would perpetuate the control of General Motors by the same corporate and financial complex which has been held by two Supreme Court decisions to be in violation of antitrust law. Yet, Mr. President, the purport and the effect of the pending bill, as I said yesterday, is to pave a superhighway for such a pass-through. Not only is that superhighway paved with tax relief to make it easy, but passage of the bill by the House and the Senate will constitute a political endorsement of a pass-through, an endorsement concurred in,

I fear, by overwhelming majorities of both House and Senate and by President John F. Kennedy, should he sign the bill into law.

I say this would be wrong; it would be adverse to the public welfare.

I think we are gaining support in our opposition to the bill. Two weeks ago I read an article which said that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] and I were standing almost alone in our opposition to it. Then I read another article in which the junior Senator from Tennessee was described as making a lonely fight. But we have been gaining. The opposition has support now which it did not have last week. One by one, other Senators have been awakening to the importance of this issue. There is some faint hope of victory in my heart now, not because I have counted votes, but because the cause I present here is so right, so identified with the public welfare, so important to the free enterprise system, so necessary to break the grip of the largest monopoly in the country, that I think more supporters of our point of view will rally to the cause.

In the brief of the Department of Justice, filed before the Federal district court in Chicago on November 22, 1961, I find the following:

This memorandum is submitted by the United States in support of the proposed final judgment which it respectfully submits should be entered by this court in making a final disposition of this action. As will be discussed in detail in subsequent portions of this memorandum, we believe that the substantive provisions of our proposal are in all respects consistent with the two decisions of the Supreme Court in this action. The central provisions of our decree providing for divestitures by Du Pont and Christiana have allowed for the greatest possible latitude and discretion with respect to the methods and time for the required divestitures, the only limitations being that the divestitures shall be completed within a 10-year period and that there should be no divestiture by way of a distribution to Christiana Corp. which would leave it or its stockholders with permanent ownership of what would be the largest single block of General Motors stock.

There, Mr. President, in the very first page of the Government's brief, is stated the issue, which is as follows:

That there should be no divestiture by way of a distribution to Christiana Corp. which would leave it or its stockholders with permanent ownership of what would be the largest single block of General Motors stock.

I read now from page 4 of the brief:

The fact that the Government has, since the outset of this litigation and consistently throughout its course, adhered to the view that divestiture by Christiana is essential to effect relief is reflected in the extracts from prior proceedings in this action set forth in appendix A hereto. This should be sufficient to negative the existence of any factual basis should Christiana reassert its prior contention that the Government has at some stage procedurally abandoned its demand for relief against it.

I read now from page 7:

In an effort to forestall an order of divestiture applicable to it, Christiana has

vigorously asserted that it has not been "adjudicated" to have violated any antitrust law. While this may be conceded as literally true, the attempt to argue therefrom that Christiana is in essence an innocent bystander which should not be subjected to any burden can hardly receive sympathetic hearing in the light of Christiana's prominent role in the condemned relationships which have existed between Du Pont and General Motors since the acquisition of the General Motors stock. However, in light of this contention, Christiana's participation in Du Pont's violation of section 7 through its stock holdings and the interlocking of its directors and officers with both Du Pont and General Motors will be reviewed.

The evidence before this Court has established such an identity of interest between Christiana and Du Pont as to justify this Court in concluding that Christiana's participation in a deliberate course of conduct by Du Pont is of the highest relevance to the question of the power of this Court to order divestiture by Christiana. Christiana, with approximately 30 percent of the outstanding stock of Du Pont, is, and has been since 1915, the controlling stockholder of Du Pont. There are nearly 200,000 shareholders in Du Pont. Of this number, one, Christiana, has almost one-third of the outstanding stock. No other single stockholder controls a block of stock of more than one-tenth of the size of the Christiana-Du Pont holdings. This control of Du Pont by Christiana was recognized by this court when it found, at 126 F. Supp. 235, 239:

"The Du Pont family had voting control of Christiana and Delaware whose Du Pont stock is consistently voted as a block in favor of Du Pont management, coupled with the fact that for many years members of the Du Pont family have been major executives of the corporation, indicates control of management of Du Pont by the Du Pont family."

I call the following to the attention of my colleagues, because the pass-through of Christiana is central to the issue before the Senate.

Since its formation, Christiana has been a control instrument through which the Du Pont family has dominated E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Might it be helpful if the arithmetic of these holdings were introduced in the RECORD, so we could see the quantitative relationships? I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee would be willing to answer some questions in that connection.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, is it true that there are about 274 million shares of common stock of General Motors?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is it true that the Du Pont Co. owns 63 million of those shares?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the testimony before our committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That comes, does it not, to about 23 percent of the General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand, the Supreme Court has ruled that this holding of 23 percent in effect gives the Du Pont Co. control over General Motors,

in view of the fact that no other holding is equal to 1 percent.

Mr. GORE. I believe that is undisputed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Now we come to Christiana: Is it true that Christiana Corp. owns 13.4 million shares of Du Pont, or 29 percent of Du Pont?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true, therefore, that Christiana controls Du Pont, and Du Pont controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the statements of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, with which I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, Christiana controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. Yes, and the Du Pont family controls Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that 65 members of the Du Pont family own or control 80 percent of the stock of Christiana?

Mr. GORE. That is according to the testimony.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that of those 65 members of the Du Pont family, 38 are husbands and wives?

Mr. GORE. That is set forth in the brief of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that memorandum printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### APPENDIX A. LINES OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CONTROL DU PONT FAMILY MEMBERS

Since Lamot du Pont Copeland was the principal witness for defendant Christiana, this appendix will examine the relative ease with which this single individual can communicate with the 65 members of the Du Pont family who were listed in Government proposed finding of fact A-35. These lines of communication and avenues of contact do not purport to be all means for facilitating unified conduct in respect to Du Pont and General Motors stock holdings which exist between Lamot du Pont Copeland and the listed individuals but are limited to record facts. Since we are concerned, not with the ability of Lamot du Pont Copeland to communicate with various of his relatives, but with the ability of the group as a whole to establish and utilize lines of internal communications, whatever facts are established with regard to Copeland's ability to communicate must be multiplied many times in gaging the relative ease and facility with which the group can communicate with a view toward common action.

Copeland is an officer and director of Christiana and Du Pont, a director of Wilmington Trust, Longwood Foundation, Winterthur, News Journal, and a Canadian trucking corporation. Where a listed individual is shown as an officer or director of a corporation, that corporation is one of those in which Copeland is also a director or officer. Where the individual or individuals concerned are interested in Wilmington Trust or Delaware Trust, either as: grantors, advisors or joint trustees of trusts; officers, directors, employees, or stockholders; or in more than one such capacity, this relationship is shown by the letter (W) or (D) following each of their names. Husband and wife are listed together:

1. A. E. Bissell (D) (W), director of Winterthur.

2. John B. and Octavia du Pont Bredin (W); they reside near Wilmington; Copeland knows both; Bredin is a former employee of

Du Pont; Bredin is a director of the Canadian Trucking Co.

3. Margaretta du Pont Carpenter (W); Copeland knows her; she lives near Wilmington.

4. W. Sam Carpenter, Jr. (W), brother-in-law of 3; board member of Du Pont, Wilmington Trust, Christiana, and Winterthur.

5. W. Sam Carpenter III and Murton du Pont Carpenter (W) the son of 4 and the daughter of 11, respectively.

6. Lamot du Pont Copeland (W).

7. Colgate W. Darden, Jr. and Constance du Pont Darden (W); known to Copeland; director of Du Pont; Copeland and Darden were fellow directors of U.S. Rubber.

8. Paulina du Pont Dean (W), known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington; her husband is an officer and director of Wilmington Trust.

9. A. Felix du Pont, Jr. (W); director of Christiana; resides near Wilmington; known to Copeland.

10. Emile F. du Pont (D), director of Du Pont.

11. Eugene E. du Pont (W), director of Du Pont.

12. Henry B. and Emily T. du Pont (W); director of Du Pont, Wilmington Trust, Longwood, and Winterthur; known to Copeland; has extensive business relations with him.

13. Henry F. and Ruth W. du Pont (W); director of Du Pont, Wilmington.

14. Irene and Irene du Pont (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

15. Irene du Pont, Jr., and Barbara du Pont (W); known to Copeland; director of Du Pont, Christiana, and Longwood; resides near Wilmington.

16. Jessie Ball du Pont; Elbert Dent, her son-in-law and cotrustee of the Alfred I. du Pont (her husband) estate lives in Wilmington; and is known to Copeland.

17. Elizabeth du Pont Bayard (W), a sister of 11.

18. Lamot du Pont, Jr. (W), known to Copeland; assistant vice president of Wilmington Trust; lives in Wilmington.

19. Margaret F. du Pont (W), known to Copeland; lives near Wilmington; and is the widow of Lamot du Pont; all of her children are known to Copeland.

20. Amelia E. du Pont, the widow of Eugene du Pont; she died in 1917. The stock listed in her name is trusted with the Bank of Delaware. It will be noted that besides being the wife of Eugene du Pont, she is herself a Du Pont and the aunt of Alice du Pont (who married T. Coleman du Pont, another relative), Mary L. du Pont (who married William du Pont), Ethel du Pont Barksdale, and Renee du Pont Harvey. Exhibit 611A shows that the Bank of Delaware is a depository for large blocks of Du Pont stock owned by her descendants through her marriage with Eugene and by her nieces' descendants. Through these several intermarriages, this group has become relatively cohesive. It includes Alice Potter, her grandniece and Bernard Peyton, her grandson, 37 and 36, *infra*.

21. Pierre S. du Pont III and Jane Holcomb du Pont (W), known to Copeland, officer and director of Du Pont; director of Wilmington Trust, Christiana and Longwood; resides in Wilmington and has other business interests in common with Copeland.

22. Reynolds and Katherine du Pont (W); known to Copeland; former employees of Du Pont, director of Canadian trucking company; originally from Wilmington.

23. Estate of Philip F. du Pont (W); Phillip was a brother of 11.

24. S. Hallock and Virginia S. du Pont (W); director of Longwood; known to Copeland; lives near Wilmington.

25. William du Pont, Jr. (D); known to Copeland; lives in Wilmington.

26. Willis du Pont (W); known to Copeland.

27. George P. and Natalie du Pont Edmonds (W); chairman of the board of Wilmington Trust; known to Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

28. Mary du Pont Faulkner (W); known to Copeland.

29. Robert B. and Lucille E. du Pont Flint (W); formerly employed by Du Pont; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

30. Crawford H. and Margaretta du Pont Greenwalt (W); president of Du Pont; director of Du Pont, Christiana, Longwood, Winterthur; known to Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

31. Edmund du Pont (W); director of Winterthur.

32. Esther du Pont Thouron (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

33. W. W. Laird, Jr. and Winnifred M. Laird (W); Treasurer of Christiana; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

34. Marian du Pont Scott (D); sister of No. 25, *supra*.

35. Ernest N. and Irene S. du Pont May (W); formerly employed by Du Pont; resides near Wilmington; known to Copeland.

36. Bernard Peyton—director of Du Pont.

37. William S. and Alice G. Potter (W); director of Wilmington and Winterthur.

38. William G. and Nancy R. Reynolds (W); daughter and son-in-law of 11; sister and brother-in-law of 5.

39. Richard E. and Edith du Pont Riegel (W); known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

40. Henry B. Robertson (W); director of Longwood; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

41. Wilhelmina du Pont Ross (W); her husband is an officer and director of Wilmington Trust; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

42. Philip G. Rust (W); formerly resided in Wilmington; known to Copeland.

43. Hugh R. Sharp (W); known to Copeland; has adjoining offices; has many business dealings with Copeland; resides in Wilmington.

44. Mary Chichester du Pont Clark (W); mother of 9.

45. Henry H. and Marianna du Pont Silliman (W); director of News Journal Co.; known to Copeland; resides near Wilmington.

46. Henry H. Silliman, Jr. (W); son of No. 45; known to Copeland; employee of Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, is it true that these people can be presumed to have a good deal of community interest and family affection which joins them together? I point out that, of course, there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. GORE. Well, through corporate ties, personal ties, blood ties, neighborliness, community interest, and financial affinity, the Wilmington branch seems to be rather closely knit—financially, at least.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And these 65 either live in Wilmington or closely adjacent to Wilmington. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. Well, it is described as "the Wilmington branch."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Neither the Louisville branch nor the Florida branch is included, except for one family. Therefore, can it be correctly said that the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family controls Christiana, and Christiana controls Du Pont, and Du Pont controls General Motors; and, therefore, the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family controls General Motors?

Mr. GORE. I think that is indisputable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

If the 63 million shares of General Motors which the Du Pont Co. owns are distributed, Christiana would receive 29 percent of those shares, would it not, since it owns 29 percent of Du Pont?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, that amounts to 18.3 million shares. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the shares which the 65 members of the Du Pont family own amount to 14.6 million. This comes to 5.3 percent of the total stock of General Motors. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is according to my understanding, which would be more than five times larger than any other bloc held.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, in addition to these holdings of the Du Pont Co. in General Motors, these members of the Du Pont family as individuals own additional General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. Yes, just as they own additional shares in other corporations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the members of the Du Pont family own Du Pont stock directly?

Mr. GORE. I understand so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that this comes to approximately 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. Held by Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. That 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock will be received by the members of the family. As a matter of fact, I think that the Du Pont family members and their family controlled corporations and trusts as individuals own 14 percent of Du Pont stock.

Mr. GORE. There must be added to that the number of shares owned directly by Christiana itself, which amounts to some 530,000 shares of General Motors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. As I understand, the Department of Justice is not seeking to divest individual members of the Du Pont family of those shares of General Motors stock which they will obtain because of their ownership in Du Pont. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. As I understand, out of the long, contentious litigation, the Justice Department has acquiesced, with a great deal of reluctance, to the retention by the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family, several members of which were the defendants in the original complaint filed, of the General Motors stock they might receive as a result of Du Pont stock they individually own.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that if a pass-through of Christiana holdings in General Motors to its stockholders is permitted, the 65 members of the family will have not only that 5.3 percent, but they will have a 3.4 percent which they will obtain because of their direct stock ownership in Du Pont. So their General Motors holdings will be, at a minimum, 8.7 percent. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. I think that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To repeat, if the pass-through of General Motors stock by

the Christiana Corp. to Christiana stockholders is permitted, we have established that 65 members of the family will get 5.3 percent of the General Motors stock. And in addition to that, because of their direct ownership in Du Pont, they will get another 3.4 percent of the General Motors stock. So that, according to the exhibit submitted by the Government, their holdings would be 8.7 percent. That fact appears in Government's general exhibit No. 2.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In studying general exhibit No. 2, the Department of Justice also listed the holdings of corporations and trust funds controlled by this family, which would amount to another six-tenths of 1 percent, or seven-tenths of 1 percent, not included in the preceding figures. So that, in reality, the holdings would be approximately 9.4 percent. That is shown in general exhibit No. 2.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I have seen that exhibit. The Senator has read and stated it correctly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It means that, even if a requirement for Christiana to divest by sale were to be carried through, and the sales took place to persons other than the Du Pont family—to outsiders—this branch of the Du Pont family would still have 4.1 percent of the General Motors stock either directly or through corporations which they control. So they are not being stripped and sent out into the world naked, so to speak. They will still be powerful owners of General Motors, owning four times more than the next largest stockholder.

Mr. GORE. But if, on top of that, a pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana is permitted, it would mean, according to the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert Kennedy, that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They would hold—own or control—at a minimum, 9.4 percent of the stock of General Motors.

Mr. GORE. Approximately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This does not include—and I think this is an important point for the RECORD—any direct holdings which the members of this family may have in General Motors itself. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. No, it does not include directly owned General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not know what that is, but it is at least possible that, just as they have direct holdings in Du Pont and Christiana, they may have direct holdings in General Motors; and we know that Christiana not only has a large block of stock in Du Pont, but over 500,000 shares in General Motors directly.

Mr. GORE. But the proponents of the bill seek to pave the way for a pass-through of Christiana, with only a nominal tax to Christiana, of General Motors stock to those members of the Du Pont family who are principal holders of Christiana stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield further for some correlative questions to indicate the amount of money which is at stake in this matter?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee, I think, has quite properly concentrated his attention upon the antitrust features of this bill, but there have also been references to the profits which have been made by the purchase of General Motors stock by Du Pont. While this is not immediately an issue, it will become an issue when the tax features of the bill are considered by the Senate.

Is it not true that Du Pont acquired stock of General Motors in 1917 and 1918, and possibly the early months of 1919, amounting to 63 million shares?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is not the testimony established that the average price of acquisition of the 63 million shares was \$2.09 a share?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Tennessee inform us what was the market price of the General Motors shares last Friday, or yesterday?

Mr. GORE. I think it was approximately \$55 yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. In that connection the Senator might find it interesting to recall that when we were debating the bill last September our distinguished friend and able colleague the senior Senator from Delaware spoke of the possible grave consequences to the stock of General Motors if the Senate failed to pass the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was the price of General Motors stock at that time?

Mr. GORE. Forty-five dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now it is \$55?

Mr. GORE. Yes. Let me point out that the senior Senator from Delaware was not the only prophet of doom.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Or gloom.

Mr. GORE. Our distinguished friend the junior Senator from Illinois had words to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. No, it was not the senior Senator. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21370, I quote the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]:

I concur in the views expressed by the Senator from Delaware with respect to the possible sharp impact on the market value of the stock as a result of the failure of Congress to take final action on this subject.

Perhaps I had better read a little further:

In the space of 3 or 4 months, before final action can be had, there can be some intensely sharp reaction before we get through.

Well, we have had some sharp reaction all right, but in the other direction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There has been an increase in value of \$10 per share.

Mr. GORE. Yes. If the senior Senator from Illinois and I win nothing else, if the Senate should pass the bill and the President should conclude to sign it—which I hope he would not do should the Senate make such an error as to pass the bill—the Government today would collect in excess of \$100 million in taxes more than it would have collected from

a divestiture under the terms of the bill, based on last September's market value of General Motors stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, since there are 274 million shares of General Motors common stock and the stock value has gone up \$10 a share, that we have increased the capital values held by the stockholders of General Motors by \$2,740 million, approximately \$2¾ billion?

Mr. GORE. The Senator heaps garlands upon my head.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have some of them for myself.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask whether the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle are claiming credit for some of the inflationary results of this administration?

Mr. GORE. I was not claiming credit for inflationary results. I was asserting that if the senior Senator from Illinois and others with me who have been making this fight should win nothing more, additional taxes due to the appreciation in stock values will at least pay our salaries for a few years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator believe that General Motors, in gratitude for the increase in value of its stock, which we have helped to bring about, should make contributions to charities in Tennessee and Illinois and dedicate their contributions to these charities to the junior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Illinois? Would that not be a touching exhibition of gratitude?

Mr. GORE. I should be satisfied to settle for no contributions in Tennessee, because I fear some might be dedicated against me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To continue this thought, since Du Pont owns 63 million shares of stock, which have increased in value \$10 per share, we have helped the Du Pont corporation by \$630 million, is that not true?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure we are responsible for having helped them. At least we saved the bill from passing last September.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the 65 members of the Du Pont family own 8.7 percent of the General Motors stock, or about 24 million shares, they are \$240 million richer now than they were last fall.

Mr. GORE. Well, that is perhaps not all the story. I am not sure they have counted it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we may go to the gains which have been made, Du Pont bought General Motors stock with the profits which it had accumulated by selling munitions first to the allied governments and then to our Government during the First World War. That issue has been threshed out for years, and I am not going to comment further on it. It is a fact that the profits made from the sale of munitions furnished Du Pont with the money with which it bought General Motors and many other corporations which it acquired in 1918,

1920, and so on. At that time Du Pont bought General Motors stock for \$2.09 a share, or a total purchase price for 63 million shares of approximately \$130 million. Now the stock is worth \$55 a share. The profit per share, if the stock were sold now, would be approximately \$53 a share, or a total of \$3,339 million. That is a \$3½ billion accretion in value on the General Motors stock owned by Du Pont.

Mr. GORE. That is an interesting statement.

The distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] made some very pertinent and challenging statements in the Senate yesterday about the propriety of being consistent in the application of tax relief or the imposition of tax burdens.

This is a corporation which has appreciation profits, as the Senator has pointed out, of more than \$3 billion, yet under the bill the Du Pont corporation, if the court followed the outlines of the bill, would be allowed to distribute this stock without payment of any tax on its profit of more than \$3 billion.

I wonder how that would sound to a "cornhusker" in Iowa, who pays his taxes on the small amount of profits he makes from the operation of his farm. How will that sound to the small businessman who is going to make his tax payment in a few weeks? How will that sound to the worker who, at the end of every week, has his paycheck diminished to pay his share of the taxes to the U.S. Government?

How are we to explain this action for the Du Pont corporation, which acquired the stock with a working arrangement under which it would control General Motors, with an understanding that it would make a 120-percent profit, an acquisition which has now been held to violate the antitrust laws, to have resulted in segregated markets, and stifled competition? Thus, it has illegally—not legally, but illegally—realized appreciated values in excess of \$3 billion.

But instead of taxing Du Pont, as we tax the worker every Friday afternoon, instead of requiring Du Pont to pay a tax such as every small businessman who has any profits at all must pay, we are asked to pass a bill providing for a complete pass-through, if the court follows the lines of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Permit me to make one further statement and then I shall be happy to yield. Let me remind Senators that despite all the propaganda about how hundreds of thousands of small stockholders—widows and their mites—are going to be helped by the bill, not one stockholder of Du Pont stock anywhere in the United States would be helped one iota by the bill unless the court should render a decision prescribing the manner and the time of divestiture strictly in accordance with the terms of the bill.

Yet it is said that the bill is not intended to influence the court. That reminds me of a man taking a running

leap off a bluff and yelling back over his shoulder, "I didn't intend to do it."

I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my friend from Tennessee knows from my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday that I have no particular misgivings with respect to section 1 of the bill. My concern relates primarily to sections 2 and 3 of the bill.

I should like to refresh the recollection of the Senator from Tennessee on one point that affects some cornhuskers, at least, in South Dakota. Several years ago there were extensive land condemnation proceedings in connection with some of our river development programs. Congress saw fit to grant relief to those whose land was taken because in those situations there were farmers with acreage which had cost a very small amount of money, but which down through the years had increased in value, so that when the Government condemned the land—an action over which they had no control whatsoever—the owners literally were forced to receive a profit. So Congress decided that relief would be granted by permitting this profit to go untaxed if the farmer would reinvest the entire amount of the proceeds, including the profit, in other land used in agriculture.

Mr. GORE. We permit the same action now in cases involving condemnation of a farm or home. If the owner reinvests in similar property he is eligible for special tax treatment.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct. The point I wish to make is that I do not believe the cornhuskers in Iowa or South Dakota would be particularly exercised if an analogous type of relief were granted to innocent stockholders who have a profit forced upon them as a result of action by the Federal Government over which they have no control, in an innocent type of situation. It is for that reason that section 1 of the bill does not give me any particular concern.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the Senator from Iowa that his statement does not deal with an analogous situation. He has leaped over one taxpayer. He has leaped over—and in his analogy he has passed through—the Du Pont Co. The Du Pont Co. is not innocent. The Du Pont Co. has been held in violation of the Antitrust Act. It is in consequence of this violation that the Du Pont Co. has been ordered to divest. So the Du Pont Co. is not analogous to the Iowa cornhusker whose farm has been condemned for a right-of-way.

Mr. MILLER. I did not mean to imply that I thought the Du Pont Co. was analogous. I think the Du Pont stockholders, the ones upon whom the profit in the form of General Motors divested stock will be forced, are analogous to the farmer. That is my point; and I think they are analogous. For that reason I believe I can in clear conscience support section 1 of the bill. But the point I wish to make is that section 2 of the bill, which relates to the Christiana Corp., and proposes to take an entirely different approach with respect to an identical transaction, gives me concern.

I was very much interested in some of the points brought out in the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. However, it seems to me that, granting all the facts that were explained on the floor of the Senate, it will still be up to a Federal Court judge in Chicago to make a decision as to whether or not the antitrust laws will be violated if there is a pass-through to Christiana stockholders. If the Federal judge in Chicago decides that the Federal antitrust laws would not be violated, a pass-through might well be indicated. But if the Federal judge decides that antitrust laws would be violated—and I am certain that that is the point Senators were attempting to bring out so far as their opinion was concerned—the Federal judge would order a sale of that stock. As was brought out yesterday, if the Federal judge should decide that there shall be a sale by Christiana in the open market of the General Motors stock, the tax results would be about the same as if we provided in the bill that there should be identical treatment to that accorded individual stockholders.

Mr. GORE. I realize that that information was given to the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa in the debate yesterday, but I respectfully suggest that it was incorrect information.

Mr. MILLER. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from Tennessee would clarify the information I received yesterday in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to do so in due time, when I reach that portion of my speech which deals with the tax questions. What I am trying to focus upon now is the antimonopoly issue, which I think is paramount in the bill. I heard the excellent discussion presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa yesterday, and I found considerable sympathy with his point of view. It seemed to me that the logic of his statements was difficult to refute, and I regretted that he was given information which I do not think was correct. But today I am trying to concentrate upon what seems to me, by all odds, the most important question. The Senator was not present when I began my remarks. When I began, I said that in my opinion the big issue was not the question of how much in taxes would be paid or which particular taxpayers would pay them, but rather whether Du Pont's monopoly control of General Motors and the monopoly of the General Motors market for paints and fabrics, which the Supreme Court held was in violation of the antitrust laws, would be broken or would be continued. I am happy that the Senator is present so that I can make that point again. I realize that he is concerned with the preservation of free enterprise. He is interested in the survival of small business. I welcome his presence.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee is making a point with regard to the antitrust situation. The point I wish to make—or at least I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he would care to comment on it—is that regardless of what

kind of case is made in the Senate regarding the antitrust situation, I do not think it would make a bit of difference to a Federal judge sitting as a true Federal judge in Chicago. He will make up his mind what he—and not the U.S. Senate—thinks should be done about the antitrust situation before him in the case of Christiana.

If that is so, it seems to me we might delete from the bill any reference to any section of the Internal Revenue Code, or to any change in the Internal Revenue laws, that might affect Christiana. If we did that, the individual shareholders would be protected. There could not be any possible suggestion that any legislation was passed in Congress which might somehow or other affect the Federal judge's decision in Chicago.

If the Federal judge decides that there should be a divestiture in the form of pass-through to the shareholders of the Christiana of General Motors stock, it will be because, no matter what case my colleagues from Tennessee and Illinois make on the antitrust situation, the Federal judge has decided that it can be done without violation of the antitrust laws.

If, on the other hand, the Federal judge decides that there should be a divestiture by sale, it would be my thought, on the basis of my understanding yesterday, that the tax consequences which would follow under present law would be practically identical to what they would be if the bill itself were amended to provide for consistent treatment as between individual shareholders and Christiana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, to begin with, the lawyers for the Du Pont Co., the lawyers for the Christiana Corp., and the officials of the Du Pont Co. do not agree with those who say that this bill, should it become law, will not have a bearing upon the decision of the judge. Indeed, the pending bill, in my opinion, is designed specifically for that purpose. Propaganda has been put out as to how this bill would benefit the hundreds of thousands of stockholders. That is not true. However, propaganda to that effect has been wildly broadcast. It is stated that hundreds of thousands of stockholders would benefit by the passage of the bill, and that the passage of the bill is in their interests. I have received thousands of letters from stockholders in Tennessee, many of them small stockholders, who think their interest is involved in this bill.

The bill is drawn so that unless the judge follows the directions, the road markers, the methods of divestiture contained in the bill, no benefits of the bill will be available to any stockholders anywhere.

I do not know just how reasonable men can conclude that this bill is not designed to influence the decision of the court. Indeed, the General Counsel of the Treasury, in testifying before the Committee on Finance on the bill, used the word "admonition." Let me read from his statement. This statement is by Mr. Knight, General Counsel of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. GORE. I am reading from page 28 of the Finance Committee's hearings:

The sum would be payable over a shorter period of time if the court adheres to the admonition contained in section 1 of the bill with regard to limiting the period of divestiture.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee, on that point, I find it difficult to believe that the mere opinion expressed by some administrative official, that a statement in a proposed bill or even in a bill that has been passed is an admonition, would have any possible bearing on the independent thinking of a Federal judge.

Mr. GORE. Let me read what an official of the Du Pont Co. has said in a document sent to all the newspaper editors of the country only last week.

It is obvious that prompt action by the Senate on H.R. 8847 would be of material assistance to the court in the efficient drawing of a final decree.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the Senator that I would also be of the opinion that a guess on the part of an official of a corporation as to what the court would be guided by is not more than a guess.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact, according to press dispatches, that the attorneys for the Du Pont Co. appearing before Judge LeBuy yesterday said that they thought his decision should be postponed until after the bill is passed, because the bill would be valuable in enabling him to make his decision? That is, according to the press dispatches, the official position of Du Pont in the Federal Court.

Here we have statements by the general counsel of the Treasury, by the officials of the Du Pont Co., and by the legal representatives of the Du Pont Co. to the effect that the action of Congress should affect the decision of the court, and that this is one reason why they want this action by Congress before Judge LeBuy hands down his opinion.

Mr. GORE. Let me add to that a statement by the attorneys for Christiana:

The company wants to move any such shares to its stockholders obviously under the new tax law which gives capital gains treatment.

The lawyers for Christiana, though a bit prematurely, are referring to the pending bill as the "new tax law."

The case is conclusive. I submit that the officials of Du Pont think this bill will help the judge.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee what his thinking is regarding the suggestion I made a few moments ago, about the possibility of deleting the provisions of the bill which relate to the Christiana Corp., leaving intact the provisions of the bill which provide equitable relief to individual shareholders.

Mr. GORE. There is a great deal of merit to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. I say this to him in all frankness and candor. I thought so when he made the suggestion yesterday. I listened to it with a great deal of

attention. It was stated in Chicago yesterday that the only remaining issue before the court was not whether Du Pont should divest—that has been decided by the Supreme Court—but the question before the Chicago court concerned divestiture by Christiana—should it divest, and if so, how.

The Senator has made a very valuable suggestion. If we eliminate any reference to Christiana, any provision relating to Christiana, any provision by which divestiture could be made by Christiana under the terms of this bill—in other words, if we eliminate all reference—I believe that is what the Senator's word was—to Christiana, I believe there is a great deal of merit to that suggestion.

Mr. MILLER. However, I should like to point out to the Senator from Tennessee that the value of my suggestion might be diminished if, as he suggests, the information given to me yesterday was inaccurate. I must say that I am still persuaded that if we change the bill to provide that Christiana would be controlled in the same manner as individual shareholders, that the transaction of divestiture would be the same to the individual shareholder as it is to Christiana, that it would not be a return of capital as to the individual shareholders, on the one hand, and an intercorporate dividend as to Christiana on the other, the tax consequences which would flow from that change would be about the same, and the Treasury would be protected in the same fashion as it would be as if nothing were said and the court ordered the divestiture by sale.

Mr. GORE. As much merit as I think lies in the Senator's suggestion, I think the preferable and more advisable action on the part of the Senate would be to await the ruling of the court.

Mr. MILLER. So far as Christiana is concerned.

Mr. GORE. So far as any issue is concerned. The judge has asked for the filing of final briefs next Monday. What is the hurry? Why must we hurry in the very first week of the session, to pass a bill, to try to preempt the issue and provide, in the words of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], "an equitable solution" to a case which has been fought in the courts for 13 years? It is still in the courts. Why not let the courts settle it? Then we can act in the light of the court's judgment. But we are asked to pass a bill to provide relief from a court decision before the court has rendered that decision. How anomalous can a situation be? How impetuous, how injudicious can the Senate become? What pressures impel us to such inadvisable lengths?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator knows that he and I have similar misgivings about certain sections of the bill. However, I suggest that I could in very clear conscience vote for at least a portion of the bill right now, regardless of what the Senator from Tennessee has just said, because so far as the Du Pont shareholders were concerned, the Court

made its decision last year, and it was that there shall be divestiture.

Mr. GORE. By Du Pont?

Mr. MILLER. By Du Pont. To me, that is the heart of the problem which the bill should reach.

Mr. GORE. The case was remanded to the trial judge with instructions to him to write an order for divestiture which would provide effective relief. What is the effective relief which the Government seeks and has sought since 1949? It is relief from the monopolistic control of General Motors by Du Pont. The Government contends, and the Attorney General says in his letter dated January 13, 1962, to me, which was read to the Senate yesterday, that if the General Motors stock is permitted to pass through the Christiana Corp. into the hands of the few members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family—well, let me refer to the letter. I read as follows:

In fact, in the proceedings pending in the district court in Illinois, the Government has urged the court to decree that Christiana Securities Corp. and its stockholders be barred from receiving General Motors stock to be distributed by Du Pont. It is proposed that this be accomplished by requiring either that Du Pont distribute cash instead of stock to Christiana or that Christiana be required to sell any General Motors stock which is distributed to Christiana by Du Pont. The Government has urged the court not to authorize a so-called pass-through of General Motors stock through Christiana to its stockholders because a pass-through would permit a large percentage of General Motors stock to be lodged in Du Pont family hands. This would mean that the Du Pont family could still effectively control General Motors as well as Du Pont.

It is relief from this monopolistic condition for which the Government has pleaded in the courts for 13 years, the Government finally having won two decisions before the Supreme Court, the last one of which held unmistakably that relief should be granted. The court then remanded the case to the trial judge, as I have said, to write an order for effective relief.

The lawyers for Du Pont have stated to the court in Chicago, according to statements read yesterday, that the only remaining issue was with respect to the treatment of Christiana. What is that issue? The issue is whether the Du Pont Co. will be allowed to distribute General Motors stock to Christiana; if so, whether Christiana will be permitted to retain it or be required to divest itself of it; and if divestiture by Christiana is ordered, whether it shall be by sale or distribution to its stockholders.

The Government maintains in the brief I have cited at length here today that the Du Pont family controls Christiana; that Christiana controls Du Pont; that Du Pont controls General Motors. I have read from the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The Du Pont Complex," which shows that this complex controls the tires that go on General Motors automobiles; that the complex controls the manufacturers of the glass that is used in the windows and windshields and the manufacturers

of the paint and fabrics; that it controls everything, in fact, but the horn. It is relief from this monopolistic condition which has been illegally brought about as to which the Government seeks a decision and has been seeking one for 13 years. Now that the case is in the final stage of litigation, Du Pont, having lost in the courts, runs to Congress and asks us to pave a superhighway for a pass-through which the Attorney General says would vest monopoly control right back in the nexus of the ownership, the Du Pont family, which now exercises that control.

This is an intolerable situation in which we are placed. I think it would be utterly unwise and unthinkable for the Senate to pass the bill under these circumstances.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot see what possible difference the provisions of this bill, so far as they relate to individual shareholders, could make in the decision of a Federal judge as to whether an antitrust situation would continue if there was divestiture to the stockholders rather than divestiture by sale. For that reason I am not persuaded that the passage of this portion of the bill would have any bearing whatsoever upon the independent thinking of the Federal judge in Chicago. However, I must say that I wonder about the passage of the provisions relating to Christiana, because as to Christiana Corp., unlike Du Pont Co., a decision has not yet been made whether there should be divestiture. To me, that is the essential difference between the two situations.

Mr. GORE. That is primarily the question on which, in my opinion, the bill seeks to influence the judge. I wonder if the Senator would offer, or would support, an amendment to strike that provision of the bill which applies to Christiana?

Mr. MILLER. I would be pleased to work with the Senator from Tennessee on that.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I say to the able Senator from Tennessee and the able Senator from Iowa that this is one of the principal points argued in the recent brief. Counsel argues that the decree of divestiture should not extend to Christiana. I have heard the discussion between the two able Senators. If I correctly understood what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said about equity, it is this very point that is being raised by the Government of the United States, namely, that using the old, established principles of equity, and citing numerous cases, the court, having once acquired jurisdiction, may reach beneath the parent corporation, in order properly to effectuate its decree. This is the argument today of the Government of the United States, and it is the argument used in the recent brief.

What situation now confronts us? While this important legal question is

pending in court, based upon what we lawyers call equity; an attempt is made to come in through the back door—into this Chamber, to ask us to apply the principles of equity, before the court itself makes its decision, under its responsibility.

I repeat what I said some months ago; namely, that this proposed legislation is entirely premature. It is an invasion of the separation of powers. This responsibility belongs to the court, not to us.

I have been reading the brief filed recently by the Government, since our last debate, and I have been much impressed. I try to consider this matter as objectively as possible. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may remember that I did not go into the technical side of this tax question. I looked—as a lawyer—at a case which had not yet been concluded. To me, it is extremely significant that defendants—after having been knocked down twice, in a sense, by the decision—are appealing to the court not to pass judgment on this case now, but to wait until the Congress acts. I say such a course is highly irresponsible.

In the course of the debate it is said that this proposed legislation is not intended to influence the court's decision. Perhaps its purpose is not to influence the court's decision, but this legislation would take away the court's responsibility and authority. I am sorry to say that the court seems to be willing to yield on this matter.

I say to the Senator from Tennessee that this is the principal point, which has been made over and over and over again. It should be made crystal clear, so that every Senator will be able to understand what the real issue is.

Certainly such action as is contemplated is not our function. Instead, it is the function of the court. When the court makes its decision, then we can act, if we then wish to apply what we may call legislative principles of equity.

However, I am frank to say—and I may speak later about this matter—that I have a suspicion as to what the court will do in this case. If my suspicion is well founded, and as I read the briefs and the record in this case, I believe the case will be taken again to the Supreme Court. I do not think the Supreme Court will permit a lower court, in passing judgment in this case, to permit a pass-through by the Christiana Corp.

Having that situation in mind, it appears that enactment of this proposed legislation is sought, in an attempt to forestall the action of the U.S. Government in this case. As has been brilliantly stated by the Senator from Tennessee, after 13 years this case now could be lost by legislative interference.

I hope that following more debate on this point, and as greater understanding of this matter comes to this body, the Senate will not lend itself to such interference and such premature action.

As I have said, I have not completed my study of this matter. I understand we shall have a day or two of additional debate. In the interval I shall reread the briefs.

I understand that the position of the Government is that the Federal courts have acquired jurisdiction; and that even though the Christiana Corp. may not have had a specific order issued against it, yet, being the child of the parent, under the rules of equity—the court's decree can be broad enough to effectuate the full relief sought by the Government in this suit. This is the basic principle involved, which is now before the court.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, so that I may ask one or two questions of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado several questions. First, let me say that I am concerned about his statement that he thinks the entire bill is premature. Frankly, I must take exception to that statement. I do not think the part of the bill which relates to the individual stockholders is premature.

Will not the Senator concede that as to the Christiana Corp. situation, a divestiture to the stockholders will either result in continuation of an anti-trust situation or it will not—either one or the other. In other words, the matter is either black or it is white; and it is for the Federal judge to make that decision.

I must say that I cannot see any possible relevance regarding the tax treatment of the individual shareholders that can be born of the court's decision, because the tax treatment of the individual shareholders has absolutely nothing to do with the question of whether an antitrust situation exists.

It is for this reason that I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he should not have any particular reservations about the sections of the bill which relate to the individual shareholders.

But I can understand how, in the case of the Christiana Corp., the question of whether there should be divestiture might be clouded a little by the tax treatment going to Christiana Corp. That is why I say I wonder about that portion of the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. In response to the question of the able Senator from Iowa, let me say that the Supreme Court has passed on this question. Despite the fact that economic hardship may be involved in its decree or its judgment, the Supreme Court has directed the lower court to fashion an order giving equitable relief; and a time limit has been set. The judge can take 2 or 3 or 4 months, for instance, if he wishes; but, as I understand, once he makes his final decision, it will become operative within 90 days. My point is that once he makes his decision—and it is about time that he makes it—then if equity relief for the shareholders is needed—a matter in which both the able Senator from Iowa and I are interested—there will be ample time for Congress to deal with that matter.

But I do not like the idea of asking the Congress to give legislative relief to the Christiana Corp. before there has been a judicial determination. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to give some thought to this matter. Certainly there will be ample time. In a short time the briefs will be filed; and the judge will study them, and then will make a determination.

As I read the history of the handling of this matter by members of the office of the Attorney General in another administration, I believe there is a general consensus of opinion that perhaps there should be some tax relief, because of the forced divestiture. But that is not the issue before us today, at all. I hope all Senators will read the brief filed by counsel, in which he asks the court to withhold judgment on the Christiana Corp. question until legislative relief can be obtained. I say this is ill advised, and it is not in the interest of good government, and it is not in keeping with the separation of powers under the Constitution. This is the point I wish to make. I shall withhold judgment until later. After the court reaches its decision, if such an application then is made to this body, there will be time enough for us to act on it. But in the meantime I suggest that we postpone such action until a day certain or until the occurrence of a certain event. Let the court pass upon it; as for now, let the bill be recommitted to the Senate Finance Committee. If it is desired that the bill be kept on the calendar, let us have a postponement until a time certain or to the happening of a certain event. I think this is a proper statement of the parliamentary situation. All we seek is to let the court do its job, and then, if we have to, we will do ours.

Mr. GORE. The Senate can, of course, make such disposition of this bill as a majority may desire. One form which that might take would be to recommit the bill to the Finance Committee with instructions to consider the matter when the decision of the court shall have become final. That would be a condition, the occurrence of a condition, such as the Senator has in mind, I dare say.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that is one possible answer. It is, I think, advisable; but I was thinking that we could keep the bill on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Yes, we could if the Senate desired to do so.

Mr. CARROLL. I think a postponement to a day certain or to the time of the happening of a certain event; until after the judgment, might be appropriate. I will check with the Parliamentarian to see whether that can be done. In law and in public service the law does not presume evil; it presumes good. The presumption is that the judgment by the court will be good and therefore in the public interest. If it is a good judgment, we may not be required to act. If relief were needed, the relief would be sought. We do not desire to punish small groups of people, and we

do not want to give benefits to certain classifications that should not get them. At that time we would consider the equity question.

Mr. GORE. What the Senator is saying is that, in all probability, we should not proceed to provide relief from the decision of a court until we know the provisions of that decision.

Mr. CARROLL. It is just as simple as that. We do not know now what the judge is going to do.

Mr. GORE. Or if the provisions of the bill will be suitable and appropriate to the decision which may finally be rendered.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will yield, I wish to make an assumption. It is a hypothetical one, and I hope I am wrong, but let us assume that the judge in the lower court rules that the decree does not apply to Christiana. Does the Senator know what would happen in that case? I think the Department of Justice would have to go to the Supreme Court with that question. I do not know how long it would take to get a decision. I think the Department of Justice, based upon the letter from the Attorney General, and based upon the briefs I have read, would go back to the Supreme Court and say to the Supreme Court, for the third time, "Please instruct the lower court in its actions."

Mr. GORE. Moreover, this has been the position maintained up to this time by the Justice Department in three administrations, two Democratic and one Republican.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly. Therefore, I think it bolsters the argument made last fall and bolsters the principal issue here. The proposed legislation is entirely premature. Why? Because there has been no final judgment. Let us permit the case to go again to the Supreme Court if necessary. If the lower court should rule that Christiana is not brought within the framework of the decree in this case, and the Justice Department goes to the Supreme Court, all divestiture proceedings would be stayed pending the Supreme Court decision. I think all proceedings would be stayed until the principal monopolistic issue were resolved.

It seems to me a matter of pure and simple logic.

Of course, as the Senator has said, if this bill passes and the President signs it, the rug will be pulled out from under 13 years of litigation. If this is what is intended, then I think the public ought to know what is going on.

I commend the able Senator from Tennessee and the able Senator from Illinois for the fight they have made on the floor to have the issue understood. It is a complicated issue, and the litigation is highly involved. I have been back in Washington only a few days. However, I have gone into the briefs and have talked with lawyers in the case. I do not know what the judge will do. I hope what I have said will not influence his judgment. He is considering the briefs, and they are brilliant briefs, submitted by both sides. Let us

wait for the judgment of the court. Let us wait to see what he will decide, without interfering with the Government's case, and without interfering with Du Pont's case.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I am sure he is aware that the Department of Justice has been concerned that the passage of the bill might cause the Government to lose its case in Chicago.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not think there is the slightest doubt that the legislation in its present form will pull the rug out from under the Government in the brief that is filed with the court, if I may use that expression again. It is why I may have to vote for some amendments, purely as a defensive action. But the truth is, I think we ought not to intervene on the Government's side. I think the bill should be recommitted or postponed to a day certain. Let the judge make his determination. The forces here involved are strong and well organized. As a defensive measure, I may have to vote for such amendments as will enable us to get the strongest bill possible, because I know the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois are fighting what looks regretably like a last-ditch battle.

If the court holds a certain way and if it is desired to bring the Christiana issue before the Supreme Court, let that be done. In the meantime, no stockholder would have lost a thing. I would hope there would not be a delay of over a year. Then if the question of equity legislation comes before Congress, we would meet that question and cross that bridge when we come to it.

I thank the Senator for having yielded to me.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his able statement. Since he has referred to the brief of the Justice Department and its position, I should like to read from page 4 of the brief filed November 27, 1961:

The fact that the Government has, since the outset of this litigation and consistently throughout its course, adhered to the view that divestiture by Christiana is essential to effective relief is reflected in the extracts from prior proceedings to this action set forth in appendix X thereto.

I had read that sentence previously. Following the able statement of the junior Senator from Colorado I thought it appropriate to read it again.

I read further from page 8:

The evidence before this court has established such an identity of interest between Christiana and Du Pont as to justify this court in concluding that Christiana's participation in a deliberate course of conduct by Du Pont is of the highest relevance to the question of the power of this court to order divestiture by Christiana.

I read one other sentence which I have previously read:

Since its formation, Christiana has been a control instrument through which the Du Pont family has dominated E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Thus, at the time of Du

Pont's initial acquisition of General Motors stock in 1917, the identity of interest between Du Pont and Christiana was already well established. This control of Du Pont by Christiana has extended to the present date. In our memorandum of September 26, 1958, in support of the Government's then proposed decree we set forth certain facts regarding the identity of Christiana and Du Pont which bear repeating here.

Mr. President, before I read these facts which were set forth in 1958 I invite to the attention of the Senate—which I dare say is not necessary—the fact that this was during the term of former President Eisenhower. This is what the Justice Department said in 1958:

Irrefutable evidence shows that throughout the history of the relationship between Christiana and Du Pont, the officers and directors of Christiana have at all times been officers and directors of Du Pont and at all times held the key executive positions in that company. This is shown by the following résumé of the various official positions held in Christiana and Du Pont by each of the persons who had been directors of Christiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table contained in the brief as filed during the Eisenhower administration with respect to these identities, found on pages 10 and 11 of the brief.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pierre S. du Pont: Christiana, director and president; Du Pont, director, president, chairman of board, member of finance committee.

Irene du Pont: Christiana, director, treasurer, and vice president; Du Pont, director, vice president, president, vice chairman of board of directors, member of executive and finance committees.

Lammot du Pont: Christiana, director and vice president; Du Pont, director, vice president, president, chairman of the board, member of executive and finance committees.

R. R. M. Carpenter: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of finance and executive committees.

A. Felix du Pont: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of executive committee.

John J. Raskob: Christiana, director, secretary and treasurer; Du Pont, director, vice president, treasurer, member of finance and executive committees.

Henry Belin du Pont: Christiana, director and secretary; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of executive committee.

H. Fletcher Brown: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, vice president, member of finance and executive committees.

Lammot du Pont Copeland: Christiana, director and vice president; Du Pont, director, secretary, member of finance committee.

Crawford H. Greenewalt: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, president, member of finance and executive committees.

W. S. Carpenter, Jr.: Christiana, director; Du Pont, director, president, chairman of board and member of finance and executive committees.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the interlocking directors and officers within the Du Pont complex as of 1948.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

## Interlocking directors and officers within the Du Pont complex, as of 1948

## EXECUTIVE POSITIONS HELD BY MEMBERS OF THE DUPONT FAMILY

	Christiana Securities Co.	Wilmington Trust Co.	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.	General Motors Corp.	United States Rubber Co.
Pierre S. du Pont.....	President, director.....	Honorary chairman, director.....	Honorary chairman, director.....	Formerly chairman.....	
Irene du Pont.....	Treasurer, director.....	Formerly director.....	Director.....	Formerly director.....	
Lammot du Pont.....	Vice president, director.....	Director.....	do.....	Formerly chairman.....	
Henry B. du Pont.....	do.....	do.....	Vice president, director.....	Director.....	
A. Felix du Pont, Jr.....	Director.....	do.....	Director.....	do.....	
Lammot du Pont Copeland.....	Vice president, director.....	Director.....	Secretary, director.....	Director.....	Formerly director and member of finance committee.
W. S. Carpenter, Jr.....	Director.....	do.....	Chairman, director.....	do.....	
C. H. Greenwalt.....	do.....	do.....	President, director.....	do.....	
B. R. M. Carpenter.....	do.....	do.....	Director.....	do.....	
Donaldson Brown.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Director.....	
William F. Harrington.....	do.....	Director.....	do.....	do.....	
Colgate W. Darden, Jr.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	Director.

## OTHER KEY EXECUTIVES

Francis B. Davis, Jr.....			Formerly president, Du Pont Viscoloid, Co.	With General Motors 1921-23.	Chairman, director.
George P. Edmonds.....		President, <sup>2</sup> director.....	Director.....	do.....	Director.
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr.....		do.....	do.....	Chairman, director.....	
A. B. Echols.....		Formerly director.....	Vice president, director.....	Director.....	
J. J. Raskob.....	Director.....		Formerly director.....	Formerly director.....	

<sup>1</sup> Deceased June 1949.<sup>2</sup> Became president of Wilmington Trust in November 1948.

Sources: Moody's Manuals; Poor's Manuals; Who's Who in Commerce and Industry (1948); Who's Who in America (1948).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus far we have pointed out that the 65 members of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family control Christiana, which in turn controls Du Pont, which in turn controls General Motors; and that, therefore, these 65 members of the Du Pont branch who have stock in Christiana control General Motors. The Senator from Tennessee has brought out the fact that Christiana Corp. is, in effect, a control device, whereby the succeeding generations of the Du Pont family may take united action inside Du Pont and inside General Motors and other companies.

Mr. GORE. Yes. Also, I wish to read from the brief of the Justice Department, page 12:

In short, the evidence is irrefutable that the directorship of Christiana has at all times constituted the top management of Du Pont.

The relationships between Christiana and Du Pont are such that, by any objective standards, they must be regarded as parts of a single organic structure dominated by Christiana.

However, the influence of Christiana and its directors does not stop with Du Pont directorships and offices but extends on into the administration of General Motors. Of the 11 persons who have been directors of Christiana during its history, 7 have also been directors of General Motors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is also true that there are two further control devices of the Wilmington branch of the Du Pont family; namely, Wilmington Trust and Delaware Trust, which are Du Pont-controlled trust companies. According to appendix D of general exhibit 2, submitted by the Government, Wilmington Trust has slightly over 2 million shares of Du Pont stock trustee to it. It has an exclusive right to vote over a million of these shares, and jointly with a family joint trustee 318,000 shares, and subject to a family adviser 460,000 more;

therefore, the total stock controlled by Wilmington Trust and family members, or by family members only, comes to 1,927,000 shares.

In addition, there is Delaware Trust, which is a Du Pont company, which has 1,657,000 shares of Du Pont stock. It has the exclusive right to vote 1,473,000 of those shares, and can vote jointly with members of the Du Pont family 145,000 shares.

The cohesiveness of the 65 members of the Du Pont family consists, therefore, not merely in a blood relationship, not only in the fact that they live in or near Wilmington, not only in the fact that they have very close relationships with Mr. Lammot du Pont Copeland, but also in the fact that they have these two other control devices owned by the Du Pont family which, between them, hold 3.6 million shares of Du Pont stock. They, with the key members of the family, have control over the voting of those shares.

Individual members of the Du Pont family may come and go. Generations may succeed each other. Du Ponts may come and go, but Wilmington Trust, Delaware Trust, and Christiana go on forever. And they give continuing unity and continuing control.

Mr. GORE. According to the brief, it is so designed. Nothing that the Senator has said is intended, I am sure, and nothing I have said is intended to be any personal criticism of, or personal assault on, members of the Du Pont family.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I think we ought to make the record perfectly clear. We are speaking of facts and effects, not motives.

Mr. GORE. The fact stands that not only was Du Pont a defendant in the complaint filed by the Government, but so also were the Christiana Corp., the Delaware corporation, and members of the Du Pont family.

The court action is not a criminal action. The defendants in that action are

not being prosecuted for some criminal act. They have not been prosecuted for a criminal act. The case is a civil action brought pursuant to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. The original complaint charges that the corporations named and the citizens who happen to be members of one family have conspired, have used concerted action, and have banded together—corporate, personal, and otherwise—for the purpose of violating the law by imposing monopoly control over a very large corporate and industrial complex. It is relief from that situation that is sought by the action against the corporations and the members of the Du Pont family.

The Government has pleaded before the courts for 13 years for relief from that situation. The case is now in the final stages of adjudication. I hope the legislative branch of the Government will permit enforcement of the law which the legislative branch passed.

In this connection I should like to read what Mr. Lammot du Pont Copeland said about Christiana Corp., about which the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] questioned me. The statement is contained in the Government brief on page 12:

The basic function of Christiana is to hold Du Pont common. It has 30 percent of it. That is its reason for being in existence. It would be contrary to its purpose to give up Du Pont common and take General Motors in its place. There would just be no logic to it. It is a reversal of its whole function. It is not an investment corporation in the popular sense of the word.

I wish to read from page 47 of the brief:

Moreover, the Supreme Court found that, "Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics." Thus the injunctive provisions in the Government's proposed judgment are not being directed at some unforeseen results of innocent conduct, but rather are aimed at barring enjoyment of

the consciously intended fruits of the violation, as well as protecting the public's interest in the matter.

Mr. President, that statement, in the words of the Department of Justice, is my answer to those who might claim that because I contend that a monopoly should not vest in a few members of the Du Pont family, I am trying to perpetrate some personal persecution. That is not the case at all. There are many laws which citizens are not permitted to violate. The injunctive process is available to citizens and officers of the court alike, as is redress for wrongs committed and relief from conditions found to be in violation of the law. That statement applies to individuals as well as to corporations.

With that comment I should like to reread from the brief of the Department of Justice the sentence that I just read:

Thus the injunctive provisions in the Government's proposed judgment are not being directed at some unforeseen results of innocent conduct, but rather are aimed at barring enjoyment of the consciously intended fruits of the violation, as well as protecting the public's interest in the matter.

As I have said, to be specific, the relief sought here is relief from a monopolistic condition. The Attorney General of the United States, in a letter read to the Senate only yesterday, and again cited today, repeated a statement which the Government has cited in briefs for 13 years: The Christiana Corp., as well as Du Pont Co., must divest itself of General Motors stock. Indeed, the Government contended in the beginning of the litigation that members of the Du Pont family should divest themselves of the General Motors stock which they held personally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As the case proceeded, the Government reluctantly withdrew from that position. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that members of the family still own approximately 3.3 percent of General Motors stock which has been certainly traced, and then an additional 0.6 percent covered in exhibits not included in the formal pleading of the Government before the courts. So that, as was said earlier, if the court orders divestiture on the part of Christiana by sale, as the Government has contended, members of the family will not be stripped of all of their General Motors stock. On the contrary, they will have approximately 4 percent of General Motors stock, and that amount will be more than four times the holding of any other single group. The issue is whether they shall have 9.4 percent. The issue is on the 5.3 percent which would be held by Christiana. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. Not held by Christiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which would be held by Christiana.

Mr. GORE. I am not at all sure that I would agree with the acquiescence of the Department of Justice to the extent described by the senior Senator from Illinois. However, that question is moot.

The only question remaining to be decided, according to the attorneys for Du Pont in Chicago, is whether this stock can be divested, as I have stated, by Du Pont to Christiana; and, if so, whether Christiana will be permitted to retain or must divest itself of it; and if it must divest, then how—by pass-through or by sale?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Since so many positions have been stated, perhaps it would be well if I read at this point the proposed order of the court which was submitted to the court by invitation of the court by the Government on October 2, 1961. I am reading from page 12:

A. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Du Pont shall completely divest itself of all General Motors stock by distribution to its stockholders and/or such other method or combination of methods as it may select, subject to the provisions of this final judgment. The divestiture shall commence within 90 days after the effective date of this judgment.

B. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Christiana shall divest itself of all General Motors stock which it now owns and any General Motors stock which it may hereafter be permitted to acquire in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this judgment. Such divestiture shall be effected by sale or such other method or combinations of methods as Christiana may select: *Provided, however,* That such divestiture shall not be effected by any disposition to a stockholder who shall remain a stockholder after the disposition.

There are provisions in the proposed order which are injunctive in nature, and I do not believe it necessarily pertinent to this discussion to read them at this time.

The Government made a second proposed judgment, in the event the court could not in its wisdom concur in the proposed judgment which I have read. The Government submitted an alternative which could be followed in the event the court decided that it did not have jurisdiction over Christiana in the premises.

A. Within 10 years after the effective date of this judgment Du Pont shall completely divest itself of all General Motors stock by such method or combinations of methods as it may select except that Du Pont shall not make any disposition of such stock to Christiana or to the stockholders of Christiana in their capacity as such stockholders.

Mr. President, how much more emphatically could a record be established? How could the President of the United States sign a bill contrary to the contentions of the government or 13 years? I would hope, in the event the Senate so unwisely acted, he would not seriously consider signing it, particularly in view of the fact that the litigation is in its final stages, and that the final briefs of litigants are requested to be submitted next Monday.

Yes, I know, Mr. President, that the committee majority, in its report, protests that "it expresses no opinion as to what particular method of divestiture of General Motors stock by Du Pont or by Christiana is appropriate. It is contemplated by your committee that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture are to be determined judicially, solely with reference to the antitrust

principles announced by the Supreme Court in the Du Pont case."

Why, then, the bill, Mr. President? If the Senate, in fact, does not wish to inject itself legislatively into a matter now in final determination in the courts, why pass this bill?

What is the purpose of the bill, unless it seeks in some way to preempt the decision? If the Senate wishes to leave the courts free of influence of a legislative and political endorsement of a pass-through, then why should the Senate pass a bill before the court has rendered its judgment? How, in good conscience and propriety, I ask, can the Senate pass a bill providing relief from a court judgment before the court has even rendered its judgment, let alone before the judgment has become final? What pressure is it that impels the Senate to act so prematurely, injudiciously and unwisely?

Many thousands of people and, I fear, some of my colleagues have been misled by a deliberate campaign of deception, misinformation, propaganda, and lobbying. This propaganda and lobbying campaign has been spearheaded by Crawford Greenewalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. He has been buttonholing every Senator he could possibly reach. Mr. Greenewalt has a right to visit Senators, and I would not deny him that right. He has a right to write letters to his stockholders, and I would not deny him that right. Neither he nor his company nor associates, however, have a right to violate the antitrust law and it is, I firmly believe, for the purpose of perpetuating the condition from which this Government has sought relief since 1949 that Mr. Greenewalt and his associates embarked upon such a vigorous and, it appears terribly successful, campaign to mislead their hundreds of thousands of stockholders and the American people, and thus to pressure the Congress into passing the pending bill.

Mr. President, I do not say these things lightly or without material evidence. Mr. Greenewalt has written letters to thousands of people in Tennessee, for instance, and I presume to people in many other States, urging them to get in touch with my senior colleague and me in behalf of the passage of the bill. As I have said, he has a right to write as many letters as he likes, but he has misinformed and misled our people. And, I do not think anyone has a moral right to mislead and deceive the American people. I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents urging me to support passage of the pending bill. Here is a letter I would like to read. This letter was written by hand on a sheet of tablet paper:

When no wrong has been done, I do not think it is just to punish me, an innocent stockholder.

It is plain that this person has been misled into believing that unless Congress passes this bill, he, an innocent stockholder is going to be unjustly punished.

Mr. President, to mislead this good, small stockholder in this manner is reprehensible, and this has been done on a

mass scale. Any person who would undertake such action in order to pressure Congress into performing an unwise act cannot but hold Congress, and the Senate, in contempt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In his prepared testimony before the Committee on Finance on September 13 last year, Mr. Greenewalt submitted two exhibits, one of which listed the number of domestic stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. by States. The total number was 209,467. In exhibit B, there was a classification of 735,000 stockholders in General Motors by States.

The significance of this classification by States—I think is fairly obvious—I may say that as to the State of Illinois Mr. Greenewalt listed 7,967 Illinois stockholders in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and 48,140 stockholders in General Motors.

I have checked with my office, and we estimate that we have received about 2,000 letters supporting the position of the Du Pont Co. This seems at first sight to be a tremendous outpouring of public opinion. However, there are over 10 million people in the State of Illinois, and it should be realized that there are perhaps 2½ million households. So these figures represent perhaps one-tenth of 1 percent of the households in the State.

While it is absolutely within the right of Mr. Greenewalt to correspond with the stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and, if he has done so, with the stockholders of General Motors, nevertheless we ought to consider the interests of the Nation as a whole and not be frightened by letters which come, after all, from a very small segment of the people in our State, who write, I think, without full information of what the real issues are, as the Senator from Tennessee has developed.

Mr. GORE. Even though they wrote with full information, even assuming they had not been misled, are Senators but robots? Must they weigh the amount of mail they receive for and against a bill? Must they stick a weather vane to the breeze to determine the manner of their conduct? Or must they measure and weigh and evaluate and consider the merits and the soundness of proposals before the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To ask that question is really to answer it. We should use our independent judgment according to what we think is best for the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I think so, of course. The senior Senator from Illinois wants to hear from his constituents. The senior Senator from Illinois and I welcome expressions of sentiment and opinion from all our constituents, from any constituent who desires to write. I know that he is aware, as I am, that 2,000 persons in Illinois are not, in the normal course of events, very likely to write to him about a complicated and technical piece of proposed legislation such as this unless they have been inspired to do so by some organized campaign.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the right of petition is inherent in the American system, and both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois have made it perfectly clear that they do not blame Mr. Greenewalt for communicating with his stockholders or with the stockholders of General Motors in this fashion. We simply ask that Members of Congress and members of the public consider this issue on its merits, and that we in Congress should not try to influence the Court in the decisions which it will shortly have to make.

Mr. GORE. I have said specifically that Mr. Greenewalt has a perfect right to buttonhole as many Senators as he can, who are willing to see him and have the time to see him. He has a right to write as many letters as he wishes. But I do not believe any citizen has a right deliberately to set out upon a campaign to deceive and misinform the American people.

In connection with the question of the innocent stockholders, there is another phrase that has been given great circulation in connection with this propaganda campaign. It is the phrase "harsh treatment."

I digress momentarily to observe that no one has said that this little stockholder in Tennessee is guilty of anything. No one has charged him with guilt. It does not follow, however, that the Du Pont Co. is innocent of violating the antitrust law. Indeed, the Supreme Court said:

The fact that sticks out in this voluminous record is that the bulk of Du Pont's production has always supplied the largest part of the requirements of the one customer in the automobile industry connected to Du Pont by a stock interest. The inference is overwhelming that Du Pont's commanding position was promoted by its stock interest and was not gained solely on competitive merit.

We agree with the trial court that considerations of price, quality and service were not overlooked by either Du Pont or General Motors. Pride in its products and its high financial stake in General Motors' success would naturally lead Du Pont to try to supply the best. But the wisdom of this business judgment cannot obscure the fact, plainly revealed by the record, that Du Pont purposely employed its stock to pry open the General Motors market to entrench itself as the primary supplier of General Motors' requirements for automotive finishes and fabrics.

It is from this condition that our Government has sought relief for 12 years. The Du Pont Co. has lost the case in the courts and now seeks to win it in Congress.

And, after much study, it is my considered opinion that it is for the purpose of avoiding the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court, finally won through the persistence of the Government and the dedicated efforts of some brilliant young attorneys in the Antitrust Division, that Mr. Greenewalt and his associates have embarked upon this highly financed campaign of misrepresentation to bring pressure upon Congress to pass this bill.

It is from this condition, as I have said, that the Government has sought relief.

I read into the RECORD this morning a wholly untrue statement which has been sent to all the newspaper editors of the country. Just last week an effort was made to mislead the press and the people of the country and the U.S. Congress. Moreover, I am sorry to say that many have been misled.

Why would hundreds of people in Tennessee write me to support this complicated, technical piece of legislation? Obviously this flood of letters has been inspired by Mr. Greenewalt's propaganda, pressure, and lobby campaign.

Now, what has he told these people? Immediately following the first Supreme Court decision, holding Du Pont in violation of the antitrust law and directing it to divest its General Motors stock, it will be recalled that there were widely circulated statements that the harsh tax burden upon stockholders of the Du Pont Co. would amount to \$1 billion or more. More recently, the consequences have not appeared to be so dire, but even in Mr. Greenewalt's letter of January 2, 1962, to thousands of people in Tennessee and, I presume, hundreds of thousands in the United States, he manages quite cleverly to leave the impression that unless they, the blighted and persecuted little stockholders, succeed in persuading their Senators to pass this bill, then, in some way which he does not exactly describe, they are going to be personally hurt.

Here is another letter from which I should like to read:

This is to let you know that if H.R. 8847, the so-called Du Pont bill, is not passed, I will be hurt directly and seriously.

When Mr. Greenewalt was under examination before the Senate Finance Committee, he had a different story to tell. There he said he proposed to follow a plan, under existing law, by which Du Pont would divest itself of General Motors stock in a manner that would not cause the individual stockholders to pay any more taxes than they would now pay on cash dividends on their stock. This testimony will be found on pages 77, 78, and 79 of the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee. Under the plan which Mr. Greenewalt proposed to follow, he said the Du Pont Co. would pay approximately \$330 million in taxes. He said, I repeat, "stockholders would be paying no more than the tax they now pay on the cash dividends."

He did not advocate passage of the pending bill because it would cause the little stockholders in Tennessee to pay less taxes—not at all. If this bill became law, it would provide complete tax exemption for the Du Pont Co. on the multibillion-dollar profits in its General Motors stockholdings. Du Pont would not pay any part of the \$330 million which Mr. Greenewalt estimated would be the company's tax liability under the plan he proposed to follow if Congress should resist the blandishment and pressure of his campaign to pass this bill.

Who would pay the taxes if this bill passes? Not the Tennessee widow with her mite of two shares of stock.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, she will not gain by the passage of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Yes, she will not gain at all. She will experience no appreciable tax consequences from whichever plan is followed. Under existing law the tax burden would be borne by the corporation. If the pending bill becomes law taxes in a substantially equivalent amount will be paid by stockholders, largely by those holding large blocks of stock.

Lest there be some room for doubt, I should like to read the statement of Mr. Greenewalt which appears on page 78.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Illinois have before him the hearings on page 78?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee will check the statement by Mr. Greenewalt, which I should like to read, and will make whatever comments may seem to him appropriate.

Mr. GORE. Very well, I will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In response to a question asked by Senator Long of Louisiana, we find the following:

Mr. GREENEWALT. That is correct, only in theory. I would like to impress upon the committee the magnitude of this problem. It is really huge. We feel, in making these estimates, that the maximum we could properly pay out in the form of General Motors stock is something of the order of 25 percent of our regular cash dividend. The reason for this is that our stockholders rely on the cash, naturally, to eat, to send their children to school, or for whatever reason they desire the cash. Obviously, we can pay no more in General Motors stock than we think there is some possibility of their being able to retain. The rest we must pay in cash, we feel. So this places a practical limit on the percentage of our regular cash dividend that we can pay out in stock. Have I made that clear?

Senator LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENEWALT. Du Pont also could offer to exchange General Motors shares for shares of Du Pont common and preferred which could then be retired. Assuming certain statutory tests are met, as we believe would be the case, the exchanging stockholders would be subject to capital gains tax. As an incentive, it would be necessary to offer a suitable premium. In that event, exchanges might appeal to stockholders with a tax-exempt status, such as religious, educational, and charitable institutions, and to those Du Pont stockholders whose cost basis for Du Pont stock is high enough so that there would be little or no tax incident to the exchange. We believe we could dispose of as many as 10 million General Motors shares through essentially tax-free exchanges.

It thus appears that we could dispose of as many as 25 million shares of General Motors by methods which would produce no additional tax revenue.

Mr. GORE. From anyone.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, from anyone. I read further:

If we are correct in these estimates, there would still be left more than 35 million shares which we expect the company would have to sell within the 10-year period. Du Pont would be required to pay a tax on any capital gains realized on these sales and the tax revenue yield on all this would be in the neighborhood of \$330 million based on current market value of General Motors stock.

Under present law, then, tax revenues under the combination of methods of dis-

vestiture which now appears most favorable—

Most favorable to Du Pont, I presume.

Mr. GORE. Well, as President of the company, he would naturally consider it from that point of view, I believe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

I continue to read—

would total about \$330 million. A distribution under H.R. 8847 would yield tax revenues of about \$350 million.

Mr. GORE. Who pays the \$330 million under existing law, under the plan proposed by Mr. Greenewalt?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main the Du Pont Co.

Mr. GORE. Yes, the Du Pont Co. If we passed this bill, who would pay the \$350 million?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main the individuals or other stockholders.

Mr. GORE. Not the Du Pont Co.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is that not strange? Senators have received thousands of letters from small stockholders who have been misled into thinking that unless the Senate passes this bill, the value of their stock will be crushed or some sort of harsh tax treatment will be meted out to them; but Mr. Greenewalt in his own testimony said that if Congress passes no such bill, he proposes to follow a plan which would not cause the individual stockholders to pay a single dollar of tax in addition to what they now pay on their cash dividends. Yet he says that if Congress passes the bill, the Du Pont Co. will pay no tax, whereas if the bill is not enacted, the Du Pont Co. will pay \$330 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the total amount of tax will be slightly greater in the second case, according to Mr. Greenewalt.

Mr. GORE. And in which case the stockholders will pay all of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And that total tax will be \$20 million more.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, how more completely can the country be misled? How can white be made to look blacker than that? Does not the Senator from Illinois think that is really a remarkable performance in so-called public relations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. So far as I can tell, I think this bill is not of benefit to the average Du Pont stockholder.

Mr. GORE. If it is of benefit to him, where is the benefit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. GORE. Yet a widow in Tennessee has stated in her letter to me that she owns five shares of the stock and she believes she is going to be personally hurt.

Mr. President, I have at my desk many letters. It disturbs me that men who have been so fortunate in companies that have had such vast and profitable success in America would set out upon a campaign—deliberately set out upon a campaign—first, to mislead the people, and, second, to pressure the Congress, through the people who have been misled, into passing a bill to perpetuate—I think it has as its primary purpose the effort to perpetuate—the monopolistic

condition of which they have been held guilty, and therefore in violation of the antitrust laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have just developed the fact that, according to Mr. Greenewalt's plan—and he is, of course, the president of Du Pont—he would not be compelled to sell the some 60 million shares, which the apologists of Du Pont have said off the floor of the Senate he would be compelled to sell, and which certain Senators have repeated on the floor, but he said he could dispose of 25 million shares by distribution in lieu of cash dividend or exchange. This would reduce the total that would have to be disposed of by sale from some 60 million to 35 million shares.

Is it not true that General Motors has a pension plan which annually purchases about 1,100,000 shares of General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that over a 10-year period this pension plan could purchase 11 million shares from Du Pont. It would diminish the number of shares to be disposed of from 35 million to 24 million shares. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is according to my information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that General Motors, on the average, issues 1,300,000 shares a year of new General Motors stock—I think the record bears that fact out—and over 10 years that would amount to 13 million shares? That new stock could come from Du Pont holdings of General Motors which are to be disposed of. It would reduce the number of shares to be sold to approximately 11 million shares over 10 years.

Can it be said that the sale of 11 million shares over 10 years would have a catastrophic effect upon the market price of General Motors stock?

Mr. GORE. I do not think so, particularly when 7 or 8 million shares or more change hands on the stock exchange every year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we not had a test of this in the experience of the Ford Foundation?

Mr. GORE. Yes; we have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Ford Foundation, in a period of 5 years, disposed of the equivalent in value of 24 million shares of General Motors stock without any adverse market consequences. As a matter of fact, the price of Ford stock has increased appreciably during those years. As I remember, the price has increased by \$46 a share—from \$64.50 to \$110.75. And Ford is a more volatile and less stable stock than is General Motors stock.

If the Ford Foundation can dispose of the equivalent of 24 million shares of General Motors stock without loss and indeed with an appreciable gain cannot Du Pont dispose of 11 million shares in 10 years without adverse market consequences?

Mr. GORE. I think so; and yet that is one of the ostensible reasons given for passage of the bill. On tomorrow I shall examine the two ostensible reasons given

for passage of the bill, and I think I shall be able to demonstrate to the Senate that the arguments advanced for neither of them will hold water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, Du Pont would have to sell only 11 million shares; but even if it had to sell 24 million shares in 10 years, if the Ford Foundation can sell the equivalent of 24 million shares in 5 years of a more volatile stock and a less stable stock, and without adverse market consequences, could not Du Pont sell even as much as 24 million shares in 10 years.

Mr. GORE. I would surely think so. If we are able to show that neither of the two ostensible reasons advanced in favor of passage of the bill is valid—or, to put it another way, is supported by facts or logic—then we must look for the real reason for advancement of the bill. I shall be glad to engage the Senate's attention tomorrow again, and I shall examine those ostensible reasons, and then refer once again, with some additional facts, to what I regard as the two real reasons for attempting to influence the court to perpetuate the monopolistic condition which the Supreme Court has held violates the antitrust laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to introduce another consideration in the question as to whether the sale of General Motors stock by Du Pont would have adverse market effects?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even if the price of General Motors stock were to be somewhat depressed by the sale—and we do not admit that, and I do not think it would occur, but even if it were to occur—it would merely alter the ratio of market price to earnings. The earnings of General Motors would not be affected. At present, the dividend is \$4. Assuming this represents earnings, the ratio of \$55 to \$4 is a little less than 14 to 1.

Even if the price of the stock were to fall to \$50 a share, the earnings would remain the same, because fundamentally the operating conditions would not change. If anything, the operating conditions might improve, because General Motors could then buy its fabrics and finishes from more competitive sources, and the costs would be decreased. The earnings to price ratio, if the price went down to \$50, would be 12½ to 1. This would make it a very attractive stock. The idle funds of the market would rush in.

It is the same as if one lowers the level of a portion of a lake and then allows the remainder of the water in the lake to seek its natural level. The water rushes in to fill the vacuum, to establish the level.

We have heard a lot about the so-called free market in the stock market. If one lowers the ratio of price to earnings of a stock, one invites a tremendous investment. This will drive up the price of the stock.

When I saw the eminent representatives from the firm of J. P. Morgan disregard this fact, I began to worry as to whether they really knew as much about the stock market as they purported to know.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I have some insertions to make in the RECORD. I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOW SOME "BIRCHERS" WERE "BIRCHED"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last November a distinguished and courageous American newspaperman, former U.S. Senator Thomas M. Storke, was awarded the Nieman Foundation for Journalism's Lauterbach Award. That award is given annually for outstanding work in defense of civil liberties. Senator Storke is editor and publisher of the Santa Barbara News-Press, an old, highly respected, and progressive American newspaper. Incidentally, Tom Storke traces his gallant ancestry, over many generations, to the days of the Dons. He loves his country with precisely the same devotion each of us in this Chamber does.

Tom Storke merited the award, a richly deserving tribute to a high public service his newspaper rendered to the people of Santa Barbara and, in a very real sense, to the people of the Nation. Something over a year ago, beautiful Santa Barbara was "sizzling with John Birch fever." This notorious, secret group is best remembered for the contemptuous and contemptible assault by its leader on the characters of great Americans like General Dwight Eisenhower, who was called a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy; Chief Justice Earl Warren, whose impeachment was demanded; the late great John Foster Dulles, a courageous American patriot; and many others. It undertook, through various "front" organizations, attacks against American school officials, against churchmen, against people in government, and against many of our fellow citizens.

Today, as Tom Storke sees it, the political temperature of Santa Barbara is about back to normal. How did it happen? It happened simply because an undaunted American patriot informed his readers of the activities of the John Birch Society in Santa Barbara and the informed good sense of the people did the rest.

Mr. President, free speech and free press in America are part of this country's Constitutional heritage. Tom Storke and men like him across the country who are part of the free press of America, help assure this country's future. America is free. We intend to maintain our freedom. And the great body of our fellow citizens condemns all

attempts at destroying the character of good Americans and of the original Constitutional system our Founding Fathers gave to us.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by Senator Storke, entitled "How Some Birchers Were Birchd," appearing in the New York Times Magazine for December 10, 1961, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HOW SOME BIRCHERS WERE BIRCHED

(By Thomas M. Storke)

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.—A year ago Santa Barbara was sizzling with John Birch fever. Today the temperature of the body politic is almost back to normal. Why the change?

The answer is simple. The John Birch Society has been brought out of hiding. It was exposed to the judgment of the public, as it can be in every community.

It was revealed as a monolithic organization ruled with a dictatorial hand by its creator, Robert Welch, a man who sees Communists everywhere—in the White House, in the Supreme Court, in Congress, in the State Department, in our churches, schools and universities, in our press, radio and television.

It was revealed as a holding company for virulent "aginner" groups that say, as does the title of a current London show, "Stop the world; I want get off"—groups that are against democracy; against all income taxes; against the welfare and protective activities of the Government, which it calls socialism; against our participation in the United Nations; against foreign aid; against alliances for mutual protection with NATO and SEATO nations; against organized labor; against academic freedom; even against fluoridation.

In any community, the true image of the John Birch Society can be exposed to public view—the image of its reactionary rebellion against the twentieth century, as well as the face of anticommunism which it presents to the world. It can be exposed by individuals, organizations, newspapers, radio and television stations in a joint effort for public enlightenment.

The Birchers will fight back—as is their right. But out of the debate, the public will be able to make its own judgment, based on facts and open arguments.

This is what happened in Santa Barbara:

More than a year ago, it became apparent that organized effort was being put behind the activities of the ever-present radical reactionary extremists. A steady pattern of attack was emerging—against school officials, particularly in the adult education field; against churchmen; against the United Nations; against university professors and administrators. Day after day, the mails brought literature vilifying the entire Supreme Court and calling particularly for the impeachment of the Chief Justice. Most of these came in envelopes bearing Robert Welch's now familiar battle cry, "This is a republic, not a democracy—let's keep it that way."

More and more, letters to the editor followed the familiar "anti" pattern. Anonymous telephone calls charging "Communist" became commonplace. Mailings to Protestant church members cast doubts on the loyalty and patriotism of their leaders.

Santa Barbarans were seeing the manifestations of organized activity, but most of our citizens did not know what was behind it—the John Birch Society. I and my newspaper, the News-Press, decided the people had a right to know about the society that was trying to influence their thinking; just

as all Americans have the right to form their own opinions from a free flow of information, and the right to promote their views in a legitimate way.

On January 22 and 23, reporter Hans Engh told the Birch story in the News-Press after weeks of digging for facts. The story was told almost entirely in the words of the society, from its founder, some of its local members and its literature. Still, it brought cries of "smear" from the Birchers, and the pattern of Birch attacks continued.

So I decided I must tell my readers what I thought of Robert Welch and his society and what they were doing to my beloved Santa Barbara. I did so in a front-page editorial on Sunday, February 26, 1961, that was accompanied by a statement of democratic principles in which I believe, and which my newspaper stands for. I introduced my editorial comments with these words:

The editor and publisher of the News-Press is in his 85th year. His entire life has been spent in this community. His memory takes him back many years and his reading even further. He lived when conditions were rugged. When West was West and men were men. He lived during periods when if a man or a group of men openly by word of mouth, or the printed word, called our President, or Vice President, our Secretary of State, the President's brother, members of the Supreme Court, and others at the head of our Government traitors, they were made to answer. Such slanders often called for a visit from a courageous and irate group which brought with them a barrel of tar and a few feathers. And such instances were particularly likely to occur if the slanderer came from New England. He lived when men were considered cowards when they hid behind their women's skirts and clothed their identity through anonymity.

It is in the light of this background that the News-Press tells where it stands on the John Birch Society.

The results were amazing. Most remarkable was the flood of support for our anti-Birch position from the moderates, both liberals, and conservatives—the people in the middle who are rarely heard from. Community leaders who had been subjected to Birch attack stood up and fought back, realizing that the newspaper and a broad segment of the public were behind them.

The air cleared and the political temperature began to drop.

We soon learned that other communities were having similar problems. Within a few weeks we filled requests for more than 15,000 reprints of the News-Press editorials and articles. The end of such requests still has not been reached.

Birch Society tactics call for the formation of front groups to carry on its program in disguise. Welch's Blue Book, bible of the society, says on page 86: "We would organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts." It says further on: "We are talking about a million men, by which of course I mean men, women, and girls and boys of college age or old enough to be in the fight \* \* \*. They are there just waiting to be recruited if we can get the story to them."

Last April the News-Press exposed, with documented evidence, the existence of a Birch front organization—the first such exposure anywhere. The front was called the Freedom Club, and it was set up on the campus of the University of California at Santa Barbara. It pretended to be just an organization of conservative students.

It was far more than that, as the News-Press revealed. At least part of its financing came from the treasurer of the John Birch Society in the Santa Barbara area. The guiding hand of both the Freedom Club and campus unit of the Birch Society was a 26-year-old man—not a student—but one of

Robert Welch's paid coordinators. His primary job was to help spawn John Birch units on California college campuses.

A report signed by the leader of the campus Birch unit contained these words: "It was decided to soft-pedal the societies [sic] activities and concentrate on the Freedom Club." And the minutes of a meeting of the Birch unit said, "A further point of attack shall be subtle movements in objectives and use of the Freedom Club so that attention shall not be focused on the actual society."

Nine of the fifteen members of the Freedom Club, it turned out, constituted the entire roster of the campus Birch cell. The Freedom Club was an instrument for bringing college students into the John Birch Society.

And not just college students. News-Press disclosure of the Freedom Club-Birch Society link came just after mailings had gone out to juniors and seniors of a local high school encouraging them to join the Freedom Club, without revealing its Birch parenthood.

Since the News-Press disclosed the deception, nothing more has been heard of the Freedom Club or campus Birch unit. Exposure was all that was needed.

More recently came Birch efforts to kill the UNICEF Halloween fund drive. A front-page News-Press editorial pinpointing the lies of the Birchers and setting the record straight probably was a factor in boosting this year's UNICEF collections to a total of \$6,000, compared with \$4,300 last year—a sizable amount for this small community.

The John Birch philosophies have been aired so thoroughly in Santa Barbara that they have lost much of their force. Welchers and Birchers and their brethren ("I'm not a member, but \* \* \*") continue to pressure church and school leaders. But now the overwhelming majority of Santa Barbarans—the rational moderates—take their outpourings for what they are, the unbalanced exhortations of a tiny, fanatical, highly vocal minority. California Attorney General Stanley Mosk has described the movement graphically as a collection of wealthy businessmen, retired military officials, and little old ladies in tennis shoes.

To me, Birchism—or Welchism—is a recurrence of a bad dream. My life spans 85 years of American history, and history has a way of repeating itself. Time and again I have seen people who should know better caught up in an emotional wave, following a leader as absurd as Robert Welch.

I recall a chat I had with President Roosevelt in the White House in 1934. I had just flown to Washington from Mexico City with Senator McAdoo, stopping en route in New Orleans, Jackson and Atlanta—the realms of three demagogues named Long, Bilbo, and Talmadge. I was deeply concerned about their successes, so I asked Mr. Roosevelt, "How are you going to combat such menaces?"

F.D.R.'s expression turned grave. He gestured with a rotating motion of his right arm and said, "I liken these threats to an epidemic of measles. You have to let it run its course. All we can do is keep the disease in its course and hope for the best."

The epidemic of demagoguery of which Long, Bilbo and Talmadge were the images did run its course and die down, if not disappear. The Birch epidemic, of which Welch is the image, also will run its course and die down.

But the distressing thing to me is the fact that there still is abroad in the land a paranoia so deeply rooted that it could sustain the John Birch movement—as for years it has sustained the Ku Klux Klan through periods of bold violence and longer periods of hiding and waiting. President Truman has said, "The Birch Society is the Ku Klux Klan, without nightshirts."

The parallel between Welchism and McCarthyism is obvious. McCarthy, like Welch, fed on the paranoid fears of his followers. But the post-McCarthy period saw the paranoia grow as communism gained new victories abroad and more and more frustrated Americans began seeing Red ghosts in every high office and under every bed.

With encouragement from Welch, a new crop of Americans began to get the idea that they could thwart communism by suspecting and smearing their neighbors, plastering the "Comsymp" label on everyone in sight and discarding our democratic heritage of free discussion of all political ideas.

Welch picked up the game where McCarthy left off, but he added refinements. He lacked the advantage of a seat in the Senate, but he more than made up for it by making sure his society was well financed and tightly organized.

Welch, as he himself boasts, is not playing for peanuts. He is out to recruit 1 million members. Yearly dues are \$24 for men and \$12 for women—which, if averaged at \$18, would mean an income of \$18 million a year, if his dream were realized; this, without considering large contributions by wealthy fanatics.

In a letter accompanying his monthly bulletins to members, Welch makes an appeal for extra gifts, beyond the dues, and blandly adds, "We shall not go into any detailed accounting as to how the money is used." This is a policy he has frankly followed from the first; no public accounting of receipts or expenditures.

Smart operators could do quite a bit with \$18 million plus a year that need not be accounted for. Smart operators are doing quite well already, on the fringes of the Birch Society and its fronts, with large fees for lectures, exposés and shock-talks to "freedom forums" or to secret study classes—delivered by reformed Reds, unemployed ex-Federal agents, columnists, and commentators.

No idea seemed too nutty for Robert Welch—even the idea that former President Eisenhower was a dedicated Communist who was working with his high-ranking partners-in-treachery to deliver us to the Russians.

Merely exposing such monstrous ideas—merely ventilating them in the public breeze—is enough to bring sanity (and sometimes laughter, to be sure) into the discussion of political issues. The absurdities fall of their own weight or continue to be held dear by a minority so minute that it is more troublesome than dangerous.

No instrument can perform the exposing operation more effectively than a newspaper. Congressional and legislative committees, sniffing the scent of subversion, have come close to launching all-out investigations of the John Birch Society. But there is potential danger in such inquiries.

A search for subversion can turn too easily into a probe of political beliefs. Legitimate questioning can too easily become intimidation of witnesses who hold minority political opinions. Even a character assassin is entitled to develop his own political philosophy and put the hard sell behind it.

Similarly, a newspaper doing its duty in a democratic society is entitled to bring every political philosophy into the light of day for public examination. It is entitled to discuss the sales technique being used, too—particularly if it is secret or semisecret in nature—and express its own opinion about both the philosophy and the sales technique.

I don't know what the real purposes are behind the Birch facade of anti-communism and the acknowledged but deemphasized aim of reversing the economic, social, and political trends of the 20th century in America. But it is worth pondering the possibility that the organization, unwittingly, is following a Communist-inspired line to destroy Americans' faith in their most respected leaders and institutions.

The Communists will adopt any tactic, even pseudo-anticommunism, if they see a chance to divide and weaken their enemy. And certainly the agitation and character assassination the Welchers have practiced have served only to make Americans distrust each other, undermine popular support for a strong national defense force, and weaken our ties with our allies.

In the end, the only protection against such aberrations as the John Birch Society and such ridiculous leaders as Robert Welch lies in the informed good sense of the people. Air the ideas of the radical extremists, and you will find in a hurry, as we did in Santa Barbara, that the moderates—conservative and liberal—are in control.

That knowledge makes all the difference in the world to the church and school leaders and others who have been under attack. When they realize that they have strong support behind them, they are unlikely to buckle under pressure.

In a letter to the News-Press last April, a research associate who was studying John Birch and other extremist movements for the California Teachers Association asked, "Am I correct in noting that since there has been so much publicity \* \* \* there have been no more open attacks—at least on schools?"

He is correct, as far as Santa Barbara is concerned. School administrators have expressed their thanks to me for bringing the Birch Society into the arena of public discussion. So have ministers of the Gospel.

If John Birch meetings are being held now in the Santa Barbara area, they have not come to the attention of the News-Press. Administrators of the University of California at Santa Barbara have noted that both the John Birch cell on the campus and its front organization, the Freedom Club, have ceased to exist. Disclosure of their activities is all that was needed. Parents and the students themselves took care of the rest.

It is true that the News-Press went a step beyond disclosure, as far as the John Birch Society in general was concerned. I spoke out editorially in plain, honest language that I don't think anyone could misunderstand.

I have published my own daily newspaper in Santa Barbara for 61 years. During that time I have learned at least one lesson well—that a newspaper will not be listened to or win respect if it pussyfoots in stating its editorial beliefs.

I have learned that you can't kill a rat with a feather duster.

#### CASTRO AND COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a few days in Punta del Este, Uruguay, the representatives of this Government and of the Organization of American States will attend an important meeting so far as this hemisphere is concerned. High on the agenda—I suppose number one—will be the policy of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere with regard to Castro in Cuba.

Earlier this month a distinguished American newspaperman, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., wrote his "Editor's Report," entitled "Playing Pattycake With Fidel Castro," which was published in the San Francisco Examiner, Sunday, January 7, 1962.

Mr. Hearst recalled that Castro came to the United States and spoke before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, indicating he wished to bring great freedom to the people of Cuba. Thereafter, in fact, only a few weeks ago, Castro conceded and confessed that he is a complete Communist, and always has been.

Some of Mr. Hearst's comments with respect to the position of the Organization of American States and the position of this country are, I think, required reading for the Members of Congress.

I recall that, a year ago, when we passed the mutual security bill, Congress specifically wrote into that measure authority for the President of the United States to invoke complete economic sanctions against Cuba. Since the bill was signed by the President, that is the law of this land today.

I urge on this floor that the President of the United States utilize the authority which Congress gave to him. I urge our representatives at Punta del Este to take a firm position against the common threat of continuing Communist infiltration into this Western Hemisphere.

We have friends south of the border. We wish to cement our friendships there. The American people wish nothing but the most intimate, pleasant, and profitable relations with our neighbors south of the border. Part of the hazard which is faced today by countries, large and small, situated in this hemisphere, can be traced to international communism and to Cuba.

I hope, Mr. President, that if my colleagues have not read the article by Mr. Hearst, they will read it, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING PATTYCAKE WITH FIDEL CASTRO—  
MONROE DOCTRINE SHOULD APPLY TO CASTRO'S CUBA—DANGEROUS TO U.S. SAFETY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

LOS ANGELES, January 6.—Our State Department this past week issued a formal white paper declaring—you guessed it—that Fidel Castro has turned Cuba into a Soviet colony.

Now the point is: Where do we go from there?

I recall, 3 years ago come spring, hearing fuzzy-faced Fidel in a ballroom of the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C., tell the American Society of Newspaper Editors what a friend of U.S. democracy he was.

A few actually believed him, because, I think, they didn't want to face up to the alarming potentials; but this column was skeptical.

Maybe Castro was all the pal he said he was, but there was some evidence to the contrary, warned the Editor's Report of April 19, 1959.

I gave it as my own opinion and that of others who knew Cuba that the jury was still out in the case of Fidel Castro.

The jury wasn't out very long. After a few months of blood baths to purge all opposition inside Cuba, and after Castro snuggled up to Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, there could only be one verdict.

If Castro wasn't 100 percent Communist he would do for the Soviet's purposes until a more reasonably accurate facsimile came along.

It was a classic example of the old saying that if a bird looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck and lays duck eggs, the odds are it's a duck.

The State Department white paper listed some \$100 million worth of the latest model Communist bloc arms consigned to Castro along with 800 military and technical advisers, noting that Cuba's armed forces are now second only to those of the United States on this side of the Atlantic.

It calls Cuba a "bridgehead of Sino-Soviet imperialism" and a serious threat to the American republics. Which will come as news to practically no one except possibly Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, who was with Castro's crew in the Cuban hills before they seized power but never suspected there was anything Red about them.

It may also come as news to a few desk-warmers inside the State Department itself. They have been so afraid of what world opinion—meaning the neutralist and Latin American nations—might say if we acted in our own interests, that they have shackled Uncle Sam as effectively as Dilliah tied up Samson.

We've seen how ready-to-use force was that most holler-than-thou of the neutrals, India, in the seizure of Portuguese Goa. As for the Latin Americans, they have so far been reluctant to act in their own interests against Castro, although he brags that he will take over all their countries for Marxism.

Two weeks from now, the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States will meet in Uruguay. High on the agenda is a demand that they act jointly to halt Castro. I am glad to see our State Department isn't just sitting back and resting on its white paper but is pushing the OAS to give Fidel an ultimatum to break with the Reds pronto.

In the light of the Roman Catholic excommunication of Castro and his henchmen for interfering with the church, some Latin American statesmen may feel pressure from their people to act.

But if they don't, the United States should act on its own.

What all countries must respect in the final analysis, is power and the will to use it. And the United States has the legal justification and the moral obligation to use power against Castro.

To quote the Monroe Doctrine, the United States would consider interference by foreign powers in the affairs of any American country as an unfriendly act "dangerous to our peace and safety."

That surely fits the Soviet-Castro setup. Castro has been screaming his old line about the United States getting ready to invade his Red stronghold.

It would be downright mean of Uncle Sam to disappoint him.

Maybe it didn't loom very large to some people this week when Premier Salazar of Portugal announced that his country would—at some future date—walk out of the United Nations and would meanwhile boycott the world body's activities. But to me this has an ominous ring.

Portugal is indignant over U.N. failure to prevent India's aggression against Goa. U.S. attempts to get U.N. action were blocked by Soviet veto in the Security Council and by Afro-Asian coolness in the veto-free Assembly.

My personal opinion is that the United States should have forced the issue in the General Assembly, despite a poll which showed the Afro-Asians—concerned only with European colonialism—wouldn't vote to block aggression by one of their own.

At least we could have made them go on record in their disregard of justice. There is no question that the Afro-Asian bloc—wielding the balance of U.N. power between the West and the Communists and enjoying it—is taking predictable attitudes which have no relation to the merit of cases.

Many people wonder whether this new U.N. lineup is making the U.N. impotent whenever a Western nation's rights are at stake.

President de Gaulle, of France, has long scorned the U.N. Belgium resents its actions in the Congo. British Foreign Minister Lord Home warns that blocs are negating the U.N.'s purposes and he makes it clear he means the Afro-Asians as well as the Communists.

No American who gets around can help but notice a growing opinion among our own people that the United States can hope for nothing much going our way if we pin our policy to the U.N.

I have been pro-U.N. from its start, believing that a democratic organization representing the peace-loving peoples of the world must eventually become a reality in some form or other.

Up to recently, the U.N. has done pretty well trying to fill that bill. But the emergence of many small new nations—mostly nowhere near advanced enough to vote on a par with such peoples as the Europeans—has changed the picture.

I recognize that many more Americans now are beginning to doubt this world body's effectiveness.

My belief in the U.N. in the past was further bolstered by the way it helped to serve our national interest. This was evidenced again and again by Russian vetoes and by the Soviet attempt only a year ago to render the U.N. secretariat impotent.

But the Communists have been strangely amiable about the U.N. recently. Isn't that because the Afro-Asian bloc—playing its own selfish game of balance of power—is also playing the Soviet's game, consciously or not?

Most of these new Afro-Asian nations wouldn't have their day in the sun if it were not for the U.N., which gives each of them the same voting power in the Assembly as the United States or Britain.

They couldn't even stay independent except for the power of the United States and the Western alliance which guards them. The Communists would swallow them overnight if they had only themselves to look to for defense.

If the ominous move by Portugal were to start a walkaway from the U.N. by any sizable number of other nations, the Afro-Asians would have only themselves to blame.

Where would they be without a strong U.N. backed by a strong West?

Or are they too impressed with the balance of power represented by their bloc voting to think about that?

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RILEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the nature of the spirit and the personality of Congressman JOHN J. RILEY was a clear testimony to the fact that he was an exceptional man in his devotion to country and especially in his standards of conduct in dealing with mankind and executing the high duties of the office to which he was elected eight times by the people of my and his Second Congressional District of South Carolina. Although I had known Congressman RILEY for many years, my intimate association with him began after World War II when my service as Governor of South Carolina coincided with his second term in the Congress.

During the years since that time I watched Congressman RILEY ably represent his district, State, and Nation in the Congress. I was impressed by his display of a steady hand and clear head in meeting some of the most perplexing and serious problems in the history of our Republic. His work on the House Appropriations Committee was admired by all those who are knowledgeable in the mountainous duties and grave responsibilities of this important committee. But beyond his duties on the Appropria-

tions Committee, and earlier, the Banking and Currency Committee, JOHN RILEY could always be found on the floor of Congress ready and able to support the great and sound principles of Government on which this Nation was founded.

Congressman RILEY's first consideration was always the welfare of his country. As a member of the South Carolina delegation for the past 15 years he served capably and faithfully and evidenced a deep reverence for principle in reaching decisions on the great and small issues he was called upon to consider in his record of public service. He rose to a place of high standing in the House because of his devotion to duty, high principles, personal integrity, absolute honesty, and unquestionable sincerity.

One of the most admirable traits of JOHN RILEY was his warm human kindness, sympathy for the needs and desires of others, and his intense determination to render a valuable service to his fellow man. This was indicated in part by his great interest in and service to young people in American Legion baseball and his favorite personal project, the Crosswell Orphanage in his hometown of Sumter.

During his campaigns he never used mass-communication methods of contacting his constituents but followed the practice of personal contact which so accurately expressed his depth of human feeling and the unpretentious nature of his personality. He was a warm-hearted man who in the heat of a campaign or during the deluge of duties in Washington could always find time to visit the sick and listen patiently to the problems of those who came seeking counsel and assistance.

Few men who have served in the U.S. House of Representatives have had the good fortune to have won and held such a strong measure of devotion, respect, and confidence of their people as had JOHN RILEY. He was so beloved by his people not because he was flamboyant, possessed of great oratorical skill, or because he attended to all the small political chores necessary to keep a constituency happy and satisfied. He made his way successfully in the oftentimes turbulent practice of politics by just being himself—a man of indomitable character and sincerity.

Congressman RILEY was a devoted servant of the people of the Second District of South Carolina and, indeed, the Nation, and my heartfelt sympathy goes out to his widow and children. While all of us in the Congress will miss him, their loss is the greatest because as a husband and father he adhered to principles set forth by the God in which he so deeply believed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STOCK DISTRIBUTION TREATED AS RETURN OF CAPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8847) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8847, as reported by the Committee on Finance, contains very sound and proper tax provisions relating to the forced disposition and forced receipt of General Motors stock under antitrust decrees and I expect to vote for it.

The bill is before the Senate after extended hearings and executive sessions by the Senate Finance Committee and a vote of 16 to 2. Some will argue that there is a better approach to the solution of this problem, but I do not believe anyone will contend that the forced disposition of this stock by the Federal Government does not warrant some tax adjudication to the owners.

However, I am concerned that the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance does not go far enough. My attention has been called to many cases where property other than stock and securities have been forced on the market in order to effectuate antitrust policies. The same reasons cited by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Finance in support of H.R. 8847 are equally applicable to the sale of all types of property.

In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, on previous occasions when those committees were considering suggestions for tax relief where the antitrust laws are concerned, the American Bar Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have urged that any legislation in this area apply to all types of property and not merely stock or securities. In fact, it is my understanding that the present proposal applies only to General Motors stock when distributed by the Du Pont Co. and would have no effect on any other antitrust case.

The pending bill is a step forward, but I submit that the Senate must take into account that there are other antitrust defendants who have been or will in the future be forced to dispose of other securities or other types of property. The shareholders of those companies will suffer for the same reason that the Du Pont and General Motors shareholders will suffer because the value of their investment will be reduced by the unintended tax consequences of a civil proceeding under the antitrust laws. The pending bill is obviously piecemeal legislation intended to meet the needs of a particular lawsuit.

When a similar measure was reported favorably in the House during the 86th Congress, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means stated that—

The committee wishes to make it clear that it believes this legislation will be of

value in facilitating enforcement of anti-trust laws generally and it is not the purpose to provide tax relief for any one case.

It is my hope that the Congress will give serious consideration to the harsh tax consequences of divestitures and distributions where any type of property is disposed of pursuant to an antitrust proceeding.

Extended hearings on this proposal have been held by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and I am advised that they are considering an early report on the same.

I shall not press consideration of this proposal on H.R. 8847, as I realize the Senate Finance Committee has not held hearings on it, but I would urge early hearings when the matter is presented to us by the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill as prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee and studied by the staff be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### H.R. 8847

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subchapter 0 of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gain or loss on disposition of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IX.—DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK AND DISPOSITIONS OF PROPERTY PURSUANT TO ORDERS ENFORCING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

"SEC. 1112. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY TO EFFECTUATE ANTITRUST POLICIES.

"(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If property is sold or exchanged solely as the result of a judgment, decree or other order of a court or of a commission or board authorized (or threat or imminence thereof) to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1-7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12-27), and none of the defendants in such proceedings has been named as a defendant in criminal proceedings, such sale or exchange shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the taxpayer could have reasonably anticipated a violation of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1-7), or of the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12-27), at the time of the transactions which gave rise to the proceedings brought under such Acts.

"(c) DISPOSITIONS TO AVOID FEDERAL INCOME TAX.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any sale or exchange of property which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income taxes.

"(d) REINVESTMENT OF PROCEEDS.—In the case of a sale or exchange of property described in subsection (a), the requirements of section 1033 dealing with investment in property shall be satisfied if the taxpayer during the period within which the property must be replaced under section 1033(a) (3) (B) purchases other property for use in a

trade or business and such investment is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a). In the case of a sale or exchange of property described in subsection (a), the other property in which the proceeds have been invested shall not satisfy the requirements of section 1033 dealing with investment in property unless it is certified by—

"(1) the Attorney General of the United States or his delegate, if the suit or other proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

"(2) by the commission or board, if the suit or other proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, that the investment in such property is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1-7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12-27)."

SEC. 2. Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to amounts received and to amounts invested after December 31, 1960, irrespective of the time of the sale or exchange. In the case of a sale or exchange to which Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the first section of this Act, is applicable, the period for making an election and replacing property referred to in Section 1033(a) (3) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall not expire prior to 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 17, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16, 1962:

##### FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

George W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1962. (Reappointment.)

##### U.S. ATTORNEYS

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years, vice Charles W. Atkinson, resigned.

Nathan S. Heffernan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice George E. Rapp.

Donald A. Wine, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Roy L. Stephenson, resigned.

##### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

James V. Day, of Maine, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for a term expiring June 30, 1965.

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

##### To be lieutenant commanders

Clinton D. Upham  
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.  
Dale E. Westbrook

##### To be Lieutenants

Donald W. Moncevic	Joe P. Pennington
Donald R. Tibbit	Robert L. Sandquist
K. William Jeffers	James S. Midgley
Harold E. McCall	John M. Doherty
Charles G. Elliott	Billy M. Keltner
Gerald C. Saladin	Charles H. Nixon
Raymond L. Speer	Melvin J. Umbach
Clifford W. Randall	Meinrade H. Schilly
Renworth R. Floyd	

##### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

##### To be general

Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

##### To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, XXXXXX Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

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

MaJ. Gen. Carl Henry Jark, XXXXXX U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Regular Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

##### LINE

Charles B. Brooks, Jr.	Joseph A. Jaap
William B. Sieglaff	Louis A. Bryan
Joseph W. Leverton, Jr.	Allen M. Shinn
James C. Dempsey	Alfred R. Matter
John W. Byng	Richard S. Craighill
Joseph D. Black	Daniel F. Smith, Jr.
Andrew J. Hill, Jr.	Thomas F. Connolly
Frederick J. Becton	Waldemar F. A. Wendt
Francis T. Williamson	Charles J. Palmer
Frederick J. Brush	Robert B. Fulton II
	Charles A. Curtze

##### MEDICAL CORPS

Harold J. Cokely

##### SUPPLY CORPS

Charles A. Blick  
John W. Bottoms  
The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

##### LINE

Leroy J. Alexanderson  
Grant G. Calhoun

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Alpha L. Bowser	James M. Masters, Sr.
Avery R. Kier	Ralph K. Rottet
Sidney S. Wade	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Thomas F. Riley	William T. Fairbourn
Frederick E. Leek	Bruno A. Hochmuth
Odell M. Conoley	Roy L. Kline
Philip W. John	William R. Collins

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Expanding U.S. Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, economically, the Nation, despite its record levels of productivity, still faces serious problems, both at home and abroad.

Our participation in the world market, for example, remains, in my judgment, far less than its potential.

With the greatest, most efficient production plants in the world, we find that only about 4 percent of our manufacturers are exporting their goods.

The expanding of the export trade would result in: More jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

For these reasons, I believe it is especially important that we undertake new creative efforts to expand U.S. exports.

Having commented on this subject recently, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of a statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: MORE DYNAMIC, CREATIVE EFFORT TO EXPAND U.S. EXPORT TRADE

Currently, the U.S. economy turns out goods at a GNP rate of about \$540 billion per year.

U.S. consumers—with a personal income of about \$429 billion—serve as the major customer of this great agricultural-industrial production plant.

In a shrinking, increasingly integrated world, however, we, as a nation, can—in my judgment—benefit also from a more enterprising effort to find and serve more markets elsewhere in the world.

Around the globe there are about 2 billion people outside the Communist orbit. Of these nations, only the industrialized countries of Western Europe exist on comparable—but still somewhat lower—economic levels. The lesser developed nations need literally everything for development and progress.

If the United States, then, could successfully serve more of these potential markets, the result would be more jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

What steps, then, need to be taken? Certainly any program should include the following:

1. Better education of business leaders on the potentials of expanding export trade;
2. Greater governmental-free enterprise cooperation in market research and development;
3. More effective dissemination of information to U.S. firms on how to expand foreign trade;

4. Expansion of research to determine how U.S. products (often too complex for utilization in less developed economies) can be modified, and then mass produced, for export to less developed economies;

5. Greater availability of information on how to finance foreign trade ventures; and

6. Greater efforts by the Government—through bilateral negotiations as well as through the U.N.—to obtain protection against expropriation, without compensation, of foreign investments.

Over the years, however, the Department of Commerce—as well as U.S. firms individually and through their associations—have made constructive efforts toward expanding foreign trade.

As a nation, we have—in my judgment—fallen far short of our potential. Only about 4 percent of U.S. manufacturers, for example, participate in, and benefit from, the export business. For that reason I believe that:

1. Congress must take a new look at our overall trade policies and programs—including a close look at reciprocal trade agreements to see what can be done to eliminate discrimination against U.S. products and thus encourage more exports;

2. The Department of Commerce—now administering a comprehensive but too-largely unutilized trade-development program—must step up its efforts to stimulate U.S. interest in expanding international trade;

3. Leaders in business and industry, themselves, must demonstrate more dynamic, far-sighted tradesmanship in broadening commercial horizons; and

4. There must be greater international cooperation among nations to remove obstructions and encourage—on a mutually beneficial basis—a greater to-and-fro flow of commodities.

If this can be accomplished successfully; we as a nation will benefit economically; other nations—particularly the lesser developed—will find themselves able to progress more rapidly; and there will be a brightening of the economic outlook of all people—particularly the "havenots," which will help create stability and peace in the world.

More Petitions Calling for an End to the  
Red Mail SubsidyEXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented to the Speaker's desk 43 additional petitions, calling for an end to the subsidy given Communist propaganda by this Nation.

These petitions, signed by 462 persons in 13 States, call for action by the Congress to stop the free distribution of Red poison in our mails.

Since March of last year, the Post Office has been forced to deliver—without 1 cent of payment—tons of Communist propaganda all over the country, most of it to persons or groups that do not want the material and are especially incensed to learn that it is delivered free.

These people cannot understand why the Congress is called upon to raise post-

age rates for Americans while the Post Office delivers Communist propaganda free and adds to the postal deficit. It is time for action by the Congress on this matter.

Legislation To Promote Greater Safety  
in River TransportationEXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill (H.R. 9700) for appropriate reference which would require the inspection and certification by the Coast Guard of certain motor vessels known as towboats. This proposed legislation is an outgrowth of a long series of exchanges of correspondence which I have had with members of the legislative committee of Local 28, International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL-CIO, of St. Louis, both in my capacity as a Representative of St. Louis in the Congress and also as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

The bill, which I am introducing by request as a means of bringing a long-standing problem before the committee in a manner which will assure thorough hearings and consideration of the underlying issue, would extend to diesel-powered towboats the same requirements for inspection and certification now required in the case of steam-propelled towboats. Insofar as the inland waterways are concerned, I am informed that steam-powered towboats have virtually disappeared.

I am not personally conversant with the technical details of inspection and certification proceedings, but as one who was born and reared in one of America's great inland ports located on our greatest river, I am certainly aware of the importance of taking whatever steps are necessary to assure the safe use of our rivers by the mammoth trains of barges which carry tremendous amounts of industrial cargo.

In previous discussions of this problem with the Coast Guard, I was informed that accident statistics have not disclosed so far any emergency situation as regards the operation of uninspected and uncertified towboats on the rivers. Nevertheless, as long as the danger of serious accidents exist, I believe we should take appropriate steps to extend the Coast Guard's inspection requirements if that course of action is feasible and practicable. The purpose of my bill is to provide the vehicle by which the whole problem can be brought up for hearings in committee, with the expectation that if the supporters of this bill can establish the soundness of their position, we can then correct any deficiencies in present law.

Other provisions of the legislation would require licensing of pilothouse employees on diesel-driven towboats just as they are now required to be licensed in steam-driven vessels of the same type.

### Exchange of Allotments

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit the exchange between farmers of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments. The full text of the bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 378 the following new section:*

#### "Exchange of allotments

"Sec. 379. The Secretary shall by regulations authorize the exchange between farms in the same county, or between farms in adjoining counties within a State, of cotton acreage allotment for rice acreage allotment. Any such exchange shall be made on the basis of application filed with the county committee by the owners and operators of the farms, and the transfer of allotment between the farms shall include transfer of the related acreage history for the commodity. The exchange shall be acre for acre or on such other basis as the county committee determines is fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the comparative productivity of the soil for the farms involved and other relevant factors. No farm from which the entire cotton or rice allotment has been transferred shall be eligible for an allotment of cotton or rice as a new farm within a period of 5 crop years after the date of such exchange."

For several years farmers who produce both cotton and rice have been asking authority to swap acreage allotments with each other within the county or an adjoining county. There were many reasons why the authority was asked by the holders of the rice and cotton allotments. In many areas where these commodities are produced small farms have been removed from production, which has hurt the general business activity in the communities. Also, in so many instances holders of small allotments do not have enough acreage to make an economic unit. A cotton farmer has equipment which is adaptable to the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of that crop. This same equipment cannot be used in the operation of a rice farm. The cotton farmer who is fortunate enough to have land which is suitable for cotton production and having the equipment being used in such an operation may have both cotton and rice allotments upon his land. He may want to dispose of his rice allotment and obtain in its stead a comparable amount of cotton allotment from his neighbor, or from a farmer within the county or an ad-

joining county. On the other hand, a rice farmer may have, let us say, a 40-acre rice allotment, and ordinarily a 60 to 70 allotment in a much more economic operation since one pump properly placed on his farm should service at least 60 or 70 acres of rice plantings. He would cherish the idea, probably, of going out of the cotton business and concentrating his efforts in the production of rice by arriving at an understanding and an agreement with a nearby farmer who desired to have additional cotton acreage and was not wanting to use his rice allotment. Both farmers are benefited by such an arrangement, as well as the community itself in which they live. The result would be approximately the same production of both crops in the affected areas where such transfers are made. The swapping of the acreage would be on the basis of comparable values.

The cotton and rice farmer differs from the corn farmer and many wheat farmers in that they are under strict controls, in which each must adhere to acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Since that situation prevails the programs for both crops should be made more palatable. Also, more flexibility in the operation of the programs is obviously most desirable.

In 1959 quite a number of bills were introduced on this subject. Hearings were held before the House Committee on Agriculture, but the legislation was not approved. Since 1959 there have been growing demands for action for legislation of this kind. Many letters have been written to Members of both Houses of Congress and to the Department urging that something be done to permit the transfer of cotton acreage allotments to rice acreage allotments and rice acreage allotments for cotton acreage allotments. This legislation can do no harm, but would be most beneficial to a major segment of farmers, who are asking that they be given this privilege of making for a more economic and logical farming operation.

### Knorr Soups

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the junior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, was host to all Senators in the Senate dining room for a serving of Knorr soup. This soup is a new hydrated product, produced by the Best Foods Division of Corn Products Co., whose headquarters plant—the world's largest food processing complex—is located in the northwestern section of my district in Argo, Ill.

Other than the fact that the quality of Knorr soup is of the highest, Mr.

Speaker, I think it will be interesting to the Members to learn of the origin of this soup. It was originated in Heilbronn, Germany, in 1838 and in the ensuing years became popular not only in Germany but also in all other countries of Europe. Later on, Knorr soups were brought to the United States by importers and were sold, primarily in gourmet and specialty stores under the brand name Knorr Suisse. Recently, the Corn Products Co. brought this soup to the United States for manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, this action represents an international business action worthy of note. Bringing in this product from abroad has meant not only a new product for the American public, but it has meant new investment and new jobs here in the United States—and at a time when we hear so much discussion of foreign-made products being sold in the U.S. market. In other words, the Knorr example shows us one way that the gold outflow problem can be ameliorated.

Not only was a brand new plant constructed at Argo, Ill., but additionally these soups have already created more than 1,130 new jobs for U.S. citizens in manufacturing, selling, and marketing—and that is just the beginning.

### The Citizen and International Affairs

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last October 30 to address the students of Salem College, my alma mater in Salem, W. Va.

The occasion was a regular assembly at chapel, as part of a political science program which was designed to bring the young men and young women of that campus in touch with persons engaged in practical legislative and decision-making matters. I spoke on the theme of "The Citizen and International Affairs," indicating the role that the enlightened citizen might perform in an area which is generally assumed to be far removed from the influence of the average voter.

Events of the past 3 months have not greatly altered the context of international relations to which I addressed my remarks, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE CITIZEN AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at Salem College, Salem, W. Va., October 30, 1961)

The theme for the development of Salem College this year is, I understand, "the importance of academic integrity." I commend you on this selection, and I hope that each of you is able to give new and functional meanings to the term in the coming year.

For the question of the integrity of the individual, in the fundamental sense of that word, although at least as old as the Book of Job, is also an ever new and evolving one. As the world changes, it presents new demands, new challenges, and new threats to the achievement and maintenance of our integrity. And we must constantly replenish our moral and intellectual resources with new insights and new perceptions of our relationship to a changing world.

This morning I would speak of the problem of attaining and securing one's integrity as a citizen, particularly in relation to foreign affairs. This difficult area—far removed from the personal experience and knowledge of most of us—today poses the greatest test of our maturity as citizens and as a nation.

The problem was well defined in a recent article in *Foreign Affairs* by Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, when he wrote:

"There has been a growing feeling that the problems of foreign affairs have become so complicated that the private citizen cannot be expected to understand them, much less make a positive contribution to their resolution. Concurrently there has been a surfeit of demands that Washington officials should develop bold, new, imaginative policies and plans. This is tantamount to asking that those eminently desirable ends should be achieved in a vacuum. That is not only undesirable, it is impossible. We do not have a Government of experts, and if we were to try to form one it would be utterly disastrous to the whole concept of democracy to which we are deeply committed. The expert has an essential but nonetheless a subordinate role to play; he can advise, but he cannot take the place of political leadership. By its very nature political leadership loses its effectiveness unless there is a significant degree of public consensus behind proposals for action. Many a novel and constructive idea, possibly conceived by experts but responsibility for which was accepted by a political leader, has come to nought for lack of intelligent popular support."

We may not, therefore, and we must not delegate our responsibilities as citizens, for our own actions and expressions are part of the "public consensus"—or lack of it—on which the ultimate political decisions are grounded. Thus, integrity of citizenship in this respect means the fulfillment of our responsibility to achieve through knowledge and imagination and understanding of America's role in the currents and cross currents of action in the world today.

Now let me give some content to this rather abstract statement and indicate some of the hazards to its attainment. Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the achievement of a positive role for the citizen in the field of international relations is the brooding omnipresence of the threat of nuclear war.

The mind balks and the imagination stumbles in the attempt to envisage the effects of a 20-megaton nuclear bomb—a weapon equal to the explosive power of 20 million tons of TNT—or the equivalent of 8 million bombloads of the World War II Flying Fortress. Yet this kind of arithmetic does not bring us much closer to an imaginative perception of the dreadful consequences of nuclear war.

Some people, in a sense of despair and fatalism, have attempted to fill the void with the slogan, "I would rather be Red than dead." A more ethically developed, but closely related view was recently advanced by the eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Paul Tillich, in his assertion that "a war fought with atomic weapons can ethically not be justified, for it produces destruction without the possibility of a creative new beginning: it annihilates what it is supposed to defend."

Though Dr. Tillich's position is unassailable from a purely ethical point of view, such ethical absolutism, abstracted from the total political matrix in which it functions, tends to disarm one from considering an alternative to the "Red or dead" polarity.

At the other extreme from the pacifism of Lord Bertrand Russell and the ethical position of Dr. Tillich is the shrill and meaningless cry for total victory against the Soviet Union and the occasional irresponsible talk of preventive war. Both extremes are determined by the overriding horror of nuclear conflict, and both reactions short circuit the process of reflection in their attempt to provide some substitute for the patient and persistent efforts to achieve a viable political solution to the antagonisms between the Soviet bloc and the free world. But there is no substitute for responsibility in our personal and political behavior, and we may not delegate it to chance or luck or a beneficent cosmos.

In his eloquent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, President Kennedy expressed his recognition of the long and difficult road ahead, for us and for the world, before peace and freedom can be achieved. Looking "across the world of threats to the world of peace" he acknowledged that " \* \* \* we cannot expect any final triumph—for new problems will arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems—for conformity is the jailer of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat or even by the wishes of all."

This, my young friends, is an honest statement of the reality of our time. It means that your generation as well as mine must learn to contend with the problems of achieving peace and freedom. And it means, in all likelihood, that we must continue to live with uncertainty; we must continue to live under the shadow of a potential nuclear war, and yet actively plan and work to realize the hope of a future world without war.

I would ask you to follow me now, in looking beyond our own shores and ambitions toward one of the prominent problem areas in our relation with other countries. I do not presume to be an expert in foreign affairs; nor do I pose any final solutions. Rather, I suggest a point of view which might be adopted by the interested and responsible citizen in his contribution to the public consensus which must underlie the successful execution of American foreign policy.

It was first suggested when I was invited to speak this time at Salem that I address the topic of "Berlin and Its Implications." Though one must naturally approach this subject with some trepidation, I shall attempt to indicate some of the principal considerations that must be kept in mind not only by our policymakers but by the thoughtful citizens who support American policy.

First, regardless of party affiliation, we must put aside the tendency to cry "Munich" every time the administration gives indication of the possibility of negotiations on Berlin. It is not only irrelevant to the present crisis, but it tends to place a dangerous limitation upon the President's freedom of action.

Second, we must recognize that the conflict over Berlin—which is only part of the larger "German problem"—is not solely, or perhaps even primarily, an ideological conflict between communism and democracy. It is in large measure a conflict not of ideas about society or the future, but of the way we see the facts of national life in central Europe.

The Soviet rulers and the Soviet people apparently believe quite literally that West Germany is controlled by unrepentant Nazis and militarists, a view which is shared by many Poles and Czechs as well. Before we

dismiss such a belief as complete fantasy, let us recall that Germany overran Eastern Europe twice in 30 years, with a dreadful toll of life taken among the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia.

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the history of the cruelty and treachery of the Russian policy in Europe during Stalin's last years from 1945 to 1952. It is across this gulf in our perceptions of the facts that we must somehow make contact and reach a modus vivendi regarding Berlin and Germany.

In so doing, we must not only maintain the Western rights of access to Berlin, but we must also be assured that the city will remain a viable part of the political and economic life of Western Germany. West Berlin has achieved a miracle of political and economic reconstruction since World War II. But if allowed to be isolated from Western Germany, it will soon wither away; its young people will leave; its industries will dwindle, and eventually it will be immersed in the gray tide of communism of East Germany.

A third factor in our consideration is the acknowledgment that Western Germany is not necessarily irrevocably and eternally married to the Western allies. And the rupture of this marriage would be the highest pinnacle of achievement for Soviet policy in Europe. This is what the noted correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Joseph C. Harsch, refers to as the "Rapallo factor." Writing from London earlier this month, he commented that "As Moscow and the West edge their cautious way toward negotiation over Berlin the word most heard in private conversation among diplomats is Rapallo."

He refers, of course, to the treaty negotiated in 1922 by a defeated Germany and the newly established Soviet Union, a treaty characterized by Ambassador George Kennan as a "triumph of Soviet diplomacy," which "detached Germany decisively and finally from the ranks of those pressing the Soviet Government for payment of the debts of previous Russian governments and for compensation for the foreign property nationalized in the Russian revolution."

This rapprochement between Germany and the Soviet Union reached its culmination, of course, in the nonaggression pact negotiated by Molotov and Von Ribbentrop in 1939 at the very time that the Soviets were also conducting negotiations with Britain and France against Germany.

To refer once again to Joseph Harsch, "Opinions differ as to whether a second Rapallo is possible. A Western pessimist is one who believes the Germans could again be tempted. A Western optimist is one who believes that whatever the provocation, West Germans are now so firmly oriented toward the West, and bear such deep scars from Soviet behavior during and after the last great war, that Germans will never again be tempted to betray the West for a deal with Moscow."

Though normally an optimist about most affairs of life, I do not believe our foreign policy can safely be predicated on one's temperamental disposition toward German political maturity. A factor which colors my normal optimism with a bit of scepticism in this regard is a letter I received earlier this month from the publisher of *Der Spiegel*, the largest weekly in Western Germany, accompanying a reprint of an article by the German-born British journalist, Sebastian Haffner. Mr. Haffner's article was entitled "Giving the Germans a sense of betrayal and mortal insult," and its general thesis was that if the Western allies recognize East Germany, it will give a sense of betrayal to the West Germans and turn "the most loyal, if also most exposed and endangered, member of the Western alliance and community into its bitter and vindictive enemy."

I would not hazard such a categorical prophecy; but I would suggest that the possibility of such an outcome should be kept foremost in our minds as we view future negotiations, especially in view of the obvious effort of one of Germany's leading publishers—and one who believes in democracy—to influence the opinion of American legislators.

All of these factors must be considered, and many more, in a resolution of the Berlin problem. We must maintain the political and economic viability of Berlin; we must not give occasion to the West Germans for a sense of betrayal and insult; and yet we must also establish conditions which will remove the Soviet fear—partly pathological and partly justified—of German militarism.

I have touched upon only a few of the relevant considerations of this problem, and not in order to indicate a solution, but to point to the avenues of understanding open to the individual student and citizen in regard to foreign affairs. And with the exception of the article by Sebastian Haffner, I have drawn upon no materials or sources of knowledge not open to any intelligent and interested person of an inquiring mind.

The citizen is not expected to be an expert in these matters. Indeed, Aristotle long ago, and Jefferson more recently, argued that the citizen need not be an expert in order to exercise sound judgment in public affairs. But that is not to state that it does not require effort and study and disciplined use of one's intellect and imagination.

But no one maintains that democracy offers an easy way. On the contrary, it still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. And in the history of man's affairs, the failures of democracy far outnumber its successes. It is not a form of society decreed by a beneficent universe—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and which will be maintained only by men and women who have the mind and will to commit themselves to something greater than their own private and personal affairs. In the final analysis, it is to this sense of commitment that we look for the meaning of the word integrity among students and citizens in a democracy.

### **Pennsylvania Postal Clerks Oppose Free Distribution of Communist Propaganda**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### **HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 16, 1962*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the action taken by the United Federation of Postal Clerks, eastern branch of the Philadelphia region, in opposing the free delivery by this country of Communist propaganda.

I now include the text of a letter from Mr. Herman A. Dyke, chairman of the publicity committee, eastern branch, UFPCC:

We, the members of the Eastern Branch, United Federation of Postal Clerks, in meeting assembled, November 13, 1961, by unanimous vote, wish to express our strong disapproval of the distribution of Communist literature through the mails by the Post Office Department.

This practice has contributed to the postal deficit and more important than that, we fear, to a deficit of American patriotism and the will to resist Communist infiltration, which, in turn, threatens the destruction of our republican form of government.

We urge every Member of Congress to give this matter careful study and to take appropriate action toward the discontinuance of this policy by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills before the House which could accomplish the objective desired by these postal clerks and millions of other Americans who are concerned about this propaganda service and the proposed increase in American postal rates. My bill, H.R. 9004, would simply declare that no postal rate is available to material determined by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

Another approach is also available to counter this flow of Communist propaganda—an amendment to the postal rate bill which will apparently come before us in the very near future. I intend to offer an amendment to the postage bill on the floor of the House if the bill has not been amended by the Post Office Committee to block the free distribution of this propaganda.

I would welcome the support of all Members who are concerned about this serious situation which confronts us.

### **United Nations Bonds**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### **HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 16, 1962*

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, many, many persons from my district have been particularly concerned over the issuance of \$200 million worth of bonds by the United Nations. Many of them have pointed out that the United States is already paying 47 percent of the total cost of the United Nations and is now considering buying \$100 million worth of these bonds that the United Nations is trying to sell. One constituent puts it rather succinctly when he writes me to the effect that each time the U.S.S.R. buys \$1 million worth of bonds, we, or the United States, buy \$2 million worth. I think that most of my colleagues in Congress would agree that, if we use this type of a purchase plan, the U.S. Treasury would be called upon to pay out very little money.

In view of the concern within my district, that I have mentioned, I am pleased to support my colleague, the Honorable H. R. Gross, Representative from Iowa, in his introduction of House Joint Resolution 595. This resolution provides that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and Gaza strip.

### **A Department of Consumers to Protect the Public**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### **HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 16, 1962*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 9619, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch, for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives, and for various other purposes. It is an omnibus bill which calls for a broad program of protection for the American consumer and I am, therefore, entitling it "Consumers Act of 1962."

In his state of the Union address on January 11, President Kennedy made this statement:

To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

I am very pleased to know that the President is taking steps to afford the American public this protection. In fact, he recognized this need during the 1960 presidential election campaign and stated on several occasions at that time his deep interest in consumer problems.

My bill, however, goes much further than improving the food and drug laws. It seeks to provide protection to the consumer not only in food and drugs, but also in safeguarding the economic interests of consumers in such areas as financial charges on installment loans, in representing consumer interests before the courts and regulatory agencies, in giving consumers greater representation and a voice in government, and in other ways.

I regard the American consumer as the biggest factor in the U.S. economy today on whom the continued growth of our economic structure depends to a very considerable extent. He is the supporter and the mainstay of our industry, commerce, agriculture, all types of services, and every other phase of our national activity. Under the circumstances, it is imperative that the consumer have a voice in government and that his interests be properly protected.

Several years ago, when I served as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I was instrumental in the creation of a Consumers Study Subcommittee, of which I was the chairman. This subcommittee conducted studies on food prices, marketing costs, agricultural surpluses, the food stamp program, food stockpiling, and so forth. Our subcommittee served as the voice of the consumer and was effective in bringing about better understanding between farmers and consumers as to their specific problems. After I left the House Agriculture Committee, the subcommittee was discontinued, and as far as I know there is

no other committee in Congress and no agency in the executive branch of the Government which is devoted primarily to the study of consumer problems and the protection of consumer interests.

I have always held a deep interest in consumer problems and still retain this interest to this very day. It is my view that Congress has a direct responsibility for safeguarding consumer interests since it not only involves the general economic situation and growth of the country, but also matters of consumer interest which come before our regulatory agencies and such Departments as Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and others.

Just as the Congress and the Government provide a voice to farmers, labor, business and industry, the armed services, the war veterans, education, science, and other segments of our national activity, so it must give a voice to the consumer, the housewife, the wage earner, the elderly and retired, and all others who struggle with the problem of how to cope with the high cost of living, with the safety of foods and drugs, with protection of health and economic security.

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and lack of wholesomeness of foods and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentation in manufacturing, questionable techniques of merchandising, usurious charges of interest rates on installment purchases, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. The consumer is being completely ignored, disregarded, stepped upon, and abused.

My bill is comprised of three major sections or titles. Title I provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers as a new department in the executive branch, headed by a Secretary of Consumers who would be a member of the President's Cabinet. The new department would assume the functions and duties of the following agencies: Food and Drug Administration of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department; the Federal Trade Commission; those areas in the Department of Agriculture which are engaged in the enforcement of the meat and poultry inspection acts; the Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor; the Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; and those areas of the National Bureau of Standards which are engaged primarily in the research and testing of articles intended for consumer use.

The Department of Consumers would be provided with wide powers in the field of consumer protection. Specifically, its functions would be: to present the consumer viewpoint in the formulation of government policies; to represent the economic interests of consumers in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies; to conduct annually a national consumers' conference, to be attended by experts on consumer education and

representatives of organizations engaged in protecting consumer interests, for the purpose of advising the Department and offering suggestions for its effective performance; to assemble, evaluate and disseminate information helpful to consumers, including information on commercial and trade practices adversely affecting consumer interests, and other functions.

Furthermore, the Department shall conduct economic surveys and investigations of the productive capacity for goods affecting consumers, of the distribution systems for consumer goods, the levels of prices and the factors entering into the establishment of such prices, the quality and suitability of consumer goods, and similar other surveys.

Title II of the bill contains the "truth in lending" proposal which requires a full disclosure of financial charges on installment loans, the purpose here being to protect the consumer and small borrower in their own interests and in the interests of the national economy. The consumer receiving such credit or loans is to be provided with clear information in writing on the cost of the property or service, the amount to be financed, the financial charges, and other details.

Title III provides for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives to deal with measures relating to the protection of consumer interests. This committee shall conduct studies and investigations of consumer problems, with particular emphasis on legislation needed to provide adequate protection for consumers against overpricing of medicines and drugs, misleading advertising, deceptive merchandise practices, impure foods, and related matters. It shall consist of nine Members of the House and is to submit to the House the results of its investigations, together with recommendations for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see to it that he obtains his dollar's worth in the market-places of our country. The American consumer taken as a totality is too big and too vital a part of our economy. He deserves greater recognition. The establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch and a Committee on Consumers in the legislative branch would provide such recognition. I hope that the House Committee on Government Operations, to whom my bill has been referred, will give early consideration to the measure.

### Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us, I am sure, will recall from our youth the village bandstand, the big brass bands which were so much a part of the American scene a generation or two

ago. Today they are all but gone from the American scene, except for films or television programs depicting that era.

A noted American musician, Paul Taubman, who is a composer, pianist, and conductor, has recently made an attempt to revive the old-fashioned brass band. He assembled a group of first-class wind players and percussionists in New York, now known as Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band, and an album of some of America's most famous marches has just been released. It is produced by Ernie Altschuler.

The album opens with "Stars and Stripes Forever," John Philip Sousa's best known march, and it concludes with a rich, sonorous version of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Among the more famous marches presented in this album are: Franz Schubert's "Marche Militaire," W. C. Handy's classic "St. Louis Blues" set in a rousing march tune, Sousa's famous "Washington Post March," the "Colonel Bogey March" from the film "Bridge on the River Kwai," and a half dozen others.

Let me add a word about Paul Taubman. In addition to conducting music for as many as 20 television and radio programs a week, he serves on the board of governors of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences and has helped organize concerts by high school students in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education. He has conducted band concerts in New York's Central Park and Washington Square and has appeared with symphony orchestras in various parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to commend his album to all my colleagues and to the public at large. I think it should be in every American home and in every school.

### The Role of Research in Managed Abundance

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently raised, among farmers as well as our Nation's food buyers, as to why we continue research to find better ways of producing and marketing better foods and at the same time carry on programs designed to cut back production of some commodities so supplies will more nearly match needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman came into my State recently to dedicate a new national animal disease laboratory in the city of Ames, and realistically faced up to this question. I might add, in that connection, that Secretary Freeman's ability to discuss every facet of foods and farming, knowledgeably and candidly, has encouraged Americans generally to take a fresh look at where we are and where we are going in agriculture.

Secretary Freeman explored "The Role of Research in Managed Abun-

dance" during the laboratory dedication program and I believe Members of Congress and both producers and consumers of foods will find his comments, which follow, interesting and informative:

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN MANAGED ABUNDANCE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, Ames, Iowa, December 14, 1961)

Since becoming Secretary of Agriculture, I have been telling the people of the United States of the significant contribution to their welfare and to their standard of living which agriculture is making. Today, at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, I believe we have a fitting occasion to show how research in agriculture benefits every person in every walk of life.

It is true that the American farmer is better off and has a better standard of living than farmers in most other countries, and production research has played a part in this. But, it is fair to say that the public has received a far greater proportion of benefits in terms of having available a plentiful supply of food at lower real cost than anywhere else in the world.

Let me illustrate this more specifically. In the past 50 years, our population has nearly doubled, while the number of farmworkers has been cut in half. Yet our people are better fed and better clothed today than ever before.

One farmer today can feed 26 people, but if we farmed with the same techniques and the same seeds, fertilizers, and chemicals used in 1940, we would need almost 8 million more workers on the farm.

But those 8 million workers can produce nearly half of all our manufactured goods. They can build all our new roads, new factories, and new homes; then can mine all our coal and iron, and leave more than enough manpower besides to drive our trucks and buses, run our railroads and airlines, supply our gas and electricity, and keep our telephones working.

And all the while, the productive success of those remaining on the farm has lowered food costs to the consumer from 25 percent of the average income in 1940 to 20 percent in 1960. By comparison, food costs in Western Europe take 30 to 45 percent of the average family income and in Russia food costs amount to well over 50 percent.

In this context, it would be fair to assume that the cost of this production research should be charged to the general public. Certainly, the benefits of continued research in developing more efficient and economical methods of producing food and fiber will be needed in the years ahead as our population increases and our standard of living continues to rise.

Yet, there are many people today who are puzzled by the fact that we are continuing this research in agricultural productivity.

They ask: "Why do we, on the one hand, continue research in agriculture to find better ways of producing farm commodities while on the other hand we are seeking to cut back production, to adjust farm output more nearly to the level of current need?"

Or they may phrase the question this way: "Why do we continue such practices as land drainage when we are paying farmers to take land out of production and put it to conserving uses?"

Now these are legitimate questions. At first glance there is a real and significant contradiction. And it is a contradiction which those of us in agriculture must understand more fully if we are first to show that it is a false analysis and, second, if we are to deal successfully with the problems of overproduction and low farm income.

I propose here to open a discussion which those in production research should pursue

further and to attempt to clarify the role of research in a program of managed abundance in agriculture.

Let us look a little further below the surface of these contradictions. If we follow the analysis of those who raise this contradiction to its logical conclusion, they are saying, in effect, that we can better meet the challenge of agricultural abundance by making agriculture inefficient and less productive.

Without production research to make the agricultural economy more productive, the whole economy of a nation suffers. Without adequate food to feed its people, a nation cannot hope to begin raising the standard of living of its people.

I raise this point to emphasize this one fact: The primary goal of research in agriculture has been to raise the standard of living of all people by providing food and clothing at relatively lower cost, while making possible the development of other productive resources. It is the public policy in a democratic society such as ours to encourage activities which will provide the maximum benefit to the greatest number of people.

And agricultural research to increase productivity has contributed materially to the economic progress of the United States. I think it would be criminal to stop this research today because we would be stopping progress which benefits the economy as a whole.

Actually, success in terms of longrun production research is not something to be turned off and on. The present level of farm technology is the result of research which began decades ago, and in order to have adequate food supplies in the decades ahead, we will have to continue production research today—we must keep the production research pipelines full.

It is generally true that production research will not provide the answer to the problems of low farm income and overproduction, and we should be under no illusion that it will. The farm income problem is a special problem of economics which grows out of the lack of bargaining power the individual farmer has in terms of his influence in the market and on the problem of overproduction.

Thus we are dealing with two separate areas and two separate goals of agricultural research. Production research is designed to gain the maximum production in the most efficient and economical manner to provide for the future food and fiber needs of a whole nation.

Since it is difficult to obtain the precise amount of food and fiber needed at a particular time, it then becomes the task of economic research to develop methods which will lead to effective resource adjustment and supply management to insure that those who produce are not penalized for their efficiency.

When efforts are made to strengthen farm income by reducing the amount of land under cultivation, this should not lead to the conclusion that research, soil improvement and other conserving practices to make agriculture more efficient should be abandoned.

If we were to cease all efforts to make agriculture more efficient, we would interrupt the longrun progress which is necessary to insure that the general public will continue to eat better and more cheaply and from which the Nation as a whole will benefit.

We must continue to seek ways which will increase the share of the Nation's wealth which goes to the farmer, and this is an area where economic research in agriculture can play an important role. But we cannot expect a slackening in production research to help solve this problem any more than we can expect continued production research to have any appreciable benefit to the farmers as a group.

New and efficient practices will benefit, for a time, the farmer who is an innovator. By putting the product of research to work first, he gains a temporary economic advantage over his neighbor who does not act as quickly to put new technology into practice.

But eventually his neighbors adopt the same practices, and climbing production is soon followed by lower prices. The result is that the benefits of technology flow through the farmer to the consumer. This pattern is often missed by those who advocate research as the answer to the problem of low farm income, and their efforts serve only to confuse two different problems.

Research has a definite role in the agricultural program of the 1960's, both in its historic function to maximize the general standard of living and in the growing task to enable the farmer to share in the results of his productivity.

It is fitting, I believe, to turn our attention at the dedication of this animal disease research facility to this role of research in a policy of managed abundance in agriculture both now and for the future.

This group of buildings and the equipment they house represents the finest and most modern facility anywhere in the world for the study of animal diseases. From the scientists who are working here will come, we hope, some of the answers to animal diseases which today rob the farmer and the Nation of 11 out of every 100 hogs farrowed and take a heavy toll of cattle and poultry.

Thus this lab can contribute great value to the efficiency and productivity of the farmer if it can identify and cure the diseases as it has been designed to do.

But this is only one aspect of overall agricultural research for the 1960's. Today, in terms of the overall goal of Managed Abundance agricultural research should serve five ends:

It should help farmers prosper in a period of abundance.

It should help provide more and better food at reasonable cost for all Americans.

It should help protect our production potential.

It should help adjust land, water, and human resources to meet growing needs for recreation, forests, and open space.

It should strengthen our ability to use food as a major instrument of foreign aid.

Obviously, economic research, utilization research, marketing research, production research, and basic research all overlap in their contribution to these five ends. We cannot depend solely on utilization or marketing research to lift farm people to a level of prosperity in periods of abundance.

The search for new and expanded markets for farm commodities must be accompanied by production research which lowers costs and improves quality—and by economic research to mark the path of agricultural adjustment to economic growth.

It means that where we have in the past placed a major emphasis on production research, we now will be calling equally on all disciplines. Each area of research, and each research facility and each person engaged in research needs to view his role not as an end in itself, but as one part of the great single force of overall agricultural research.

It is this broad view—the new perspective of overall agricultural research—which will be most meaningful to the farmers and non-farmers of the Nation in programs of Managed Abundance.

We should consider the overall impact of the research carried out here on animal disease as it relates to research carried out elsewhere on forages and mechanization, and further relate these programs to the economic research or agricultural adjustment such as that being done at the Center for Agricultural Adjustment here on the campus at Ames.

We will continue expanding industrial and food uses for farm commodities through utilization research. It already has brought such well established innovations as frozen foods, concentrated fruit juices, potato flakes, and other dehydrated foods.

Scientists will continue the search to improve packaging, transportation, wholesaling, retailing, and other functions of the distributing process. Research in this area can produce savings—some of which may be passed on to the farmer but most of which will go to the consumer in lower prices—and it will result in better quality products.

The basic research in dietary problems will continue because there are many questions still to be answered that could lead to healthier lives for all the people of the Nation. We need to know more about the exact role played by fats in the diet and their effect on health. We need to know more about what nutrients are actually contained in the 1,000 most commonly used foods.

It also is vitally important that we continue production research to further improve farm production practices and the use of agricultural resources. In doing this, we protect the gains in farming efficiency which already have been made while maintaining the momentum of progress in creating further efficiency and economy.

No one here today can predict with precise accuracy what our population will be in the next 15 or 20 years, or what food and clothing needs of those people will be. We do know that the demand placed on our agricultural resources will be greater than they are today.

It then follows that if we are to maintain the high standard of living which we now have—and which the citizens of this country will expect to be continually improved—we will need to continue basic and applied research in agricultural production.

We not only must continue production research for this reason, but also for the simple fact that agriculture, as a science dealing with living things, is constantly changing.

In the past 10 years, for example, we have had to completely replace our Durum wheat varieties, grown in the northern Great Plains,

because of a new and more virulent race of stem rust disease. Oat producers in many areas have had to switch varieties completely three different times in the last 20 years to stay ahead of fungus diseases that otherwise would have made oat production completely unprofitable. It is the same story with livestock and other crops across the entire range of farm production.

In conjunction with production research, the continual improvement of conservation and resource management practices are equally as vital to meeting the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In many ways, they may become more important than production research since the pressure on land and forest is likely to increase even more rapidly than population will.

We should insure, within the context of conservation and land use management, that the best croplands are maintained—and improved—so that the food and fiber we will need can be produced when it is needed.

We should also be prepared to accommodate the rapidly increasing demand for recreation and leisure time activities. These pursuits which a high standard of living makes possible will require substantial amounts of land and forest areas.

I think it is apparent that overall agricultural research will occupy an important position in the agricultural programs of the 1960's. Research, in one sense, has become the power source to drive the massive agricultural machine which has developed around the democratic concept of family owned and operated farms.

It is, I believe, the public consensus that we should maintain the astounding productive vitality of this system, and I want to discuss the branch of research which will contribute most heavily to securing this goal.

There is an example of this branch of economic research at work on this campus—as I mentioned a moment ago—in the Center for Agricultural Adjustment. This unit was created several years ago to determine if a more coordinated approach to research would help bring the Nation closer to solving the basic farm problem of overproduction and low farm income.

The studies underway in the center, we hope, will shed new light on the means of

developing the procedures which will be most useful in adjusting agricultural resources to produce the kind of food and fiber we want when we need it.

Economic research can address itself most directly to this task which, in itself, may provide the answer to the problems which the individual farmer faces today.

We know that, for the foreseeable future, the farmer can produce more food and fiber with presently known techniques than can be used commercially and concessionally at home and abroad. If we are going to correct this situation before it destroys those who have made our agricultural abundance possible, then we must accept the fact that we will need to develop the tools which can be applied to manage this abundance. In this effort, we will look to the scientist for help.

Scientific research is, in essence, the search for truth. Whether it is carried out in agriculture, or in nuclear energy or in the way man reacts to his environment, it is the means by which man seeks to expand the limits of his knowledge.

We often are troubled today because we don't know how to utilize the power which scientific research has given us—particularly in harnessing the atom for peaceful purposes rather than in experimenting with its destructive potential. But the progress which this research represents also gives us hope that the answer may be found tomorrow as we seek more knowledge.

We know that the search for knowledge in agriculture has produced the answer for many of our problems. Research has brought within reach the power to banish forever man's age-old fear of hunger and starvation. It has shown us how to take strontium 90 out of milk, and it has shown us how one farmer can be four times as efficient today as 50 years ago.

And so I believe that the stimulus of success in production research which has given us the power of an abundantly productive agriculture will lead, through research in economics, to an expansion in our knowledge which will enable the farmer to live with abundance as profitably as do all other people.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1962

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

Rabbi Jacob Handler, Temple Israel, Manchester, N.H., offered the following prayer:

Ovinu Shebashomaim: Our Father, who art in heaven, Eternal Ruler of the universe, with humility in our hearts we pour forth our gratitude unto Thee for the beneficence and loving kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon Thy people. Thou hast inspired men in the past to look for new horizons, and, discovering a land with inexhaustible material resources and precious spiritual blessings—a land now inhabited by people who, though of diversified backgrounds, are united by the bond of a common destiny—to be of service to Thee and to the United States of America for spiritual triumphs of freedom and liberty over the forces of evil and enslavement.

O merciful Father, in whose hand are the souls of the living and the dead, be

with us, assembled in this great Chamber, as we consecrate this hour to the memory of a man of valor and vision, of great courage and devotion, whose deeds and action, here in the Senate and in his own beloved home State, New Hampshire, represented the highest ideals of noble living and American citizenship.

Grant that the soul of the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, whose memory we cherish, may be bound up in the bond of everlasting life. May the reminiscences of his life stir our finer sensibilities and arouse within us a desire to emulate the splendid example set for us by STYLES BRIDGES as he served Thee and his fellow men with such great sincerity, kindness, loyalty, and devotion, in fulfilling the teaching of the ancient sages, which is that the world exists on three basic principles: Upon learning, upon service to fellow men, and upon the practice of benevolence.

O God, who art manifested in the lives of good men and in the righteousness of nations, keep our Nation forever righteous and just.

Vouchsafe unto those who have been chosen to lead our Nation wisdom equal

to their strength and courage equal to their great responsibilities—to help make our land a mighty force of righteousness among the nations of the world. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 16, 1962, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was