

Col. Delmar L. Crowson, 4954A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Anthony T. Shtogren, 4956A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William C. Lindley, 4976A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Lawrence S. Lightner, 5219A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Archie A. Hoffman, 19222A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
 Col. Clarence J. Galligan, 4772A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. John L. Martin, Jr., 7556A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. William D. Dunham, 8097A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Lawrence F. Tanberg, 8286A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Royal N. Baker, 8315A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Jewell C. Maxwell, 8393A, Regular Air Force.
 Col. Chesley G. Peterson, 9383A, Regular Air Force.

UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Very Reverend Volodymyr Bukata, pastor of Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Holy Ascension, Newark, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of all good, benefactor of mankind:

We lift up our hearts in prayer to Thee and invoke Thy blessings upon this deliberative body—the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

May Thy grace and benevolence descend upon and fill these, Thy servants, the translators of the will of the free American people in this blessed country of ours. Take our land, we pray, its Government, Armed Forces, and its people, under Thy care. Preserve for the world and its peoples this bastion of defense against tyranny and oppression.

The universal cause of the dignity of man under God and his freedom is indivisible. We, therefore, on this day in commemoration of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian people 45 years ago as the Ukrainian National Republic raise our voices in prayer for this long-suffering nation which is denied freedom by Communist imperialism. We pray also for the many other nations which aspired and continue to aspire to freedom despite the brutal and ruthless suppression then and now by the most despotic ideology and regime the world has ever known.

The independence of the Ukrainian nation was destroyed and drowned in blood by the aggressive onslaught of the Communist hordes. Ukraine is enslaved, but not defeated. The Ukrainian people never ceased to struggle for liberty and independence. It continues the struggle even now by every means available to it. The eternally burning torch of freedom passes from hand to hand, from generation to generation, lighting the way to ultimate liberation.

The aspirations of all captive and oppressed peoples are the torches which will one day blend into a great flame, destroying evil and heralding the birth of a new day of freedom.

Permit us, O Lord, to pay tribute to those millions of patriots of Ukraine and all other nations in captivity who even today sacrifice for liberty, for the right of self-determination, for freedom from oppression and fear, for freedom of thought and speech, and for the right to worship Thee, our God.

O Lord, we pray to Thee: May the Ukrainian nation and all other captive nations soon have a new birth of freedom; that they may take their rightful place among the free nations of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 21, 1963, 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.

ATTENDANCE AT SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to call to the attention of the House an old statute, which while it has not been enforced for many years is still in effect. In my opinion the enforcement of this statute would result in expediting the business of this session, and would in a large measure eliminate a practice which has grown up over the years, resulting in making it virtually impossible to conduct the business of this House in the most efficient and most expeditious manner.

I am referring to the statute providing for deductions by the Sergeant at Arms from the pay of a Member who is absent from his seat without a sufficient excuse. The statute reads:

The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House, respectively, shall deduct from the monthly payments of each Member or Delegate the amount of his salary for each day that he has been absent from the Senate or House, respectively, unless such Member or Delegate assigns as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or of some member of his family.

This is a reasonable law. I would be happy to be enlightened as to why it has not and is not now being enforced.

In my opinion, when an individual is elected a Representative in Congress he assumes a full-time responsibility. Many of us have outside interests, but the duties and responsibilities of the office of Representative should not be second-

ary in importance to any other avocation or vocation.

If, for instance, a Member of this House continues in the practice of a profession which is lucrative in remuneration, and he finds that it is necessary to absent himself when the House is in session, he should not object to a forfeiture of his pay for a duty which he did not perform.

I believe I am speaking for a majority of the Members of this House when I express the opinion that the work of this body could be greatly expedited if the House would be in session 5 days each week, and a rollcall taken each day to establish the presence of the Members. This would, admittedly, work a hardship on the regular members of the so-called T-to-T Club, but it would permit the committees of this House to function, as they are unable to do at the present time when so many Members are away on long weekends.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully inquire, How about complying with the law, or if we are not in agreement with the law, how about repealing it?

SOW THE WIND AND REAP THE WHIRLWIND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, sow the wind and reap the whirlwind. The Supreme Court of the United States has contributed more to present-day racial problems and racial discord by its sociological edicts than any other agency of Government in the history of the Nation. The Nation's Capital City has had a full measure of these problems. I should think the members of that august Court would have some cause for concern when they read in their own publication that the women employees of the Court are not safe when they leave the building. Lawlessness in the National Capital, particularly crimes against women, are a national scandal. I call attention to the lead article in the docket sheet for the Supreme Court of October 1962:

WOMEN EMPLOYEES AGAIN REMINDED TO HAVE POLICE ESCORT WHEN LEAVING AFTER DARK

As a reminder again this fall—as darkness comes earlier each day—women employees are requested to exercise caution in leaving the building. They are urged by Lt. Harry N. Hayes to stop at police headquarters, room 35, for a police escort to the parking lot or out front for a taxi. This system, now in effect for several years, has proved effective. Women employees, especially when leaving alone after dark, should take advantage of this protection. Either Lieutenant Hayes or Sgt. Thomas A. Barnett, who are on duty in police headquarters at that time of day, will be glad to arrange a police escort for you.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

Mr. MINISH. 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. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to escort to the House my distinguished constituent, the Very Reverend Walter Bukata, of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Newark, who offered the moving prayer in commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. His eloquent words reflect the sentiments of the membership of the House of Representatives who annually pay tribute to the heroic Ukrainian people and pray for their deliverance from the cruel yoke of their oppressors.

Ukrainians have been most unfortunate in their modern history, and to a great extent their misfortune has stemmed from the geography of their beloved homeland. Placed almost squarely between Europe and Asia the Ukraine has found itself the gateway to Europe for the invaders from the East. As one of the richest granaries of Europe, its fertile soil has aroused the envy and avarice of neighboring peoples. For these reasons the country has been an arena of discord between the East and West.

In the continental struggles between contending civilizations, between the Asiatic East and European West, the fate of Ukraine has been conditioned by forces and factors over which its people could exercise little control. For centuries their country was overrun by conquering armies, and remained divided under alien rulers until 1918. Then, as the forces which had suppressed their nationalist spirit were overthrown, the Ukrainians seized the opportunity and proclaimed their political independence. That historic event took place on January 22, 45 years ago.

But the new state, from the time of its very birth in 1918, was surrounded by powerful forces of destruction, and was marked by its foes, especially by the Russian Communist regime, as ready prey. In 1920 the country was overrun by the Red army and all Ukrainian opposition was subdued. That was the end of the short-lived Ukrainian National Republic.

Since then the people of Ukraine have been enduring their long national ordeal under the Soviet regime. The country has become part of the Soviet Union, and today more than 42 million Ukrainians are prisoners in their homeland. Of course, they cannot celebrate their great national holiday, their Independence Day. But those Ukrainians living in the free world, and especially Americans of Ukrainian descent in this great Republic, do so in the hope that someday and soon this Independence Day will be celebrated in a free and liberated Ukraine. I gladly join all freedom-loving Ukrainians in their wish that their cherished dream will be realized.

DISTRIBUTION OF HARTWELL POWER

MR. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed allotment of power from the Government dam at Hartwell on the Savannah River is unfair and discriminates against the REA co-ops and other preference customers in the State of South Carolina. The Department of the Interior is proposing to allot 50 percent of the Hartwell power to Georgia, 37½ percent to North Carolina, and only 12½ percent to South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, this means that Hartwell power would be wheeled right straight through western South Carolina into North Carolina, even to the borders of Virginia and Tennessee. This arbitrary plan or deal would establish a precedent and would create an unlimited service area. Under this plan, Hartwell power would be wheeled 125 miles, 150 miles, and even 200 miles away from the Hartwell damsite on the Savannah between South Carolina and Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress authorized the construction of Hartwell Dam. The Congress appropriated nearly \$100 million to build this gigantic project. We did so in order that this power might be made available to preference customers and thus be a yardstick for power rates in that area. I expected and intended, when I supported this project, that this power would go first to the preference customers in the immediate area, certainly no further than 100 and 125 miles from the dam.

The REA co-ops and municipalities in my district and throughout western South Carolina could use this power and are entitled to their fair share. Not one acre in North Carolina is flooded by Hartwell Reservoir. More acres are flooded in South Carolina than in Georgia. Under the Department of Interior plan, my people will not only lose tax revenue but will lose the advantages of cheap power. This is definitely wrong. If South Carolina would be allotted its fair share of Hartwell power, South Carolina consumers would save \$300,000 annually.

The REA has done an excellent job for the rural people of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see the great REA program in western South Carolina undermined by this capricious, arbitrary, and autocratic proposal. I hope the Department of Interior will revise this plan and give the REA municipalities of South Carolina a fair deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the daily RECORD a resolution of protest unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Saluda River Electric Co-op.

MODERN COLONIALISM—HUNGARY FORGOTTEN?

MR. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

MR. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since there have been so many arresting international problems of recent days, few people have noted the action of the U.N. in relation to the question of Hungary.

Instead of continuing to authorize the special mission of Sir Leslie Munro to investigate the Hungarian situation, as was done in the past, the matter of implementing the action of the U.N. in relation to investigating conditions in Hungary was referred to U Thant, the Secretary General, to take such action as should seem appropriate to him.

Among other reasons, it was suggested that some of our associates in the U.N. were becoming tired of having this question repeatedly brought before the bar of this international organization.

If this is true, it is a strange commentary, indeed, to find that questions of oppression and tyranny can lose their immediacy with the passage of a few months.

A trenchant editorial on this subject appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) American on January 7, 1963, and in the interest of further circulation of this excellent statement, I am appending this editorial hereafter.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Jan. 7, 1963]

HUNGARY FORGOTTEN?

With world attention presently focused on the Congo, few people will have noted that the United Nations has apparently tossed in the towel in the matter of Hungary.

It was in 1956 that a resolution was adopted by the U.N. which condemned the enslavement of the Hungarian people by Soviet troops. Each year, until 1962, that resolution was reiterated. Last year for some unknown reason it was not.

Now the U.N. has canceled the special mission of Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, to investigate the Hungarian situation. The whole business has been placed in the hands of Secretary General U Thant to handle as he sees fit. In this action the United States has acquiesced, unfortunately.

In effect, this withdrawal of any U.N. action on the matter of Hungary—and the other captive nations as well—is simply giving tacit approval to Russian colonialism.

The reasoning behind this is difficult to understand, unless it is that the West should tread softly in dealing with Moscow, for fear of creating any new crises.

But that gives little reassurance to the peoples of Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—to name only a few—that the Western Powers are thinking in terms of eventual liberation for these captive countries. They may certainly not be criticized if they have the feeling that the free world has forgotten them.

President Kennedy spoke recently in terms of liberation for the people of Cuba, although short of lipservice to the ideal the administration has made it fairly clear that it will do nothing to give encouragement to the Cuban freedom fighters.

If the United States can talk of liberation (eventually) for Cuba, why not talk of liberation for the captive nations of Europe? Soviet suppression of once-free peoples is no less offensive in Europe than in Cuba.

The U.N. decision to drop the Hungarian investigation is a sad commentary on the state of world affairs.

AMERICA NEEDS AN UNDERGRADUATE FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. RODINO. 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. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I hope the House will forgive me if I return to a familiar theme, but I should like to direct your attention for just a few minutes to something I regard as essential for the future security of this country, namely, the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy.

I think the need for this Academy has long been obvious, and I think the proposal merits our most serious consideration. For 17 years we have been the object of a relentless cold war waged by the Communist powers of the world. Sometimes this war has flared into military conflict, but most of the time it has been carried on in the gray areas of propaganda, psychological, and economic warfare. The military aspects we can handle. We have a superb officer corps, highly trained at West Point, Annapolis, and at the new Air Force Academy, which is quite capable of devising the strategy to hurl back the Communist military challenge. But we have no comparable corps of Foreign Service officers, schooled in the techniques of nonmilitary conflict, capable of anticipating the Communist thrust and devising an effective parry, or, indeed, possessing the attitude of mind which thinks in terms of a prior thrust by the forces of freedom, for which communism must seek the counters.

To correct this condition I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1122, for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. This Academy would instruct and train diplomatic cadets, in preparation for careers as officers in our Foreign Service. The course of instruction would be prescribed by the Secretary of State, and would be the equivalent of the curriculum in the field of foreign affairs currently prescribed for the bachelor's degree in many of the Nation's leading institutions. Emphasis would be placed on history, culture, customs, folklore, and languages of the nations in which the diplomatic cadets would elect to serve, and provision would be made for field study in such nations. Entrance to the Academy would be on the basis of competitive examinations.

I wish to state most categorically that my proposal in no way reflects on the institutions currently offering training in foreign affairs. All across the country there are a number of first-rate programs which can offer the student a broad understanding of international relations, a specialized knowledge of an area, or both. But most of these programs are at the graduate level. Parenthetically I may add that a number of other bills introduced on the subject of a Foreign Service Academy are cast in terms of graduate instruction. There

is nothing wrong in this. But I wonder if it does not result in the creation of detached, critical scholars, of which the country has an ample supply.

In contrast, I believe in the old-fashioned maxim, "catch 'em young." Of course we want the members of our Foreign Service to be thoroughly schooled, to be fully acquainted with the basis of international politics, and to know their areas thoroughly. But we want them to be engaged, or perhaps I should say committed, to believe completely in the cause of the United States, and to advance that cause by all legitimate means. In my judgment this can be accomplished successfully only if the recruits to our Foreign Service have gone through a course of study which instills this outlook. A U.S. Foreign Service Academy, which will feed in the bulk of the recruits to our Foreign Service, is the answer to the problem. It will give us not only scholars of international relations, not only men possessed of a deep knowledge of an area, but men capable of being the junior officers of the cold war—men who see the picture as a whole, who see it true, and who understand that the United States cannot sit idly by, but must advance the cause of freedom, else it will wither away.

My bill does not propose that the Foreign Service Academy will be the exclusive mode of entry into the Foreign Service. Graduates of our private colleges and universities would be admitted as before. But preference in making appointments to the Foreign Service would go to the graduates of the Academy. In this way there would be the stiffening of professionals, just as the officer corps of the military services is stiffened by the graduates of West Point and Annapolis in its midst. These would be the men professionally dedicated, the men with the concept of service. Such men have been needed at all times in our history, but never more than now, and nowhere is their dedication more appropriate than in the Foreign Service.

I might even add that educationally there is a unique feature to my bill. Field study of an area is not widely conducted at the undergraduate level. The usual pattern is for such study to be carried on at the graduate level, and it is not unknown for graduate students to so immerse themselves in the viewpoint of the area in which they specialize as to lose all perspective as Americans. But younger students, under the discipline of the Academy, could observe foreign cultures at close hand, could integrate that observation with classroom study, yet should be able to secure an appropriate grasp of how these studies fitted into the context of their own country's policy.

If I may summarize: I advocate the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy because it is educationally sound and politically necessary. I believe a unique opportunity is now at hand for the establishment of such an Academy. I say we should seize that opportunity, and establish such an Academy forthwith. I am confident that in just a few years the return would be well worth the cost.

WORLD WAR II CLAIMS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed Public Law 87-846 which amended the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize settlement of several classes of meritorious World War II claims which were not covered by the original law or its subsequent amendments. On August 8, 1962, at the time the measure was on the floor of the House, I supported the bill but pointed out that there was a grave inequity in it. It provided payment of a war claim only if the claimant, and all predecessors in interest, were on the date of the loss nationals of the United States. The claims of persons who were nationals of another country at the time of the loss but later came to the United States and became citizens of this country cannot be recognized. On August 8 I sought to amend the measure to include those citizens who suffered losses and later became American citizens.

Today I have introduced a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to allow the filing of claims by those citizens of the United States who would be eligible to file for compensation under the present law except for the fact that they were not citizens at the time of their loss.

My bill would in effect allow all citizens to file for compensation regardless of the date of their citizenship with the exception of members of the enemy armed forces during World War II.

I believe that the present law with its unjustifiable discrimination against American citizens creates, in effect, two classes of citizenship. The concept now embodied in the present War Claims Act that the United States owes a greater obligation to those who became citizens earlier than their fellow citizens is wholly antithetical to the spirit of the Constitution. Under our Constitution all American citizens are treated alike with the single exception of eligibility for the presidency. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly stated that naturalized citizens are not second-class citizens.

It has been argued that this subject of war claims compensation involves international law and that the rules of international law require continuous citizenship from the date of loss to the time of filing with respect to claims one government asserts against another on behalf of its nationals. However, it must be remembered that we are not concerned with international law. This is not a situation in which the U.S. Government negotiates with a foreign government to obtain redress for wrongs against our citizens. The war claims are to be paid out of assets owned by the U.S. Government to U.S. citizens by the U.S. Government. This is a wholly domestic matter and should be governed

by our fundamental constitutional principle that all citizens no matter when they became citizens should be treated alike.

In a sense the present policy discriminates against those who deliberately chose to owe their allegiance to the United States. Having renounced their former allegiances, they cannot now look to any other government for redress. Although they pay taxes and chose to be Americans, we refuse to treat them on the same basis as any other citizens.

I urge all the Members of the House to support this bill so that a serious inequity can be corrected in keeping with our constitutional principle of equal treatment for all citizens.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely proper that we in this country should take the occasion, once each year, to pay our respects to the freedom movement that still exists in the hearts of the people of the Ukraine. Assuredly it is appropriate for this House of Representatives to observe the celebration here and in many other lands of Ukrainian Independence Day.

The people of the Ukraine are now ruled by the political instruments of the Soviet Union, dominated by the Communist Party leaders centered in Moscow. But the Ukrainians are not Russians. They tried to break away from the Russian state in 1918-20, when the tides of revolution and war swept over Eastern Europe, and they have never ceased to long for a national homeland of their own.

There are tens of millions among the Ukrainians, with their central city of Kiev, who would seek today to restore their independence and sovereignty, to establish their own government, to practice the ways of freedom and democracy. They are held in bondage as a captive people, victims of Soviet colonialism that asserts a right to extend its empire to the limits of the brute strength of the Red army.

We know what the record shows—the existence all over this country of unswerving support of the Ukrainian independence movement among those of Ukrainian descent and among leaders who have themselves been forced to flee from the Soviet secret police. We know that even the most recent of Eastern Europe's wars revealed the Ukrainian people as turning in anger against aggressors and invaders of both Moscow and Prussia. We know that when resolutions of Congress memorializing in behalf of an independent Ukraine have been publicized, the Soviet Union has responded with a violence of denunciation that may expose the weakness of their position.

It has been 45 years since Ukrainian leaders proclaimed their nation's inde-

pendence on January 22, 1918, and helped hurl out the remnants of the collapsed czarist armies. They were almost instantly victimized again by the Kaiser's armies, which backed the establishment of a monarchy headed by a puppet general, but they reasserted their rights on January 22, 1919, when the puppet king fled along with his military masters. Yet once again they were doomed to disappointment when Lenin sent the Red army back in and the Ukrainian leaders were either slain or forced to flee.

We have made a practice in this House of declaring our support of the captive nations held in thrall by Soviet power, and it is a privilege for me to assert again my support of this custom.

We should not be misled into imagining that such a practice infringes in any way on the prerogatives of the executive in foreign policy nor infringes on the accepted comity of nations.

The executive has its own responsibilities, and the gentlemen in the State Department may well feel they must deal with officials at present in control of the territory of the Ukraine. We in Congress also have our own responsibilities, and the proclamation that this Nation still stands for freedom is a necessary part of our duties.

We speak out in this House against imperialism and colonialism wherever the practice exists and whoever may be the aggressor. And I dare say the time is not likely soon to come when we shall hesitate to denounce Communist colonialism as well as the older imperialism of the West, which happily are now being disavowed and dismantled.

It is a privilege to declare the kinship of the American people with all those who love freedom, who seek independence and self-government, who wish to run their lives according to their own traditions and preferences. Most especially this group of high honor includes the captive people of the Ukraine.

BILL TO ESTABLISH OFFICE OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice and to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners, and for other purposes, entitled the "Federal Administrative Practice Act."

This bill is sponsored by the American Bar Association. The need for an Office of Federal Administrative Practice has been recognized not only by the American Bar Association, but by every committee, commission, and conference that has inquired into the complex structure of Federal agency regulation. The need for such an Office was first recognized by the Attorney General's Committee in

1941. It was proposed again by the first President's Administrative Conference, and concurrently by the Hoover Commission, in 1953. It has again been proposed by the second President's Administrative Conference in its concluding report of last month. An array of our most distinguished legal scholars have written or testified in support of establishing an Office of Federal Administrative Practice.

While there is widespread support for such an Office, there are differences of view concerning the details of the Office's functions and its relation to the three branches of Government. The Office sponsored by the American Bar Association would be an independent agency. It would be headed by a Director who would be appointed for a term of 10 years. The Director would be given two classes of functions: first, that pertaining to agency proceedings, and, second, that pertaining to the administration of the trial examiner system which is presently administered by the Civil Service Commission.

The Director is given no authority over any other Government agency, but he is authorized to make continuous studies on the adequacy and efficiency of agency proceedings for the purpose of assisting in the effectiveness and fairness of their important regulatory operations. The Director is authorized to make recommendations to the Congress or to the President on any matters assigned to him under the act. These recommendations would include, for example, ways and means of minimizing undue delay and expense of agency proceedings, and recommendations which will provide persons the opportunity to participate more effectively in the development of agency regulations.

The importance of the Administrative Procedure Act is widely accepted, but presently there is no responsible agency charged with general superintendence to insure that what Congress intended by that important statute is fairly and effectively carried out in the conduct of agency proceedings.

The Director would also be authorized to receive complaints regarding matters of practice and procedure, and, while this function is somewhat controversial, it is regarded by many as a key provision of any independent office. The right of petition is one of our cardinal freedoms, and in the agency environment there is a substantial body of opinion which holds that a person who feels aggrieved or unfairly treated should have an opportunity to present his complaint to some central and responsible official. While the Director would have such "watchdog" functions in these matters, he would also be able to help the agencies and to help the Congress in improving agency organization and the regulatory process. The Director would provide assistance to the Congress in somewhat the same manner as the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Comptroller General. Congress obtains reports and information on the state of the hearing dockets of the Federal courts, but there is no comparable report or source of information on the state of hearing dockets of

the Federal agencies. These agencies are now handling more cases than the courts and their trial examiners are now more numerous than all of the Federal court judges.

In another area Congress has set up machinery for conducting a postaudit function and determining how the agencies have complied with the congressional purpose in the expenditure of appropriated funds. We have no comparable machinery for systematically reviewing on a postaudit basis how effectively and fairly the agencies are carrying out what Congress intended in the Administrative Procedure Act in the exercise of a host of regulatory functions, which in one way or another now affect every person and business concern in the United States. Inquiries into such matters are made from time to time by various committees of the Congress on an individual or selective basis, but there is no systematic, continuous, and across-the-board approach to these problems by an informed and expert agency which would be able to assist all of the agencies and all of the committees of Congress in the discharge of their several functions.

Section 110 of the bill lists the important functions which would be assigned to the Director, none of which is now being performed, and in this sense the Office of Federal Administrative Practice would fill what is now a vacuum as to matters involving the agency proceedings.

The proposed Office would be one of the most independent agencies of Government. For example, it would be exempt from the Reorganization Act of 1946. The Director, as above stated, would have a fixed 10-year term and would be authorized to report directly to the Congress with regard to needed legislation rather than through the Bureau of the Budget.

The second major purpose of the Office of Federal Administrative Practice would be to assume administration of the trial examiner system, which is presently administered by the Civil Service Commission. There is widespread recognition of the importance of the trial examiner's position in the conduct of Federal agency proceedings. These men must be competent, judicious, objective, and impartial in the trial and decision of agency cases. President Kennedy in his message of April 13, 1961, said to the Congress with regard to standards for appointment, compensation, promotion, and removal of hearing examiners that the application of these standards "has been a continuing source of controversy." The President's message declared that—

None of the regulatory agencies can be completely efficient and effective unless they are staffed by capable hearing examiners.

And he concluded with the statement:

It is my hope that raising the selection standards and increasing the compensation of the hearing examiners will improve both their stature and their general level of competence.

The Attorney General's Committee in 1941 recommended that the selection and appointment of hearing examiners be given to a specially constituted board.

Subsequent committees and commissions have proposed that the trial examiner system be removed from the Civil Service Commission and reassigned. The American Bar Association has sponsored this point of view. A distinguished staff director of a committee on hearing examiners of the recent Administrative Conference advised that administration of the trial examiner system be reassigned. This recommendation was a matter of controversy in the Administrative Conference, I am told, and was not adopted.

We now have about 400 trial examiners in the regulatory agencies, and there are substantial complaints concerning the trial examiner structure and the lack of improvement in the selection and qualifications of the examiners. The administration of trial examiners was assigned to the Civil Service Commission in 1946 by the Congress as an experimental and compromise effort. In view of the continuing widespread concern about the importance of the hearing examiner system and the persistence of controversies with respect to its administration, this subject needs to be thoroughly reexamined by the Congress at an early date, and the bill which I am introducing is a good starting point for such an inquiry.

ROLE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and pleasure to introduce Mr. Justice Reed at the 14th annual University of Miami Law School breakfast in Miami last October. From a Kentucky law practice, Mr. Justice Reed moved in rapid progression to General Counsel of the Federal Farm Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Office of Solicitor General and in 1938 was appointed to the Supreme Court by President Roosevelt, where he served for 19 years, until his retirement on February 25, 1957. It was once said by a Washington lawyer:

If you wish to get Justice Reed to agree with you, give him facts, not theory.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the address delivered by Mr. Justice Reed before the law school alumni. He makes a scholarly and timely presentation on the role of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Justice Reed said:

My first visit to Miami was in January 1908. In my early years of practice in Kentucky, I returned a number of times on business to other parts of Florida, particularly the Lakeland region. There, with my clients, I weathered the boom and bust, and am still the fortunate possessor of a quarter section on the west coast that is worth more than it has cost. The Florida East Coast Railroad had only recently been constructed on my first arrival in Miami, and forward-looking men were struggling to get southern Florida started on the remarkable development that has produced the prosperous region we know

today. Like other sections of our country, it owes its progress to the enterprise and foresightedness of its citizens and the system of government under which we live, with the rewards—economic and social—that have marked our Nation's progress. As lawyers and judges, you alumni have been and are contributing your part to the Nation's efforts to keep our legislation and decisions in step with our material and social progress.

It has long been a matter of particular interest to me to reflect and comment upon the various historical stages that have marked our law, stages that naturally correspond to our maturing economic and social advance. Neither the common law, statutes or judicial decisions are enacted or adopted from a preconception of what law should be. They develop out of man's contacts with other men and so take from the need of society as learned from human experience.

By far the most interesting and important clash of views dates from the Constitutional Convention and revolves around the power of the judiciary to declare invalid those statutes of Congress, acts of the States, or orders or acts of their personnel, or those of private individuals, which are beyond Federal constitutional limits. I refer to the kind of decisions we had in *Marbury v. Madison*, applying to litigants, or *In re Debs*, controlling disorder violating Federal rights, or *The Steel Seizure Case*, invalidating Presidential orders (*Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*).

There is nothing sacrosanct in the right to judicial review. Few governments allow judicial review on the issue of the constitutionality either of legislation or of executive action. The power of courts to pass upon the conformity of such actions with constitutional requirements was an American contribution to the evolution of democracy.

Since in a republic, "all the citizens, as such, are equal, and no citizen can rightfully exercise any authority over another, but in virtue of a power constitutionally given by the whole community,"¹ machinery was necessary to adjudicate rights.

The 17th century philosophers who taught the theory of the inherent rights of man left unnamed the arbiter whose decision would determine when fundamental rights were invaded by government. Obviously each individual cannot decide that for himself. "Fire burns both in Hellas and Persia; but men's ideas of right and wrong vary from place to place." If we are all to have our way, each would have a universal war against everyone—"bellum omnium contra omnes." Everybody would sit in judgment on everybody. We found our answer in judicial review of actions challenged as unconstitutional. While the power to declare State and Federal laws unconstitutional when violative of the Federal Constitution is nowhere expressly granted to the Federal courts, the expressions in the Constitutional Convention, the explanations in the Federalist, the early and continuous line of decisions by men familiar with the purposes of the Founders and the almost universal acceptance of the necessity for an arbiter have settled the question of judicial review for constitutional issues. The alternative is final determination of compliance with constitutional mandates by Congress or by the Executive. Since both of these arms of government have the power to initiate governmental action and to originate public measures in the heat of political conflicts and the height of popular discontent, the judiciary, which can only interpret and condemn after public hearing with reasoned decision, and which is without affirmative power to enact or administer, has been accepted as the arbiter of disputed issues of Federal constitutional law. By *Marbury v. Madison* the power over Federal

¹ *Penhallow v. Doane's Adm.*, 3 Dallas 54, p. 93.

action was established and by judicial interpretation of the Supremacy Clause a similar power was recognized in *Cohens v. Virginia* as to constitutional issues in State courts.² From this judicial power constitutional decisions have come from time to time that have had pronounced effect upon the development of the Nation. Judicial review has proven a workable political idea. The intermittent protests of the States, even when their own laws were made ineffective through the Supremacy Clause, have been unavailing from *Gibbons v. Ogden*, State steamboat licensing, to *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, State punishment for a subversive act covered by Federal law.

Many court decisions, based on statutory construction, are important, sometimes destructive of or limitations on congressional purpose to accomplish social or economic changes.³ Congress can remedy such decisions by curative legislation. But constitutional judgments adverse to the general field of legislation may set back advances for decades, as happened with minimum wages for women⁴ and child labor.⁵

Such adverse rulings may require a constitutional amendment, as did the ruling in 1783 in *Chisholm v. Georgia*⁶ on the right of a citizen of a State to sue another State in the Supreme Court of the United States. This decision brought prompt action through the 11th amendment, February 7, 1795. Usually such action is tedious. The judgment holding unconstitutional the income tax act of 1894 in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U.S. 429, was remedied by the income tax amendment, ratified in 1913. It took the adoption of the 14th amendment after the War Between the States to set aside the Dred Scott decision denying Federal citizenship to Negroes. Consequently, the Supreme Court approaches constitutional questions gingerly. One needs no citation of authority to assert that it is doubly difficult to secure a judgment by the Supreme Court overruling a former judgment on constitutional questions. Nor is the criticism of "men in a hurry," that the Court avoids constitutional decisions whenever reasonably possible, just. Perhaps avoidance sometimes approaches evasion, as in *United States v. CIO*, 335 U.S. 106, but justification is claimed, I think soundly, because of the far-reaching effects that questionable conclusions may have when handed down before full information is available for study.

Occasionally other means than amendments are available to overcome constitutional decisions contrary to purposes desired by the people. Thus the marginal seas decisions, which turned on the scope of national dominium, were rendered innocuous by the Submerged Lands Act, when Congress gave the States what the Court had refused.⁷ The Supreme Court even suggested in *California v. Roiph*, 264 U.S. 219, 227, how the disadvantages arising from *Southern Pacific v. Jensen*, 244 U.S. 205, declaring States without power to apply compensation acts to maritime workers, could be rectified.

Since *Marbury v. Madison* we have accepted the view that the judiciary has power to interpret our Constitution. In order to get

certainty in constitutional requirements, another theory has also been offered. This relates to whether, when a decision on constitutional interpretation has been reached by the Supreme Court of the United States—an interpretation treated as binding upon the courts, State and Federal—the Supreme Court can itself change its view as to constitutionality.⁸ Such a question seemed pertinent to some because of the understanding that the English House of Lords could not overrule one of their prior legal decisions without an act of Parliament.⁹

Desirable as fixity is, it is fortunate, in my view, that the English conclusion has not been reached here on constitutional issues. Our requirements for constitutional amendments might well bar necessary adjustment. After the War Between the States, the practice by the Supreme Court of overruling decisions deemed erroneous was applied in the Legal Tender cases. In *Hepburn v. Griswold*,¹⁰ the Court had decided in 1869 that contracts payable in species could not be satisfied by the U.S. notes, although these notes were legislatively declared legal tender in payment of debts. Later, in the Legal Tender cases,¹¹ *Hepburn v. Griswold* was specifically overruled, thus giving the necessary flexibility as to the nature of legal tender. This reversal was the forerunner of the gold clause legislation of 1935. Surely the sounder rule is that announced by Chief Justice Taney in the Passenger cases: "After such opinions, judicially delivered, I had supposed that question to be settled, so far as any question upon the construction of the Constitution ought to be regarded as closed by the decision of this Court. I do not, however, object to the revision of it, and am quite willing that it be regarded hereafter as the law of this Court, that its opinion upon the construction of the Constitution is always open to discussion when it is supposed to have been founded in error, and that its judicial authority should hereafter depend altogether on the force of the reasoning by which it is supported." (7 How. 283, at 470, dissenting.)

With the adoption of the last of the war amendments, the 15th, on the right to vote, the Nation turned from the major questions concerning National vis-a-vis State sovereignty to the problem arising from the growing industrialism, burgeoning corporations, conflicting governmental regulations.

A determination that had far-reaching results soon came down—*Santa Clara County, California v. Southern Pacific Railroad* (1886), 118 U.S. 394—decided that the word "person" in section I of the 14th amendment included corporations under equal protection. The Santa Clara case was the determinate decision in the California series of important railroad tax cases passing through the courts to determine the legality of State railroad assessments and classifications. The ruling on the point was short: "Mr. Chief Justice Waite said: 'The Court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the 14th amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a State to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applied to these corporations. We are all of opinion that it does,'" page 396.

It occurred after lengthy discussion in the brief for defendant¹² and the ruling, 1882

² See the article by Prof. Emory Washburn, of the Harvard Law School, "Limitations of Judicial Power," 1 Southern Law Review, N.S. 354.

³ *London Street Tramways Co. v. London County Council*, (1898) A.C. 375.

⁴ 8 Wall. 603.

⁵ 12 Wall. 457.

⁶ Sanderson, "Brief for the County of Santa Clara, No. 464, 1885 Term, U.S. Supreme Court," p. 28; "Brief for County of San Bernardino, No. 619, 1885 term," p. 69.

in the Railroad Tax cases by Justice Field, who there said: "A similar provision is found in nearly all of the State constitutions; and everywhere, and at all times, and in all courts, it has been held, either by tacit assent or express adjudication, to extend, so far as their property is concerned, to corporations. And this has been because the property of a corporation is in fact the property of the corporators."¹³

Between the Santa Clara case and the great depression, the history of the struggle for regulation of industry through the Sherman and Clayton Acts, the Interstate Commerce and similar enactments, continued. Then came the depression.

One must recognize the innate conservatism of the law, its habit of holding firmly to the existing order. One must recognize, too, that lawyers are not as conservative as the law. New social or economic problems stimulate discontent with older concepts that seem to have failed. Old understandings will be applied to new situations. Fresh approaches will be adopted to find solutions. So it was in the thirties.

Fortunately, the Court's determination that the Federal commerce clause permitted regulation of acts that affected commerce, as well as that commerce itself, had laid a framework for elaborate structures of national economic and social policy. This determination was made in the Shreveport case, 1913, where the Court's opinion written by the then Mr. Justice Hughes, upheld I.C.C. power over intrastate railroad rates.¹⁴ He said: "While these decisions sustaining the Federal power relate to measures adopted in the interest of the safety of persons and property, they illustrate the principle that Congress in the exercise of its paramount power may prevent the common instrumentalities of interstate and intrastate commercial intercourse from being used in their intrastate operations to the injury of interstate commerce."

Thus, in 1913, there was the genesis of the theory of Federal legislative power over local activities affecting commerce "among the States." The recognition that Federal power over commerce when exercised could control more than the actual incident of transportation was a weighty factor in enabling the Nation to adjust to the economic problems arising from the depression of the thirties. The National Labor Relations Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, and the Wage and Hour Act used "power over matters affecting commerce" as the constitutional basis for their enactment. They were upheld. A narrower interpretation of the commerce clause might well have required a constitutional amendment to accomplish the economic readjustments that enabled the United States to pass through the change from a conception of government as a policeman to maintain order to the idea of it as a public spirited enterprise to aid in those matters that the States cannot adequately accomplish for themselves.

Other Federal acts intended to aid economic recovery were found constitutional under other grants of power. For example, the 1935 Social Security Act gained approval for its taxation features under the provision of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, authorizing excise taxes, and for Federal contributions under the authority of the Federal Government to provide for the general welfare.¹⁵ Fortunately an earlier decision, declaring unconstitutional the Agricultural Adjustment Act, had decided that expenditure under the general welfare clause

¹³ 13 F. 722, 746-747; see McLaughlin, "The Court, the Corporation and Conkling," 46 American History Review, p. 45.

¹⁴ *Houston & Texas Ry. v. United States*, 234 U.S. 342, p. 353.

¹⁵ *Steward Machine Co. v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 548; *Helvering v. Davis*, 301 U.S. 619.

² *Cohens v. Virginia*, 6 Wheat. 264.

³ *United States v. Congress of Industrial Organization*, 335 U.S. 106; cf. *United States v. Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S. 587, *Arrow-Hart Co. v. Commission*, 291 U.S. 587. Clayton Act amendment of 1950, 64 Stat. 1125.

⁴ *Adkins v. Children's Hospital*, 261 U.S. 525; *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish*, 300 U.S. 379.

⁵ *Hammer v. Dagenhart*, 247 U.S. 251; *United States v. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100.

⁶ 2 Dallas 419.

⁷ *Ci. Alabama v. Texas*, 347 U.S. 272, with *United States v. California*, 332 U.S. 19, and *United States v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 707.

"for public purposes is not limited by the direct grants of legislative power found in the Constitution."¹⁶

Hardly had the recognition and acceptance of the economic and social advances of the 1930's been completed before the distractions of the increased wealth, earnings and leisure, with their temptation to obtain easy money, began to create problems of crime. Adolescence vies with early manhood as the danger period for emerging criminality. Rapid economic and social changes have brought men into positions of business and organizational trust without backgrounds of established character that kept them free from wrongdoing. As shown by the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, crime has increased more rapidly than the population.

We are too close to the problems of crime, communism, and civil rights to foresee the final outcome, but the good sense and adjustability of our people and our law have not failed us in the past. The coming generations will not let the future be less well guided.

Wherever one goes, from hamlet to the Atlantic megalopolis stretching along Highway 1 from Boston to Miami, the influence of the lawyer reaches beyond the courts into the daily life of the communities, giving a sense of soundness and security in the ordinary affairs of life. One feels that the Nation has confidence in the sound administration of the law.

The institutions of this fortunate land have long been directed to assuring that no bar of race or creed or birth shall block man from his goal. Such opportunity has been attained to an extent unimagined for centuries and is now an essential ingredient of our national life. The chance of helping ourselves while we help others has cleared the forests and drained the swamps, built great cities, established factories, spanned the earth, and harnessed air and water to serve our needs of transport and communication, and has enabled us to contribute our full share to the world's production of things of the mind and spirit—articles of beauty, structures of artistic merit, books, inventions in the fields of chemistry, physics, electronics—the applications of which have eased the rigors and enhanced the pleasures of life. This material and intellectual advance has not dulled our interest in philosophy and religion. Our philanthropies are immense, our charitable institutions are unmatched examples of altruism, our magnificent religious foundations work ceaselessly for the moral uplift of our people.

What formula for life has produced this unprecedented balance of material and spiritual riches? Is it merely an exploitation of the manifest wealth of our land? Can it be that our cross-breeding has produced a superior race? Other countries have equal fertility, equal mineral wealth, equal or better access to the sea and to adjacent lands. Our amalgam cannot be said to be a better mixture of blood than that of other races. Our immigrant forefathers were not drawn predominantly from the producing intellectuals of their native lands. The rest of the world's recent contributions to electronics, atomic physics, economics, and philosophy forbids us to boast that our thinkers have an intellectual capacity beyond that of the thinkers in other nations.

We have had, however, for our earliest beginnings in the highest degree something others lack, or, at best, possess in a relatively undeveloped form: a system of free enterprise and a classless society. Here every door to achievement in any line swings open to energy, determination, imagination, and intelligence. Those are two of the most important factors that have brought America successfully to this good hour, and so long as they remain our ideals we shall continue

our advance. We cherish these freedoms to work, acquire, and advance not only because they offer opportunity for success to all but because our experience has shown their use has produced bountifully for the benefit of all. The test is to compare the way of life of our people with that of any other nation.

Because we are a government of laws and not of men, the people, realizing that power to act arbitrarily corrupts, find the primary protection of our liberties in the law and in lawyers. When we are admitted to the bar and the bench, the obligation for the preservation of those liberties devolves upon us.

Our members must be alert and sensitive to these values of our society in order to do their part to maintain America's primacy as a land of prosperity and freedom.

I know the alumni of the University of Miami will do their part.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the reluctance on the part of Members of Congress to openly support my proposal for a national lottery, outside support continues to grow.

Last October 11, at the national convention of the American Legion, former President Harry S. Truman took a firm and strong position in favor of a national lottery. He argued that the only way we can eliminate our national debt is through a Government-run lottery.

I am happy to report to this House that another eminent citizen has also come forward in support of my bill. In the February issue of McCall's magazine, which hit the newsstands Tuesday, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy and a former Member of this House, affirmatively answers the question:

Do you think we should have a national lottery similar to the Irish Sweepstakes?

In urging favorable consideration of this revenue-raising measure, Mrs. Luce writes:

A national lottery might be an excellent way for the Government to cash in on a \$50-billion-a-year business; namely, the gambling industry, much of the profits from which now go into the hands of organized crime.

It would seem that the Government would be far better off to foster a legal lottery than to continue tolerating the illegal.

I feel that the Government could endorse carefully regulated lotteries. These, of course, should be managed and controlled by scrupulously selected officials. However, the question of public support for a national lottery should be settled by holding a referendum in which every American could have his full say.

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, although these are merely preliminary remarks in response to the gentleman from New

York I cannot resist the urge to express my strong opposition to the proposed measure calling for a national lottery.

The gentleman says there is widespread gambling throughout our Nation today, a statement with which no one could reasonably argue, yet I do not see the advisability of legalizing something simply because it is being practiced by many of our citizens. The records reveal that some of our most atrocious crimes are associated with gambling.

Additionally, if we are to follow the gentleman's argument to its logical conclusion, we would legalize the commission of any crime or undesirable practice simply because people continue to commit such acts.

May I respectfully submit to this body, Mr. Speaker, that our forefathers were primarily motivated by their love of God and came to this country seeking a place to worship Him according to the dictates of their conscience and to rear their families in the proper atmosphere. It is difficult enough for those who so sacrificially labor in our homes and in our churches and other religious endeavors to compete with the criminal elements, without this Congress making their assignment more difficult by legalizing lotteries.

As to the financial returns should the Government legalize the gambling business, no one could successfully argue that there would not be substantial revenue produced through such a measure. Yet on the other hand the additional taxes received would be more than offset by the increased law enforcement costs to our local and State governments, as well as the Federal police authorities, in properly policing national lotteries.

Not only would we be faced with the added law enforcement problems and costs, but our welfare payments would skyrocket. Many of our families who are now existing on marginal standards would be further robbed of a decent livelihood because of the inability of some member of the family to resist the temptation which would be offered by national lotteries.

Further, this practice would encourage our young people to look for the easy road in life instead of pursuing the only sure road for successful living—that of hard work.

Mr. Speaker, this country was not founded on such a basis nor will it continue to prosper should our Government resort to such unwise methods to raise money—methods which are in conflict with the best interests not only of our national welfare but also of our churches, and our local communities.

DEBATE ON U.S. BASES

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in the RECORD extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have all been rather agitated and, rightly so, over the whole

¹⁶ United States v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1, p. 66.

Cuban situation. To me, a most interesting article in today's paper says that the United States is to take missiles out of Turkey.

Have you ever been to Turkey? You know how close it is to the Communists? Do you know anything about the feeling between those two peoples? Do you know anything of the friendship of Turkey for us? Better look it up and think it over.

Further, I want to remind you that on October 7, 1962, there was an article in the Times that had some very pertinent remarks in it. One was:

The U.S. intercontinental advantage has not eliminated the strategic need for oversea bases. Oversea airfields are still highly useful for these purposes.

It further says:

Withdrawal from facilities abroad could lead to the end of the U.S. system of international alliance upon which the entire postwar security system has been based.

I would like to ask the administration what they propose to do about these matters. I believe we have the right to be told.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper articles to which I have referred are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1962]

DEBATE ON U.S. BASES—PROGRESS ON MISSILES
VIEWED AS AID TO RED DRIVE ON FACILITIES
OVERSEAS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

U.S. bases overseas and military dispositions ranging from Japan to Greenland are again under Communist attack as a byproduct of the Cuban crisis.

Communist pressure is being aided by the global growth of nationalism and neutralism and by technological developments. The development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, Polaris missile-firing submarines and the art of refueling bombers in the air has reduced materially U.S. dependence upon oversea bases.

Today, the United States can deliver a devastating nuclear attack on the Soviet Union without utilizing oversea bases. By the end of 1962, the United States will have approximately 200 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in position.

NINE POLARIS SUBMARINES

There are nine nuclear-powered Polaris submarines with a total of 144 missiles in commission. The Navy maintains 16 attack carriers with more than 400 attack bombers, each capable of carrying nuclear weapons. The Strategic Air Command operates more than 700 B-52 and B-58 bombers with ample range to reach the Soviet Union—without air refueling from the United States. There are also 700 or 800 B-47's with shorter ranges. These are gradually being replaced by missiles. With air refuelings they can reach Soviet targets and return to bases in this country.

The smallest strategic warhead or bomb utilized by these planes and missiles has an explosive force of about half a megaton (the equivalent of about 500,000 pounds of TNT). The largest U.S. bombs are rated at 20 to 30 megatons.

This is held to be the major reason that the first chapter of the Cuban crisis was terminated in favor of Washington. The immensely superior nuclear delivery forces of the United States give it the capability to devastate the Soviet Union no matter what it did first; Moscow could hurt, but not destroy us.

The Soviet Union probably has considerably fewer than 100 ICBM's in position and its long-range bomber fleet and missile-fir-

ing submarines are inferior in numbers, quality and general technology. The Soviet Union has no aircraft carriers.

MOSCOW'S MISSILES

But Moscow has long had a large number of medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic missiles of sufficient range to reach the territory of U.S. allies and most of the U.S. bases overseas from Soviet soil. These missiles are incapable of reaching the United States.

Thus the Soviet missile bases in Cuba, though primarily of political and psychological importance, compensated to some extent militarily for the Soviet Union's intercontinental inferiority. If Moscow had been allowed to turn much of Cuba into a vast missile-launching site, the U.S. greatest military advantage would have been not eliminated but seriously reduced.

Moreover, the Cuban missile sites were so close to U.S. shores that little warning of missile firings would have been possible. In any case, the United States has no ballistic missile early warning system along its southern coast comparable to that in Alaska, Greenland, and England.

These facts would seem to indicate that Moscow, from a technological point of view, would benefit more from oversea bases than the United States.

There are other and more dominating reasons, however, for oversea bases, which would make any exchange of Cuba for Turkey (or similar bases) highly dangerous, in the opinion of both military men and political observers.

NEED FOR BASES SEEN

The U.S. intercontinental advantage has not eliminated the strategic need for oversea bases. Oversea airfields are still highly useful for these purposes: dispersion of strategic forces, bases for refueling aerial tankers, post-attack recovery bases for planes that have completed their attack missions, transport and air-supply staging bases, sites for tactical aircraft (fighter-bombers and light bombers) capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

Oversea bases and facilities are far more important as a political part of the general United States deterrent to Soviet expansionism, and as a military deterrent to limited aggression than as part of the strategic nuclear deterrent. Use of such bases would be essential, as the Turkish airfields were during the Lebanon crisis, to contain any threatened conflagration. In this context, they are virtually indispensable.

Withdrawal from facilities abroad could lead to the end of the U.S. system of international alliances upon which the entire postwar security system has been based. This is all the more true since some allies have expressed open suspicion that U.S. acquisition of an intercontinental delivery system might tend toward an isolationist "Fortress America" policy and that Washington would be unlikely, once it withdrew, to come to the aid of a threatened ally, particularly when it knew such aid might risk a nuclear attack upon the United States.

Washington has described the IL-28, a light bomber, as an "offensive" weapon when based in Cuba and has asked for its withdrawal along with the missiles. If the same reasoning were applied to Turkey, the Turkish airfields would probably become unavailable to any U.S. military aircraft, since fighter-bombers, as well as light bombers, can carry nuclear weapons and have range enough from Turkey for deep penetrations into the Soviet Union.

Such an interpretation, if applied, would, military men believe, effectively neutralize Turkey and perhaps detach her from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The real measure of the oversea base, therefore, is its purpose. The U.S. contention, shared by its allies, has always been

that its oversea bases were established solely in answer to Communist aggressive expansionism at the request of the countries concerned.

The United States maintains or has access to more than 300 bases, facilities, posts or stations overseas, ranging from small radar outposts to great air-land complexes, such as some facilities in Germany, or sea-air installations, such as the Navy's base at Rota, Spain.

There are about 60 Thor 1,500-mile missiles in Britain, which are now considered as obsolescent and are scheduled to be dismantled in the next 12 months. There are 30 Jupiters near Bari in Italy, and 15 Jupiter 1,500-mile missiles in Turkey. There are protected underground sites for winged Mace missiles in West Germany and in Okinawa, as well as some unprotected sites for older Matador winged missiles elsewhere in Germany.

The Mace sites still have technological usefulness; the rest of our land-based oversea missile sites could gradually be eliminated, if the countries concerned agreed, without significant impairment of our nuclear deterrent capability.

But the other functions of our oversea bases and positions are still of high importance. These indispensable functions include the protection of our sea-air lines of communications with our allies and oversea sources of raw materials; outpost warning positions; intelligence gathering functions; stabilizing points in areas of unrest (as in the Middle East), and as backup points and bases for the support of limited war operations.

Even more important, U.S. bases overseas have tremendous political and psychological—and in some cases, economic—importance.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1963]
UNITED STATES TO TAKE MISSILES OUT OF
TURKEY

(By Murrey Marder)

A new element in the shifting pattern of East-West relations was underscored yesterday in an official announcement by Turkey that the United States will dismantle its Jupiter missile bases there.

While the announcement was foreshadowed by reports to this effect in Washington last week, it drew added attention to the manner in which Soviet-American postures have changed since the Cuban crisis, for a combination of reasons.

The Soviet Union long has charged that one of the greatest obstacles to reduction of East-West tension is its "encirclement" by American bases overseas. This has been a main theme of Soviet propaganda.

U.S. officials vigorously denied yesterday, as they had last week, that plans to remove 30 Jupiter missiles from Italy and 15 from Turkey have any connection with the correspondence between President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev during the Cuban crisis last October. At one point in that crisis Khrushchev demanded withdrawal of the American nuclear weapons from Turkey to offset his removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba.

Removal of the 1500-mile Jupiters from NATO bases in Italy and Turkey was contemplated long before the Cuban crisis, along with the earlier withdrawal of Thor missiles from Britain, as part of the process of "weapons modernization," American officials stressed.

Moreover, they noted, the targets in Soviet bloc territory at which these missiles are aimed will now be assigned to more effective, submarine-launched Polaris missiles. The result is more defensive power for the West, not less, American officials said.

Removal of the Jupiter bases from Italy and Turkey will end a situation in which

these nuclear bases have been a "lightning rod" for Soviet propaganda that threatens to wipe them out first in event of nuclear war, American officials agree.

As a result, these officials acknowledge, the thrust of Soviet psychological warfare probably will have to be altered to meet this shift of deployment of weapons by the Allies.

But, it is insisted, no political significance whatever can be read into this change. There is absolutely no foundation, they assert, to speculation that this decision may be the result of a secret deal between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev.

Many independent diplomatic observers, however, dispute the interpretation that there is no political import to the present action.

Even if only by implicitly reacting to circumstances that have developed since the United States and the Soviet Union stood on the brink of nuclear war in October, each side independently has taken actions that have tended to ease the tensions between them.

The Soviet Union has backed considerably from any showdown by force in Berlin.

Both nations have joined in a new round of nuclear test ban talks now going on in Washington as the result of direct communication between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev.

The Soviet Union may, of course, and presumably will, shift its target of attack from the land-based missiles to the sea-based missiles, but the psychological barb of confronting nuclear strategic missiles at its borders will be gone.

Turkish Foreign Minister Feridun Cemal Erkin made the announcement of the plans to dismantle two American Jupiter missiles. State Department spokesman Lincoln White said, "We are discussing the modernization of weapons systems with a number of countries, including Turkey." White said he is "not prepared to say more at this point."

I believe the people of this country have a right to know what is behind the withdrawals to which the administration has apparently agreed.

AIR SUPPORT AND THE BAY OF PIGS INVASION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, national confidence in our ability to cope with the Cuban situation is at a low ebb.

After 2 years of being permitted to believe that air support was pledged, but withdrawn, in the Bay of Pigs invasion, we suddenly are advised by the Attorney General that air cover was never offered or intended.

Thousands of words have appeared in the press in the last 22 months quoting military and civilian leaders and Cuban invasion participants as flatly affirming the promise of U.S. air support in April 1961.

This tremendously important controversy transcends political parties and partisan motivations. At this late date, an honest, accurate report of events leading up to and including the invasion would not breach security. It would, instead, indicate the manner in which we

have been, and are, dealing with the deadly menace of communism just 90 miles from our shore.

If our leadership in military strategy is shaky, sophomoric or incompetent, we must know it. If the facts are as the Attorney General has presented them, we are entitled to have our minds put at ease.

Cuba's present threat to our national existence will not disappear through wishful thinking. Cuba is even more of a threat today than it was last October. Reports that the Russians even now are constructing highly sophisticated ground and air bases in Cuba makes a complete review of our system of military policy-making absolutely urgent. It is a Communist base for propaganda, infiltration and subversion.

Therefore, I am introducing a concurrent resolution, identical in many respects to one introduced yesterday by Senator GOLDWATER. My resolution, however, would create a Special Joint Committee, composed on a bipartisan basis of Members of both House and Senate.

I urge its adoption be expedited by both Chambers of the Congress.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE STATE OF NEW YORK IN CORN PROGRAM

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed, as are many New Yorkers, at the discrimination being practiced under Secretary Freeman's order posted on January 9, 1963. This makes in order preferential freight rates on Government-owned corn shipped into the Southeastern States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that is the fashion around here to believe that the State of New York is bounded by the George Washington Bridge on the north, the Battery on the south, Brooklyn to the southwest, and Long Island City to the southeast. Mr. Speaker, this is a fallacy. The State of New York has vast farm areas. In my district the greatest single industry is dairy farming and of course we have poultry, truck farming, and so forth, in great quantity.

The Secretary's order reads:

The corn will be offered at a price delivered f.o.b. car at 25 cents per bushel over the Chicago cash market price in quantities of 5 or more jumbo freight cars or 10 or more ordinary freight cars—in quantities of 1 through 4 jumbo cars or of 2 through 9 ordinary cars, the f.o.b. price will be 27½ cents above the Chicago cash market price.

Obviously this is discrimination against the State of New York and all the Northeastern States.

When we have complained to the Department about this discrimination we have been put off with the ridiculous statement that New York has a drought program in operation. Of course this is

a preposterous excuse, and will not hold up. The Secretary's order on freight rates covers an entirely different problem and is in no way compensated for by the drought program.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the Congress will go to work at once to right this grievous wrong to the farmers of the Northeast.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the courtesy and consideration of the Congresswoman from New York in extending me time to address some comments to the subject of her remarks.

I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur with and endorse the Congresswoman's statements, and in support thereof I submit to the RECORD the two following communications:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Although no press release was effected on the matter, I have been advised that under date of January 9, 1963, the Department of Agriculture posted notice that it was offering—on an f.o.b. delivery basis—Government-owned grain (chiefly corn) at 25 cents over the Commodity Credit Corporation bushel quotation in Chicago. The pertinent rate is applicable to bulk shipments of 500 tons, with a rate of 27½ cents per bushel applying on a single car base.

This action was, of course, taken under the Emergency Feed Grain Act of 1961 and will have application to 12 Southeastern States, Maryland, and Delaware included.

This represents to me a gross inequity, being extremely unfair to Maine poultrymen and dairymen. Such action on your part, as Secretary of Agriculture, places Maine poultry and dairy interests in an extremely disadvantageous position in marketing their products in market areas common to producers of both the Northeast and Southeast parts of the country.

I urgently petition you to eliminate this inequity by acting to restore equitable conditions to the market for all feed grain users, with emphasis on those of Maine and the rest of the northeastern United States.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been delegated by Republican members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives to register vigorous opposition to the order posted by you on January 9, 1963, as pertaining to preferential freight rates on Government-owned corn shipped in the Southeastern States.

As per this order: "The corn will be offered at a price delivered f.o.b. car at 25 cents per bushel over the Chicago cash market price in quantities of 5 or more jumbo freight cars or 10 or more ordinary freight cars—in quantities of 1 through 4 jumbo cars or of 2 through 9 ordinary cars, the f.o.b. price will be 27½ cents above the Chicago cash market price."

We Republicans of the New England delegation contend that this action under the Emergency Feed Grain Act of 1961 is discriminatory, having the effect of providing—through reduced freight rates—a price advantage for feed grain users in the Southeast over those in New England.

Equity dictates that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not extend preferential treatment under the law to one geographical area of the United States over another. In consonance with this consideration, we Republicans of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives strongly implore you immediately to take such action as is necessary to liquidate this obviously inequitable treatment to poultry raisers and dairy-men of New England. We appeal to your good conscience to effect an equitable balance of costs for both feed grain users of both New England and the Southeast.

Your serious attention to this petition will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON STATE DOCTORS PLAN FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

MR. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article from the Seattle Times.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MR. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from the Seattle Times demonstrates the willingness of Washington members of the medical profession to voluntarily alleviate the medical problems of our senior citizens:

KING COUNTY MEDICS PIONEER PAST-65 PATIENTS' PLAN

(By Hill Williams)

The King County Medical Society has discovered—to its surprise—that it is pioneering in a new method intended to make sure older persons get needed medical care.

The society on July 1 put a plan into operation under which persons over 65 who felt they could not afford doctors' care could apply for reduced fees.

The plan was aimed at helping persons who had a little too much savings or income to qualify for State welfare aid but who felt that doctors' bills were a hardship.

"We didn't realize we were pioneering," a society spokesman said. "We thought we were using a plan tried out in St. Louis. But it turned out to be a very small trial in St. Louis County, so now we have the most experience in the country."

"There has been a tremendous amount of interest in our plan by groups for the aging and by other medical societies."

The society's past-65 plan has no connection with medical-insurance plans of the King County Medical Service Corp. There are no premiums in the past-65 plan. And it does not cover hospital bills.

Here is how it works:

A person who thinks he may be eligible talks to his own doctor, or goes to the society office, 105 Cobb Building, and is interviewed.

The interviewer asks the amount of income and savings the applicant has, how much he is paying for medicine and what his living expenses are. Then a committee of six doctors screens the applications.

Persons found eligible are given a card to show their physician. It entitles them to a specific percentage reduction in fees. More

than half the society's members have agreed to take part in the plan.

Some doctors, who have not formally agreed to participate, have honored the cards anyway.

The past-65 plan has been approved by trustees of the Seattle-King County Pharmaceutical Society. Patients are urged to show the card to their pharmacist, who may be able to give them some price break.

"Many of the people we've interviewed tell us their doctors have been treating them all along at reduced rates," a member of the screening committee said. "Many tell us that drug prices are the biggest hardship."

Applicants have varied from a woman who had no income and was living on her savings of about \$2,500 to a couple who had \$19,000 in the bank and \$400 a month income. The woman was given the biggest possible reduction. The couple was rejected.

The society has issued 165 cards and has rejected only 35 applicants. Those rejected were urged to apply again if their situation changed and they thought themselves eligible.

The society does not require bankruptcy or a "pauper's oath" for eligibility.

"Many applicants have incomes of about \$100 a month and are trying to stay off welfare," a committee member said. "We feel like encouraging them."

The society's standards are flexible. But if an elderly couple had a small income and a couple of thousand dollars saved, the society would be inclined to give them a fee reduction.

But if the applicants were hanging on to substantial property or savings, the society would inform them it feels they should use at least part of it.

The plan is open to persons over 65 who have lived in King County at least a year.

The society has tried to spread the word about the plan through retired persons' clubs and similar groups.

"We had heard that there was a medical need in King County, not being met by welfare, composed of older persons barred from welfare aid by small savings accounts or property," a committee member said.

"We are trying to reach this group. So far, the response has been very gratifying, although we haven't found a great many cases we can help."

"We are most happy to explore any we hear about."

LEGISLATIVE CODE OF ETHICS

MR. LINDSAY. 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 York?

There was no objection.

MR. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed a law that established a modern conflicts-of-interest code for the executive branch of our Government. It was a notable achievement and represents the first major overhaul of our conflicts-of-interest laws in the 20th century. I was pleased to play a key role in that historic undertaking which represented the culmination of many years' effort on the part of Congress and the Executive with a superlative assist from the Bar Association of the City of New York.

However, we failed to enact a conflicts-of-interest code for the employees and Members of Congress. This is an omission which should be remedied.

Today I am submitting a concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Commit-

tee on Ethics to recommend a comprehensive code of ethics for Members of Congress and all legislative employees. It is unfair for Congress to bear down vigorously on the financial affairs of Executive appointees when no code of ethics exists to guide Members of Congress.

In addition to establishing a joint committee to draft a code of ethics for Congress, the resolution would lay down an interim code. This would require a Member of Congress to file with the Comptroller General record of any financial interest—valued at \$10,000 or more—in an activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a Federal regulatory agency. It would place limitations on outside employment and would ban the disclosure or use of confidential information for other than official purposes. It would also ban the use of official influence to gain unwarranted privileges and exemptions.

It is sad to say that the prestige of Congress is not exactly at an alltime high. Enactment of this resolution would be an important step toward restoring the U.S. Congress to the position of respect to which it should be entitled as the greatest legislative body in the world.

I am also introducing today a companion measure which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide any written or oral communication between a Member of Congress or his staff and a Government agency concerning matters under adjudication before the agency be made a part of the public record of the proceeding in question. Enactment of this measure will make it more difficult for congressional influence to manifest itself in an improper fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state that both measures have been introduced in the other body by the distinguished gentlemen who ably represent the State of New York, Senators JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING.

I am hopeful that the Congress can overcome its traditional aversion to putting its own house in order and act favorably upon this legislation.

DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESS OF THE ARTS IN THE UNITED STATES

MR. LINDSAY. 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 York?

There was no objection.

MR. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing three important measures designed to encourage the development and progress of the arts in the United States. The first bill abolishes the present Federal admissions tax on live dramatic performances, whether or not musical. The second extends the capital gains benefit to copyrights, a benefit now enjoyed by patent owners. The third grants an income tax spread-back to individuals who create artistic works, spread ratably over the period during which the work took place. I am pleased to state that my colleague

from New York, Senator JAVITS is introducing companion measures in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, at a later date I shall have more to state about each of these measures and also on the subject of a Federal Arts Council.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to remedy a chaotic situation in the aircraft industry which exists because of conflicting State law as to the validity of conveyances of aircraft and related equipment.

The bill amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish a uniform rule as to which State's law applies to a given conveyance, lease, or other transfer of title or interests in such equipment. The bill makes no change in the substantive law of the various States.

At least three rules are now in use, and the uncertainty which this creates in an industry where equipment is constantly in rapid movement across State lines is obvious. The bill would create a uniform rule that the substantive law of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered is applicable. Comparable provisions already exist in relation to ships and motor vehicles, I therefore urge that prompt action be taken now to solve this problem in regard to aircraft.

I am pleased to announce that the bill is being introduced today in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator of New York JACOB JAVITS. Last year an almost identical bill passed the Senate. I am hopeful that the House will act affirmatively on this needed measure.

With the permission of the House, I include at this point in the RECORD a memorandum which explains the bill in greater detail:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 503 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect the title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment. This is accomplished by providing that the substantive validity of such an instrument, i.e., a conveyance, lease, mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, other instrument executed for security purposes, or assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto, is to be determined by the substantive law of the jurisdiction within the United States or its territories or possessions in which such instrument is delivered. Thus, the Federal law would look to the substantive laws (as distinguished from adjective laws, including recording and filing provisions) of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered and if such instrument is valid under that law and is in turn recorded under the applicable provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the instrument would be deemed valid in all jurisdictions in the United States in respect of the property covered by the instrument.

There is an urgent need, emphasized by recent court decisions, for the proposed legislation so as to bring order to the existing chaotic situation with respect to conveyances by and to domestic air carriers.

The laws of the various States differ as to the requirements governing the validity of mortgages, conditional sale agreements, leases, equipment trust agreements, and the like. Furthermore, there are at least three theories considered applicable in attempting to resolve the question as to which jurisdiction's laws should be taken into account in determining the validity of many such instruments, namely, (1) the jurisdiction in which the particular property is located at the time the instrument is executed and/or delivered, (2) the jurisdiction within which the instrument is executed and/or delivered, and (3) the residence of the parties of the transaction, particularly the conveyor. Which theory or theories should be adopted regarding a proposed financing of an air carrier incorporated under the laws of one State, maintaining airport facilities and aircraft and related equipment in many States, flying scheduled routes over many more States and seeking the financing from banks located in other States? At the time a chattel mortgage, for example, is given to the banking institution by the air carrier, its aircraft may be located in or over any number of States. Were the parties to such a transaction to follow only the first theory referred to above, at the moment the chattel mortgage on the air carrier's fleet of aircraft (many of which would be in the air) is executed the laws of many States would come into play, and a moment later the laws of different States would apply, notwithstanding any contradiction between the laws of such States. Moreover, there is no real logic in considering the law of State X paramount as to the validity of a chattel mortgage on a specific aircraft when the aircraft is at that moment traveling over the State at a speed in excess of 500 miles an hour and at a height in excess of 40,000 feet.

The proposed legislation would serve to preempt the field as to the substantive validity of such conveyances just as present section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 has, since 1938, preempted the field as to the recording of such conveyances. A provision comparable to the proposed legislation has been applicable to conveyances of U.S. flag vessels since the enactment of the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920. Similarly, a 1958 amendment to the Motor Carrier Act now provides comparable legislation as to motor vehicles.

The proposed legislation has been drafted within the framework of section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It applies only to those conveyances enumerated in said section and does not conflict with or impinge upon the other provisions of said section or the act.

ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LINDSAY. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, January 22 signifies a historical landmark in man's epic struggle to attain national independence and personal liberty. For on that day in 1918 the Ukrainian Central Council gathered in the capital city of Kiev to proclaim the Ukrainian National Republic, thus bringing to its

culmination a centuries-old struggle by the Ukrainian people to free itself from the oppressions of foreign domination. On this past Tuesday men devoted to freedom and justice commemorated throughout the world the anniversary of that inspiring event, and I consider it an honor to join today in this commemoration.

Search the voluminous annals of history and you will nowhere find a more heroic nor a more tragic account of one nation seeking, striving, struggling to survive. One thousand years ago Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine and the oldest city in the U.S.S.R., was the brilliant nerve center of a thriving and progressive people, the first eastern Slav state in history. And then this brilliance was snuffed out and the long dark era of oppression and persecution began. First came the Mongol hordes from the East; later the Poles and the Lithuanians from the West; and finally the Russians from the North. As early as 1667 the Czar began annexing the Ukrainian lands and enslaving the Ukrainian people. By 1700 he had torn away those lands east of the Dnieper and before another century had passed the Russian forces of reaction and repression had engulfed the entire Ukraine. Again the flame of Ukrainian freedom was dimmed but, as always, never extinguished. In 1831 that spark ignited in a revolution against the foreign oppressors only to be smothered beneath the sheer weight of 150,000 Russian troops. During the course of the latter 19th century Ukrainian books were banned and Ukrainian language theater performances proscribed as the Czar attempted to complete his cruel scheme to extinguish the smoldering coals of Ukrainian genius and Ukrainian independence.

January 22, 1918, proved that brutality and injustice were a poor match for the heroic determination and indomitable spirit of the Ukrainian people. Long had been their struggle for independence but short was to be their enjoyment of that hard-won freedom. Even as they proclaimed their independence the armies of the German Kaiser and the Russian Soviets were contesting who would be the next oppressor in the Ukraine. The people resisted for 3 long years, but in December 1920 the Bolshevik Army returned Russian domination to the Ukraine; the brutal oppression of the Czars found its successor in the cruel terror of the Soviets. Throughout the 1920's Ukrainians such as Mykola Khvylov attacked this "rebirth of Muscovite messianism in a Communist guise." The Stalinism of the 1930's produced the greatest brutality in the Ukraine where lands were forcibly collectivized and leaders openly liquidated. This tragic epic of one nation's suffering and struggle reached its most tragic climax during World War II when Ukrainians valiantly but vainly fought to eject from their lands both Hitler's Wehrmacht and Stalin's Red Army.

Today the Ukraine remains the largest non-Russian captive nation in eastern Europe and in the U.S.S.R. The 45 million people of the Ukraine comprise one-fifth of the Soviet Union and give the

Ukraine the sixth largest population in Europe. Its area approximately equals that of France and provides one-fifth of the cultivated land in the U.S.S.R. These are the human and natural resources which the Communists have appropriated for themselves over the eloquent protestations and tenacious resistance of the Ukrainian people.

We Americans gained our independence within the course of several years; for the Ukrainians that struggle is one which spans centuries of heroic efforts and tragic defeats. But let the people of the Ukraine know that, whether their freedom burns brightly as it did in 1918 or smolders under foreign oppression as it has before and after that memorable date, that freedom shall never be extinguished. I join with my colleagues in sincere sympathy for their long suffering and with limitless admiration for their epic struggle. Their hope and their heroism shall not have been in vain.

DETERIORATION OF U.S. POSITION IN NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the 5-year history of the so-called nuclear test ban negotiations the United States steadily has been losing its nuclear shirt. Whipsaw tactics of Soviet negotiators have eroded away U.S. determination to achieve an enforceable treaty with effective machinery to detect cheating backed up by necessary inspection procedures adequate to expose a cheater. Had President Kennedy exhibited the same ruthlessness in imposing his will at the test ban negotiating tables as he has against American businessmen this situation would not have come about.

When the negotiations began in 1958, a minimum of 20 annual on-site inspections of Soviet soil to investigate suspicious seismic signals which might be underground test violations was demanded. This week, when Khrushchev hinted at only two to three inspections, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Presidential Scientific Advisor Jerome B. Wiesner danced with joy and babbled "we are encouraged," we are "within shooting distance" of agreements.

All this evidences a "treaty for treaty's sake" psychosis which seems to throw the Kennedy administration into an emotional jag whenever Khrushchev and company remove a switch-blade knife from the negotiating table and replace it with sandpaper to wear away another U.S. demand.

With secret negotiations now going on right here in Washington, today, on the fifth floor of the State Department Building it should be instructive for all Americans and particularly President Kennedy, Secretary Rusk, Disarmament

Administrator William C. Foster, and others in that fifth floor secret discussion to review and compare our position in 1958 when test ban negotiations began and what it is now.

Here is the then and now comparison:

Then the negotiations started after the United States had completed an adequate series of tests and after adequate time to evaluate carefully a prior series of Soviet tests. Now negotiations are being carried on with a major series of Soviet atmospheric tests having hardly been completed and while it is yet highly unlikely that sufficient time has elapsed to determine what kind of nuclear weapons breakthroughs might have been achieved during the U.S.S.R. test series carried on to the last few days of December 1962.

Then the area of the Soviet Union which demands adequate detection machinery and inspection procedures spreads across two continents, encompasses 8½ million square miles and comprises one-sixth of the world's land area. Now the situation is no better.

Then a network of 180 internationally manned and controlled seismic detection stations was contemplated. Now the international network has been abandoned. Instead a system whereby cheaters would be expected voluntarily to submit seismic evidence of their crimes is under discussion.

Then 19 of the internationally manned and controlled detection stations were to be at necessary locations within the Soviet Union. Now only three unmanned, tamper-prone black-box seismic devices for the entire Soviet Union are within Khrushchev's terms. Even these would be shuttled back and forth by Soviet airplanes and installed by Soviet personnel.

Then, as earlier mentioned, 20 annual on-site inspections of suspicious events on Soviet soil was demanded. Now the secret negotiations are seeking a compromise between Khrushchev's low of 2 and Kennedy's high of 10.

Then the inspections were to be at the independent initiative of an international control commission. Now the discussions revolve around a scheme which contemplates inspections only at the invitation of the suspected cheater, a highly unlikely occurrence unless the cheater decides early in the year to use up the maximum allowed inspections on wild-goose chases, then safely proceed with his perfidy for the remainder of the year.

Then the inspections were to be carried on without limitations on necessary personnel or reasonable procedures including aerial photography, physical above and under the ground surveillance, radiation monitoring equipment, and the like. Now it appears inspection would be hamstrung by limitations on personnel and equipment due to complete dependence on Soviet transportation and logistics support which could easily limit, delay, or misplace equipment and personnel necessary for adequate inspection.

Then inspections were to be at any suspected location wheresoever. Now inspection teams could be restricted or completely denied entry into suspicious

areas on grounds of danger to the security interests of the U.S.S.R. Teams would travel on Soviet airplanes piloted by Soviet crews and, according to Khrushchev, further be restricted by screening of windows in the planes, prohibitions to carrying photo cameras, and so forth.

Then the negotiations started with the objective of posing such serious risks of getting caught to cheaters that cheating would be deterred. Now negotiations are carried on in a frame of reference encouraging cheating because risks of getting caught would be so nominal.

Then negotiations started with the possibility France and Red China also would become subject to a test ban. Now both of these countries have declared an unwillingness to forego nuclear testing.

In short, negotiations began on a relatively safe basis for future U.S. security. Now they are being carried on from a relatively unsafe basis for future U.S. security.

This criticism of the Kennedy administration bargaining position at the test ban negotiating table springs from no desire to perpetuate the threat of nuclear war. Of course, the peaceminded people of the world, amongst whom I include the entire U.S. citizenry along with myself, want to be rid of the threat of nuclear war. But it must be clearly understood that the basic threat to mankind is nuclear war not nuclear testing.

The real threat, nuclear annihilation, cannot be dissipated by a lopsided, cheat-prone, illusory nuclear test ban treaty. Its loopholes only would increase that threat to America and her free world allies.

This is because Communist dogma has not relaxed its decree of destruction for all that is non-Communist. Until some better insulation against it comes along, U.S. policy has been to keep its nuclear capabilities so superior that potential Kremlin button pushers are deterred from attempting the destruction process with intercontinental nuclear warheads by our ability for instantaneous, costly retaliation.

The Kremlin has long chaffed under this limitation on implementing its design for world domination. It underlies the widely publicized differences between Moscow, which has something to lose from U.S. retaliation, and Peiping, which has little or nothing to lose. It is no secret Communist dogma also dictates that Mr. Khrushchev eliminate this restriction by fair means or foul as rapidly as he can. In the Communist book of immorality, what is good for communism's goals is good to use to reach them.

Thus from the Communist viewpoint, a test-ban treaty which would keep us from testing while the Soviet Union does it surreptitiously and achieves some overwhelming nuclear breakthrough would be ideal for the purpose.

For this reason President Eisenhower, when the test-ban negotiations began in 1958, demanded that adequate detection and inspection machinery be included in any treaty. He recognized clearly that cheating must not be left a possibility. The risk of a surprise Soviet nuclear breakthrough to overwhelming nuclear

superiority must be precluded unless the United States wishes some day to face a surrender-or-die ultimatum. In his 1959 state of the Union message President Eisenhower reiterated this viewpoint by saying:

We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms.

In concluding I wish to make two very firm recommendations to President Kennedy:

The first is that without delay demands by the United States for realistically adequate detection and inspection machinery in any such treaty be restored and declared nonnegotiable.

The second is that fully airborne atmospheric test data gathering equipment be at once assembled, installed in a fleet of airplanes, and held on standby readiness to meet any necessity for instantaneous resumption of atmospheric tests based on any eventuality.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY REFORM ACT

Mr. CRAMER. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for a considerable number of years I have been deeply interested in and a staunch supporter of the Federal-aid highway program. Since my election to this honorable body, as a Representative of the State of Florida, it has been my privilege to participate directly and actively in the advancement of this program through consideration of legislative proposals and other aspects of the highway program which have received congressional attention.

My approach to highway matters has been guided by several basic convictions, the most important of which are these:

First. The continuation of the Federal-aid highway program, including the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, is absolutely essential to the Nation.

Second. The basic concept of a State-Federal partnership program—with the States doing the work subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal agency, and the Federal Government bearing its proportionate share of the cost—must be preserved because of its proven success, since 1916, as evidenced by the best national highway system in the world today.

Third. The State and Federal officials and employees charged with the tremendous responsibility of carrying out this tremendous construction program are, in the main, honest, competent, and dedicated public servants, who have fully justified the trust placed in them.

Despite these convictions—or perhaps because of them—I have viewed the highway program from a realistic, objective standpoint. As a citizen, as a

Member of the Congress, as a member of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee, and particularly as ranking minority member of the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I have received information which clearly shows that thievery and incompetency does occur with disturbing frequency in the highway program, and the need for congressional action is urgently needed. In September of 1961, following hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program concerning Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Florida, I introduced H.R. 9353, to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act to revise and strengthen Federal criminal laws in regard to offenses committed in connection with the Federal-aid highway program. In March of 1962, the Department of Commerce, which includes the Bureau of Public Roads as a constituent unit and is responsible for the administration of the Federal-aid highway program, awakened to the need for such legislation, and, as part of its legislative program, recommended enactment of a bill somewhat similar to my bill, H.R. 9353.

Following the introduction of my bill, additional hearings were held by the Special Subcommittee, involving the States of Massachusetts and West Virginia. Despite the revelations of these hearings, which further emphasized the need for congressional action, no action was taken by the 87th Congress with respect to either my bill or the draft bill submitted by the Department of Commerce.

Today I am again introducing a bill to revise and strengthen the Federal laws relating to offenses committed in connection with the Federal-aid highway program, and a copy of my bill is appended following these remarks. I have not been advised as to whether the New Frontier administration will press again for enactment of such legislation. In any event, I am convinced that such legislation is desperately needed, and will continue to press for its enactment, for the reasons I explained several times during the 87th Congress.

I want to set forth, in chronological order, the incidents which led to my introduction of legislation on this subject. But first, I want to make my position clear. I am convinced of the honesty, integrity, and competence of the vast majority of those involved in the Federal-aid highway program. However, for the protection of the public interest and the status and reputation of the thousands of honest, competent highway officials, and employees, I want the Congress to provide the Federal law enforcement agencies with tools which are adequate to root out and punish those responsible for the comparatively few incidents of dishonesty, graft, and incompetence which could destroy public confidence in and support of the Federal-aid highway program.

The events leading to my introduction of the proposed legislation are as follows:

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, enacted during the second session of the

84th Congress, launched the greatest and most costly public works project in history. It provided for the completion, by 1972, of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, at a total cost then estimated to be approximately \$27.6 billion, and now estimated to be at least \$41 billion. This tremendous undertaking is to be accomplished under the traditional State-Federal partnership concept, with the State highway departments being responsible for the actual construction, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Bureau of Public Roads, but with the Federal Government bearing 90 percent of the cost.

Any program which involves such tremendous sums of money and the participation of so many thousands of people, is bound to be a temptation to dishonest and unscrupulous persons who can find many opportunities to profit at the expense of the public. Reports and rumors of fraud and thievery in the highway program quickly followed enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

In Indiana, the chairman of the State highway commission and several others were indicted and convicted of fraudulent activities concerning the acquisition of land for highway rights-of-way. In Arizona, the chief right-of-way agent for the State highway department was arrested for allegedly causing a State warrant to be issued to a fictitious person, and of pocketing the proceeds. In Arkansas, a subcontractor and a highway department engineer were convicted by a Federal court on charges involving false certification as to the quantity of materials delivered to a Federal-aid project.

Because of these incidents and other reports and rumors, in the summer of 1957, the Bureau of Public Roads established a Project Examination Division with the specific responsibility of making reviews and investigations, on a "spot-check" basis, to determine whether prescribed procedures were being followed, and whether irregularities were occurring. Despite this and other action by the Bureau of Public Roads, reports and rumors of fraud and theft continued and, indeed, substantially increased. Because of this, in September 1959, the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program was established as a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, to investigate the highway program and act as a congressional "watchdog" to protect the Federal interest.

The first public hearings of the subcommittee with respect to a State highway department's activities in the Federal-aid highway program was held in May of 1960, and concerned the State of Oklahoma. These hearings disclosed that there had been deplorable failure to meet specifications during the construction of at least one highway. An amazing picture was presented of inadequate or no supervision, failure to make proper tests and inspections, falsification of test reports and samples, and the fact that a member of the Oklahoma Highway Commission was a hidden

member of a firm bidding on highway department sodding contracts.

Since the Oklahoma hearings, several other hearings have been held, involving my own State of Florida, as well as New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. The disclosures have been shocking.

Before the creation of the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I was convinced that the vast majority of the persons building our highways were honest, competent, and dedicated to serving the public interest. I am still so convinced. However, the disclosures of the special subcommittee have made it abundantly clear that fraud, graft, thievery, and incompetency are far more widespread, and involve far more persons, than most of us would have suspected or believed.

I have mentioned the hearings involving Oklahoma. Let me briefly review the disclosures of the hearings involving other States.

In our own State of Florida it was shown that over the years many of the big highway contractors have been making payments of cash, whisky, turkeys, and other merchandise of substantial value to officials and employees of the State road department who were, of course, paid by the State to see that these same contractors complied with specifications. The Florida hearings have also shown that due to inadequate planning and worse, the State has disposed of valuable improvements on rights-of-way in total disregard of the public interest and has allowed the contractors and speculators to reap windfall profits that should have been realized by the State, a system that has permitted some contractors to use these valuable assets for what might be euphemistically called *payola* to grease the palms of two city commissioners and at least one highway official.

Hearings concerning highway construction practices in the State of New Mexico disclosed events somewhat similar to those which occurred in Oklahoma. Detailed evidence was presented showing negligent or nonexistent inspections, failure to comply with construction specifications, and the failure of a highway project before it was opened to traffic.

Hearings involving right-of-way acquisition practices in Massachusetts continued for several weeks. These hearings disclosed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in the payment of clearly inflated prices for property needed for highway rights-of-way. The hearings did not cover fraudulent practices of contractors and consulting engineers despite my insistence that these matters be fully exposed. However, I understand the Bureau of Public Roads is continuing to investigate these matters.

The latest hearings of the subcommittee held last July concerned right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia. Among other things, it was disclosed at these hearings that the practice is followed of requiring State highway department employees to make regular monthly contributions to the Democrat Party sustaining fund. State

employees are furnished with a coupon book for their use in making the regular payment. State officials have denied that these contributions are mandatory but I have letters in my files from State employees who state that the only way they can keep their job or get a promotion is to make these so-called voluntary contributions.

The disclosures are certainly not at an end and investigations are continuing in a number of areas. However, it has become disturbingly clear that the Federal laws need to be greatly strengthened in order to protect the public interest. In September of 1961, more than a year ago, I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act. This bill would have added several new provisions to the law and amended some portions of existing law and would, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the Federal law enforcement agencies in their efforts to prevent frauds and abuses and to punish such actions when they are detected.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has also recognized the need for revising existing Federal statutes and, in March 1962, submitted proposed legislation to the Congress as part of its legislative program.

In a letter dated March 15, 1962, which transmitted the proposed legislation to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Under Secretary of Commerce stated, in part:

The continuing investigation of the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has produced ample evidence that such legislation is not only a desirable but a vitally necessary adjunct to present highway program legislation. It has become apparent that we cannot rely solely upon the deterrent effect of regulations issued under Federal-aid highway statutes nor upon the administrative authority of the Federal Highway Administrator to withhold participation of Federal aid funds in indicated cases.

I do not always agree with the Department of Commerce, but I most heartily subscribe to this quoted statement. It accurately reflects the conclusions which led me to introduce a bill, some 6 months earlier, to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act to accomplish the same objectives as those which the Department of Commerce so belatedly decided are so important.

A brief summary of my new bill to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act is as follows:

First, the bill would provide a deterrent to conflicts of interest by prohibiting officials, employees, and other persons performing services in connection with a Federal-aid highway project from having any financial or other personal interest in any contract with respect to which they perform such services or have any official authority or responsibility. This part of the bill would also prohibit officials, employees and other persons performing services in connection with a Federal-aid highway project from having any financial or other personal interest in any real property acquired for the project without full and public disclosure of such interest.

Second, The bill would prohibit the reprehensible activities that have been disclosed in several hearings of the special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program: the practice of highway contractors and others working on Federal-aid projects giving money and other things of value to the State officials who are supposed to be supervising their work, and the directly related matter of knowingly performing work or furnishing equipment or materials, or knowingly permitting the performance of work or furnishing of equipment or materials, other than as provided in the plans, specifications or contract.

Third, the bill would revise and strengthen the existing Federal law relating to false statements and representations concerning Federal-aid highway projects by extending its terms to cover false statements and representations relating to the acquisition, administration and disposition of real property, as well as the work, material and equipment.

Fourth, the bill would prohibit political contributions to any political party, committee or candidate by any person or firm who is at the time negotiating for or performing a contract in connection with a Federal-aid highway project.

A word about the provision relating to political contributions. Existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, prohibits firms and individuals performing certain contracts with the United States from making political contributions to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use, and equally punishes anyone who knowingly solicits any such contributions. This in my judgment is sound public policy designed to prevent indirect financing of campaigns for and elections to public office out of the U.S. Treasury.

The statute does not, however, extend the same protections with regard to abuses of Federal-aid highway funds even though from 50 to 90 percent of the funds are Federal aid, because in this case the contracts are with the States and not the United States, although they are subject to Federal approval. But if it is bad to misuse Federal funds for political purposes at the Federal level, it is equally bad at the State level, and the obvious purpose of the legislation is to prevent political use of funds appropriated by the Congress for highway construction, nonpolitical purposes. Our highway hearings clearly showed that many highway contractors are very heavy political contributors and have considerable political influence. This ultimately results in some instances of control over State personnel and resultant shoddy workmanship—at the cost of the taxpayer.

Insofar as political contributions are concerned, my bill would simply extend to Federal-aid highway contracts let by the States substantially the same provisions which now apply with respect to contracts with the United States.

Our experience over the past few years has clearly demonstrated that existing Federal criminal laws are in need of strengthening and revision. It is not

enough to simply detect dishonest and improper practices. The guilty persons must be appropriately punished, both as a matter of justice to the public and the thousands of honest, conscientious highway employees, and as a means of deterring others from surrendering to temptation. To accomplish these ends, we must provide our law enforcement agencies with the proper weapons—strong and effective laws.

It is for these reasons that today I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act, and I strongly urge its speedy enactment. A copy of the bill follows:

H.R.—

A bill to prohibit certain improper and undesirable practices relating to the Federal-aid program, and/or other purposes designed to protect the public interest and investment therein, and to prohibit indirect financing of primaries and elections out of Federal funds appropriated for highways.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following two new sections:

§ 1028. Conflicts of interest.

(a) No officer or employee of the United States or of a State, municipality, or other local governmental body, who is authorized in his official capacity to negotiate, make, accept, or approve, or to take any part in negotiating, making, accepting, or approving any contract or subcontract in connection with a project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23, United States Code, shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest in any such contract.

(b) No officer or employee or other person performing services for the United States or for a State, municipality, or other local governmental body, in connection with a project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23, United States Code, shall have, directly or indirectly, a financial or other personal interest, other than his employment or retention by the United States or by such State, municipality, or other local governmental body, in any contract or subcontract with respect to which he performs such services.

(c) No officer or employee or other person performing services for the United States or for a State, municipality, or other local governmental body in connection with a project undertaken pursuant to title 23, United States Code, shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other interest in any real property acquired for such project unless such interest is openly disclosed upon the public records of the State highway department and of such other governmental instrumentality, and such officer, employee, or person has not participated in such acquisition for and in behalf of the State.

(d) Whoever willfully violates any provisions of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000 and to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

§ 1029. Highway projects.

(a) Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States or of any State, municipality or other local governmental body, having any official duty, responsibility, or function in connection with a highway construction or related project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code,

"(1) knowingly performs any work, or furnishes or uses any material or equipment, or authorizes or permits the performance of any work or furnishing or use of any material or equipment, other than as provided for or permitted under plans, specifications, or contracts applicable to such highway construction or related project; or

"(2) directly or indirectly solicits, demands, accepts, or receives any fee, commission, compensation, gift, reward, or other consideration of value in connection with such highway construction or related project (other than lawful salary, fees, or compensation paid by the United States or any State, or any political subdivision thereof); or

"(3) directly or indirectly solicits, demands, accepts, or receives any fee, commission, compensation, gift, reward, or other consideration of value (other than lawful salary, fees, or compensation paid by the United States or any State, municipality or other local governmental body), from any person, association, firm, or corporation performing work on, furnishing materials or equipment for, or having an interest in such highway construction or related project, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

"(b) Whoever, other than an officer, agent or employee of the United States or of any State, municipality or other local governmental body,

"(1) knowingly performs any work or furnishes or uses any equipment or material, or permits the performance of any work or furnishing or use of any material or equipment, other than as provided for or permitted under applicable plans, specifications, or contracts in connection with a highway construction or related project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code; or

"(2) offers, pays, or gives any fee, commission, compensation, gift, reward, or other consideration of value to any officer, agent, or employee of the United States or any State, municipality or other local governmental body, having official duty, responsibility, or function with respect to a highway construction or related project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code in connection with which such person, association, firm, or corporation performs work, furnishes material or equipment, or has an interest in a contract for the performance of work or furnishing of material or equipment, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) For the purposes of this section and section 1028 of this title, the term "State" includes the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any political or other subdivision thereof."

SEC. 3. Section 1020 of chapter 47 of title 18 United States Code is amended to read as follows:

§ 1020. False statements in connection with highway projects.

"Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or of any State or territory or political subdivision thereof, or whoever, whether a person, association, firm, or corporation, knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, value, or cost of the material or equipment used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or costs of construction of any highway or related project for which Federal funds are or will be paid under title 23, United States Code; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, false report, or false claim with respect to the character,

quality, quantity, value, or cost of any work performed or to be performed, or materials or equipment furnished or to be furnished, or any property acquired, disposed of, or administered or to be acquired, disposed of, or administered, in connection with the construction of any highway or related project for which Federal funds are or will be paid under title 23, United States Code; or

"Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or false representation as to a material fact in any statement, certificate, or report submitted in connection with a project undertaken pursuant to the provisions of title 23, United States Code, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

SEC. 4. Section 611 of chapter 29 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

§ 611. Contributions by firms or individuals contracting with the United States and with the States on certain highway projects.

"(a) Whoever, entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof, or selling any land or building to the United States or any department or agency thereof, if payment for the performance of such contract or payment for such material, supplies, equipment, land, or building is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by the Congress, during the period of negotiation for, or performance under such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, equipment, land, or buildings, directly or indirectly makes any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, whether an individual, firm, partnership, corporation or association, entering into any contract with any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any municipality, or other local governmental body, except for a lawful contract of employment as an employee thereof, either for the rendition of personal or other services or furnishing any material supplies, or equipment in connection with the construction of any highway or related project on account of which Federal funds are or will be paid under the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code during the period of negotiation for, or performance under such contract or furnishing of material, supplies, or equipment, directly or indirectly, knowingly makes any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution, to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Whoever knowingly solicits any such contribution from any such individual, firm, partnership, corporation, or association, for any such purpose during any such period shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

SEC. 5. (a) The analysis reference to section 611 at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

611. Contributions by firms or individuals contracting with the United States and with the States on certain highway projects."

(b) The analysis reference to section 1020 at the beginning of chapter 47 of title

18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"1020. False statements in connection with highway projects."

(c) The analysis of chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1028. Conflicts of interest.

"1029. Highway projects."

FUMIGATING THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in my short tenure here, I have learned not to be surprised at anything the State Department does or has a hand in. But, to me, the dismantling of our missile bases in Turkey and Italy certainly indicates the dire need for a thorough fumigation of this Department.

Only time will tell how much more of our security measures the State Department has bartered away, and the American people are entitled to know just how far down the road of appeasement we have been led. Mr. Speaker, I am therefore calling upon Congress to conduct a full-scale investigation of the State Department and its role in the Cuban crisis.

One of the first issues raised by Mr. Khrushchev during the Cuban talks was the removal of our bases in Turkey. Obviously, this concession has been made to Russia, and the American people have been led to believe that Russian missiles and offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba, when in truth and fact, there has been a steady buildup of Cuba's military posture. Yet, in face of all this, we are expected to accept removal of bases designed for our own protection.

This sort of appeasement of communism and bartering away our national security must be halted and those responsible for such ill-advised policies removed from Government service, Mr. Speaker.

WEAKENING OF OUR ALLIANCES

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it has been universally recognized that the greatest single contribution of the late John Foster Dulles to the security of the free world was the system of alliances which he so painstakingly and carefully constructed.

It is, therefore, tragic to behold the gradual dismemberment of these alliances partially as the result of thoughtless and arrogant statements by spokesmen of the present administration.

Instead of strengthening our vital alliances, this administration has time and again taken actions which have sapped away the vitality of the alliance of free men.

We have substituted arrogance for leadership, vituperation for cooperation.

One of the best examples I have yet seen of this New Frontier diplomacy occurred on January 23. On that date the Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, a top administration spokesman, undertook to launch a venomous personal attack against one of this century's foremost citizens of the Western World, the great soldier-statesman, Charles de Gaulle. Although the general's name was barely mentioned, Mr. Ball, by innuendo, characterized President de Gaulle as "harboring obsolete yet fiercely held ideas" that echo "a distant and earlier age."

Mr. Speaker, our Government has often had differences of opinion with Chiefs of State of other friendly countries. In the give and take of international diplomacy, this is only natural. However, I do not know of one single instance in which a person of Mr. Ball's official standing has mounted a vicious personal attack against a friendly chief of state because that leader failed to accept as gospel truth the opinions current within our own Government.

Mr. Ball is obviously piqued because President de Gaulle has refused to yield to administration arm twisting to: First, admit the British into the European Common Market instantly and without regard to the problems which this might involve for the Republic of France; and second, accept the same strategically questionable Polaris deal that the British were obviously forced to accept as their sole nuclear deterrent.

As an American citizen, I both regret and resent the arrogance and poor taste which these remarks reveal in a spokesman of our Government. I am certain, however, that General de Gaulle will rightly ascribe to this affront the same importance that an eagle would attribute to the attacks of a housefly.

POSTAL TRANSPORTATION TRAVEL ALLOWANCES

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks. The legislation which I am introducing will amend legislation in effect since June 10, 1955, and will increase maximum travel allowance from \$9 per day to \$12 per day.

The 87th Congress enacted legislation, which was signed by the President, increasing the maximum rates of per diem allowance for Government employees traveling on official business and for

other purposes, but excluded postal transportation employees. I concur wholeheartedly with the opinions expressed by the Civil Service Commission in testifying before the 87th Congress:

It is our belief that the rates presently paid for per diem and travel in the Federal Service are not adequate to reimburse employees for their out-of-pocket expenses for those purposes.

In testifying before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 87th Congress on S. 470, the Assistant Chief of Office Management and Organization in the Bureau of the Budget stated:

As a matter of fact, in 1954 the Bureau of the Budget made a study of costs and on the basis of that study we recommend a maximum of \$13 per day.

Postal transportation clerks are required to be away from home for extended periods, must travel long distances, and seek housing in metropolitan areas of all sizes. Since the enactment of the present governing legislation in the year 1955, the cost of hotel accommodations, meals, and other incidental expenses has increased steadily.

I feel there is an urgent need for increasing the travel allowance for these employees, since there has been no change in the amount allowed them in the past 7 years.

OXFORD—A WARNING FOR AMERICANS

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the whole truth about the events that occurred at Oxford, Miss., last fall have never reached the American people. The national press, radio, and television networks have distorted, censored, and slanted the Oxford incidents unashamedly in a deliberate and prejudiced effort to smear and malign the good people of the State of Mississippi.

Recognizing the futility of trying to have the truth about these incidents told to the people of the United States through these mediums, the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce, 501 Electric Building, Jackson, has prepared and distributed more than a million copies of a document entitled "Oxford—A Warning for Americans." This document furnished background information on the Meredith case hitherto withheld from public view by the shroud of censorship exercised by biased communication mediums.

Events at Oxford were inspired by power hungry national politicians and the tragedy there was precipitated by a politically motivated Attorney General.

The Attorney General has abused the truth in trying to brainwash the American people about Oxford. On a nationally televised program the day after his marshals had fired point blank into a

defenseless group of men and women students, Robert Kennedy stated:

The Supreme Court, the lower courts, all held that Mr. Meredith should be entered in the University of Mississippi.

That statement was a falsehood—whether deliberate or not, I do not know. But, as Attorney General, he should have known that the U.S. district court had thrown out Meredith's suit against the University of Mississippi and had ruled that he was not qualified for admission.

It is lamentable that people have to resort to private printing in order to promote truth and thus overcome the distortions of high Government officials. However, that was the reason the Mississippi Jaycees printed and distributed "Oxford—A Warning for Americans."

As a part of my remarks, I include this, the true story of Oxford.

OXFORD—A WARNING FOR AMERICANS

OUR SENSE OF DUTY

The whole world knows of the tragedy at Oxford, Miss., on the night of September 30, 1962, when Federal marshals and U.S. troops invaded the State of Mississippi. An almost infinite amount of national and international publicity has been devoted to it. However, the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce soon realized that much of the actual story remained untold. Imbued with a sense of duty to our beloved State and Nation and to Jaycees everywhere and realizing the desire of Jaycees and others to know the circumstances surrounding the invasion of the State of Mississippi, and dedicated to a sincere belief in the Jaycee creed, a portion of which states: "That government should be of laws rather than of men," the real story of Oxford will now be told.

BLUEPRINT FOR TRAGEDY

The tragedy at the University of Mississippi resulting in two deaths, injuries to many persons, and heavy destruction of property was precipitated by the unwillingness of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and President John F. Kennedy to await the completion of judicial processes which they had invoked, and which, if permitted to continue, would have resulted in a final determination of the Meredith case and enforcement by regular judicial processes of whatever that determination might have been. The blueprint for tragedy:

1. Neither Gov. Ross R. Barnett nor Lt. Gov. Paul B. Johnson were parties to the James Meredith case in the U.S. district court. They were not parties to the appeal in the U.S. court of appeals nor parties to the petition for writ of certiorari (a request to be heard) before the Supreme Court of the United States. Neither they nor the State of Mississippi were joined until September 25, 1962, and then only as respondents to a restraining order issued without notice or hearing by the U.S. court of appeals. Their rights and duties under the Mississippi constitution and statutes had not been adjudicated. At all times leading up to the tragedy the original Meredith case was before the Supreme Court on petition for writ of certiorari. From September 25, 1962, to the date of the tragedy, September 30, 1962, restraining orders obtained by the U.S. Attorney General were pending.

2. When Governor Barnett and Governor Johnson personally denied admission to Meredith at the university, this provided a legal test as to whether the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor were bound by a suit in which they had not been joined as parties. Additionally, it provided legal means to test the constitutional right of the Governor (under the 10th amendment to the Constitu-

tion of the United States) to enforce State statutes not before the Court in the suit between Meredith and the University of Mississippi officials and the board of trustees.

3. At the time Governor Barnett acted, the University of Mississippi officials and the board of trustees had found that Meredith was not qualified to become a student at the university; the U.S. district judge had upheld the university's denial of admission after a full hearing and on the appeal one of the members of the three-judge panel of the U.S. court of appeals found that the U.S. district judge was correct in holding that Meredith was not qualified to become a student at the university and that "his entry therein may be nothing short of a catastrophe." In a 2-to-1 decision, the U.S. court of appeals reversed the U.S. district court and held against the university. The university officials then petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari (a request to be heard). The very nature of the case called for both the State of Mississippi and the Attorney General of the United States to pursue their legal remedies through the courts to final completion.

4. Without awaiting a determination of these proceedings, the U.S. Attorney General and the President rushed in more than 400 armed Marshals and more than 25,000 troops on September 30 and October 1, 1962. Hasty action resulted in two deaths, injuries to many people, destruction of much property, and the most tragic situation which has occurred in the United States in many years. This was solely because of a refusal to await ordinary and proper judicial procedures to determine whether the U.S. district court or the U.S. court of appeals would be upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States and, if the U.S. court of appeals was upheld, whether or not the judgment was effective as against the Governor and Lieutenant Governor and the State of Mississippi, who were not parties to the original suit. Attorney General Kennedy had invoked these procedures just 5 days before the use of Armed Forces, and a hearing on these procedures was set for only 2 days after the dispatch of the forces to Oxford. Just 8 days later the U.S. Supreme Court considered the petition for writ of certiorari (a request to be heard).

5. There had not been any disturbances, property damages, injuries, or deaths while Governor Barnett was allowed to be responsible for law and order in Mississippi. Neither had there been a clash between law-enforcement officers of Mississippi and armed officers of the Federal Government. Mississippi officers were unarmed until after they were fired upon with tear gas. Governor Barnett (whose total force of State highway safety patrolmen available for duty as traffic officers throughout the entire State numbers less than 225 officers) maintained peace and order at the University of Mississippi so long as he was permitted. The tragedy was not precipitated by Mississippi or its public officials.

THE JUDICIAL SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

James Meredith had previously applied to the University of Mississippi for admission and his application was rejected for failure to comply with standard requirements for admission to the university.

February 5, 1962: The U.S. district judge who heard the Meredith case ruled that Meredith failed to meet the requirements for admission to the University of Mississippi and further found as a matter of fact that he had not been denied admission because of his race. The case was then dismissed. The Governor of Mississippi was not a party to this suit.

June 25, 1962: The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed the district judge's decision and ruled by a 2-to-1 vote

that Meredith had been denied admission to the university because of his race.

The dissenting judge in his written opinion stated that the district judge "was correct in finding and holding that appellant [Meredith] bore all the characteristics of becoming a troublemaker if permitted to enter the University of Mississippi, and his entry therein may be nothing short of a catastrophe."

The Governor of Mississippi was not a party to this appeal.

July 17, 1962: The U.S. court of appeals ordered the district judge to issue an injunction requiring University of Mississippi officials to admit Meredith. The Governor was not a party in this order.

July 18, 1962: A U.S. court of appeals judge issued the first of three stays granted delaying enforcement of the injunction until the U.S. Supreme Court could decide the case. Such stays are not unusual.

August 31, 1962: After the U.S. court of appeals twice overruled the court of appeals judge who had issued the stays, the case reached the U.S. Supreme Court for the first time. The U.S. Attorney General and the Justice Department intervened in the Meredith case by requesting that Justice Hugo Black of the U.S. Supreme Court set aside the stays.

September 10, 1962: Justice Black vacated the stays and ordered the court of appeals' ruling put into effect. Such actions are very unusual. Justice Black signed the ruling alone but said he had polled the other Justices. There was no hearing before the Supreme Court.

GOV. ROSS BARNETT INTRODUCES DECLARATION OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY

On September 13 in a television address, Mississippi Gov. Ross Barnett introduced his declaration of State sovereignty, quoting the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Here are additional quotations from Governor Barnett's address:

"I speak to you as your Governor in a solemn hour in the history of our great State—in a solemn hour, indeed, in our Nation's history."

"In the absence of constitutional authority and without legislative action, an ambitious Federal Government, employing naked and arbitrary power, has decided to deny us the right of self-determination in the conduct of the affairs of our sovereign State."

"As your Governor and chief executive of the sovereign State of Mississippi, I now call on every public official and every private citizen of our great State to join with me in refusing, in every legal and constitutional manner available, to submit to illegal usurpation of power by the Kennedy administration."

"I especially call upon all public officials, both elected and appointed, in the State of Mississippi, to join hands with the people and resist by every legal and constitutional means the tyrannical edicts which have been and will be directed against the patriotic citizens of our State."

"The last hope of our constitutional form of government rests in the conscientious enforcement of our State laws; and the perpetuation of the sovereignty of the States. Without this, there can be no government of, by, and for the people. If our Nation is to survive, we must maintain strong State governments and unity in matters of national security."

"Therefore, in obedience to legislative and constitutional sanction, I interpose the rights of the sovereign State of Mississippi to enforce its laws and to regulate its own internal affairs without interference on the part of

the Federal Government or its officers, and in my official capacity as Governor of the State of Mississippi, I do hereby make this proclamation:

"Whereas the United States of America consists of 50 sovereign States bound together basically for their common welfare; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America provides that each State is sovereign with respect to certain rights and powers; and

"Whereas pursuant to the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the several States; and

"Whereas the operation of the public school system is one of the powers which was not delegated to the Federal Government but which was reserved to the respective States pursuant to the terms of the 10th amendment; and

"Whereas we are now face to face with the direct usurpation of this power by the Federal Government through the illegal use of judicial decree:

"Now, therefore, I, Ross R. Barnett, as Governor of the sovereign State of Mississippi by authority vested in me, do hereby proclaim that the operation of the public schools, universities, and colleges of the State of Mississippi is vested in the duly elected and appointed officials of the State; and I hereby direct each said official to uphold and enforce the laws duly and legally enacted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, regardless of this unwarranted, illegal, and arbitrary usurpation of power; and to interpose the State sovereignty and themselves between the people of the State and any body politic seeking to usurp such power.

"Let us invoke the blessings of divine providence as we struggle to maintain our liberties. With the help of Almighty God, and with the unbounding determination of our people to remain free, we shall be invincible and we shall keep the faith."

ATTEMPTS MADE TO ENROLL MEREDITH

Governor Barnett tried in absentia

September 13: U.S. district court entered an injunction ordering University of Mississippi officials to enter Meredith as required by the U.S. court of appeals. Governor Barnett was not a party to this injunction.

September 20: While case was still pending before the U.S. Supreme Court Meredith attempted to enroll at the university and Governor Barnett personally denied him admission at Oxford.

September 25: Governor Barnett refused admission to Meredith at Jackson. On request of the U.S. Attorney General the U.S. court of appeals made the Governor a defendant to a restraining order granted without notice and without a hearing. The court cited the Governor to appear at New Orleans on September 28 to face a charge of contempt of court.

September 26: Lt. Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr., refused admission to Meredith at Oxford. U.S. court of appeals ordered Lieutenant Governor Johnson to appear in court on September 29 to face contempt charges. On that date he did not appear in New Orleans. He was tried in absentia and was found guilty of contempt and given until October 2 to absolve himself of contempt or be fined \$5,000 for each day of delay.

September 28: Governor Barnett did not appear in New Orleans. The U.S. court of appeals tried him in absentia, found him guilty of civil contempt, and ordered him to admit Meredith by October 2 or face arrest and be fined \$10,000 for each day of delay.

September 29: Meredith's case for admission was before the U.S. Supreme Court awaiting action. A hearing was set in the U.S. court of appeals for October 2 on the enforcement of the contempt orders. With-

out waiting on normal judicial processes, U.S. Attorney General Kennedy and President Kennedy ordered hundreds of U.S. marshals to Oxford, where the University of Mississippi is located. Thousands of Federal troops were ordered into action. At midnight, President Kennedy federalized Mississippi's National Guard.

ON A QUIET SABBATH EVENING MISSISSIPPI INVADED—VIOLENCE RESULTS

September 30: Meredith, protected by over 400 Federal marshals, arrived on the university campus. The marshals encircled the Lyceum Building—the main administration building—fully armed with night sticks, gas masks, tear gas guns, revolvers, and wearing protective vests and riot helmets. A crowd of university students and outsiders, many from other States, gathered in the vicinity of the marshals. The unarmed Mississippi highway safety patrolmen stood between the marshals and the crowd. Some of the crowd began to taunt and jeer the marshals. Several articles were thrown in the direction of the marshals. Without warning, on orders of James P. McShane, the chief Federal marshal, the marshals fired tear gas projectiles at close range directly into the crowd. This incensed the crowd and the riot began.

October 1: U.S. troops poured into Oxford. By dawn on Monday, order was restored on the campus, but rioting continued in downtown Oxford. Meredith was then enrolled by armed force as a student and started attending classes escorted by Federal marshals. In Mississippi, the force of Federal troops was built up to more than 25,000 men. (United States has only 6,000 men in Berlin.) The entire town of Oxford was under strict military control.

October 8: The petition for writ of certiorari (a request to be heard) was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court 8 days after the U.S. Attorney General Kennedy and the President resorted to armed forces.

THE CONDUCT OF THE FEDERAL MARSHALS

Despite reports to the contrary, the conduct of the Federal marshals during the tragic events at Oxford was not something of which Americans can be proud. In fact, their conduct was reprehensible. Their inexperience was confirmed by President Kennedy at a meeting of Democratic congressional leaders as reported by the nationally syndicated Allen-Scott Report when the President was said to have stated, "The U.S. marshals were inexperienced and blundered in their use of tear gas. It was a very sad day."

After the battle began the night of September 30 the marshals went on a rampage firing tear gas projectiles at close range into students and even into the back of the head of a Mississippi highway safety patrolman knocking him unconscious. The marshals actually invaded the dormitories, firing tear gas projectiles. Because of the unnecessary use of tear gas by the marshals, the campus was thick with gas for several days. Some of the classrooms could not be used for days.

The treatment of prisoners, many of whom did not participate in the battle, was shocking. Many of the prisoners were 15- and 16-year-old boys; several were students; many were outsiders; and a few were elderly men.

The night of September 30 and the next day were hours of unbelievable terror for those prisoners, some of whom had nothing to do with the riot. The marshals administered beatings with nightsticks, knocking a few almost into a state of unconsciousness. A storeroom with no windows located in the Lyceum Building was converted into a virtual dungeon. Ordinarily, about 15 persons could have gotten into that room, and the marshals had packed it with almost 100 prisoners. The prisoners were neither fed nor given water for many long hours. With tear gas still in the air, the area was hardly

bearable. Many of the boys had dried blood on their clothes and faces. A television newsman told at a press conference of the cruel treatment the prisoners received from the marshals in the Lyceum Building.

The events of the night of September 30 and the morning of October 1 were a long nightmare to many university students, townspeople, and particularly so for the prisoners. Beatings, unlawful searches and seizures, and harassments were not isolated instances at the university and in Oxford. One student, testifying under oath before a legislative investigating committee, told of his capture about 9 o'clock a.m. on the campus while driving to his girl's house (the daughter of a professor) on the morning of October 1. He was ordered out of his automobile and it was searched. An unloaded shotgun kept in the trunk for a planned hunt later, and which had not been fired in 2 or 3 weeks, was seized. The shells were in his hunting jacket in his dormitory room. He was taken under guard to the Lyceum Building, where the marshals blurted, "make room for the shotgun boys," and he was handcuffed to another boy. The marshals, while using filthy language, also, screamed at him "killer," "murderer." His personal belongings were taken from him and he was lined up against a wall. Later, in a national news service photo taken of him and some other prisoners, the caption said, "These prisoners were taken in rioting disturbances at the University of Mississippi at a place outside of the building in downtown Oxford." Of course, it was false. The picture was taken in the Lyceum Building on the campus and he and some of the others in the picture were not captured in any rioting. A marshal hit him in his ribs and back with a nightstick. He was not allowed to call his girl friend, his parents or an attorney; they held him incommunicado. He told of beatings by the marshals of other prisoners and their refusal to obtain medical aid for the injured. Finally, after being told to sign a release of his shotgun, and through the intervention of a faculty member, he was released. Many other innocent people were arrested without cause and subjected to inhuman treatment. This boy can still not believe that it all happened in America.

PRESS CONFERENCE HEARD BY FEW

In a press conference on October 2 in Jackson, Miss., members of the national press gathered in Jackson and heard certain details and reports that had failed to reach the American people. Part of this news conference is presented:

Lt. Gov. Paul B. Johnson: "Ladies and gentlemen, I have a panel of gentlemen here with me who are willing to answer questions pertaining to the trouble at the University of Mississippi Sunday (September 30) and Monday (October 1). I'll be glad to answer any questions if you have them."

Newsman: "First, I would like to know if the Mississippi highway patrol was withdrawn from the campus in a critical moment in the demonstrating as Attorney General Robert Kennedy has charged."

Governor Johnson: "The highway patrol has never been withdrawn at any time since they went there Sunday night (September 30) until late yesterday (October 1) afternoon after the Army had come in and completely taken charge with 6,000 or 7,000 troops."

Newsman: "A newsman, who was up there, and others in our crew reported at various times during the demonstrating that highway patrol cars were being brought out or had moved off the campus. At one time, they reported only a few officers of the highway patrol, I believe at the alumni building—and what is the cause of that maneuvering back and forth?"

Governor Johnson: "Many of the cars were leaving—some of them hauling different people who had been hurt. In addition to

that—trying to get out of the gassed area because of the heavy concentrations of gas. They were not equipped to operate in such a melee as that. That is the reason that many of them had pulled off back from the scene of the rioting—because they were overcome by gas the same as the students and others who were present."

Newsman: "Governor, were you there on the campus when the disturbances began?"

Governor Johnson: "No, I was not present. Officer (Gwin) Cole, the investigator from the [Mississippi] highway patrol, was present at the time. I'd like for Mr. Cole to tell you what had happened."

Officer Gwin Cole: "I was standing in the street in front of the Lyceum Building. There were about 200 marshals, I would say, surrounding this building and Army trucks sitting in front of the building that brought the marshals in, highway patrolmen, sheriffs, and deputy sheriffs, and other officers were engaged in getting these students back out of the street, on the curb—they were heckling the marshals and some of them were heckling us and throwing cigarette butts and what have you. And all at once I saw a chief duty marshal, Mr. James P. McShane—he shouted, 'Let 'em have it—gas.' And I dropped down to my knees—the gas was coming by me and over my head fired from these guns and I dropped down to my knees—and I saw him run back in the Lyceum Building. I followed him with my eyes full of gas and I got inside the building and I told him, I said 'That's the dirtiest trick that I have ever seen done.' And he dropped his head and walked off and Mr. (Deputy U.S. Attorney General) Katzenbach of the Justice Department walked up to me and told me he was sorry but somebody jumped the gun. And that's when the riot started."

Newsman to Governor: "What did you find when you reached the campus?"

Governor Johnson: "When I reached the campus, I found the entire area covered with gas—there had evidently been tons of it that had been released—I found that a lot of it had been shot into the dormitories and they had driven the students from their dormitories out onto the campus. I found that it was so heavy that you couldn't stay in there unless you did have gas masks and when I got there I contacted Colonel (T. B.) Birdsong (director, Mississippi highway patrol) and Officer Cole and had them go with me to the Lyceum Building to see Mr. John Doar of the Justice Department and Mr. Katzenbach. And I told them at that time the highway patrol wanted to help and cooperate in any way that they could but that they could not operate on the campus in that gas—that if they would stop shooting the gas we felt that it would die down where we could come in and help them, but that the other proposition was that we could set up road blocks and prevent others from coming onto the campus. Mr. Doar said he thought that was the thing that needed to be done—set up the road blocks, and we set the road blocks up and kept people out all night and until the following morning when our highway patrolmen were relieved at the point of bayonets by the troops. They walked around to their backs and ordered them to move and used curse words and ran them off after we had helped them all night long."

Newsman: "What about the report from the Attorney General last night that at one point the highway patrol, I think he mentioned possibly 150 of them in some 80 cars, parked a half mile from the campus?"

Governor Johnson: "They gave orders for them to come down there so that they would all be available for further orders. They had left there in the Lyceum Building—the highway patrol had left a walkie-talkie radio in order that we might have connection between the Justice Department officials there

and the highway patrol—so that we could help them in the ways in which it was possible for us to help them. We had to call the men to these concentrations so we could talk to them and give them the orders and have the roadblocks set up."

Newsman: "In other words, those 150 were waiting for instructions on roadblocks in accordance with John Doar's wishes?"

Governor Johnson: "A large part of our patrolmen were there; a good many of them were still around the edges of the campus where they could operate effectively."

Newsman: "How long do you think the situation can continue up there as it is now?"

Governor Johnson: "That would be a very difficult thing to say, strictly because of this use of the troops as an excuse to come in there and to have a tremendous buildup. I think actually what was trying to be done, they were trying to keep from doing the same thing that Eisenhower did at Little Rock. They provoked this incident in order that these troops could have an excuse to come in there. As a matter of fact, a good many of the troops were already on the way to the Oxford campus when I left Jackson to go to Ole Miss."

Newsman: "You think it was a deliberate provocation, sir?"

General Johnson: "That is the only thing that I can see, because evidently those orders had been given a long time previous to this incident for the MP's to have been able to get in there as quickly as they did, and then the crowd from Georgia being called in at the same time when I was headed for Oxford—the Kosciusko (Mississippi) unit of the National Guard. I'd say this—since there is a question about who started it—I do feel that for the benefit of the American people, in order that this sort of thing may never happen again in this country—I do think that the truth ought to come to light through a congressional investigation, and it ought to be done quickly before any changes are made."

THE USE OF TROOPS WAS ILLEGAL

Literally thousands of the Armed Forces of the United States, including units of the 101st and 82d Airborne Division, moved onto the university campus and into the small town of Oxford. Citizens were arrested and searched without proper warrant, shoved around at bayonet point, detained for long periods without cause, and many were deprived of personal property by force. And yet martial law was never declared.

The invasion of the State of Mississippi by armed troops of the Federal Government was in direct violation of article IV of the U.S. Constitution, which states:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence."

There was no such application made by the legislature or executive of the State of Mississippi. The United States did not protect the State of Mississippi against invasion as guaranteed under article IV of the U.S. Constitution, but rather the Federal Government, through President Kennedy and the U.S. Attorney General did, without legal authority, cause Oxford, Miss., and the University of Mississippi to be invaded and occupied by Armed Forces of the Federal Government. There is no express grant of power in the Constitution that authorized the President of the United States to use Federal troops as he did in Oxford and at the University of Mississippi.

The federalization of the Mississippi National Guard by the President of the United States under the circumstances in this case

was in direct violation of the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution which states:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

The calling of the Mississippi National Guard into Federal service deprived the State of Mississippi of the security of the militia as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, the State had withdrawn from it by the Federal Government the very source of its State power to enforce law and order in Oxford, Miss.

Prior to the use of troops at the university, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, stated:

"It is shocking, to me, that consideration would be given, even for a moment, to the use of troops. The Meredith case, now pending . . . in the Federal courts, is strictly a civil matter, and all the proceedings in connection with it should be confined to the civil authorities."

Senator STENNIS pointed out that the Attorney General of the United States intervened "so he said" as *amicus curiae* (friend of the court). The Senator then stated: "I bring up this point expressly at this time, because it relates to the civil rights bill of 1957, which then contained what was called title III."

"Title III proposed that the Department of Justice have exactly the same authority that the Department of Justice is exercising today in this case. Title III was debated for a long time on this floor; and when the vote was taken, the Senate—by a vote of 52 to 38 struck that provision from the bill."

"But that is not all. The vote I have mentioned was taken in 1957. But in 1960 another vote was taken in the Senate on the same provision, in substance; perhaps a few words were changed, but the substance was the same. Again, part 3 was stricken from the bill, that time by a vote of 55 to 38."

"That is not all. In 1961, title III or its substance, was offered as an amendment to an appropriation bill. The Senate again rejected title III—this time by a vote of 47 to 42."

"In the brief span of less than 5 years, on three separate occasions this identical proposal or proposed authority has had its day in this legislative Chamber, and every time it has been voted down."

"The use of Federal troops in Mississippi or in any other State is an exercise of a power of a police state at its worst. I believe such action is illegal."

"So, I think, at all levels of the Federal Government, among all authorities, this is a time to stop, look, and listen, with calmness, and to have a prayerful consideration of the major points involved not just for my State, but for all States and all the people of our great United States. We should calmly weigh the consequences. How many red lights are we running by?"

A BROKEN PROMISE

Governor John Patterson, of Alabama, formerly one of President Kennedy's strongest supporters in the South, on September 29, 1962, wired the President's brother, Robert Kennedy, U.S. Attorney General, "I wish to remind you of your pledge at the Democratic National Convention in 1960 that Federal troops would never be used against the Southern States." Governor Patterson received his answer on September 30 when the Federal troops were sent into Oxford, Miss.

DESIRE FOR EDUCATION

There are two important facts which cause one to doubt that James Meredith's enrollment at the university was a sincere desire to obtain an education. On October 9, 1962, it was revealed by Aaron Henry, Mississippi's president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in an interview with the Associated Press, that the James H. Meredith case has "already cost it

upwards of \$30,000." That same day James H. Meredith in an interview with the Associated Press criticized the U.S. Army for segregating the Army troops at Oxford. Is he a sincere student or is he a spokesman for the NAACP?

NOT "THE LAW OF THE LAND" BUT RATHER "THE LAW OF THE CASE"

When the Constitution of the United States became a living document, the world was given for the first time a government upon the premise that people as individuals are endowed with the rights of life, liberty and property, and with the right of local self-government. The people and their local governments formed a central government and conferred upon it certain stated and limited powers and those necessarily implied therefrom. All other powers were reserved to the States and to the people.

The tragedy which has occurred at the University of Mississippi arose from a difference between one of the sovereign States and our Central Government. It is the right of every citizen, however humble he may be, to stand courageously against whatever he conscientiously believes to be the exercise of power beyond the constitutional rights conferred upon our Federal Government. This is also true of any one of the sovereign States whenever it acts to protect the powers reserved to it and the other States by the Constitution of the United States. Mississippi acted through its Governor, Lieutenant Governor, attorney general, legislature and its other public officials. Such action is not defiance of the law or defiance of the President of the United States or the Attorney General. Such action is an exercise of the heritage of freedom and liberty under the law.

The courts of our land and particularly the Supreme Court of the United States are entitled to and receive our deference and respect. Yet, their decisions are not now and never have been "the law of the land." Such decisions are "the law of the case."

Article VI, paragraph 2, of the Constitution of the United States provides that:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

In 1922, the eminent historian of the U.S. Supreme Court, Charles Warren, in volume 2, Warren, "The Supreme Court in the United States History," at page 748, stated:

"However the Court may interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decision of the Court."

Alfred J. Schweppe, one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers in the United States, formerly dean of the University of Washington School of Law, said in an article appearing in the American Bar Association Journal in February, 1958:

"Thus, the lawmaking power is in Congress alone. Only Congress makes the law of the United States. Supreme Court decisions and district court decisions are not 'law of the United States' in the constitutional and statutory sense, suffice it to say at this point that they are merely decisions between parties to a case or controversy which declare what law is binding between those parties. They do not bind any person anywhere. On the other hand, 'laws of the United States' passed by Congress bind everybody everywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States."

If there is one thing clear from the history of our Nation and from the plain words of the Constitution, it is the proposition that a decision of the Supreme Court is not "the law of the land."

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

LAW IGNORED

(Extension of remarks of Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, October 2, 1962)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Monday, October 1.

Most of the members of the American bar agree with the thinking advanced by Mr. Lawrence.

I commend this article to the attention of each Member of the Congress and the Justice Department:

"DUE PROCESS OF LAW IGNORED—ROOT OF MISSISSIPPI CONFLICT SEEN IN ILLEGALLY ADOPTED 14TH AMENDMENT

"(By David Lawrence)

"There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States or in the laws passed by Congress which authorizes the use of Federal troops to compel any public educational institution to admit a certain student just because he demands that he be enrolled.

"There is nothing in the Constitution which denies the Governor of a State an opportunity to be heard by the full membership of the Supreme Court of the United States in a dispute between State and Federal authority.

"There is nothing in the Constitution which even mentions education as one of the subjects coming within the powers of the Federal Government.

"Whatever authority the Department of Justice or the Federal courts claim today in this field is derived from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 which gave no legal reason but only sociological consideration as an argument for reversing an 1896 decision that permitted separate but equal facilities in dealing with segregation.

"The 1954 decision cited the 14th amendment as the basis for its ruling, but the amendment was never legally adopted by the necessary number of States. In fact, the legislatures of some of the Southern States were compelled at the point of the bayonet by Federal troops to ratify it. Since this happened in 1868—3 years after the War Between the States was over—the Supreme Court of the United States has never been willing to rule on the validity of the process by which the 14th amendment was allegedly ratified.

"Yet 1 of the 10 original amendments—known as the Bill of Rights and duly ratified in 1791—does say that no person shall be 'deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law.'

"Governor Barnett nevertheless has been threatened with jail—without due process of law.

"Last Saturday Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, in a telephoned address to the American Bar Association's Convention at San Francisco, said that the distinguished lawyers of Mississippi had not spoken out in the battle over integration. Apparently Mr. Kennedy didn't note the speech made in the Senate just 2 days before by Senator JOHN C. STENNIS of Mississippi, one of the ablest lawyers in the country. He has sat on the bench. He is one of the fairest minded men in the Senate. He told of the origin of the case of James Meredith, the Negro applicant, as a private suit against the board of trustees of Mississippi's State University and how a learned judge of the U.S. district court ruled that the Mississippi college authorities were justified in denying admission to Meredith. Mr. STENNIS described the subsequent legal battles in the U.S. circuit court of appeals. He referred to the fact that in the circuit court of appeals one judge said he thought Meredith would be a troublemaker and should be denied admission.

"But the main point of criticism made by Senator STENNIS was that the State of Mississippi was being denied a hearing by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Constitution specifically provides that the Supreme Court must hear as a matter of original jurisdiction all cases involving a conflict between a State and the Federal Government and that the lower courts have no right to decide such a question. But only one member of the Highest Court—Justice Black—ruled on it, though he claims he consulted the other judges individually, since the Court was not in session. He doesn't say whether he did this by telephone or by personal visits, as the case arose recently during the time the Supreme Court members were on vacation. Certainly no opportunity was afforded the defendants for oral argument by their attorneys before the entire Court.

"This," says Senator STENNIS, "is certainly not judicial consideration of the case on its merits. This is not the type of searching thought and application of legal principles which should be given such a serious case. Is it really true that a Governor might be held in contempt of court, or sent to jail, or a sovereign State might be invaded by Federal troops and its citizens terrorized at the point of bayonets, on this fragmentary attention by one judge?"

"Senator STENNIS also pointed out that on three separate occasions the Senate had soundly defeated proposals to give the Attorney General the very authority to exercise the powers which he has assumed." Senator STENNIS referred to the substitution of the Attorney General as a plaintiff in court for a private citizen.

"Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi—who has been for many years chairman on the all-important Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate—said to the Senate:

"If the day has come when not only a citizen of Mississippi, but also the Governor of that great State, can be dragged across a State line by Federal marshals or troops and subjected to the dictates of appellate judges appointed to their cushy jobs for life, then judicial tyranny is a reality and not a fiction."

"There is serious doubt from a legal standpoint whether a President has the right to send troops into a State under the circumstances existing in Mississippi. This correspondent made the same criticism 5 years ago when President Eisenhower ordered Federal troops to Little Rock, Ark.

"Whatever one's individual feelings may be about segregation or desegregation, it seems only fair to express agreement with Senator STENNIS that the whole case should be heard on its merits by the Supreme Court. It seems fair also to suggest that the fraudulent method of 'ratifying' the 14th amendment—on which the whole series of court rulings and new Executive orders mobilizing Federal military forces are based today—should be opened up for trial after 94 years of tragic silence by the Supreme Court of the United States."

THE TRAGIC LESSONS

Certainly, nearly all of mankind would agree that the Oxford saga is a sad one. Americans have witnessed one of the most tragic events in the history of their beloved country—Federal force against a sovereign State, brother against brother, education at bayonet point, violence at its worst, the loss of two lives, injuries to many persons, extreme property destruction, damage to the reputation of a great university, and deep wounds that will be long in passing.

At a time in the history of our country when the need for national unity has never been greater, all Americans should pause and reflect on the tragic situation at Oxford.

Was it all really worth it? Is the forced education of one man regardless of his race, worth millions of dollars in expense, the interruption of an education for 5,500 other students, denial of the constitutional rights of many, violence, and death and destruction? We do not believe so!

Tyranny is tyranny—whatever the form. It is the duty of every American citizen to be alert when his freedom is endangered. Our forefathers were not without courage—now the same responsibility to defend freedom is ours.

Let us not be unmindful of the right of dissent and our freedoms under the U.S. Constitution. In a recent speech, John C. Satterfield, a former president of the American Bar Association, stated: "We must realize that a person or State which tests whether or not he is or it is bound by the decree of any court to which he or it was not a party, or attempts to persuade a court to overrule any one or more of its decisions, is exercising a heritage of freedom which is ours under our form of government and is not a violation of the laws or a defier of the Constitution of the United States. In this time of peril, these truths should be recognized by all citizens of our great country, whether they be liberal, moderate or conservative, radical, middle of the road or reactionary. There must be forbearance and there must be understanding."

Every citizen of this great country must recognize that our Nation of liberty under the law, freedom of speech and action, is a nation in which men may honestly differ and yet respect each other. This will never be attained until we learn to disagree without being disagreeable, that might does not make right, that liberty under the law means the freedom of dissent, and that those with whom we disagree may nevertheless be honest, law-abiding, and patriotic American citizens.

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LIBONATI. 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. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the 22d day of January 1963, marks the celebration of the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's national independence. The sadness of this day in reviewing events through the years, suffered by the Ukrainian people held in captivity, calls for a day of lamentation and mourning. The Ukrainian people were the first victims of Communist aggression. I join with my friends of Ukrainian descent, in prayer, that the presently suppressed desires of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom, be realized.

In America, where we enjoy all of the God-given freedoms it is important that we keep alive, by open discussion, the cause of Ukrainian independence. We are their only hope and we must be ever active to keep alive their fires of freedom and, further, by strengthening our potential military might, give realistic impetus to their belief that, some day, these peoples will return to enjoy the democratic fundamental principles of liberty, and as a nation. The flag of aqua blue and yellow gold is unfurled all over our land for those pioneers of

Ukrainian ancestry who contributed so much to the economy and culture of our Nation. It is a reminder of the continuing protest of the American people against the enslavement of the Ukrainian people. We cannot accept the servitude of the people of the Ukraine nation without thinking that the purpose of our foreign policy is to restore to them their historic claim of freedom as an independent nation in the free world. We have, through our courageous and determined President, John F. Kennedy, in the recent Cuban incident, shown these devout Christian people, with a long record of opposition to Communist domination, that the military power of the United States is to be feared and respected.

The day is not distant when we will refuse to permit our enemies to retreat. The 86th Congress of the United States was militant in its pointed action toward this end—the sincerity of its attitude toward captive nations and their leaders was reflected in the passage of the Captive Week resolution, Public Law 86-749, authorizing a Shevchenko statue and honoring this "Europe's Freedom Fighter," House Document No. 445.

At the insistence of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, as in the 87th Congress and presently in the 88th Congress, House Resolution 14 urges the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. It is of monumental importance for the United States to further impress all of the peoples within the immediate control of the Soviet nation that our determined foreign policy be accentuated in purpose to strongly symbolize to the world the determination of the American people, reflected by the Congress, to work toward the liberation of those captive nations.

The United States must destroy the false image of the capitalist system and its leaders. These are set up by our enemies as mental figments of clever propaganda—the method used to influence the peoples of the captive nations to transfer their loyalties and support to the Soviet Union.

We must, in our future actions, not only contrive to stop the spread of communism, but must, by every means, counteract false propaganda within the Soviet Union itself, and its satellites, to thus weaken our enemies from within.

The victory of this age of the cold war will only be ours when the internal control of the Soviet states will be weakened. This can best be accomplished by destroying the Russian image of power and falsity of purpose.

The freedom-loving patriots within these captive nations, armed with the truth and realistic proof, can cause such a measure of unrest and confusion that enormous military forces will be needed for security surveillance.

This aroused populace, flexing its muscles of freedom, will, in itself, weaken and destroy the stability of the controls at Moscow. It will hasten the end of the cold war and result in independence and freedom among all nations at the new,

extended frontier of peace. We must persevere. We owe it to the Ukrainian people; they must be free.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY—A CASE FOR THE NATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the malignancy of employment discrimination is eating through the fiber of America's economy, education, morality, and international leadership. Some kind of employment discrimination can be found in almost every industry, and contributes to the current staggering welfare assistance costs as well as to the disillusionment of high school students, increased school dropouts, and juvenile delinquency and crime. Inequality of opportunity strikes at the very heart and core of the democratic ideal. Persistent employment discrimination in the United States casts doubts upon our sincerity in furthering the cause of individual liberty and human dignity throughout the world.

Elimination of employment discrimination is a national problem, not limited to any particular city or region of the country. As a national problem it must be confronted and resolved by national policy and procedure. We can no longer ignore the anguish and spiritual suffering of our fellow citizens who, as a result of discrimination, are unable to get jobs commensurate with their abilities. We can no longer afford the immeasurable loss to the Nation and to the economy of unused skills and undeveloped potentialities. We can no longer endure the incalculable loss of international prestige and good will when the Nation's discriminations are broadcast throughout the world.

Twenty-four States have enacted fair employment practices laws. Just a few days ago one of our distinguished citizens, the Honorable Terry Sanford, Governor of the great State of North Carolina, called upon his fellow citizens to eliminate discrimination in job opportunities in that State. He is certainly to be commended. However, a State-by-State declaration and implementation of fair employment practices is not enough. There are now 100 million people not covered by State laws. State laws vary greatly in coverage and effectiveness. State commissions have encountered difficulty in dealing with large, multiphased operations of businesses in interstate commerce. Therefore, the task falls to the Congress to immediately declare and implement a national policy of equal employment opportunity and rid America of this virulent infection.

I have introduced a bill (H.R. 405) to establish a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with power to eliminate discrimination in employment

on account of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age. It is my hope that my colleagues will join with me in realizing the urgent necessity for enactment of this proposed legislation. This bill, when implemented, will remove arbitrary barriers and open the doors to greater job opportunity, and consequently increased employment and economic stability. Immediate enactment of this bill will make real our claim of leader of the free world. Let us not delay.

DEMOCRATIC OBJECTORS ON CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that during the 88th Congress the official objectors on the Democratic side for the Consent and Private Calendars shall be as follows:

Consent Calendar: The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL].

Private Calendar: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

AIR SAFETY DOUBTS STEM FROM MAGAZINE'S ERRORS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the January 19 issue of Saturday Evening Post there were two articles and an editorial which raised serious questions about the operation of the Nation's airways and the level of safety for millions of Americans who travel by air. The Federal Aviation Agency and its Administrator, N. E. Halaby, were criticized, accused of impeding the investigation of an airline accident and failing to do everything possible to raise safety levels. The Administrator and the Agency have taken exception to the material on the grounds that much of it is untrue and that it presents a distorted, damaging view of U.S. air commerce. To help put the situation into perspective, the Agency brought to public attention last week a number of the errors along with the facts in the case. This material, which includes a statement made by Mr. Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, is hereby made a part of the RECORD so that all interested in this critical field of air safety can better eval-

uate the situation as described in the magazine:

AIR SAFETY DOUBTS STEM FROM MAGAZINE'S ERRORS

The January 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries two stories and an editorial on U.S. civil aviation. This material contains errors which cast grave doubt on the high level of air safety today. Two of them are so serious they must be answered immediately.

In writing about the March 1 crash of American Airline Flight One, the magazine says the Federal Aviation Agency interfered with and impeded the Civil Aeronautics Board's investigation. This is not true. The FAA assumed its proper role as provided in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Mr. Alan S. Boyd, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, stated this today:

"When it became apparent in early 1961 that Mr. N. E. Halaby and I were to be appointed respectively Federal Aviation Administrator and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, we agreed to devote whatever efforts were necessary to maintain and improve the coordination and spirit of cooperation between our two agencies. We have devoted a great deal of time and effort to these matters. The result is the greatest measure of cooperation these two agencies have ever known.

"With reference to the investigation by the CAB of the American Airlines Flight One accident, the fact is that the Federal Aviation Agency cooperated fully with the Board. The assertion that FAA obstructed the investigation or that there is feud between the two agencies is contrary to fact.

"Mr. Halaby and I have joined forces to promote cooperation of our agencies in the public interest. Within our jurisdictions this public interest is in the safety of flight. Flying is safe today; the statistics for 1962 indicate 0.34 fatalities per 100 million passenger miles of domestic scheduled aviation—the second best year in aviation history. While we seek the ideal of a complete absence of accidents, we are pleased that scheduled commercial flying is the safest mode of travel today."

In another story, the magazine strongly implied that the Nation's air traffic controllers operate on the verge of nervous disorder. This also gives a false and extremely unfair impression. They are a calm, competent group of dedicated men and women who, working in a system that is being constantly improved, make a major contribution to the fine safety record U.S. civil aviation has made in recent years.

A detailed commentary on the material in the January 19 issue is attached.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY MEMORANDUM, JANUARY 15, 1962

Subject: An article entitled "The End of Flight 1," by Trevor Armbrister, appearing in the Saturday Evening Post for January 19, 1963, carries a number of errors, the most important of which is that the FAA had no business being concerned with the accident investigation and that the Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board were at cross purposes in the investigation. Because of public and congressional determination that the two agencies work closely and well to assure flight safety, a number of errors made in the article are repeated here with a following explanation of what did happen and what the truth is.

Page 14: "Suddenly the jet's nose lurched hard to the left. The plane banked sharply to 50°, 60°, 90°, then rolled all the way over on its back."

Fact: From the CAB's accident report: "Except for one witness who testified that the aircraft appeared to stall just before nosing over, most of the witnesses stated

that the entire maneuver was characterized by smooth continuous movement with no indication of recovery action being discernible."

Page 14: "Last week, 10 months later, the Board announced its findings. The probable cause of the crash—a rudder control malfunction sparked by a tiny pencil-length wire one-sixteenth of an inch thick."

Fact: From the CAB report: "The Board determines that the probable cause of this accident was a rudder control system malfunction producing yaw sideslip and roll leading to a loss of control from which recovery action was not effective."

Page 15: "The search begun that morning in March was to be one of the most expensive, exhaustive, and frustrating in history. It was barnacled with an ugly cluster of obstacles. Not the least of these was a feud between the two Government agencies involved."

Fact: In accordance with Board investigative procedures, FAA technicians were assigned to the various working groups and worked hand in hand with Board investigators during the course of the investigation. Full cooperation and mutual and immediate exchange of information existed at all times. The Board's report makes this absolutely clear. Minor isolated differences of opinion could have existed between individual technicians as can be expected during the course of a major investigation with dedicated investigators, but there was never any indication of a feud between the agencies nor is there any now.

Page 15: "Disintegration was total."

Fact: Accident investigators and technicians recovered a considerable amount of aircraft structure, components, and systems intact, available for inspection and functional testing, as explained in the CAB report.

Page 16: "Reviewing the logbook all flight crews keep, he found this notation for January 23, 'Rudder and elevator are too sensitive.' On January 28, 'Rudder kicks when boost is turned on; nose goes to left.' That was all."

Fact: Referring to Docket SA-366, Exhibit No. 5E, Witness Huyler, page 4, Review of Logbook Entries. The following log entries are the ones previously referred to in their entirety:

1. 1/23/62, log page 2416280. With altitude control on autopilot rudder and elevator too sensitive. Corrective action: Replaced amplifier computer checked OK.

2. 2/7/62, log page 2416288. Rudder kicks when boost turned on and off nose goes to left. Takes one unit nose left trim to take it out. (Receival flight to Boeing for accomplishment of modification II with a total ship time of 7,996 hours.) Corrective action: Adjusted system at the tab and rudder. Ran picture pages—operation satisfactory. (This correction was accomplished at the Boeing plant.)

Page 17: "Gradually they deciphered some secrets; airspeed 220 knots; altitude 1,860 feet. Now they could be sure the jet hadn't stalled."

Fact: Airspeed and altitude would not be the only controlling parameters in determining stall condition in this instance. Other controlling conditions can cause a stall condition even at relatively high indicated airspeeds. Page 15 of the CAB's accident report states: "The medium acceleration trace shows a rise from 1.0 to 1.8 g. from time 1008:26 to 1008:30 at which time an abrupt change is recorded in a manner indicative of heavy stall buffet, which intensifies and continues until impact."¹

¹ Reference CAB's advance release copy of aircraft accident report—American Airlines, Inc., Boeing 707-123B, N 7506A, Jamaica Bay, Long Island, N.Y., Mar. 1, 1962.

Page 17: "As Cowan worried about lower 41, the answer to the whole puzzle lay unnoticed on the hangar floor—hidden inside a device called a servo. On a jet a servo's main function is to move the control surfaces electronically when the autopilot is turned on."

Fact: The Board does not in its report conclusively place the cause of the accident in the servo, as the article states.

Page 17: "Salvage crews had snatched up the rudder servo from American 1 as far back as March 2. But because of its heavy black housing seemed undamaged, it hadn't yet been examined."

Fact: In contrast to this statement the housing of the rudder servo reflected substantial damage. Reference: Docket SA-366, Exhibit No. 7E, Witness Cowan.

Page 25 of the CAB accident report further states: "A large portion of the housing of the rudder servo was missing, partially exposing the servo motor. The rate generator end of the motor was completely exposed."

Page 17: "For the first time since March 1 Cowan felt he was on to something. Deliberately he asked to see eight other servo units on American's stock shelf. Six bore similar cuts and scratches; one still carried the manufacturer's seal."

Fact: None of the stock shelf servo units examined showed evidence of cuts, the word "cut" having important and specific meaning in this case. Reference: CAB accident report, page 27. "Eight spare servo unit motors from the American Airlines stock were then examined, and six of these had the same type of scratching or gouging as found on the rudder servo. Some of them also had similar indentations or imprints on the sleeving enclosing the wires."

Page 17: "By themselves the cut wires meant nothing. But open wires can reclose in the wrong way. If the wire ends had crossed, shooting 18 volts across a circuit designed to operate on 5 volts, the rudder might have kicked—violently—and thrown the jet into an uncontrollable roll."

Fact: A violent hard-over rudder movement from such a wiring failure, resulting in uncontrolled roll, cannot be substantiated with results of any tests made thus far. The CAB reported: "Flights were also conducted in an attempt to duplicate the bench test malfunction while simulating approximately the flight conditions of N 7506A. A Boeing 707-131B was used in the flight tests. Duplication of the crossed wires malfunction in one maneuver, starting from a 30° banked turn to the left at constant altitude produced in 8 seconds a left rudder deflection of 7° at 210 knots IAS, causing the airplane to sideslip and to roll to the left. Although the hard-over signal was continuously applied throughout the maneuver and recovery action was delayed for 4 seconds, sufficient aileron control was available to stop the roll at 56° in 1 1/2 seconds and then to level the wing."

Page 18: "This afternoon, on the assembly line, Cowan and his group watched three craftsmen assemble servo units. On one man's workbench lay a pair of tweezers, he hadn't used them. Cowan asked why not. The man replied he used them only now and then when he wanted to reach between the sleeving and the motor housing and pull out a cord to wrap around the wires."

"Show me how you do that," Cowan asked. The man took the tweezers, reached down and squeezed. Cowan examined the sleeving. He saw no marks. Yet the tweezers still worried him. Photographs were taken. The spaces between the tweezer points precisely matched the spaces between the marks on the original wires. Soon afterward factory inspectors examined other servo units at the plant. Six of them had punctured sleeving, damaged wires, and scratches on the housing. Pay dirt. But Cowan's problems, far from being solved, were just beginning."

Fact: From the Board's accident report, page 28: "One of the scratched units from the American Airlines stock still bore the manufacturer's seal, indicating that it had never been disassembled since last leaving the factory." As a result of these findings, inspection of servo units was made on the production line at the manufacturer's plant. Board investigators enlisted the aid of the FAA manufacturing inspectors who found six unsatisfactory units. Marks, indentations, and electrical wire damage within the sleeving were found which was similar to the damage previously mentioned. FAA inspectors determined that this damage had occurred as a result of improper use of tweezers when tying the wire bundles to the motor housing. Additional units were found to have marks and damaged protective sleeves, but no wire damage within the sleeves.

Page 18: "The FAA can make and enforce new safety rules based on the information it gets from the CAB, but that is the extent of the FAA legal role. It is not allowed to muscle in."

Fact: FAA has statutory responsibilities in accident investigation as set forth in section 701(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Page 18: "On April 5 the CAB related Cowan's findings to the FAA. Next day, FAA, George Prill, sent wires to all airlines operating 707s, suggesting that neither yaw damper nor autopilots be used below 5,000 feet. He said that until flight tests could be held, the companies themselves should examine their autopilot systems paying particular attention to the rudder servos."

Fact: As a result of the coordinated team effort, the FAA became cognizant, through its representative, in addition to being notified by the CAB, of this condition and initiated immediate action which resulted in an Agency Alert Bulletin on April 6. This type of action exemplified the excellent cooperation which exists between the two agencies and particularly the technical staffs.

Page 18: "On April 14 the flight tests began at Idlewild. Their announced purpose was to review the noise abatement turns and also to see whether a serious autopilot malfunction could be controlled by the crew. One top CAB official was invited to come along. He refused. 'FAA was using a Boeing 720,' he explained; 'the controls are fairly similar but let's be honest; it's just not the same airplane that American flew. You don't test oranges to see if you are going to like apples.'

Fact: Appropriate technical representatives of CAB assisted the FAA in the formation and accomplishment of its flight test program and in the reduction of flight test data thus obtained. The Boeing 720 in many areas is identical to the 707/123B. This is particularly true in the control systems. The areas of aerodynamic differences are relatively small and readily interpolated. Electronic systems in most areas would be interchangeable. Hydraulic systems are identical. The airplane handling characteristics are recognized as being so similar that pilots are not required to qualify on each model separately. A qualification on either model is recognized as a qualification for the other model.

Page 18: "FAA's tests also ignored other important details. For one thing, the Agency tried to stimulate the gross weight of flight 1 simply by reducing their own jet's engine thrust. Aerodynamically that is impossible."

Fact: The simulation of gross weight by reducing thrust was not a part of the tests to investigate malfunction of airplane controllability. In these areas a lower thrust when used symmetrically would not affect the results of a control system malfunction at a given velocity. It was only on the demonstration of the performance of the airplane in the noise abatement flightpath that an attempt was made to use similar thrust-to-

weight ratio. It is a common practice in flight testing to simulate various thrust-weight ratios when conducting performance testing.

Page 18: "Secondly, as the tests continued the FAA simulated an autopilot malfunction by having their pilot shove his foot down hard on the rudder pedal."

Fact: The simulation of an autopilot malfunction was conducted by the use of electronic equipment which would introduce into the automatic pilot a hard-over signal such as would actually occur in the case of an actual malfunction. This unit was obtained from the Boeing Co. and installed with the cooperation of the Boeing Co. and the Bendix Corp. to produce the exact effect of an autopilot hard-over electrical signal. All flight tests to investigate a hard-over in the rudder axis were conducted using this installation.

Page 18: "Van Epps pointed out that if the tests were to help the investigation at all they had to duplicate the exact conditions existing on March 1. This meant that in order to take into account the element of surprise the autopilot malfunction had to be triggered electronically. Van Epps even offered to pilot the jet himself during such a test. His offer was declined. 'The net result,' he recalls, 'was that I had to decide that we couldn't accept the FAA's findings as truly representative of what actually happened.'

Fact: The exact conditions existing on March 1 were not known at the time nor are they known now. The purpose of the investigation was to attempt to determine these conditions. As stated in the preceding item, FAA representatives did exactly what Mr. Van Epps is quoted as saying should have been done to produce the element of surprise. Mr. Van Epps was personally allowed to pilot the airplane during autopilot hard-over and rudder boost malfunction, and to participate in any other test phases he desires.

Page 18: "Furthermore, said the Administrator, N. E. Halaby, the noise abatement turn prescribed at Idlewild had nothing to do with the accident. In other words, according to the FAA, the severed wires Cowan had found in the servo unit were meaningless. The CAB was stunned."

Fact: The FAA never said the severed wires in the servo unit were meaningless. On the contrary, an April 20 alert bulletin reading as follows was issued: "This telegram should not, repeat, not, be taken as deemphasis of hazards of ignoring autopilot malfunctions but is a recognition that malfunctions can be handled by the crew within normal pilot competence."

Page 18: "On April 17 CAB Chairman Alan Boyd wrote Halaby strongly recommending that FAA require an immediate and detailed examination of all rudder servos."

Fact: The suggestion in Chairman Boyd's letter of April 17 had been complied with April 6. This action was in unanimous agreement with all of the FAA, airline, and Board technical participants of Project Race.

Page 18: "The FAA recommended: 'While inspection of the servos is desirable, an electrical check is acceptable for units already installed in aircraft.' On May 11 Halaby answered Boyd's letter. He declined to require a check on the servos."

Fact: The Administrator called the CAB's attention to the previously issued alert bulletin which called for appropriate inspection of the servos. In view of these alert telegrams, the Administrator did not deem it necessary to publish an airworthiness directive on the same subject unless further substantiation warranted such action.

Page 18: "The theory sounded good, but there were several things wrong with it. Van Epps insisted that it was ridiculous to blame a bolt without having any hard evidence, and the bolt itself was still missing. Boeing said it had already alerted the airlines to the

situation and on four occasions suggested inspection. The CAB and Boeing both asked Prill to reconsider. But he was adamant."

Fact: There is no "hard evidence" available to fully substantiate either the missing bolt theory or the rate generator shorted lead theory. Boeing's concern regarding the possibility of a missing bolt appears evident by the company's actions in suggesting an inspection and issuing, prior to the American Airlines Flight One accident, a service bulletin which incorporated design changes to add safety wiring that would help insure retention of the bolt. This design change had not been incorporated into the accident airplane.

Page 18: "On June 12 he issued what is known in aviation as an alert bulletin. It is usually sent through channels. Instead Prill held a press conference."

Fact: Four newsmen who covered each step of the investigation and who were going to write about this alert bulletin were given a briefing by Mr. Prill on this highly complex equipment at the request of the Agency information officer who did not feel qualified to explain it. The alert bulletin was sent through established channels.

Page 18: "Van Epps felt the bolt could not have caused the disaster for several reasons. Had it slipped out, it would have flipped the jet over onto its back quickly. Witnesses reported that the fatal roll was gradual."

Fact: The CAB's accident report, pages 48 and 49: "The Board, therefore, concludes that a throttled rudder control valve malfunction could have been the initiating abnormality which resulted in the accident."

Page 18: "Second, tests proved there was still pressure on the rudder hydraulic-boost gage at impact. If the bolt had fallen out, fluid would have rushed against the rudder boost; the pressure would have dropped."

Fact: The CAB's accident report, page 45, treats this point but offers no such conclusion. There are no known test procedures which could substantiate the existence of pressure on the rudder hydraulic-boost gage at impact.

Page 18: "Third, if the bolt had dropped out, where had it gone? The reason it was installed upside down was because there was no space in the hydraulic feed line. There was hardly room enough for it to slip away."

Fact: The CAB accident report, page 46, states, "It is possible that the bolt could drop out entirely free of the bellcrank and rod end."

Page 18: "Furthermore, the bolt theory has been pretty well discredited."

Fact: The Agency has no knowledge which eliminates the bolt as a possible source of the difficulty, as the CAB report states.

Page 19: "The yaw damper had kicked the rudder; because the plane was in climbing bank Heist had temporarily lost all visual reference to the ground; it was impossible for him to sense the sudden yaw. By the time he knew something was wrong, it was much too late to do anything."

Fact: Visual reference to the ground is not lost during a climbing turn of the reported type performed by American Airlines flight 1.

shipboard or World War II radar is used and all of it was designed to handle aircraft.

Page 20: "This sort of thing" (microphone button jamming), says Controller Freer, "happens at least twice a week. That's twice too often."

Fact: We have no record of radio outages at Chicago twice a week due to microphone jamming. The system is designed to expect radio failure at any time for any reason and have built in procedural safeguards to contend with such emergencies. In November 1962, however, the month when Mr. Armbrister visited O'Hare Tower, official records show three cases of microphone button jamming. We have no records or other similar incidents at O'Hare before or since.

Page 20: "If Thomas' statistics hold, there will be 1,000 incidents in 1963."

Fact: The statistics cited of controller errors were based on only the qualified controller work force and did not consider the total work force employees, including clerical and supervisory personnel and assistant controllers. Actually, incidents are decreasing. Calendar year 1962 had a total of 263 incidents as compared to a total of 288 incidents which occurred in calendar year 1961; and 1963 is predicted to show slight improvement over calendar year 1962.

Page 21: "Until October 1961, the washout rate at O'Hare was high, an astounding 65 percent of the men who came from the FAA academy's 8-week course or transferred from smaller facilities couldn't adapt to the pace."

Fact: Of the 16 trainees assigned to Chicago in 1961, 7 failed to make the grade (washout rate 44 percent). Since October 1961, 30 experienced personnel have been assigned to O'Hare and there have been no failures at O'Hare.

Page 21: "There is hardly a facility in this country that does not have one-third to one-half of its staff suffering from ulcers."

Fact: These percentages are not supported by available medical or statistical records. In fact, during the 34-month period from October 1959 through July 1962, 239 control and communications personnel were separated due to death or disability. Of these, 28 had ulcers and 57 had a heart condition. No findings to date support claims of abnormal effects of stress conditions.

Editorial: "Comments on 8-Hour Shift and No Lunch Breaks."

Fact: Air traffic controllers, like policemen, nurses, and firemen, and many other health and safety personnel are scheduled on 8-hour duty so that three 8-hour shifts cover a full 24 hours.

There are days when work demands are such that lunch cannot be eaten, but in most cases, controllers are provided time for lunch without being charged for a lunch break on the basis that he is available for duty during the full 8 hours. Additional personnel are provided at busy locations to arrange for relief and for training. Controllers have consistently resisted a longer workday with a stated lunch hour (such as 3½ hours with ½-hour lunch break like other employees). Most favor an 8-hour day with lunch relief being contingent upon workload.

Editorial: "The controller, who was handling nine aircraft at the time and who had worked for 9 years without making a mistake, was blamed and was removed to a less active post."

Fact: The system and not the man was blamed. The Administrator publicly made this statement. The system was changed to require pilots to report altitudes more frequently and no adverse action was taken against the controller in this case.

Editorial: Referring to Mr. Halaby, "He has been known to walk into a traffic control center and announce with a sweeping gesture to the men who worked there, 'Some of you won't be here the next time I come,' leaving a badly shattered staff in his wake."

Fact: The Administrator never made this statement or anything similar at any traffic control center or any other FAA installation. Since Mr. Halaby became Administrator, FAA has been operated prudently and economically but new jobs have been provided as required. New positions totaling 5,387 have been added during the present administration, 1,155 of which were new controller positions to provide for the operation of new towers, new radars, radar hand-off and other new services. The Administrator also pushed through a grade raise for controllers.

Among the new facilities added were 12 long-range radars, 34 control towers, 21 instrument landing systems, 12 airport surveillance radars, 30 approach light systems, and hundreds of smaller aids and devices.

TAX REDUCTION AND REFORM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 43)

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 Ways and Means and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The most urgent task facing our Nation at home today is to end the tragic waste of unemployment and unused resources, to step up the growth and vigor of our national economy, to increase job and investment opportunities, to improve our productivity, and thereby to strengthen our Nation's ability to meet its worldwide commitments for the defense and growth of freedom. The revision of our Federal tax system on an equitable basis is crucial to the achievement of these goals.

Originally designed to hold back war and postwar inflation, our present income tax rate structure now holds back consumer demand, initiative, and investment. After the war and during the Korean conflict, the outburst of civilian demand and inflation justified the retention of this level and structure of rates. But it has become increasingly clear—particularly in the last 5 years—that the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth is the unrealistically heavy drag of Federal income taxes on private purchasing power, initiative and incentive. Our economy is checkreined today by a war-born tax system at a time when it is far more in need of the spur than the bit.

My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession, nor should it be rejected by any fear of inflation or of weakening the dollar as a world currency. The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues and persistent budget deficits. One recession has followed another, with each period of recovery and expansion

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY MEMORANDUM,
JANUARY 15, 1962

Subject: Comments on Saturday Evening Post article "They Can't Afford To Wait."

Page 20: "We are trying to provide service to 600-knot jets," one controller complains, "with equipment designed 20 years ago to handle 10-knot battleships."

Fact: The controller is probably talking about VG horizontal displays, designed originally for shipboard use, which are being replaced with television-type bright tubes just now becoming technically available. No

fading out earlier than the last. Our gains fall far short of what we could do and need to do, measured both in terms of our past record and the accomplishments of our overseas competitors.

Despite the improvements resulting from last year's depreciation reform and investment credit—which I pledged 2 years ago would be only a first step—our tax system still siphons out of the private economy too large a share of personal and business purchasing power and reduces the incentive for risk, investment, and effort, thereby aborting our recoveries and stifling our national growth rate.

In addition, the present tax code contains special preferences and provisions, all of which narrow the tax base (thus requiring higher rates), artificially distort the use of resources, inhibit the mobility and formation of capital, add complexities and inequities which undermine the morale of the taxpayer, and make tax avoidance rather than market factors a prime consideration in too many economic decisions.

I am therefore proposing the following:

(1) Reduction in individual income tax rates from their present levels of 20 to 91 percent, to a range of 14 to 65 percent—the 14-percent rate to apply to the first \$2,000 of taxable income for married taxpayers filing joint returns, and to the first \$1,000 of the taxable income of single taxpayers.

(2) Reduction in the rate of the corporate income tax from 52 to 47 percent.

(3) Reversal of the corporate normal and surtax rates, so that the tax rate applicable to the first \$25,000 of corporate income would drop from 30 to 22 percent, so as to give particular encouragement to small business.

(4) Acceleration of tax payments by corporations with anticipated annual liabilities of more than \$100,000, to bring the corporate payment schedule to a current basis over a 5-year transition period.

(5) Revision of the tax treatment of capital gains, designed to provide a freer and fuller flow of capital funds and to achieve a greater equity.

(6) Removal of certain inequities and hardships in our present tax structure.

(7) Broadening of the base of the individual and corporate income taxes, to remove unwarranted special privileges, correct defects in the tax law, and provide more equal treatment of taxpayers, thereby permitting a larger reduction in tax rates than would otherwise be possible and making possible my proposals to alleviate hardships and inequities.

The tax program I am recommending for enactment in 1963 would become fully effective by January 1, 1965. The rate reductions provide a cut in tax liabilities of \$13.6 billion—\$11 billion for individuals and \$2.6 billion for corporations. Other adjustments, some of which lose and some of which gain revenue, would, on balance, produce a revenue gain of \$3.4 billion, leaving a net reduction of \$10.2 billion. Accelerating tax payments of large corporations to a current basis over a 5-year transition

period would reduce the effect on tax receipts to \$8.7 billion. These figures do not include offsetting revenue gains which would result from the stimulating effects of the program on the economy as a whole and on the level of taxable income, profits and sales—gains which may be expected to increase as the economy recaptures its vigor, and to lead to higher total tax receipts than would otherwise be realized.

I. BENEFITS TO THE ECONOMY

Enactment of this program will help strengthen every segment of the American economy and bring us closer to every basic objective of American economic policy.

Total output and economic growth will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total incomes will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages. Investment and productivity improvement will be spurred by more intensive use of our present productive potential; and the added incentives to risk-taking will speed the modernization of American industry. Additional dollars spent by consumers or invested by producers will lead to more jobs, more plant capacity, more markets and thus still more dollars for consumption and investment. Idle manpower and plant capacity make this possible without inflation; and strong and healthy economic activity is the best insurance against future recessions.

Unemployment will be reduced, as firms throughout the country hire new workers to meet the new demands released by tax reduction. The economic prospects of our depressed areas will improve as investors obtain new incentives to create additional productive facilities in areas of labor surplus. Pressure for the 35-hour week, for new import barriers or for other shortsighted and restrictive measures will be lessened. Companies and workers will find it easier to adjust to import competition. Low-income farmers will be drawn to new jobs which offer a better livelihood. The retraining of workers with obsolete skills will proceed more quickly and efficiently in a full employment climate. Those presently employed will have greater job security and increased assurance of a full workweek.

Price stability can be maintained. Inflationary forces need not be revived by strengthening the economy at a time of substantial unemployment and unused capacity with a properly constructed program of tax reduction. With the gains in disposable income of wage earners there should be less pressure for wage increases in excess of gains in productivity—and with increased profits after tax there should be less pressure to raise prices. Inflationary expectations have ended; monetary tools are working well; and the increasing productivity and modernization resulting from new levels of investment will facilitate a reduction of costs and the maintenance of price stability. This Nation is growing—its needs are growing—and tax revision now will steadily increase our capacity to

meet those needs at a time when there are no major bottlenecks in manpower, plant, or resources, no emergencies straining our reserves of productive power, and no lack of vigorous competition from other nations. Nor need anyone fear that the deficit will be financed in an inflationary manner. The balanced approach that the Treasury has followed in its management of the public debt can be relied upon to prevent any inflationary push.

Our balance of payments should be improved by the fiscal policies reflected in this program. Its enactment—which will make investment in America more profitable, and which will increase the efficiency of American plants, thus cutting costs and improving our competitive position in world trade—will provide the strongest possible economic backing for the dollar. Lagging growth contributes to a lack of confidence in the dollar, and the movement of capital abroad. Accelerated growth will attract capital to these shores and bolster our free world leadership in terms of both our strength and our example. Moreover, a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require.

Consumers will convert a major percentage of their personal income tax savings into a higher standard of living, benefiting their own families while generating stronger markets for producers. Even modest increases in take-home pay enable consumers to undertake larger periodic payments on major purchases, as well as to increase purchases of smaller items—and either type of purchase leads to further income and employment.

Investment will be expanded, as the rate of return on capital formation is increased, and as growing consumer markets create a need for new capacity. It is no contradiction to say that the best means of increasing investment today is to increase consumption and market demand—and reductions in individual tax rates will do this. In addition, reducing the corporate tax from 52 percent to 47 percent will mean not only greater incentives to invest but more internal funds available for investment. Reducing the maximum individual income tax rate from 91 percent to 65 percent makes more meaningful the concept of additional reward and incentive for additional initiative, effort and risk taking. A rising level of consumer demand will enable the more than \$2 billion worth of investment incentives provided by last year's tax actions (the depreciation reform and investment credit) to achieve their full effect. In addition, tax reform will reduce those distortions of effort which interfere with a more efficient allocation of investment funds. The cumulative effect of this additional investment is once again more income, therefore more consumer demand, and therefore still more investment.

State and local governments, hard-pressed by a considerably faster rise in expenditures and indebtedness than that experienced at the Federal level, will also

gain additional revenues without increasing their own tax rates as national income and production expand.

II. BENEFITS TO THE TAXPAYER

The increased purchasing power and strengthened incentives which will move us toward our national goals will reach to all corners of our population and to all segments of our business community.

Wage earners and low-income families will gain an immediate increase in take-home pay as soon as the tax program is enacted and new withholding rates go into effect. While tax rates are to be reduced for every bracket, the largest proportionate tax reduction properly goes to those at the bottom of the economic ladder. Accordingly, in addition to lowering rates in the lower brackets, I urge that the first bracket be split into two groups, so that married couples with adjusted gross incomes of \$2,000 or less (or single persons with \$1,000 or less) receive a 30-percent reduction in their tax rate. Some one-third of all taxpayers are in this group—including many of the very old and very young whose earning powers are below average. Many of the structural revisions proposed below are also designed to meet hardships which rate reduction alone will not alleviate—hardships to low-income families and individuals, to older workers and to working mothers. This program is far preferable to an increase in exemptions, because, with a far smaller loss of revenue, it focuses the gains far more sharply on those who need it most and will spend it quickly, with benefits to the entire economy.

Middle and higher income families are both consumers and investors—and the present rates ranging up to 91 percent not only check consumption but discourage investment, and encourage the diversion of funds and effort into activities aimed more at the avoidance of taxes than the efficient production of goods. The oppressive impact of those high rates gave rise to many of the undue preferences in the present law—and both the high rates and the preferences should be ended in the new law. Under present conditions, the highest rate should not exceed 65 percent, a reduction of 29 percent from the present rate—accompanied by appropriate reductions in the middle income ranges. This will restore an idea that has helped make our country great—that a person who devotes his efforts to increasing his income, thereby adding to the Nation's income and wealth, should be able to retain a reasonable share of the results.

Businessmen and farmers: Everyone whose income depends directly upon selling his products or services to the public will benefit from the increased income and purchasing power of consumers and the substantial reduction in taxes on profits. The attainment of full employment and full capacity is even more important to profits than the reduction in corporate taxes; for, even in the absence of such reduction, profits after taxes would be at least 15 percent higher today if we were operating at full employment. Enactment of a program aimed at helping reach full employment

and capacity use which also reduces the Government's interest in corporate profits to 47 percent instead of 52 percent, thus lowering corporate tax liabilities by a further \$2.6 billion a year—while increasing consumer demand by some \$8 billion a year—will surely give American industry new incentive to expand production and capacity.

Small businessmen with net income of less than \$25,000—who constitute over 450,000 of the Nation's 585,000 corporations—will, under this program, receive greater reductions in their corporation taxes than their larger competitors. Under my program, beginning this year, the first \$25,000 of corporate taxable income will be subject to a tax rate of 22 percent rather than 30 percent, a reduction of almost 27 percent. This change is important to those small corporations which have less ready access to the capital markets, must depend more heavily for capital on internally generated funds, and are generally at a financial and competitive disadvantage. Unincorporated businesses, of course, will benefit from the reduction in individual income taxes.

III. THE TAX PROGRAM AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

A balanced Federal budget in a growing full-employment economy will be most rapidly and certainly achieved by a substantial expansion in national income carrying with it the needed Federal revenues—the kind of expansion the proposed tax revision is designed to bring about. Within a few years of the enactment of this program, Federal revenues will be larger than if present tax rates continue to prevail. Full employment, moreover, will make possible the reduction of certain Government expenditures caused by unemployment. As the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased tax revenue thereby generated will be applied toward a reduction in the Federal deficit.

As I have repeatedly emphasized, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack, on the one hand, and transitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment and thus make possible an ultimately balanced budget. Because this chronic slack produces inadequate revenues, the projected administrative deficit for fiscal 1964—without any tax reduction, leaving the present system intact—would be \$9.2 billion. The inclusion of the tax program—after the “feedback” in revenues from its economic stimulus and the acceleration of corporate tax payments—will add only an additional \$2.7 billion loss in receipts, bringing the projected deficit in the administrative budget to \$11.9 billion. The issue now is whether the strengthening of our economy which will result from the tax program is worth an addition of \$2.7 billion to the 1964 deficit.

If the tax brake on our economy is not released, the slack will remain, Federal revenues will lag and budget deficits will persist. In fact, another recession would produce a record peacetime deficit that would far exceed \$11.9 billion, and with-

out the positive effects of tax reduction. But once this tax brake is released, the base of taxable income, wages, and profits will grow, and a temporary increase in the deficit will turn into a permanent increase in Federal revenues. The purpose of cutting taxes, I repeat, is not to create a deficit but to increase investment, employment and the prospects for a balanced budget.

It would be a grave mistake to require that any tax reduction today be offset by a corresponding cut in expenditures. In my judgment, I have proposed the minimum level of Federal expenditures needed for the security of the Nation, for meeting the challenge facing us in space, and for the well-being of our people. Moreover, the gains in demand from tax reduction would then be offset, or more than offset, by the loss of demand due to the reduction in Government spending. The incentive effects of tax reduction would remain, but total jobs and output would shrink as Government contracts were cut back, workers were laid off, and projects were ended.

On the other hand, I do not favor raising demand by a massive increase in Government expenditures. In today's circumstances, it is desirable to seek expansion through our free market processes—to place increased spending power in the hands of private consumers and investors and offer more encouragement to private initiative. The most effective policy, therefore, is to expand demand and unleash incentives through a program of tax reduction and reform, coupled with the most prudent possible policy of public expenditures.

To carry out such a policy, the fiscal 1964 budget reduces total outlays other than defense, space and interest charges below their present levels—despite the fact that such expenditures have risen at an average rate of 7.5 percent during the last 9 years. Federal civilian employment under this budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our population as was true when this administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago. The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53 percent, compared to 57 percent when this administration took office. Last year the total increase in the Federal debt was only 2 percent—compared to an 8-percent increase in the gross debt of State and local governments. Taking a longer view, the Federal debt today is only 13 percent higher than it was in 1946—while State and local debt increased over 360 percent and private debt by 300 percent. In fact, if it were not for Federal financial assistance to State and local governments, the Federal cash budget would actually show a surplus. Federal civilian employment, for example, is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while State and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 percent. This administration is pledged to enforce economy and efficiency in a strict control of expenditures.

In short, this tax program will increase our wealth far more than it increases our public debt. The actual burden of that debt—as measured in relation to our

total output—will decline. To continue to increase our debt as the result of inadequate earnings is a sign of weakness. But to borrow prudently in order to invest in a tax revision that will greatly increase our earning power can be a source of strength.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE ACTION AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Fully recognizing that it is both desirable and necessary for the Congress to exercise its own discretion in the actual drafting of a tax bill, I recommend the application of the following basic principles in this vital task:

A. The entire tax revision program should be promptly enacted as a single comprehensive bill. The sooner the program is enacted, the sooner it will make its impact upon the economy, providing additional benefits and further insurance against recession. While the full rate reduction program must take effect gradually for the reasons stated below, I am proposing that the individual tax rates for 1963 income be reduced to a range from 18.5 percent to 84.5 percent, with a cut in the withholding rate from the present 18 percent to 15.5 percent becoming effective upon enactment of the law. This will increase the disposable income of consumers at an annual rate of nearly \$6 billion a year in the second half of 1963. Also the rate of corporate tax on the first \$25,000 of net income would be reduced from 30 percent to 22 percent for the year 1963. Equally important is action in 1963 on the additional individual and corporate rate reductions proposed for 1964 and 1965. The prompt enactment of a bill assuring this combination of realized and prospective tax reductions will improve the business climate and public psychology, induce forward business planning, and increase individual incentives. It will enable investors and producers to act this year on the basis of solid expectations of increased market demand and a higher rate of return. To delay decisive action beyond 1963 risks the loss of opportunity and initiative which this year uniquely offers.

B. The net amount of tax reduction enacted should keep within the limits of economic sufficiency and fiscal responsibility. Too small a tax cut would be a waste, gaining us little but further deficits. It could not cope with the task of closing a \$30 to \$40 billion gap in our economic performance. But the net tax cut of over \$10 billion envisioned by this program can lead the way to strong economic expansion and a larger revenue yield.

On the other hand, responsible fiscal policy requires that we avoid an overly sharp drop in budgetary receipts for fiscal 1964-65, and that we hold the temporary increase in the deficit below the level which in the past has proved both manageable and compatible with price stability. Therefore, to make these reductions possible, I propose a program: (a) to phase the tax reductions over a 3-year period, with the final step effective January 1, 1965; (b) to couple these reductions, amounting to \$13.6 billion, with selected structural changes and reforms gaining \$3.4 billion net in reve-

nues; and (c) to offset the revenue loss still further, during the next 5 years by gradually moving the tax payments of larger corporations to a more current time schedule, without any change in their tax liabilities.

C. Tax reduction and structural reform should be considered and enacted as a single integrated program. My recommendations for rate reductions of \$13.6 billion are made in the expectation that selected structural changes and reforms will be adopted, adding on balance \$3.4 billion in revenue and resulting in a net reduction in tax liabilities of no more than \$10.2 billion. Larger cuts would create a larger budget deficit and the possibility of renewed inflationary pressures. Therefore, should the Congress make any significant reductions in the revenues to be raised by structural changes, these reductions would have to be offset by substantially equivalent increases in revenue, and this could only be achieved by sacrificing either some of the important rate reductions I have proposed or some of the measures I am recommending to relieve hardship and promote growth.

On the other hand, an attempt to solve all tax problems at once by the inclusion of even more sweeping reforms might impair the effect of rate reduction. This program is designed to achieve broad acceptance and prompt enactment.

Some reforms will improve the tax structure by reducing certain liabilities. Others will broaden the tax base by raising liabilities and will meet with resistance from those who benefit from existing preferences. But if this program of tax reduction is aimed at making the most of our economic potential, it should be remembered that these preferences and special provisions also restrict our rate of growth and distort the flow of investment. They discourage taxpayer cooperation and compliance by adding inequities and complexities that affect similarly situated taxpayers in wholly different ways. They divert energies from productive activities to tax avoidance—and from more valuable or efficient undertakings to less valuable undertakings with lower tax consequences.

Some departures from uniform tax treatment are required to promote overriding national objectives. But taxpayers with equal incomes who are burdened with unequal tax liabilities are certain to seek still further preferences and exceptions—and to use their resources where they yield the greatest returns after tax even though producing less before taxes, thus lowering our national output and efficiency.

Tax reduction is urgently needed to spur the growth of our economy—but both the fruits of growth and the burdens of the resulting new tax structure should be fairly shared by all. For the present patchwork of special provisions lightens the load on some by placing a heavier burden on others. Because they reduce the tax base, they compel a higher tax rate—and the reduction in the top rate from 91 percent to 65 percent, which in itself is a major reform, cannot be justified if these other forms of preferential tax treatment remain.

The resistance to tax reform should be less when it is coupled with more-than-offsetting tax reductions benefiting all brackets—and the support for tax reform should be greater when it is a necessary condition for greater tax reduction. Reform, as mentioned earlier, includes top-to-bottom rate reduction as well as structural change—and the two are inseparable prerequisites to the achievement of our economic and equity objectives. The new rates should be both lower and more widely applicable—for the excessively high rates and various tax concessions have in the past been associated with each other, and they should be eliminated together.

In short, these changes in our tax structure are as essential to maximizing our growth and use of resources as rate reduction and make a greater rate reduction possible. The broader the Congress can extend the tax base, the lower it can reduce the tax rates. But to the extent that the erosion of our tax base by special preferences is not reversed to gain some \$3.4 billion net, Congress will have to forgo—for reasons of both equity and fiscal responsibility—either corporate or personal rate reductions now contained in the program.

V. PROPOSALS FOR RATE REDUCTION

The central thrust of this proposed tax program is contained in the most thorough overhaul in tax rates in more than 20 years, substantially reducing rates at all levels, for both individuals and corporations, by a total of \$13.6 billion. While the principal components of my proposals for rate reduction have been alluded to in the foregoing discussion, it might be well to specify them in detail here.

1. Reduction in individual income tax rates. Personal tax liabilities will be decreased by \$11 billion through a reduction in rates from their present levels of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent, with appropriate reductions generally averaging more than 20 percent and covering every bracket. The lowest 14 percent rate would apply to the first \$2,000 of taxable income for married taxpayers filing joint returns, and to the first \$1,000 of the taxable income of single taxpayers—a reduction of 30 percent in the taxes levied on this new bracket, in which falls the entire taxable income of one-third of all taxpayers. The new maximum rate of 65 percent would enable those individuals who now keep only 9 cents out of each additional dollar earned to retain 35 cents in the future. I am attaching tables showing the proposed rate schedules for married and single taxpayers.

2. These reductions would take place over a 3-year period:

For calendar year 1963, I propose a rate schedule ranging from 18.5 percent to 84.5 percent, reducing the appropriate withholding rate immediately upon enactment from its present level of 18 percent to a new level of 15.5 percent. For purposes of taxpayer computations, the new tax rates would apply to the entire calendar year, thus requiring the lower withholding rate to minimize overwithholding.

For calendar year 1964, I propose a rate schedule ranging from 15.5 percent to 71.5 percent, effective for the entire year and accompanied by a withholding rate of 13.5 percent beginning July 1 of that year.

For calendar year 1965 and thereafter, I propose a permanent rate schedule ranging from 14 to 65 percent, maintaining the withholding rate at 13.5 percent.

3. Reductions in the corporate income tax rate will cut corporate tax liabilities by \$2.6 billion per year (in addition to the reduction of \$2 billion per year provided by the 1962 investment tax credit and depreciation reform), and take effect in three stages:

For calendar year 1963, the present normal tax of 30 percent, applicable to the first \$25,000 of taxable corporate income (the entire earnings of almost half a million small corporations) would drop to 22 percent, a reduction of almost 27 percent, while the rate applicable to income in excess of \$25,000 would remain at 52 percent, thus reversing the present normal tax of 30 percent and the surtax of 22 percent. The normal tax would remain permanently at 22 percent.

For calendar year 1964, the corporate surtax would be reduced to 28 percent, thereby lowering the combined corporate rate to 50 percent.

For calendar year 1965 and thereafter, the corporate surtax would be reduced to 25 percent, thereby lowering the combined corporate rate to 47 percent and ending the role of the Government as a senior partner in business profits.

4. Since the \$25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22 percent normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I, therefore, recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80 percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add \$120 million annually to tax receipts.

5. On the other hand, if affiliated corporations are treated as an entity for the surtax exemption and other purposes, they should be permitted to obtain the advantages of filing consolidated returns without incurring the present tax of 2 percent on the net income of all corporations filing such returns. The 2-percent tax was removed in 1954 from consolidated returns of regulated public utility enterprises; and I recommend that it be repealed for all corporate enterprises beginning in 1964. This proposal will contribute to a more realistic corporate tax rate structure and reduce the adverse effect of high marginal tax rates on growth—at an annual cost to the Treasury of only \$50 million.

6. To offset revenue losses by an estimated \$1.5 billion per year over the next

5 years, without increasing the actual net burden of tax liability of corporations, I recommend that corporations with an annual tax liability in excess of \$100,000—which are now on a partially current payment basis—be placed on a more current tax payment schedule beginning in 1964. Under this plan, such corporations would make a first declaration and payment of estimated tax on April 15, with subsequent payments due on June 15, September 15, and December 15, reaching a fully current basis similar to that required of individual income tax payers after a 5-year transition period. More current payment of corporate taxes will strengthen the Government's budgetary position, but will not—even during the 5-year transition period—offset the benefits of rate reduction for these corporations.

VI. PROPOSALS FOR STRUCTURAL REVISION AND REFORM

The changes listed below are an integral part of a single tax package which should be enacted this year. All of them should be effective January 1, 1964. Some remove inequities and hardships and thus further reduce revenues; others recoup revenue by revising preferential tax treatment now accorded particular types of transactions, enterprises or taxpayers. Their combined revenue effect makes possible \$3.4 billion of the \$13.6 billion reduction in tax rates, for a net reduction of \$10.2 billion. But their combined economic effect is even more important—to provide greater equity in a broader tax base, to encourage the full and efficient flow of capital, to remove unwarranted special privileges and hardships, to simplify tax administration and compliance and to release for more productive endeavors the energies now devoted to avoiding taxes. While rate reductions are also a major reform, they are in large part justified and made possible by structural reform—and the case for structural reform, in turn, would be weakened by the absence of substantial rate reduction.

These reforms may be divided into three categories:

- (A) Relief of hardship and encouragement of growth;
- (B) Base broadening and equity; and
- (C) Revision of capital gains taxation for growth and equity.

(A) RELIEF OF HARDSHIP AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF GROWTH

1. A minimum standard deduction: I do not believe that the individual income tax should apply at levels of income as low as \$667 for single persons and \$1,333 for married couples as it does now. One way to provide relief to low-income taxpayers—in addition to the splitting of the first bracket as already recommended—would be to raise the personal exemption above its present level of \$600. This is an extremely costly approach, however, and one which would not fulfill our objective of giving relief where it is needed most.

As a more effective and less costly means of securing the same objective, I recommend the adoption of a minimum standard deduction of \$300 (\$150 for each spouse filing a separate return) plus \$100 per dependent up to the present

maximum of \$1,000. Under present law the standard deduction cannot exceed 10 percent of a person's income. The establishment of a minimum standard deduction will provide about \$220 million of tax relief, primarily to those with income below \$5,000.

If this proposal is adopted, single individuals would remain free of income tax liability until their incomes exceeded \$900 rather than the present \$667, thus giving them the equivalent of an increase in the personal exemption of \$233. A married couple, without dependents, now subject to tax on income in excess of \$1,333, would be taxed only on income in excess of \$1,500. A couple with two dependents would be taxed only on income in excess of \$2,900, as compared with \$2,667 under present law.

2. A more liberal child care deduction: Employed women, widowers, and divorced men are now allowed a deduction of up to \$600 per year for expenses incurred for the care of children and other dependents who are unable to care for themselves. In its present form this provision falls far short of fulfilling its objective of providing tax relief to those who must—in order to work—meet extra expenses for the care of dependents.

I recommend increasing the maximum amount that may be deducted from the present \$600 to \$1,000 where three or more children must be cared for. I also recommend three further steps: raising from \$4,500 to \$7,000 the amount of income that families with working wives can have and still remain fully eligible; increasing the age limit of children who qualify from 11 to 12; and extending the deduction to certain taxpayers who now do not qualify—such as a married man whose wife is confined to an institution.

The revenue cost of these changes in the child care deduction would be \$20 million per year, most of which would benefit taxpayers with incomes of less than \$7,000.

3. The tax treatment of older people: The special problems encountered by older people are recognized in a variety of not always consistent provisions under the present individual income tax law, resulting in widely different tax burdens for similarly situated older people whose incomes are derived from different sources. The relief is not only unevenly distributed, but, to the extent that its benefits accrue to those with high income, is unnecessary, wasting revenue which could be used to provide more adequately for those who need it.

For example: a single taxpayer aged 65, whose income of \$5,000 is entirely in the form of wages, now pays an income tax of \$686. If he were retired and his income were in the form of dividends, his tax liability would be less than half as much—\$329. Moreover, the extra \$600 exemption helps most those with substantial incomes. I am convinced, therefore, that a more uniform and equitable approach, one which will reduce and tend to equalize the tax burdens of all lower and modest income older people, is required.

To this end, I recommend that all people aged 65 or over, regardless of the source of their income, be allowed a credit of \$300 against taxes otherwise

owing. This credit would replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit, and would be of far greater value to the vast majority of older taxpayers. Under present law the amount of retirement income utilized in computing the retirement income credit is reduced, dollar for dollar, by social security and railroad retirement benefits received. The proposed \$300 credit would also be reduced but only by a limited amount. (This amount would be equal to the taxpayer's bracket rate times one-half of the benefits—that portion attributable to the employer's contribution.)

This treatment of social security and railroad retirement benefits is more favorable than present law in its effect on lower and middle income taxpayers; and, indeed, the overall result of this proposal for a \$300 credit would be to liberalize substantially the tax treatment of aged lower and middle income taxpayers. Although this provision would moderately reduce the benefits of aged upper income taxpayers, they stand to gain substantially from the general rate reduction and will still pay lower taxes. Those whose incomes are wholly or primarily in the form of social security or railroad retirement benefits, of course, will still not be subject to income tax and these benefits will remain excludable from income.

The enactment of this recommendation will insure that single older people will not be subject to individual income tax liability unless their incomes exceed \$2,900 (for married couples \$5,800). These figures contrast with as little as \$1,333 for single older individuals and \$2,667 for older married couples under present law. It will also remove the existing excessively high tax cost imposed upon those older people who, out of preference or necessity, continue in gainful employment. The vital skills and energies of these older workers should not be discouraged from contributing materially to our economic strength.

A further major advantage of this recommendation is that it will greatly simplify the filing of tax returns for our older people. As much as two-thirds of a page of the individual income tax return now required for computation of the retirement income credit will be eliminated. In addition, a large number of older people who presently file tax returns will no longer find it necessary to do so because the filing requirement will be raised from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

The revenue reduction associated with these gains in equity and simplicity in the tax treatment of older people will be \$320 million per year.

4. Income averaging. Many taxpayers are heavily penalized if they receive income in widely fluctuating amounts from year to year. I have instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to present to the Congress as part of this program an income averaging provision. It will provide fairer tax treatment for those who receive in a single taxable year unusually large amounts of income as compared to their average income for preceding years.

This proposal will go beyond the narrowly confined and complex averaging

provisions of present law and will permit their elimination from the Internal Revenue Code. It will provide one formula of general application to those with wide fluctuations in income. This means fairer tax treatment for authors, professional artists, actors and athletes, as well as farmers, ranchers, fishermen, attorneys, architects and others. The estimated annual revenue cost of this proposal is \$30 million.

5. Employees' moving expenses: Under present law employees are allowed to exclude from their taxable income any reimbursement received from their employer for moving expenses when changing their place of residence and job location while continuing to work for the same employer. In order to facilitate labor mobility and provide more equal treatment of similarly situated taxpayers, I recommend appropriate extension of this tax benefit to new employees. This recommendation will entail a revenue loss of \$20 million per year.

6. Charitable contributions: Under present law an extra 10-percent deduction over and above the basic 20-percent limitation on deductions for charitable contributions is allowable for contributions to churches, educational institutions, and medical facilities and research. I recommend that this limit on the deduction for charitable contributions be liberalized and made more uniform. To this end the 30-percent limit should extend to all organizations eligible for the charitable contributions deduction which are publicly supported and controlled. This recommendation can be implemented at a revenue cost which is minor. But it will prove advantageous to the advancement of highly desirable activities in our communities, such as symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers.

7. Research and development:

Current business expenses for research and experimental purposes may now be deducted as incurred. But under present law the cost of machinery and equipment, now so vital to modern research and development activities, must be capitalized and the cost deducted only over the useful life of the machinery or equipment.

As a spur to private research and development, so essential to the growth of our economy, I recommend that expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research or development activities be allowed as a current expense deduction.

I am confident that this measure, which will involve a revenue cost of some \$50 million, will provide future benefits in the form of better products, lower costs, and larger markets. These benefits, in turn, will bear fruit in larger tax bases and budgetary receipts.

(B) BASE BROADENING AND EQUITY

1. A floor under itemized deductions of individuals: Most taxpayers use the "standard deduction," generally equal to 10 percent of income up to a maximum of \$1,000. But ever since this standard deduction was introduced during World War II, the proportion of taxpayers using it has declined steadily. At present, more than 40 percent of all individ-

ual income tax returns are filed by people who itemize deductions for a variety of deductible personal expenses, such as State and local taxes, interest, charitable contributions, medical expenses and casualty losses. The amount of itemized deductions claimed on tax returns has gone up sharply—from less than \$6 billion in 1942 to \$25.7 billion in 1957 and \$40 billion in 1962.

The present practice of allowing taxpayers to deduct certain expenses in full—the only exception being medical expenses which are subject to a 3-percent floor plus a 1-percent floor for drugs—raises difficult problems of equity, taxpayers' compliance, and tax administration and enforcement. One purpose of itemized deductions is to relieve those taxpayers who are burdened by certain expenses or hardships in unusually large amounts, such as those involved in heavy casualty losses or serious illness. Another purpose is to stimulate certain desirable activities, such as charitable contributions or home ownership. Where such outlays are minimal relative to annual income, no serious hardship occurs and no special incentive is needed.

I, therefore, recommend that itemized deductions, which now average about 20 percent of adjusted gross incomes, be limited to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5-percent floor will make \$2.3 billion of revenue available for reduction in individual tax rates. At the same time incentives to home ownership or charitable contributions will remain. In fact, this tax program as a whole, providing as it does substantial reductions in Federal tax liabilities for virtually all families and individuals, will make it easier for people to meet their personal and civic obligations.

This broadening of the tax base which permits a greater reduction in individual income tax rates has an accompanying advantage of real simplification. An additional 6.5 million taxpayers will no longer itemize their deductions but still benefit overall from the reduced rates and other relief measures.

2. Simplification and liberalization of the medical expense deduction: The medical expense deduction allowed to taxpayers who are under 65 years of age is limited to medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of their income. A separate floor of 1 percent of income is applicable to expenditures for drugs. In the interests of simplification, these two floors should be combined. Under this recommendation, only those medical and drug expenses which together exceed 4 percent of income would be deductible. The qualifying expenses would, of course, along with other itemized deductions, be subject to the general 5-percent floor.

To lighten the burdens of our older citizens, all taxpayers who have reached the age of 65 should be relieved from the present 1-percent floor on drug expenses. They are already exempt from the 3-percent floor on medical expenses.

Under present law there is also a maximum limit on medical deductions of \$5,000 for a single person and up to \$20,000 for a married couple. This maximum limit represents an anomaly in the

law in that it prohibits the deduction of the truly catastrophic expenses for medical care and drugs that are sometimes incurred. I recommend, therefore, that the maximum limit be removed.

Other amendments in the definition of certain medical and drug expenses, designed to prevent abuses, will be required in connection with these changes.

The net revenue change as a result of these recommendations for simplification would involve an increase of \$30 million—an insignificant part of the \$6 billion of medical expense deductions which are taken today.

3. Minor casualty losses: Casualty losses on property are today fully deductible, without any floor comparable to that applicable to medical expenses to separate the extraordinary casualty from the average run of minor accidents. There is no reason why truly minor casualties—the inevitable dented fender, for example—should receive special treatment under the tax law.

I, therefore, recommend that casualty losses enter into the calculation of itemized deductions only to the extent that they exceed 4 percent of the taxpayer's income. The qualifying expenses would, of course, along with other itemized deductions, be subject to the general 5-percent floor. This recommendation will increase annual tax receipts by \$90 million.

4. Unlimited charitable deduction: Present law permits a handful of high income taxpayers to take an unlimited deduction for charitable contributions, instead of the 20 to 30 percent of income normally allowable. These taxpayers for a number of years have made charitable contributions in an amount which, when added to their income tax liability, exceeds 90 percent of their taxable income—thus making the contribution fully deductible. Usually these contributions are made in substantially appreciated stock or other property. In this way the appreciation in value, without ever being subject to tax, constitutes a major part of the unlimited deduction. While naturally these generous contributions are beneficial, these taxpayers—given their otherwise high taxable income (up to several million dollars annually in some cases)—should not be escaping all Federal income tax as is the case today. They should be limited to the same 30-percent deduction for charitable contributions as everyone else.

Repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction would mean an annual revenue increase of \$10 million.

5. Repeal of the sick pay exclusion: Employees who are absent from work because of illness or injury may exclude from income subject to tax up to \$100 a week received under employer-financed wage or salary continuation plans. This "sick pay" exclusion is clearly unjustifiable. The taxpayer escapes tax on the salary he continues to receive, although his substantial medical expenses are deductible; and the employee who stays on the job, even though ill or injured, is in effect penalized for working. The sick pay exclusion—which is of greatest benefit to those with large salary incomes and of far less value to

most wage earners—should be repealed. This action would provide \$110 million per year in additional revenue.

6. Exclusion of premiums on group term insurance: Neither the current value of group term life insurance protection nor the benefits received thereunder are now subject to tax if purchased for an employee by his employer. This is, in effect, a valuable form of compensation, meeting the widespread desire to provide protection for one's family, which other taxpayers must pay for with after-tax dollars. I recommend that the current annual value to the employee of employer-financed group term life insurance protection be included in income, with an exception for the first \$5,000 of coverage to correspond to the present exclusion for uninsured death benefits.

Revenues would be increased by \$60 million per year.

7. Repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion: There is now allowed as an exclusion from income the first \$50 of dividends received from domestic corporations, and, in addition, a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of such dividend income in excess of \$50. I repeat the recommendation made in my 1961 tax message that these provisions be repealed.

Proponents of the dividend credit and exclusion argued, in 1954, when these provisions were enacted, that they would encourage equity investment and provide a partial relief to the so-called double taxation of dividend income. Although these provisions involve an annual revenue loss at current levels of \$460 million, they have failed to accomplish their objectives. The proportion of corporate funds secured from new equity financing has not increased; and the "relief" gives the largest benefits to those with the highest incomes.

A far more equitable and effective means of accomplishing the objectives of the dividend credit and exclusion is to be found in my recommendation for reduction in the corporate income tax rate. The five-point reduction in that rate will reduce the tax differential against distributed corporate earnings by approximately 10 percent for all taxpayers. The dividend credit, on the other hand, provides much less relief for taxpayers with taxable incomes of less than \$180,000 (\$90,000 for single individuals) and greater relief only for the very highest income recipients.

Moreover, since the benefits of the dividend credit and exclusion go largely to those in the middle and upper brackets, their repeal is necessary to justify the rate schedules I am recommending. Should no action be taken on this recommendation, a higher rate schedule designed to yield an additional \$460 million from the middle and upper brackets would be appropriate. This would involve a rate structure scaled to a top rate of 70 percent rather than 65 percent, with appropriate changes in other brackets.

8. Natural resources: We must continue to foster the efficient development of our mineral industries which have contributed so heavily to the economic

progress of this Nation. At the same time, however, in the interest of both equity and the efficient allocation of capital, no one industry should be permitted to obtain an undue tax advantage over all others. Unintended defects have arisen in the application of the special tax privileges that Congress has granted to mineral industries, and correction of these defects is required if the existing tax provisions are to operate in a consistent and equitable fashion. The changes recommended below will alleviate this situation and yield an additional \$300 million per year in revenue.

The following areas in particular suggest the need for revision:

(a) Carryover of excess deductions: Under present tax law, mineral industries are permitted to deduct from taxable income a depletion allowance based on a percentage of gross mineral income but subject to a limit of 50 percent of net income from each producing property. The intent of this net income limit is not always realized, however, because substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred while the property is being developed are not brought into the net income limit for the purpose of computing the depletion allowance, but are instead charged off against income from other sources. The result is that in many cases percentage depletion far exceeds 50 percent of net income earned over the life of the property, when net income is properly defined to include development costs.

One method of removing this defect in present law would be to provide that amounts in excess of gross income from the mineral property, which are deducted against other income of the taxpayer, should be used to reduce the net income from the property (for purposes of computing percentage depletion) in later producing years. These carryover amounts could either be applied fully as the taxpayer obtains income from the property or be spread over several years. The deduction of drilling and development expenditures when made would not be affected; but, regardless of when they were made, they would be taken into account in computing the 50 percent of net income limitation on percentage depletion. This proposal would apply only to expenditures made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963.

(b) Grouping of properties: This same 50-percent limitation imposed by the Congress has also been minimized by the effect of legislation enacted in 1954, which permitted large oil and gas producers to pick and choose properties to be combined into an operating unit for the purpose of computing depletion and reducing taxes. Percentage depletion historically has been computed separately for each mineral property. This grouping procedure has little or no business significance; and it benefits almost entirely companies with a large number of widely scattered mineral properties. The original strength and purpose of the 50-percent limitation should be restored by returning to the rule that different oil and gas leases or acquisitions may not be combined for tax purposes, and that separate interests may be combined

only if they are all on a single lease or acquisition. Such a change would bring tax rules regarding the grouping of properties into accord with business procedures.

(c) Capital gains on sale of mineral interests: The Congress, in section 13 of the Revenue Act of 1962, recognized that the owners of depreciable business assets were obtaining an unfair advantage by taking depreciation deductions against ordinary income greater than the actual loss in value, and then, upon the sale of an asset, paying only a capital gains tax on the recovery of these deductions. The Congress, therefore, decided that any gains realized on the sale of such property should be taxed as ordinary income to the extent that the cost of the property has been deducted in the past—still permitting the excess of the sales price over the original cost to be treated as a capital gain. This same rule, which under my capital gains proposals discussed below would be extended to real estate and a variety of other situations, should also apply to mineral property subject to depletion, and would increase revenues by \$50 million.

(d) Foreign operations: Inasmuch as American firms engaged in oil, gas, and mineral operations abroad are permitted the same depletion allowances and expensing of development costs as domestic producers, their U.S. tax on income from those operations is frequently smaller than the foreign tax they are entitled to credit. The law should be amended to prevent an unused or excess foreign tax credit from being used to offset U.S. taxes on other forms or sources of foreign income. In addition, the deduction of foreign development costs should apply only to the income from those operations, and should not be permitted to reduce the U.S. tax on their domestic income.

Action by the Congress in these four areas will adopt the most clearly justified steps needed to place the present system of depletion allowances in a more appropriate framework. In addition, both the administration and the appropriate committees of the Congress should study more closely the impact of the present percentage depletion rates and their applicability regardless of size or income on the development of our natural resources and the number of investors and producers attracted to the extractive industries. While these are complex as well as controversial problems, we cannot shrink from a frank appraisal of governmental policies and tax subsidies in this area.

9. Personal holding companies: The present restrictions upon the use of personal holding companies have been inadequate to prevent many high-bracket taxpayers from sheltering large amounts of passive investment income in corporations they own and control. By generating a relatively small amount of operating income, or through the use of rentals and royalties as a shield for dividend income, they have been able to avoid personal income taxes upon portfolio investments. I recommend that these provisions be tightened to end these escape routes which permit such

passive investment income to be accumulated in closely held corporations at low rates of tax. Such action will increase annual tax revenue by \$10 million.

(C) REVISION OF CAPITAL GAINS TAXATION

The present tax treatment of capital gains and losses is both inequitable and a barrier to economic growth. With the exception of changes that have added various ordinary income items to the definition of statutory capital gains, there have been no significant changes in this area of the income tax since 1942. The tax on capital gains directly affects investment decisions, the mobility and flow of risk capital from static to more dynamic situations, the ease or difficulty experienced by new ventures in obtaining capital, and thereby the strength and potential for growth of the economy. The provisions for taxation of capital gains are in need of essential changes designed to facilitate the attainment of our economic objectives.

I, therefore, recommend the following changes, the nature of which requires their consideration as a unified package, coupling liberalization of treatment with more sensible and equitable limitations:

1. Percentage inclusion: Reduce the percentage of long-term capital gains included in individual income subject to tax from the present 50 percent of the gain to 30 percent. Combined with the proposed individual income tax rate schedule ranging from 14 to 65 percent, this will produce capital gains tax rates that will start at 4.2 percent—instead of the present 10 percent—and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent—instead of the present 25 percent.

With the enactment of this recommendation, the same ratio will exist for all income groups between the tax rate payable on ordinary income and the tax rate payable on capital gains—which is not the case at the present time.

The present 25-percent alternative tax on the capital gains of corporations should be reduced to 22 percent as a part of the reduction of the corporate normal tax rate to 22 percent. This will greatly simplify tax accounting for the more than half a million small corporations subject only to the normal tax.

2. Holding period: Extend the minimum holding period for qualifying for long-term capital gains treatment from the present 6 months to 1 year.

Preferential capital gains treatment with respect to gains on assets held less than 1 year cannot be justified either in terms of longrun economic objectives or equity. Moreover, the present 6-month test makes it relatively easy to convert various types of what is actually ordinary income into capital gains. This proposal will provide far greater assurance that capital gains treatment is confined to bona fide investors rather than to short-term speculators. The new lower rates of ordinary income tax, which will apply to gains realized on holdings of less than 6 months as well as 6 months to 1 year, will mitigate the reduced rate of turnover of securities and other assets that might otherwise result.

3. Carryover of capital losses: Permit an indefinite carryover of capital losses

incurred by an individual in any one year.

Under present law capital losses may be carried over for only 5 years. They may be charged against ordinary income in an amount of up to \$1,000 in each of the 5 years and against capital gains. The 5-year limitation frequently works serious hardship on investors, particularly small investors, who incur substantial capital losses and do not within 5 years have the opportunity to realize gains sufficiently large to absorb them. More adequate capital loss offsets will improve the investment odds, encourage risk taking on the part of investors, and stimulate economic growth.

4. Tax treatment of gains accrued on capital assets at the time of gift or death: Impose a tax at capital gains rates on all net gains accrued on capital assets at the time of transfer at death or by gift.

Adoption of this proposal is an essential element of my program for the taxation of capital gains; certainly in its absence there would be no justification for any reduction of present capital gain rate schedules.

A number of exceptions would limit the applicability of this proposal to fewer than 3 percent of those who die each year. These exceptions would provide special rules for the transfer of household and personal effects, assets transferred to a surviving wife or husband, and a certain minimum amount of property in every case. Appreciation on property subject to the charitable contribution deduction would continue to be exempt both on gift and at death.

For those who would have a substantial amount of appreciation taxed upon transfer at death, a special averaging provision would prevent the application of higher rates than would have applied upon disposition over a period of years. In addition, it should be clearly understood that the tax upon transfer at death would reduce the size of the taxable estate, and thereby reduce the estate tax. The present provisions for extended payment of estate taxes would apply to the new taxes upon appreciated property transferred at death and would be liberalized.

My proposal, if enacted, would apply to gifts made after this date, but would be phased to apply fully to transfers at death only after 3 years. The Secretary of the Treasury will present a technical elaboration of this proposal and its relationship to the existing rules for the taxation of various kinds of assets transferred at death.

5. Definitional changes: The wartime increases in the income tax rate structure led to repeated efforts to obtain extension of capital gains treatment to a variety of sources of ordinary income. In some cases this treatment was related to the very high rates of tax on ordinary income. In such cases capital gains treatment is no longer appropriate. In some other cases the justification given for the special treatment was the desire to give a special subsidy to the industry concerned. In other situations, as mentioned earlier with respect to mineral properties, many taxpayers have been able to profit through

claiming deductions against ordinary income for expenses, interest, depreciation or depletion, which are later recovered on disposition of property at much lower capital gain rates.

The existing sprawling scope of this preferential treatment has led to serious economic distortions and has encouraged tax avoidance maneuvers sometimes characterized as the "capital gains route." This trend should now be reversed, particularly because of the benefits of the lower capital gains rates as well as lower personal tax rates which I am recommending. Wherever the case for a special subsidy is not compelling, the definitions should be changed to limit capital gains to those transactions which clearly merit such treatment. The details regarding specific proposals in this area will be presented by the Secretary of the Treasury. They will include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Real estate tax shelters, which are giving rise to increasingly uneconomic investment practices and are threatening legitimate real estate developments; and

b. The tax treatment of restricted stock options. The difference between the price paid for optioned stock at the time of exercise of such an option and the option price represents compensation for services quite as much as do wages and salaries. Under present law, however, such gains are taxed under capital gains rules at very favorable rates and the tax liability may be postponed for many years.

Under present war-inspired high tax rates, compensation arrangements of this kind clearly have their attractions. But under the new, more reasonable rates I am recommending, the favored tax treatment of stock options can no longer be said to be either desirable or necessary; and larger salary payments will be more effective than at present as a means of attracting and holding corporate executives.

I, therefore, recommend that, with respect to stock options granted after this date, the spread between the option price and the value of the stock at the date the option is exercised be taxed at ordinary income tax rates at the time the option is exercised. The averaging provision referred to above which the Secretary of the Treasury will present will prevent a tax penalty due to bunching of income in 1 year. In addition, payment of tax attributable to exercise of the stock option would be permitted in installments over several years.

This change will remove a gross inequality in the application of the income tax, but it is not expected to yield appreciable amounts of revenue; for the gains to be taxed as compensation to the employee will, as in the case of compensation in other forms, be deductible from the income of the employer.

The overall effect of all these changes in the capital gain provisions affecting individuals and corporations will stimulate freer flow of investment funds and facilitate economic growth as well as provide more evenhanded treatment of taxpayers across the board. They have a direct positive revenue impact of about

\$100 million per year. The reduction in the tax rate on capital gains will be somewhat more than offset by the increased revenue from the change in holding period, the taxation of capital gains at death and the changes in definitions—including those affecting real estate shelters and sales of mineral properties.

However, the "lock-in" effect of the present law, due to the ability to avoid all capital gains taxes on assets held until death, will be eliminated. This will result in a sharp increase in transfers of capital assets as individuals feel free to shift to the most desirable investment. The increased volume of transactions under these new rules should, in an average year, yield approximately \$700 million in additional revenue. Indeed, this figure will be substantially higher during the first few years after enactment as those who are presently "locked in" respond to the new situation.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The foregoing program of rate reduction and reform provides for a fair and comprehensive net reduction in tax liabilities at all levels of income. As shown in the attached table 3, the overall savings are proportionately highest at the lower end of the income scale, where for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$3,000 the reduction is nearly 40 percent. As we move up the income scale, the percentage reduction in tax liabilities declines to slightly less than 10 percent for taxpayers with incomes in excess of \$50,000. For all groups of taxpayers combined, the reduction is approximately 18 percent, but five out of six taxpayers—most of whom have incomes below \$10,000—will enjoy a reduction of more than 20 percent.

In addition, the proposed reforms will go a long way toward simplifying the problem of filling out tax returns for the more than 60 million filers each year. Under these proposals more than 6 million people will no longer find necessary the recordkeeping and detailed accounting required by itemized deductions. Hundreds of thousands of older people and individuals and families with very low incomes will no longer be required to file any tax returns at all.

Special tax problems of small business, the aged, working mothers and low-income groups are effectively met. Special preferences—for capital gains, natural resources, excessive deductions and other areas outside the tax base—are curbed. Both the mobility and the formation of capital are encouraged. The lower corporate tax rates will encourage and stimulate business enterprise. The reduction of the top 91-percent rate will assist investment and risk taking. Above all, by expanding both consumer demand and investment, this program will raise production and income, provide jobs for the unemployed, and take up the slack in our economy.

Members of the Congress, there is general agreement among those in business and labor most concerned that this Nation requires major tax revision, involving both net tax reduction and base-broadening reform. There is also general agreement that this should be

enacted as promptly as is consistent with orderly legislative process. Differences which may arise will be largely those of degree and emphasis. I hope that, having examined these differences, the Congress will enact this year a modification of our tax laws along the general lines I have proposed.

To repeat what I said in my message on the state of the Union—"Now is the time to act. We cannot afford to be timid or slow. For this is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1963.

TABLE 1.—Comparison of tax rates under proposed program and present law for married persons filing jointly

Taxable income bracket	Under proposed program			
	Under present law	Calendar year 1963	Calendar year 1964	Calendar year 1965
0 to \$2,000	20.0	18.5	15.5	14.0
\$2,000 to \$4,000	20.0	19.0	17.0	16.0
\$4,000 to \$8,000	22.0	21.0	19.0	18.0
\$8,000 to \$12,000	26.0	25.0	22.0	21.0
\$12,000 to \$16,000	30.0	28.5	25.5	24.0
\$16,000 to \$20,000	34.0	32.0	29.0	27.0
\$20,000 to \$24,000	38.0	36.0	32.0	30.0
\$24,000 to \$28,000	43.0	41.0	36.0	34.0
\$28,000 to \$32,000	47.0	44.5	39.5	37.0
\$32,000 to \$36,000	50.0	47.5	42.5	40.0
\$36,000 to \$40,000	53.0	50.0	45.0	42.0
\$40,000 to \$44,000	56.0	53.0	48.0	45.0
\$44,000 to \$52,000	59.0	56.0	50.0	47.0
\$52,000 to \$64,000	62.0	59.0	53.0	50.0
\$64,000 to \$76,000	65.0	62.0	55.0	52.0
\$76,000 to \$88,000	69.0	65.5	58.5	55.0
\$88,000 to \$100,000	72.0	68.0	61.0	57.0
\$100,000 to \$120,000	75.0	71.0	62.0	58.0
\$120,000 to \$140,000	78.0	73.0	64.0	59.0
\$140,000 to \$160,000	81.0	76.0	65.0	60.0
\$160,000 to \$180,000	84.0	78.0	67.0	61.0
\$180,000 to \$200,000	87.0	81.0	68.0	62.0
\$200,000 to \$300,000	89.0	82.5	69.5	63.0
\$300,000 to \$400,000	90.0	83.5	70.5	64.0
\$400,000 and over	91.0	84.5	71.5	65.0

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, Jan. 22, 1963.

TABLE 2.—Comparison of tax rates under proposed program and present law for single persons

Taxable income bracket	Under proposed program			
	Under present law	Calendar year 1963	Calendar year 1964	Calendar year 1965
0 to \$1,000	20.0	18.5	15.5	14.0
\$1,000 to \$2,000	20.0	19.0	17.0	16.0
\$2,000 to \$4,000	22.0	21.0	19.0	18.0
\$4,000 to \$6,000	26.0	25.0	22.0	21.0
\$6,000 to \$8,000	30.0	28.5	25.5	24.0
\$8,000 to \$10,000	34.0	32.0	29.0	27.0
\$10,000 to \$12,000	38.0	36.0	32.0	30.0
\$12,000 to \$14,000	43.0	41.0	36.0	34.0
\$14,000 to \$16,000	47.0	44.5	39.5	37.0
\$16,000 to \$18,000	50.0	47.5	42.5	40.0
\$18,000 to \$20,000	53.0	50.0	45.0	42.0
\$20,000 to \$22,000	56.0	53.0	48.0	45.0
\$22,000 to \$26,000	59.0	56.0	50.0	47.0
\$26,000 to \$32,000	62.0	59.0	53.0	50.0
\$32,000 to \$38,000	65.0	62.0	56.0	52.0
\$38,000 to \$44,000	69.0	65.5	58.5	55.0
\$44,000 to \$50,000	72.0	68.0	61.0	57.0
\$50,000 to \$60,000	75.0	71.0	62.0	58.0
\$60,000 to \$70,000	78.0	73.0	64.0	59.0
\$70,000 to \$80,000	81.0	76.0	65.0	60.0
\$80,000 to \$90,000	84.0	78.0	67.0	61.0
\$90,000 to \$100,000	87.0	81.0	68.0	62.0
\$100,000 to \$150,000	89.0	82.5	69.5	63.0
\$150,000 to \$200,000	90.0	83.5	70.5	64.0
\$200,000 and over	91.0	84.5	71.5	65.0

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, Jan. 22, 1963.

TABLE 3.—*Tax program for individuals*DISTRIBUTION BY ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME CLASS OF THE FULL YEAR EFFECT OF ALL TAX CHANGES DIRECTLY AFFECTING INDIVIDUALS¹

Adjusted gross income class	Number of taxable returns	Tax liability under present law ²	Proposed rate change	Estimated revisions	Estimated total
0 to \$3,000	9.7	Millions \$1,450	Millions -\$410	Millions -\$150	Millions -\$560
\$3,000 to \$5,000	10.5	4,030	-1,090	-40	-1,130
\$5,000 to \$10,000	22.9	18,300	-4,520	+730	-3,790
\$10,000 to \$20,000	6.7	12,710	-2,690	+770	-1,920
\$20,000 to \$50,000	1.0	6,760	-1,410	+590	-820
\$50,000 and over	.2	4,170	-920	+540	-380
Total	51.0	47,420	-11,040	+2,440	-8,600

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY INCOME CLASS

0 to \$3,000	19.0	3.1	3.7	-6.1	7
\$3,000 to \$5,000	20.6	8.5	9.9	-1.6	13
\$5,000 to \$10,000	44.9	38.6	40.9	29.9	44
\$10,000 to \$20,000	13.1	26.8	24.4	31.6	22
\$20,000 to \$50,000	2.0	14.3	12.8	24.2	10
\$50,000 and over	.4	8.8	8.3	22.1	4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100

PERCENT OF TAX LIABILITY UNDER PRESENT LAW

0 to \$3,000	100.0	-28.3	-10.3	-39
\$3,000 to \$5,000	100.0	-27.0	-1.0	-28
\$5,000 to \$10,000	100.0	-24.7	+4.0	-21
\$10,000 to \$20,000	100.0	-21.2	+6.1	-15
\$20,000 to \$50,000	100.0	-20.9	+8.7	-12
\$50,000 and over	100.0	-22.1	+12.9	-9
Total	100.0	-23.3	+5.1	-18

¹ Excludes capital gains revisions. The net direct change is of minor revenue significance. The greater volume of transactions that can be expected will produce a revenue gain of \$725,000,000.

² Excluding tax on capital gains at 25 percent alternative rate.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, Jan. 22, 1963.

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL MESSAGE ON TAX REDUCTION AND TAX REFORM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the special message on tax reduction and reform conforms to the same concept of the role of government in our lives reflected in the earlier messages: state of the Union, budget, and Economic Report—the planned economy by the Federal Government. Government planners are to replace the millions of decisions by millions of citizens that we respectfully and appreciatively call the private market and free society.

Generalities mainly are all that can be said at this time in speaking of the tax message, until the rather general message is replaced by a specific tax bill submitted by the President. There are basic concepts that must be challenged and contradicted: First, that tax cuts need not be matched by expenditure cuts; second, that deficits lead to prosperity, that spending money we do not have will create wealth, not debt; third, that we need not fear inflation on the one hand, nor weaken the dollar again through further imbalance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, why must we forget lessons of experience? New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier deficit financing

and pump priming failed to solve the problems intended and left us with the debt as a remembrance of our fiscal stupidity. Why cannot we try the American way, private enterprise, individual initiative and hustle, less—not more—government, less tax, less spending?

If we will do this, balance the budget, build a surplus, pay down the debt, reduce Government's scope and operation, we will free money for reinvestment, free brains for economic growth instead of trying to outwit Government redtape and control which continually throttles economic growth.

The President, in his message, recognizes the sensible approach to tax reform in the Baker-Herlong formula, which I have been happy to cosponsor, but then he completely negates this positive approach to fiscal responsibility by trying to make us believe that such tax reform need not be related to the budget or to spending. Once again, in very broad terms because he has not spelled out any specifics for tax cuts and reform, he reflects the fuzzy thinking of his economic advisers who have demonstrated a lack of faith in the private enterprise system in spite of the fact that their theories have proven to be impractical and stultifying to economic growth. We need only to look at Western Germany which spurned the program now being presented to us when it was offered to them by Walter Heller, the President's chief economic spokesman and West Germany prospered under private enterprise. This did not

discourage Mr. Heller who now, through the President, wants this Nation to sail the uncharted seas of economic theory and experimentation, and the President obviously is following his advice.

Mr. Speaker, just once, let Congress take a long step forward in returning to the sound, basic economics of private investment, private initiative, the free enterprise capitalist system under which we became the greatest, the wealthiest, the most powerful, the best fed, the best clothed, the best educated people on earth. We can do this by rejecting the fuzzy economic proposals of the President for spending ourselves rich and adopting in this session of Congress a fiscal program based on living within our means as a Government so that the people may keep more of their own money and unleash the tremendous power inherent in a free people motivated by the heights to which they may attain through their own talent, ability, and willingness to work and risk.

It will be in this spirit, I hope, that the Committee on Ways and Means will study the President's tax proposals so that Congress may encounter with a basically sound economic program developed on the same basic American principles which have given this Nation the highest standard of living in the history of man, offered greater opportunity to more people and given to every man the chance to be his own master, not bonded to a government through what amounts to total confiscation through high taxes made necessary by huge spending.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 163) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Charles B. Hoeven, of Iowa; Paul B. Dague, of Pennsylvania; Page Belcher, of Oklahoma; Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine; Charles M. Teague, of California; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; Don L. Short, of North Dakota; Catherine May, of Washington; Delbert L. Latta, of Ohio; Ralph Harvey, of Indiana; Paul Findley, of Illinois; Robert Dole, of Kansas; Ralph F. Beermann, of Nebraska; Edward Hutchinson, of Michigan.

Committee on Appropriations: William H. Harrison, of Wyoming; Ben Reifel, of South Dakota; Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire.

Committee on Armed Services: Leslie C. Arends, of Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, of Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, of Oregon; William H. Bates, of Massachusetts; Alvin E. O'Konski, of Wisconsin; William G. Bray, of Indiana; Bob Wilson, of California; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., of New Jersey; Charles S. Gubser, of California; Frank J. Becker, of New York; Charles E. Chamberlain, of Michigan; Alexander Pirnie, of New York; Edward G. Hall, of Missouri; Donald D. Clancy, of Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, of Vermont; Ed Foreman, of Texas.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Clarence E. Kilburn, of New York; William B. Widall, of New Jersey; Eugene Siler, of Kentucky; Paul A. Fino, of New York; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Seymour Halpern, of New York; James Harvey, of

Michigan; Oliver P. Bolton, of Ohio; William E. Brock, III, of Tennessee; Robert A. Taft, Jr., of Ohio; Joseph M. McDade, of Pennsylvania; Sherman P. Lloyd, of Utah; Burt L. Talcott, of California.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Joel T. Broylehill, of Virginia; James C. Auchincloss, of New Jersey; William L. Springer, of Illinois; Anchors Nelsen, of Minnesota; Alvin E. O'Konski, of Wisconsin; William H. Harsha, Jr., of Ohio; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland; Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.

Committee on Education and Labor: Peter Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey; William H. Ayres, of Ohio; Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan; Albert H. Quie, of Minnesota; Charles E. Goodell, of New York; Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana; John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio; Dave Martin, of Nebraska; Alphonzo Bell, of California; M. G. (Gene) Snyder, of Kentucky.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio; E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; William S. Mailiard, of California; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey; William S. Broomfield, of Michigan; Robert R. Barry, of New York; J. Irving Whalley, of Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, of Iowa; E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota; Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois; F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts; James F. Battin, of Montana; Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin.

Committee on Government Operations: R. Walter Riehman, of New York; George Meader, of Michigan; Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan; George M. Wallhauser, of New Jersey; John B. Anderson, of Illinois; Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania; Ogden R. Reid, of New York; Frank J. Horton, of New York; K. William Stinson, of Washington; Robert McClory, of Illinois.

Committee on House Administration: Willard S. Curtin, of Pennsylvania; Joe Skubitz, of Kansas.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania; J. Ernest Wharton, of New York; E. Y. Berry, of South Dakota; Jack Westland, of Washington; Craig Hosmer, of California; J. Edgar Chenoweth, of Colorado; John Kyl, of Iowa; Hjalmar Nygaard, of North Dakota; Homer E. Abele, of Ohio; Joe Skubitz, of Kansas; Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois; Laurence J. Burton, of Utah; Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: John B. Bennett, of Michigan; William L. Springer, of Illinois; Paul F. Schenck, of Ohio; J. Arthur Younger, of California; Milton W. Glenn, of New Jersey; Samuel L. Devine, of Ohio; Anchors Nelsen, of Minnesota; Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts; Willard S. Curtin, of Pennsylvania; Abner W. Sibal, of Connecticut; Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska; James T. Broylehill, of North Carolina; Donald G. Brotzman, of Colorado.

Committee on the Judiciary: William M. McCulloch, of Ohio; William E. Miller, of New York; Richard H. Poff, of Virginia; William C. Cramer, of Florida; Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia; George Meader, of Michigan; John V. Lindsay, of New York; William T. Cahill, of New Jersey; Garner E. Shriver, of Kansas; Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland; James E. Bromwell, of Iowa; Carleton J. King, of New York; Pat Martin, of California.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Thor C. Tollefson, of Washington; William K. Van Pelt, of Wisconsin; William S. Mailiard, of California; Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington; Milton W. Glenn, of New Jersey; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas; George A. Goodling, of Pennsylvania; Stanley R. Tupper, of Maine; Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio; James R. Grover, Jr., of New York; Rogers C. B. Morton, of Maryland.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, of Iowa; Joel T. Broylehill, of Virginia; August E. Johansen, of Michigan; Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska; George M. Wall-

hauser, of New Jersey; Robert R. Barry, of New York; Katharine St. George, of New York; Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas; Homer E. Abele, of Ohio.

Committee on Public Works: James C. Auchincloss, of New Jersey; William C. Cramer, of Florida; John F. Baldwin, Jr., of California; Fred Schwengel, of Iowa; Howard W. Robison, of New York; William H. Harsha, Jr., of Ohio; James Harvey, of Michigan; John C. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania; Robert T. McLoskey, of Illinois; James R. Grover, Jr., of New York; James H. Quillen, of Tennessee; Carl W. Rich, of Ohio; James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts; James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania; J. Edgar Chenoweth, of Colorado; William K. Van Pelt, of Wisconsin; R. Walter Riehman, of New York; Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, of Indiana; Alphonzo Bell, of California; Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington; Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois; James D. Weaver, of Pennsylvania; Edward J. Gurney, of Florida; John W. Wydler, of New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: August E. Johansen, of Michigan; Donald C. Bruce, of Indiana; Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin; John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: William H. Ayres, of Ohio; E. Ross Adair, of Indiana; Paul A. Fino, of New York; John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania; Charles M. Teague, of California; Seymour Halpern, of New York; Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin; Robert F. Ellsworth, of Kansas.

Committee on Ways and Means: Harold R. Collier, of Illinois.

Mr. HALLECK (interrupting reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this list of committee assignments on our side of the aisle has been made public and confirmed in conference this morning, so that all of our Members know about it, and the members of the press know about it, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee assignments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

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

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

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1963.
Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of

1959 (title 50, Appendix, United States Code, sec. 2162(a)(2)), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. Wright Patman, Hon. Albert Rains, Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Hon. William B. Widnall, and Hon. Paul A. Fino.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable unhappiness that I again take to the well of the U.S. House of Representatives, where debate is formed, on the problems of the textile industry. After many years of wonder, doubt, frustration, and disappointment, along with others, I had such great visions and hopes because of the seven-point program announced by the Democratic administration. I have supported that administration and its textile program; I recognize that the hopes, the fortunes, and the future of my people are in the hands of this administration, and the actions and decisions which will be forthcoming will write the success or failure of the textile economy in America for the next three or four decades.

It is said, indeed, that the acknowledged problems of the textile industry have not been solved. It is sad, indeed, that as we progress in so many areas of national growth, we have not made significant progress in solving the textile import problems, progress that we should have had long since, the progress that I am sure the President of the United States wants, but progress to which some in the State Department of this country have never, neither in the past, nor in the present, nor, unless conditions change in the foreseeable future, ever intended, hoped for, or tried to promote. Some have said that I have been too quick to accuse; I only wish that others had been quick to accuse. I say this of no individual, and of no group, but the facts were present yesterday just as they are today in the textile industry. The workers, the people dependent on that industry are suffering, their future is not secure.

South Carolina is a textile State. In the wonderful economy which has brought such a great civilization to my people and those of contiguous areas of South Carolina, to be sure, we have a great farming program, tobacco, dairy, cotton, beef cattle, and production of wool. All of these are important, just as our shipping industry is important, our transportation industry is a necessary ingredient of our economy, and

communications—I could go on and on—but the truth of the matter is that the economy of South Carolina is indelibly wedded to the fortunes of the textile industry of the Nation. When the textile market is soft in New York, the textile mills are not running in South Carolina. When we get some order for shipment of textile goods overseas, wherever that order is directed to a producer, we, in South Carolina, benefit from the demand, because our South Carolina textile industry is as dependent on the overall market just as any other segment of the textile industry, wherever located, is dependent.

Let me pause here to point out that I have no vanity in the remarks I make so frequently about the textile industry and its problems. I would quickly get on my knees to thank the Almighty for deliverance from this plaguing question, seek out the reporters to heap praise on any who would give assistance in our effort or to our ambition. I do not come to criticize, for criticism is futile, the energy wasted, unless some productivity is the end result. I have spoken of betrayals in the past, and my remarks have not, so far, been refuted, but today I would talk of a few facts and figures.

On May 2, 1961, President Kennedy announced his seven-point textile industry program, a program declared to be designed to cover the problems of all fibers, manmade and otherwise. In that program, the President included, as point 4, a direction that the Secretary of Agriculture make recommendations for the offsetting or the elimination of unfavorable differences existing between domestic and foreign prices for cotton. As all know now, this differential, the direct outgrowth of the U.S. Government's cotton policy, allows foreign purchasers to buy U.S. cotton at prices one-fourth less than our own taxpaying domestic mills, employing American labor, must pay for the same cotton. Since that declaration, the Secretary of Agriculture, under the direction of the President, made application to the Tariff Commission for relief, but the Tariff Commission, ignoring the needs of Americans, bought, confused, or brainwashed by some foreign powers or some unjust considerations, decided against the American position, turned down the meritorious plea of Americans that some equalization be effected by the Tariff Commission.

There are too many on the Government payroll who would subscribe to such a program calling for the demise of the textile industry. The decision of the Tariff Commission will ring the infamy with other disgusting betrayals that the history of English speaking people will recite in future years. As a result of this decision, the American textile industry was robbed of its right to fair play, equal consideration, was condemned to a continuation of unjust or greedy discrimination. While, in my opinion, the Tariff Commission sought to buy friendship, those whose pressures bought and brought on an inequitable decision, I am sure, have only contempt for the horrifying weakness of Government as exhibited by the Tariff Commission's betrayal. I appeared at the hearing before the Tariff

Commission, but I knew better than to expect justice. For my part, I am in favor of abolition of the Tariff Commission of the United States as presently conceived.

I see here at this point, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Lenoir, N.C. [Mr. BROYHILL] and I would be happy to have him join us in the tremendous effort which we are making, and I shall yield to him at this time for such remarks as he cares to make.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], on the preparation of these remarks, and I certainly would agree with him that we have not made progress in solving the textile import problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been impressed with the fact that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], has talked in facts and figures here today rather than in accusations, as the gentleman said. I certainly know that the people in our area were very disappointed and dismayed that the Tariff Commission did turn down the proposal to add an equalization fee on foreign textile imports.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem confronting our part of the country and confronting this Nation too, because this is certainly a great industry that is under distress. These textile imports which we see are flooding the markets, Mr. Speaker, and they have ominous consequences not only for the industry but for the workers who are employed in this industry and for the communities which receive their livelihood from this great industry.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], for his courageous stand on this vital problem.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL]. Recently he did me the tremendous courtesy of visiting my office. We talked over many problems which were mutual problems in our particular section of the country and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] evidenced a quick and early interest in the problems of the textile industry. I told the gentleman at the time, and I repeat again today, that I hope his service, which I am sure will be distinguished, will not be plagued by the fact that these problems have not been solved during his tenure here.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan problem. It is the problem of all of us in America, although sometimes we think people in other sections do not seem to appreciate the fact that whatever affects the textile industry in one part of America affects American industry and the American economy everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] for his bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, there are many who committed themselves to the conclusion that the only way to eliminate the two-price cotton system would be: First, reducing the domestic farm price to world level;

and second, a subsidy for domestic consumption, similar to the manner in which exports are presently subsidized. Unfortunately for the ambitions of so many to correct the inequities, up until 1963, the majority in the Congress have exhibited neither inclination nor desire to adopt either alternative. We of the textile areas continue to fight our cause.

Recently, the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. House of Representatives, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, introduced legislation aimed at correction of the two-price inequity. I have not seen the bill because it has not been printed. I commend the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, for his interest, for his effort, and I hope for him the success and achievement which his dedication deserves. I understand that this legislation is designed to promote a domestic subsidy. I am anxious to hear testimony which I hope the legislation will evoke before the Committee on Agriculture. I shall not comment on the merits or demerits at this time.

The American textile industry today is sitting in the seat of ambiguity because of this problem. In Lancaster, S.C., in my congressional district, is the largest textile plant under one roof in the world. This is the Lancaster plant of the Springs Cotton Mills.

Everybody has heard of "Springmaid." I hope they hear of it for decades to come. Certainly, this part of the textile industry deserves the recognition, the accommodation, the continuation that we would wish—a fine, lively progressive American industry. In the Lancaster (S.C.) News of January 17, 1963, I read an article which was entitled "Proposed Legislation Would Affect Area Textile Plants." I would like to place this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point. I call your attention to one significant statement:

The price differential the two-price system causes has been a major factor in the flood of foreign-made cotton textiles entering the American marketplace.

I include the article at this point:
PROPOSED LEGISLATION WOULD AFFECT AREA TEXTILE PLANTS

Proposed legislation to end the inequity of the two-price cotton system, to be introduced early in the next session of Congress at the request of President Kennedy, will have a direct bearing on Lancaster County's textile industry.

The two-price cotton system forces American textile plants to pay 8½ cents a pound more for American-grown cotton than competing foreign textile manufacturers would pay for the same American cotton.

William H. Ruffin, president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, central trade association of the U.S. textile industry, said that the system caused South Carolina plants to pay \$113 million more for the cotton they used during the past 12 months than their oversea competitors would have paid for the same cotton.

The effect of this artificial cost factor on Lancaster County's five textile plants, its more than 6,500 textile workers, and textile payroll should be obvious, Mr. Ruffin said. South Carolina's 338 textile plants weave and

knit almost one-third and finish half of the cotton fabric produced in America, he said.

The price differential the two-price system causes has been a major factor in the flood of foreign-made cotton textiles entering the American marketplace, Mr. Ruffin said.

Imports of cotton products including apparel have increased from 64 million square yards in 1948 to an alltime high of more than a billion yards estimated for 1962. While these imports were increasing, American exports of cotton textiles have dropped from 1½ billion square yards to about one-third that amount, he said.

Such loss of markets, both domestic and foreign, is having an impact on South Carolina with its 122,028 hourly rated textile employees who earn \$412,076,835 a year and its 29,315 apparel plant workers whose annual wage payments total \$66,069,113. Those payroll figures do not include the 14,026 salaried employees of the industries in South Carolina.

Department of Agriculture officials are drawing up a cotton program designed to end the inequity for textile plants while protecting the income levels of cotton farmers, Mr. Ruffin said. This program is to be put before Congress early this session, according to administration sources.

Recently, Mr. Edward Goldberger, treasurer, M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., made a magnificent address before the Charlotte, N.C., Textile Club, December 10, 1962. I am sorry I was not present as I would have loved to have heard it. The Lowenstein group has a great and valuable plant in Rock Hill in my district, interests in Cherokee County and other parts of South Carolina. The title of Mr. Goldberger's address was "Some Problems of the Textile Industry—Who Is to Blame?" Significant is a particular statement from his remarks:

You see, our Government, essentially our State Department, has used world trade as a global weapon, and the pawn in the game has been the textile industry.

I include this fine address in my remarks.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY— WHO IS TO BLAME?

The textile industry for quite some time has been making a number of complaints. Now, what are these complaints? Are they based on fact or groundless. What is wrong with the textile industry?

Recently a textile company reported record sales and sizable earnings. The press carried reports that certain departments of the Government were questioning whether the industry really needed protection after all, and there was also a report that the Commerce Department was going to make an investigation.

What caused all this furor? The company made a record; sales exceeded \$1 billion. This was the first time that any textile company in history had done this. I think it ought to be pointed out that this fantastic showing of sales and the large amount of earnings, the company showed a return of 3.8 percent on sales. The company's annual report has not been published as yet so we are not able to calculate the return on investment.

Now, did this achievement require a congressional investigation? I think it might be pointed out here that, compared to this return on sales of 3.8 percent, U.S. industry as a whole in 1961 showed a return on sales of 5.6 percent, and on investment, U.S. industry, as a whole, showed a return of 8.7 percent. Bear in mind that U.S. industry figures really mean average for all industry. Maybe the Government thought these figures

were out of line since the showing of the textile industry for the fiscal year 1961 was poorer.

The ATMI maintains an index of earnings of what it calls leading companies—six of them—Burlington Industries, Cone Mills, Dan River Mills, M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., Reeves Bros. and J. P. Stevens Co. If the figures for these six companies were combined for the year 1961, they would reflect a return of 2.1 percent on sales and 4.65 percent on investment. Bear in mind the figure of U.S. industry as a whole in 1961 showing 5.6 percent on sales and 8.7 percent on investment. The textile industry, accordingly, did only 37 percent as well as industry generally on sales, and 53 percent as well on investment.

Let us suppose we were to buy one share of each of these companies; the package would cost us, based upon recent market prices, approximately \$100. The book value of these combined shares would be approximately \$195. There would be net current assets—that is current assets less all liabilities, current and noncurrent, of approximately \$77. Probably no other industry would reflect such large asset values.

Now, all of this in an industry which had 23,700,000 cotton spindles in 1939 and 16,500,000 in 1962. Maybe we shouldn't be so sad when we realize that Great Britain had 55,600,000 spindles in 1913 and now, half a century later, has only 9,700,000.

So, what is wrong with the textile industry? And when I speak of the textile industry I am referring to the cotton textile industry, the industry manufacturing broad woven cotton fabrics. May I be so bold as to suggest a few answers:

The first matter is Government policy. If you were to tell any knowledgeable person that a U.S. textile manufacturer has to pay 25 percent more for his cotton than any foreign purchaser, he will look at you in amazement. At first he may say it isn't so. When you show him that a foreign mill gets the benefit of a subsidy of 8½ cents per pound on American cotton, he may say, "Well, why not buy foreign cotton?" The answer is that we are not allowed to buy foreign cotton. There are rigid quotas set which limit the amount of foreign cotton which can enter the United States. The total which can be brought in, in any year, is equivalent to 1 day's operation of U.S. mills.

Our Government, in the interest of aiding the farmer, has set up support prices. These are called loans. The farmer can put his cotton into the loan on a nonrecourse basis and if the Government, so to speak, forecloses on the loan, the cotton cannot be sold until much later, and then only at a premium price. Now, this price which the Government sets as its support price is at present 8½ cents per pound over the world price. Of necessity, it is passed on to the consumer in the form of a higher price for the cloth or article made from the cloth. When I say it is passed on to the consumer, that may be an overliberalization. Based upon actual practice, it would seem that a good part of this excess cost is borne by the U.S. manufacturer since he is not able to pass this item along to the consumer and, at the same time, make a decent profit. But aside from this factor, there are other bad effects:

1. Competing fibers can undersell cotton with these artificial costs included.

2. The competition in the marketplace for the consumer's dollar in his choice of all products is made that much more difficult for cotton products.

I don't want to go into the history of agricultural price supports; they were designed to enable the farmer to exist at a time when cotton was selling at 5 cents a pound. Today the cotton economy of our country has changed. There are rigid limitations on the acreage which can be planted for cotton.

The total amount of cotton produced on small farms is not great. Large planters would be content to operate without any Government subsidy or support if production controls were eliminated. The situation is political. Government fears the repercussions that would come from the elimination of marginal farms.

The industry has long complained of the inequitable situation that has resulted from this two-price system of cotton pricing. It has taken a long time to get the thought across to Washington. Now, finally, there is an awareness by the Government that the cotton textile industry has problems, and one of them is the unrealistically high domestic price of cotton. The President has stated that steps will be taken to bring cotton to the mills at the world price. Let us not accept this as an accomplished fact; there is still a long row to hoe, and whether this will come about, and if so, when, are questions about which I would not like to chance a guess. At least the Government is aware of the problem, and policy pronouncements have been made at the highest levels.

I will return to this subject of cotton after I touch upon another area—foreign imports. Until fairly recently the United States was a net exporter of cotton textiles. Following World War II almost every nation set out to have its own textile industry. I might add that they were aided and abetted by the U.S. Government. They were encouraged to build plants, given funds, loans, machinery, cotton and know-how. Countries which had no tradition of history of textile manufacture became textile manufacturers overnight. Places such as Taiwan, Korea, and even the minuscule territory of Hong Kong began to be manufacturers and exporters of textiles. Japan felt she had a proprietary right to a portion of the U.S. market and was the first to secure a fixed slice of our market, at the same time forbidding the import to its land of any U.S. textiles. You know the story—everyone jumped on the bandwagon; practically every country with a loom started shipping to the United States. It didn't matter whether their own people had enough textiles: the U.S. dollar was what they wanted.

In 1961 the U.S. per capita consumption of textiles was 35½ pounds. In 1959 the per capita consumption of textiles in India was 4½ pounds. But India became, and is, a large exporter of textiles to the United States: result—the United States is now a net importer of textiles.

A lot of things have happened in a few years, including the change in the U.S. position in the matter of balance of payments. Why has this situation of imports come about? These foreign countries were able to buy U.S. cotton at 25 percent below the cost of the U.S. manufacturer and ship their product here and undersell the American manufacturer.

In 1952-53 the fabric value of 20 cotton constructions was a little over 68 cents per pound. In August 1962, it was 61 cents. In other words, textile manufacturers received 10 percent less for the product in 1962 than they did 10 years before. The cost of cotton in 1952-53 was 36 cents a pound. In August 1962, it was practically unchanged. However, the mill margin—the difference between what the manufacturer pays for his cotton and gets for his cloth—went down from 32 to 25 cents, a difference of 20 percent.

Bear in mind that the foreign manufacturer has been able during this period to buy his cotton at approximately 25 percent less than the price paid by the American manufacturer. This has been a major cause in depressing prices of American textiles. Also bear in mind, in connection with the above figures and the drop in the mill margin, the increases which the manufacturer of textiles has had during this 10-year period—labor, supplies, to say nothing about

additional depreciation charges due to increased costs of machinery.

Now, cotton is not the only reason why the competition from low-wage foreign countries is unfair competition. Even though U.S. fabric manufacturers could buy cotton at the world price, these foreign countries could undersell us. Their labor rates are only a fraction of ours. U.S. textile manufacturers cannot compete with products made in countries paying slave-labor rates. We are confronted with a battle that involves widely different standards of living. It is a great fallacy to think that American ingenuity can find a way to overcome matters so basic as the low wages paid by many foreign producers.

Imports are a threat not only to textiles; they are a threat to practically every field of endeavor in the country. Not so many years ago many industries took little interest in the problems of imports. They felt it applied only to someone else. One could run through a long list of industries which realize the menace of unregulated imports from low-wage countries, but our subject is cotton textiles. Foreign mills can buy U.S. cotton at a big discount off the price U.S. mills must pay. Foreign mills have a labor cost advantage which U.S. mills in no way equalize.

You see, our Government, essentially our State Department, has used world trade as a global weapon, and the pawn in the game has been the textile industry. We all recognize the international problems which our Government faces and we must all do our share, but we insist that the cost of our Government's global strategy is not to be borne exclusively by the American textile industry.

It has always seemed to me to be an anachronism that the United States, an industrial nation, should have a policy of excluding raw materials, such as cotton, while allowing unlimited entry of the products made from cotton. This has been precisely the policy up to the recent international limitation agreement.

After ceaseless cries by the industry the Government has finally given its ear. A temporary 1-year international agreement limiting imports and a 5-year limitation agreement have been signed. This has come about only after the industry has clamored long and loud for effective quotas on the importation of foreign textiles. For the year of the operation of the temporary agreement, imports have exceeded the agreed-upon quotas by 30 percent. The effectiveness of the restraints leaves much to be desired. But, at least some limitations have been set and we are hopeful that the future will see these limitations better controlled.

Thus you can see the need for quantity limitations on imports as well as the need for availability of cotton to U.S. mills at the same price at which foreign mills can buy it. I am hopeful that action will be taken on cotton price equalization. Had the Tariff Commission ruled favorably on the application for an equalization fee on imports with the cotton cost of imported fabrics equaling the cotton cost to U.S. mills, we would have had this phase largely solved, but the Commission ruled otherwise. Legislation seems to be the only answer now. I would point out that there is no move without a checkmate; the elimination of the differential at one fell swoop could result in great injury to the industry. The possible drop in inventory value could be great and the uncertainty of prices during the changeover period could be harmful to business generally. I feel that consideration should be given to reimbursement to all in the manufacturing and distributing and processing field for any adjustment in cotton support prices, in the event that Government policy puts into effect the elimination of support prices. In short, a refund

on the floor stocks should be considered. A gradual shift in this 8½ cents differential—say over a 3-year period—might be wise.

The industry must return to a one-price system. It can never right itself under an artificial, unrealistic, and uneconomic method such as we have now.

I have blamed the Government and I have blamed unfair foreign competition. There is another group that must accept its proper share of blame for the plight of the industry, and that is the American cotton textile industry itself. The law of supply and demand applies to textiles just as it does to any other commodity. Is it intelligent to produce and produce and over-produce when the demand is not there? It is not a question of capacity. The industry does not have excess capacity as such unless one says that three shifts 6 days a week (and in some places more than 6 days) is "normal." Probably, with all the problems of foreign competition, the industry, operating at 5 days a week, would be hard put to meet demands but "no," we run hell-bent for election as though the market was burning up.

Does any other industry operate with such imbalance? The steel industry doesn't feel embarrassed to operate at a percentage of capacity if the orders are not there. The automobile industry does the same. Texas does it for its oil industry. But it seems to be a badge of honor to run textile mills even if no orders exist.

The charts show this clearly. In periods when inventories are low and forward orders high, prices are up; and, conversely, when inventories are high and forward orders low, prices are depressed, but that seems to be the time to turn on the steam and produce a bit more. There are reasons, of course—the industry has widespread individual ownership and management. It is an industry which probably has more rugged individualists than any other. There is a mistaken notion of getting ahead of the depreciation by running overtime and paying time and a half. There is also a feeling of getting a little advantage over one's friendly competition by producing more and more. And, finally, there is a lack of knowledge and appreciation of the needs of the market and one's relation thereto.

Now, what can be done about it? Individual companies should recognize the need for industrial statesmanship and pursue a course of action consistent with some elementary economic principles. In short, they should regulate their production with demand. Maybe Congress will set up a bureau to give its blessing to an industry imposing self-limitation. This could carry with it a danger to the whole system of free enterprise. But, if antitrust laws forbid action in concert and individuals fail to see the need for intelligent individual action, we may have to look to government to save us from ourselves.

Gentlemen, we have a great industry. We must be wise enough to see our problems and bold enough to examine ourselves. Our industry has been mistreated. We hope redress will be made. There are indications that for the first time in a long time there is an understanding of the problem; a realization in high government of the need for action, and the determination that some tangible things be accomplished. Industry too must take its part in solving this difficult problem.

Let me pause here to salute the foresight of Mr. Goldberger, to tell him of the continuing gratitude of those of us who live in a textile area for his great textile group and others which give our people employment, who provide great and good impact on our economy.

We of the textile industry have tried to impress those in power with the neces-

sity of a strong textile industry for purposes of defense. One of the causes of Napoleon's defeat in Russia was lack of clothing, as we have said before here. We fool ourselves today to think that we engage only in a cold war, but for the men who are risking their lives in the Strategic Air Command flights and other flights, emphasizing the readiness of the United States to fight—and some have died in the crashes—and as well as to those who are dying in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, the war is a hot war. I am not one of those who is so deluded by the Russian promise of peace as to believe that we could not have a hot war any minute. We need textiles for defense purposes, and I include here an article from the *Clover (S.C.) Herald* of January 17, 1963, which so ably expresses this truth:

CLOTHING FOR COMBAT REQUIRES TEXTILE AID

In recent years, imaginative textile people have pooled their knowledge and resources with those of military quartermaster personnel to produce an astonishing array of unusual military items.

These include such things as bulletproof fabric vests, lightweight but strong parachutes to bring space capsules back to earth, collapsible bulk storage tanks for oil and gas, high-speed ejection equipment for supersonic aircraft, and easily laundered uniforms for crew members on atomic submarines.

Now, the same sort of imagination and knowledge is hard at work on another urgently needed military clothing item: a single uniform which will provide a combined system of protection against both natural and enemy-imposed combat conditions.

The nature of modern military operations makes it impractical to issue different sets of clothing to protect individual soldiers against chemicals, biological agents, climate conditions, radiation, and other factors. All of these protective factors must be built into a single, all-purpose uniform, military clothing and equipment men believe.

According to the Chief of the Clothing and Organic Materials Division of the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, what is needed is a material which will include:

1. A fiber which will provide a maximum contribution in meeting functional needs.
2. A fabric structure which would be as light in weight and as durable as possible and, yet, would itself be an important part of protecting individual combat troops.
3. A textile finish to add still more functional and protective properties.

"We are currently searching for finishes which will provide positive protection against the heat effects of nuclear weapons and chemical warfare agents," the military scientists say. Already, experiments have been conducted with finishes which foam up instantly when high intensity thermal radiation strikes and thus provide thickness for shielding. Another of their experiments is with a foam which produces a shielding smoke.

Also under study are dyes which will provide protection against visual observation, infrared photography, and infrared viewing devices such as sniper scopes which permit a sniper to see a target in the dark.

The development of such things may seem like something straight out of the old "Buck Rogers" comic strip, but they are a serious part of the work being done every day by the modern, progressive American textile industry. They are another illustration of the part the industry plays in the security and military preparedness of the United States.

Recently I was privileged to join the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. House of Representatives, on a trip to North and South Carolina. In the group were the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman Harold Cooley, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; Cotton Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, E. C. Gathings; the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. George M. Grant; the gentleman from Missouri, Hon. Paul Jones; the gentleman from South Carolina, Hon. John L. McMillan; the gentleman from California, Hon. Harlan Hagan; the gentleman from Nebraska, Hon. Ralph Beermann; Hon. Parker T. Stanton, counsel of the committee; members of the committee's staff, and others. The gentlemen from North Carolina, Congressman ALTON LENNON and Congressman CHARLES JONAS, accompanied us at Kannapolis, N.C., and the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman BRYAN DORN later joined us at Clemson, S.C. To each of these men who gave of his time and experience to this trip, I express my continuing gratitude and my sincere salutation. I have written to each of them to tell them how good it was to have these great men of the Congress come to our textile mills to talk with us about the problems of our two-price cotton system.

We left National Airport on the morning of January 10, 1963, and flew to Salisbury, N.C., where we boarded a bus and went to the Cannon Mills at Kannapolis, N.C. There we were greeted by Mr. C. A. Cannon, chairman of the board of Cannon Mills, a distinguished American, a beloved citizen and philanthropist, a brilliant advocate of the textile industry, its employees, and its dependent and related businesses. We toured the mills at Kannapolis where there are 12,000 employees, in a community of 37,000 people. Incidentally, I might advise here that Kannapolis is unincorporated and so there are no municipal taxes and so the industry there provides such services as police protection, fire protection, garbage disposal, and the like.

Every man, woman, and child in that community is dependent, as a U.S. citizen, on the prosperity and well-being of the textile industry.

This mill complex at Kannapolis uses about 65,000 bales of cotton a year. It could easily convert to rayon which would not only mean the loss of jobs but a dissipation of the cotton industry.

We first went to the opening room, separated from the mills because of the fire hazards, and there we had demonstrated the waste in the cotton because of bagging and ties and many other factors. When a mill buys cotton, it buys the waste along with the cotton. When a mill buys rayon, there is no waste because in rayon the purchase is of net rayon. There was some rayon exhibited to us in the opening rooms, but "Mr. Charlie," as he is affectionately known by his employees, made the statement that he would rather use cotton because he believed cotton is alive, it breathes, has moisture, works better, and in his desire to produce goods on a quality peculiar to his magnificent operation, he felt cotton was best.

Next we toured the cotton storage warehouses, with great sprinkling systems, and saw enough cotton here to last until September 1963.

Next we were taken to the picking room, card room, and spinning room. I was interested to know, in the spinning room, that each spinner has 14 to 16 frames. I was also interested to hear Mr. Cannon and others point out that there were 5,000 employees in these departments, and, until the cotton reached the yarn stage, we were just putting application to it to make it usable. It was pointed out that yarn can be purchased in Portugal and Taiwan and other places and beamed and weaved if we want to buy back our own cotton with the 8½-percent differential given to foreign goods. But if the mills buy foreign yarn, Americans producing yarn lose jobs.

We went on through the cardroom where we saw carded cotton and carded manmade fibers, and there was a considerable comment on the waste factor. For our reasoning and information, it was pointed out that rayon and manmade fibers skip three processes, therefore, eliminating waste.

As we left the weave room we then went to the cloth room and other parts of the mill. I have been in a cotton mill many, many times, but I was impressed again.

We went through the bleachery and up to the sheet department and the towel hemming department. We saw hundreds of people happily engaged in the production of textiles in Kannapolis, N.C.—only about 60 miles from my own hometown—and I could not help but wonder whether we of the Government deserve the confidence they have in the future of America when we allow certain departments of our Government to betray the Government, the President, and the people of this Nation in declaring the textile industry to be expendable and resorting to trade tricks and other tricks to import foreign textiles.

We had lunch at this point before leaving for Clemson, S.C., and I would like to include here the material which was so well explained to us at the luncheon, consisting of certain charts [charts not printed in RECORD] and certain statements:

The excessive cost of U.S. combed cotton goods over Japanese goods amounts to about 40 cents for a broadcloth shirt to the U.S. consumer.

The excessive cost of U.S. combed cotton goods over Japanese goods amounts to about \$1.10 for a double-bed size and \$1.65 for the larger—king size—percale sheet to the U.S. consumer.

The yield per acre has increased from 270 pounds to 444 pounds or 53 percent.

The acreage harvested has decreased from 26.9 to 13.5 million and the production has remained about the same, although there has been an increase in population of about 40 million people. Thus the American farmer has been deprived of any benefit which he should have reaped on account of increased efficiency.

Foreign cotton production and consumption have gone up steadily while U.S. production and consumption have remained stationary in spite of a population increase of about 40 million.

The production of cotton in the United States has dropped from 39 percent of the

world total to 30 percent and the U.S. consumption has dropped from 26 to 19 percent of the world total.

The charts and explanations speak for themselves. They show the advantage the Japanese get from our two-price cotton differential. Add this cost advantage to a 7-to-1 labor differential and there can be no longer any wonder why imports from Japan are so cheap.

The two-price cotton program must be replaced with some just system. If we are unwilling to raise tariff rates, would not some import fee, some tax, on our cotton, brought back to plague us, be just? Do not the American textile employees, from the man who sweeps and lays up roping, to the man who makes the major management decision, deserve help from us of the Congress? Do we think more of foreigners and their prosperity than we do of our own people? Of course we do not.

All of us enjoyed our visit to Kannapolis, and I am sure I speak the gratitude of the group to Messrs. Charles A. Cannon, chairman of the board, Mr. William C. Cannon, assistant chairman of the board and vice president, and Mr. Don S. Holt, president, and others, for their hospitality and provision.

Later on January 10, we flew to the new Greenville-Spartanburg Jet Airport, and went to Clemson, S.C. At a dinner at Clemson, we experienced the hospitality and provision of Dr. R. E. Edwards, president of Clemson College, and Mr. W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., vice president, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. At the dinner that night were gathered many figures important to the textile industry in South Carolina. I cannot name all of them. Suffice it to say that they were there because of the acknowledging dangers threatening the textile industry today. Dr. Edwards made a fine brief talk outlining the progress made by Clemson in textile education and leadership. The gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman GATHINGS, and others, commented on the two-price cotton practice.

On Friday, January 11, 1963, we visited the Utica-Mohawk, Clemson plant of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. There, under the direction of Messrs. Robert T. Stevens, president, James Harrell, vice president, W. Gordon McCabe, Jr., vice president, and Mr. W. H. Burton, general manager, we took a tour of the entire plant. Again, we saw happy Americans working the cotton, anxious to continue their jobs, confident that their Government recognizes the problem threatening the industry giving them employment. We had a magnificent visit, and I personally saw many old friends whom I had known in earlier days.

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., is celebrating its 150th anniversary this year. For more than one-half the life of this great Nation, this great company has been a part of the American scene, provided jobs, built plants, and paid taxes, bolstering the economy of communities all over the land. Again, I salute this great company for what it has done, what it wants to do, and for what we hope it will do if we, of the Congress, the adminis-

tration, and we of the Nation, make possible the relief so necessary.

Included in our visit was a stop in which it was pointed out that this entire modern efficient plant could convert to rayon in less than 24 hours.

Later this group toured Deering-Milliken research and production facilities at Spartanburg, S.C. I was unable to continue because of a call from Chester, but the group reports that this visit was informative, hospitable, and educational.

At the same time, we were looking around for some relief to the two-price cotton problem, events all over the world were emphasizing the importations that our textile industry was being subjected to this very year. Some of these may be related, and I quote from a textile periodical:

Some \$3 million has been authorized through the Export-Import Bank to purchase U.S. equipment for a \$5.8 million Greek mill. Construction plans call for \$2 million worth of carding, drawing, doubling, combing, and roving equipment and 108 spinning frames totaling 36,000 spindles to be built by Whiting Machine Works.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has authorized Yugoslavia to purchase \$13.5 million (about 100,000 bales) of American upland cotton. The USDA issued two food-for-peace dollar credit authorizations to Yugoslavia to finance purchase of the cotton and pea beans from U.S. suppliers.

Total U.S. consumption of cotton in November 1962 amounted to 667,192 bales compared with 875,443 bales in November 1961, and 823,270 bales in October 1962. Consumption of synthetic staple rose to 59,121,000 pounds from 56,659,000 in November 1961 but fell from the October level of 71,454,000 pounds. About 19,542,000 cotton spinning spindles were in place on December 1—16,395,000 spinning cotton, 2,335,000 spinning other than cotton, and the remainder inactive.

Despite increased sales, the textile mill products industry lost ground in terms of profits after taxes during the third quarter of 1962. Sales rose to \$3.6 billion from \$3.5 billion in the second quarter. But profits after taxes dropped to \$86 million from \$89 million. Apparel manufacturers' sales rose to \$3.4 billion from \$3.1 billion while profits increased to \$65 million from \$43 million, according to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the FTC.

Manmade fiber fabric imports rose to 5.1 million yards in October from 4 million yards a year earlier. But this was a decline from 7.4 million imported during September. Even so, imports in the first 10 months of 1962 rose to 54.8 million yards—81 percent more than the 30 million yards in the same 1961 period. Japan shipped in more than half the October total (4.3 million yards), increasing shipments to the United States by 1.6 million yards compared with October 1961.

A Commerce Department report from its Charleston, S.C., field office indicates official Washington considers textiles an ailing industry. After glowing accounts of increased bank deposits in several Southern States, bigger department store sales, increased home building and rising employment in the first 9 months of 1962, the report points out that "even the textile industry" reflected "some stability" as 6 percent more bales of cotton were consumed and a "slight gain" was reflected in the number of spindles in place.

New cotton legislation will get nowhere "unless the selfish pulling and hauling" of some producing sections is stopped, a south-

ern Congressman warns. Representative GEORGE GRANT, Democrat of Alabama, third ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, charges western growers are "seemingly intent upon using any new legislation as a vehicle to take cotton allotments from old Cotton-Belt space and move acreage into new areas."

To compensate the United Kingdom for higher tariffs on carpets and glass, the United States is cutting tariffs on 17 items—including textiles and yarns. New rates effective January 1 dropped the duty by 10 percent. Another 10 percent cut is scheduled in 1 year. The move decreased duties on lace window curtains, for example, from 50 to 36 percent on January 1. Next January, the duty will drop to 32 percent.

While imports of cotton fabrics doubled, U.S. exports in the first 10 months of 1962 dropped to 340.7 million yards from 390.9 million a year earlier. This was a 13 percent decline. On the other hand, imports soared to 400.2 million yards from 196.5 million in the January-October 1961, period—shifting the export-import balance of trade to a 60-million-yard deficit from a year-earlier surplus of 194 million.

Scoured wool and cotton cloth from Communist Yugoslavia arrives regularly at Charleston, S.C., for processing in South Carolina and Georgia mills. A Charleston broker—who declines to estimate what portion of the imports are made up by domestic mills for sale in the United States or how much is shipped out again as finished products—explain that Yugoslavian exports under the same customs tariffs applied to other Western European countries. For example, linen would be charged a 10-percent duty. But linen from Czechoslovakia (behind the Iron Curtain) would be charged 40 percent.

October output of spun sales yarn averaged \$15.6 million pounds weekly compared with 16.6 million pounds in October 1961, Census Bureau figures show. Carded cotton sales yarn was down, to 7.3 million pounds; combed was down, to 4.2 million pounds; wool was up, to 2.5 million pounds; and synthetics were up, to 2.5 million pounds.

October exports of manmade fiber fabrics dropped to 10.4 million yards from 13.2 million yards a year ago. Value of shipments also was down from \$6.9 million to \$5.4 million. For the first 10 months of the year 1962, manmade shipments totaled 115 million yards compared with 113.9 million for the same 1961 period. Value of these exports rose to \$63.2 million from \$61.7 million the year before.

About 33 million yards of corduroy entered the United States last year in the form of apparel, some 60 percent more than in 1961. Despite the fact that Japan's exports to this country made up most of the total and represented an "excessive concentration" in particular textile items, thereby violating the bilateral agreement, negotiations begun in September failed to produce an agreement. Domestic producers fear this means continued heavy shipments under the 5-year international cottons agreement (of which Japan is a signatory) since 1962 figures are the base for future shipments.

Upland cotton producers have approved marketing quotas for the 1963 crop by a favorable vote estimated at 93.7 percent, the USDA says. Extra long staple cotton growers approved marketing quotas by an 81.8-percent favorable vote. This means quotas will continue in effect for 1963 crops and that price supports will be available to growers who don't exceed the acreage allotment. Those who do will be subject to penalties on excess production—50 percent of the cotton parity price as of June 15, 1963.

These are just the signs of the times, and I commend them to every American for study.

On November 15, 1962, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute prepared a memorandum at the request of, and presented it to, the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, the Under Secretary of Agriculture. This memorandum is significant, and I include it at this point in the RECORD in order that we may properly document, again, our problems and necessity for a quick and just solution.

THE ESSENTIALITY OF A ONE-PRICE SYSTEM
FOR COTTON

INTRODUCTION

A combination of legislative and administrative policies relating to cotton, including the inequity of the present two-price cotton system, has imposed upon the domestic textile industry an intolerable burden. To correct this inequity a clear-cut return to a one-price system, enabling domestic manufacturers to purchase American-grown cotton at the same price paid by foreign manufacturers, is required.

The desire of the domestic industry to have the Government abolish two-price cotton was expressed in a cotton policy resolution adopted by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute on October 12, 1962, the essence of which was:

1. As early as possible, a return to a one-price system for American cotton whether sold at home or abroad.

2. The exclusion of any form of processing tax on manufactured cotton products.

3. Movement of cotton through normal trade channels rather than Government hands.

4. A fair procedure in respect to the net income position of the cotton farmer.

5. An increase in cotton acreage realistically geared to the increase in the demand for U.S. cotton that will result from a sound long-range cotton program."

PRESIDENTIAL MANDATE

Following a finding of the Tariff Commission to the effect that a cotton textile import fee equal to the raw cotton export subsidy not be imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1939, as amended, the President, on September 6, 1962, made public a statement of his position on the two-price cotton system. In it he stated:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end."

The President observed, in addition, that because the objective undoubtedly could be achieved only through legislative action, he would ask the next session of Congress to enact legislation "designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

A FALLACY DISPOSED OF

Since the Tariff Commission decision and the President's statement, the Department of Agriculture and representatives of all segments of the raw cotton industry from farmers to manufacturers, have been exploring in detail how to achieve the President's objective.

Unfortunately, the idea has been advanced that the inequity can be eliminated by something less than a return to a clear-cut one-price system for cotton, under which the American-grown product would be available to domestic mills and for export at the same price. This idea is both irrelevant and erroneous.

It is irrelevant because the President has directed that the two-price cotton system be abolished.

It is erroneous because the idea is apparently predicated on the belief that it costs foreign mills more to take cotton from the United States and send goods back than it costs domestic mills to bring cotton to the mill and ship goods to the consuming centers.

The fallacy of this idea is rebutted in the attached exhibit A. It should be observed that in the illustration used in exhibit A, Japan was selected because of its distant geographical location and the fact that she imports all cotton used. Other countries which raise as well as spin cotton, enjoy a much greater advantage over the United States than does even Japan.

The differences in the cost of marketing and distribution of cotton and cotton textiles prior to 1956 are present today, and anything less than a complete return to the one-price system will perpetuate that portion of the inequity which is allowed to remain.

THE REAL ISSUE

Among the most significant considerations involved in stating the issue and in providing a remedy are these:

1. The U.S. Government, upon three separate occasions has recognized the raw cotton export subsidy level as constituting a disparity, and has established its policy accordingly.

A. The inability to sell American cotton competitively in the world market prompted the enactment of section 203 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1956. The present export subsidy of 8½ cents per pound on raw cotton is a clear-cut recognition by the United States that without this subsidy the requirements of section 203 would not be met and that U.S. cotton would not be competitive on the world market.

An equivalent payment, adjusted for manufacturing waste loss, is made on cotton textile exports; however, these exports of cotton textiles have trended downward, even with the payment of the full equalization fee.

B. In the letter to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission requesting the Commission to make an immediate investigation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to determine whether an offset fee was necessary to prevent injury from cotton textile imports, President Kennedy directed the inquiry toward "a fee equivalent to the per pound export subsidy rate."

C. During the Tariff Commission's hearing in which the Department of Agriculture brilliantly pleaded for an offset import fee on cotton goods equal to the export subsidy on raw cotton, the Department's spokesman told the Tariff Commission that the export subsidy rate was recommended for the fee because "it is the most accurate measurement we have for the disparity between the domestic prices of cotton and the prices in the world market."

2. A clear-cut one-price cotton system, under which American mills can buy American cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign mills, will contribute to reversing the devastating import trend that is draining the vitality of the industry through which the cotton farmer's product must move to market.

The 1-year international cotton textile arrangement (October 1, 1961, to September 30, 1962) was designed to restrict cotton textile imports to the import level of fiscal year 1961. However, with the additional incentive created by the unfair two-price cotton system, imports of cotton textile products from all countries except Japan exceeded the 1961 fiscal year base by ap-

proximately one-third, establishing an all-time high level of imports. Japanese cotton textile exports to the United States are covered by a separate bilateral arrangement; however, these imports in 9 months have already exceeded the full 12 months bilateral arrangement total.

In the past 10 years U.S. imports of foreign-made cotton products from all countries have risen from the average cotton equivalent of 68,000 bales in 1952 to 225,000 bales in 1956, 234,000 bales in 1958, 526,000 bales in 1960 and an estimated 672,000 bales in 1962.

This upward import trend for the most part has occurred since 1956 when the raw cotton export subsidy program was initiated, creating the two-price system.

A careful examination of these imports reveals that among others sharp increases have occurred in imports of cotton yarns and cotton sheetings. Raw cotton is, of course, a major cost factor in the manufacture of these items.

Since the advent of two-price cotton, active cotton-system spindles have dropped 9.1 percent; active spindles on 100 percent cotton have fallen to an average of 88.7 percent of these active spindles during August-September 1962, while the remaining 11.3 percent of all active cotton-system spindles are now running on synthetic fibers.

Furthermore, textile employment has decreased by 176,000 workers; per-capita mill consumption of cotton has dropped by 3.7 pounds; and imports of cotton textiles continue their relentless upward surge.

Beyond question the import experience of the past few years demonstrates that the devastating impact of these imports cannot and will not be brought under reasonable control until American mills can buy American cotton at the same price foreign mills can purchase it.

The difficulties encountered in the administration of the 1-year international cotton textile arrangement because of the two-price cotton program are carried over into the 5-year international cotton textile arrangement (October 1, 1962, to September 20, 1967), and will continue unless corrected by the establishment of one-price cotton.

To allow these imports to continue at their present rate is to cause a further deterioration in the American textile industry, with its inevitable adverse impact on the entire cotton economy and the millions dependent upon it for livelihood.

3. U.S. mills must use only American-grown upland type cotton, purchased at the U.S. Government supported price, except for an amount equal to less than 1 day's supply. In the 1962-63 cotton season an estimated 34.7 million bales, produced outside the United States, will be available to foreign mills at whatever prices they can bargain for. The result is that the foreigners can buy and do buy an important portion of their requirements at prices even lower than the subsidized U.S. export price. This condition exists today. The price of foreign cotton is 1 to 1½ cents per pound less than the price of U.S. cotton in foreign markets. This is in spite of the requirement in section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, that U.S. cotton be competitively priced abroad. Thus, the inequity for the American mill in many instances is not restricted to the current 8½-cent differential—it is in the neighborhood of 9½ to 10 cents per pound or something more. When adjustments are made for the manufacturing waste losses involved in the higher priced cotton, the inequity is even greater.

4. The United States is the world's largest and most efficient producer of cotton.

The domestic textile manufacturing industry is the largest and most dependable outlet for this production. Primarily through Government imposed cost inequi-

ties, the domestic industry is losing markets at home and abroad, with the number of cotton spindles constantly declining. The U.S. industry is failing to expand its use of cotton, while outside the United States cotton consumption is at record high levels.

A bale of cotton is virtually worthless until it is processed. Thus, except for an uncertain export market, the strength of our Nation's raw cotton economy cannot possibly be any greater than that of the industry through which the product moves to market.

A healthy expanding textile industry with maximum employment and increasing cotton consumption is important not only to millions of those engaged in producing and handling cotton, but it is also vital to the growth and strength of the U.S. economy.

Since the President and the administration have recognized the existence of the undesirability of the two-price cotton system and have resolved to abolish it, the sooner it is forthrightly and completely accomplished, the better it will be for all concerned.

5. In addition to requiring competitive pricing, section 203 requires that we regain and maintain our fair historical share of the world market for cotton. To do otherwise continues to relegate us to the position of residual suppliers.

Expanding cotton exports for dollars is important to cotton farmers and to the industry. It is also vital to the maintenance of a favorable international balance of payments and our gold reserves.

6. Cotton is losing markets here at home to a wide variety of competing fibers and other products. Highly detailed studies by the Department of Agriculture, the National Cotton Council and the textile industry itself demonstrate beyond question that current price levels are destroying markets.

For example, rayon staple fiber production, with an increasing price advantage, continues to advance in the United States. From 1955, when production of rayon staple fiber was 9.9 percent of U.S. cotton consumption, it had increased to 11.6 percent in 1961.

It is the considered judgment of textile manufacturers who consume millions of bales of cotton annually, and who are constantly exploring every conceivable market outlet, that a return to a one-price system for cotton would give cotton an opportunity to share equitably in market expansion and regain some of its losses.

Over and beyond the cold competitive impact involved, a forthright one-price policy would have a tremendous psychological effect on both users and competitors of cotton. To the users it would provide new hope and confidence, with consequent investment incentives, where a lack of confidence now exists; to the competitors it would serve as a warning not to develop or expand competitive products based entirely on an artificially high cotton cost.

7. The U.S. Government backed by a broad cross section of public opinion, apparently is committed to a policy of removing barriers and freeing trade throughout the world. Although the policy has not yet been applied to most major agricultural products, there is no guarantee that this situation is permanent.

Cotton enjoys (1) a supported price substantially above the world level, (2) a virtually complete embargo on competitive imports—therefore a monopoly on domestic consumption, and (3) a legislated provision that export sales must be subsidized to whatever extent is necessary to insure export sales abroad at historic levels.

Everything considered, raw cotton enjoys what is probably the most complete protection of any important American product, either agricultural or manufactured.

However, this preferred position is jeopardized so long as foreign mills can buy U.S.-produced cotton at a price below that which U.S. mills are required to pay.

Supporting statistical tables with additional data are attached as exhibit B.

CONCLUSION

The need for a return to one-price cotton is clear. The President has recognized this need and directed that it be met by the cooperation of all relevant interests in the executive branch of Government. The cotton industry supports the decision of the President and is eager to assist in designing the most desirable method of correcting the situation.

Textile markets already reflect uncertainty and hesitation attendant the timetable of carrying out the President's decision to abolish two-price cotton. Delay in getting the job done will continue to paralyze the market. Cotton will continue to pile up in Government warehouses. Foreign competitors will continue to harvest unearned and unjustified profits.

The return to one-price cotton must be complete and must take effect at the earliest possible moment.

EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF HANDLING AND MARKETING COSTS OF COTTON AND COTTON TEXTILES

Presently, the Federal Government subsidizes the purchase of U.S. cotton by foreign buyers in the amount of 8½ cents per pound. This creates a two-price system for U.S. cotton. It is well known that a substantial

quantity of upland-type raw cotton is exported under this subsidy plan and later shipped back into this country in a manufactured form to compete with the output of U.S. mills. In seeking relief from the disadvantage caused by payment of this subsidy, domestic cotton textile manufacturers have been told that extra transportation and handling charges borne by foreign users of U.S. cotton serve to counteract a part of the 8½-cent-per-pound subsidy enjoyed by the foreign mills.

The purpose of this exhibit is to show that this is not the case. To illustrate the point it will be shown that textile manufacturers in the Southeastern United States do not have a freight advantage over Japanese textile merchants buying U.S. cotton and shipping cotton cloth to major U.S. markets located in either the East, West, or South. Fresno, Calif., is used as the point of origin of the raw cotton for both the foreign mills and the domestic manufacturers. Eastern, western, and southern market points of New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco are used to compare the landed cost of cotton cloth. These examples will show the cost of taking raw cotton from the producing area to the manufacturing areas and the cost of returning cotton cloth to the U.S. markets.

In preparing this exhibit, costs for the freight, handling and other services for textiles were computed on a basis considered most representative of actual movement of goods to and from the areas named. Freight on raw cotton to the domestic mills was considered by rail carload. From Charlotte, N.C., freight on textiles was figured by

motortruck to New York and New Orleans, since the eastern and southern markets require truck service for delivery of cotton fabrics. To San Francisco from Charlotte, N.C., freight is shown via freight forwarder or motortruck because these services are demanded and carry most of the tonnage. Also, the costs for movement of cotton to Japan and cotton cloth from Japan are based on quantities and conditions considered most common.

Various import charges are based on flat charge per entry. Therefore, a typical shipment of 24,000 pounds of cotton cloth was used to measure these entry costs. In computing ocean freight from Japan to the United States, nonconference steamship rate quotations were used, and while these rates may appear low, in many instances they are considerably higher than the rates actually paid by the Japanese shippers. It should be pointed out that various schemes are employed in making ocean freight charges on shipments to and from Japan—wherein part of the cost of transporting cotton is used to further reduce negotiated "tramp" rates on cotton cloth returned to the United States.

The conclusion reached by the following examples A, B, and C is: (1) that the foreign mills have a cost advantage in freight and handling to the San Francisco market of more than 8½ cents per pound; and (2) that the difference between foreign mill cost and domestic mill cost for freight and handling to New York is only two-tenths of a cent per pound and to New Orleans only one-tenth of a cent per pound.

EXAMPLE A.—Comparison of costs for delivery of cotton cloth to the San Francisco market using as nearly as can be determined the typical conditions of transportation

	Amount (cents)	For detail see—		Amount (cents)	For detail see—
To and from Japan:			To and from Charlotte, N.C.:		
Cost of delivery of raw cotton Fresno to Japan (per pound of cotton).	4.660	Exhibit 1.	Cost of delivery of raw cotton from Fresno to Charlotte (per pound of cotton).	4.040	Exhibit 1.
Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Japan to San Francisco (per pound of cloth).	1.908	Exhibit 2.	Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Charlotte to San Francisco (per pound of cloth).	5.990	Exhibit 5.
Total to and from Japan (per pound).	6.558		Total to and from Charlotte (per pound).	10.030	
			Excess cost to domestic mill for delivery to San Francisco market (per pound).	3.372	

EXAMPLE B.—Comparison of costs for delivery of cotton cloth to the New York market using as nearly as can be determined the typical conditions of transportation

	Amount (cents)	For detail see—		Amount (cents)	For detail see—
To and from Japan:			To and from Charlotte, N.C.:		
Cost of delivery of raw cotton Fresno to Japan (per pound of cotton).	4.660	Exhibit 1.	Cost of delivery of raw cotton from Fresno to Charlotte (per pound of cotton).	4.040	Exhibit 1.
Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Japan to New York (per pound of cloth).	1.850	Exhibit 4.	Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Charlotte to New York (per pound of cloth).	2.270	Exhibit 5.
Total to and from Japan (per pound).	6.519		Total to and from Charlotte (per pound).	6.310	
			Excess cost to foreign mill for delivery to New York market (per pound).	0.209	

EXAMPLE C.—Comparison of costs for delivery of cotton cloth to the New Orleans market using as nearly as can be determined the typical conditions of transportation

	Amount (cents)	For detail see—		Amount (cents)	For detail see—
To and from Japan:			To and from Charlotte, N.C.:		
Cost of delivery of raw cotton Fresno to Japan (per pound of cotton).	4.660	Exhibit 1.	Cost of delivery of raw cotton from Fresno to Charlotte (per pound of cotton).	4.040	Exhibit 1.
Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Japan to New Orleans (per pound of cloth).	1.877	Exhibit 3.	Cost of delivery of cotton cloth from Charlotte to New Orleans (per pound of cloth).	2.390	Exhibit 5.
Total to and from Japan (per pound).	6.537		Total to and from Charlotte (per pound).	6.430	
			Excess cost to foreign mill for delivery to New Orleans market (per pound).	.107	

EXHIBIT 1.—Comparison of analysis of cost of purchasing, assembling for shipment, and delivery of raw cotton from origin to Japan through San Francisco and from Fresno, Calif., to Charlotte, N.C.

	San Francisco to Japan	Fresno, Calif., to Charlotte		San Francisco to Japan	Fresno, Calif., to Charlotte
	Points	Points		Points	Points
Buying commission	20	20	Exchange	3	4
Invoicing charge (seller)	10	10	Overhead	50	50
California ad valorem tax	3	3	Ocean freight	171	
Interest (45 days at 5 percent)	21	21	Tare	(1)	(1)
Insurance (interior)	2	2	Controller (foreign)	5	
Receiving and 1 month's storage	19	19	Insurance (marine and war risk)	11	
Loading and/or marking	10	10	Insurance (country damage)	(2)	
Interior compression	38	34	Selling agent's commission	32	20
Freight to port or group 201	48	181	Quality exactness as against claims system under export contracts		30
Forwarding	2		Total charges	466	404
Wharfage	4		Cents per pound	4.66	4.04
Patches	10				
Unloading at port and dock handling	7				

¹ No allowance is made for tare in order to equalize selling terms of export and domestic shipments.

² No allowance is made for country damage insurance as most sales now are made for delivery at shipside with country damage insurance eliminated.

EXHIBIT 2.—Cost of delivering cotton cloth, printed, dyed, or colored, carded—to San Francisco from shipside, Japanese port.¹

	Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting		Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting
A. Ocean freight (nonconference rate quoted Oct. 25, 1962).	\$28.00 per 2,000-pound ton	1.400	E. Customs broker fee	\$15.00 per entry	.063
B. Marine and war-risk insurance	\$0.3375 per \$100 valuation	.327	F. Forwarding agent's fee	\$7.50 per entry	.031
C. Wharfage	\$0.80 per 2,000-pound ton or 40 cubic feet	.060	G. Surety bond	\$0.50 per \$1,000	.049
D. Dock handling fee	\$1.35 per 2,000-pound ton	.068	Total charges		1.998

¹ In order to convert tariff charges (which vary with size of shipment, valuation, and method of packaging) to cents per pound of cloth, an example is shown of a shipment of 24,000 pounds of sheeting valued at 97 cents per pound at shipside, Japanese port.

The price of 97 cents used was taken from Department of Commerce FT. 110, July 1962, as the valuation of this type of cloth imported from Japan during July 1962.

EXHIBIT 3.—Cost of delivering cotton cloth, printed, dyed, or colored, carded—to New Orleans from shipside, Japanese port.¹

	Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting		Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting
A. Ocean freight (nonconference rate quoted Oct. 23, 1962).	\$28.00 per 2,000-pound ton	1.400	E. Forwarding agent's fee	\$8.50 per entry	.035
B. Marine and war-risk insurance	\$0.3375 per \$100 valuation	.327	F. Surety bond	\$0.50 per \$1,000 valuation	.049
C. Wharfage	\$0.15 per 2,000-pound ton	.008	Total charges		1.877
D. Customs broker fee	\$14.00 per entry	.058			

¹ In order to convert tariff charges (which vary with size of shipment, valuation, and method of packaging) to cents per pound of cloth, an example is shown of a shipment of 24,000 pounds of sheeting valued at 97 cents per pound at shipside, Japanese port.

The price of 97 cents used was taken from Department of Commerce FT. 110, July 1962, as the valuation of this type of cloth imported from Japan during July 1962.

EXHIBIT 4.—Cost of delivering cotton cloth, printed, dyed, or colored, carded—to New York from shipside, Japanese port.¹

	Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting		Tariff charges in dollars per unit shown	Tariff charges converted to cents per pound of sheeting
A. Ocean freight (nonconference rate quoted Oct. 23, 1962).	\$28.00 per 2,000-pound ton	1.400	E. Forwarding agent's fee	Included in customs charge	
B. Marine and war-risk insurance	\$0.3375 per \$100 valuation	.327	F. Surety bond	\$0.50 per \$1,000 valuation	.049
C. Wharfage	None		Total charges		1.859
D. Customs broker fee	\$20 per entry	.083			

¹ In order to convert tariff charges (which vary with size of shipment, valuation, and method of packing) to cents per pound of cloth, an example is shown of a shipment of 24,000 pounds of sheeting valued at 97 cents per pound at shipside, Japanese port.

The price of 97 cents used was taken from Department of Commerce FT. 110, July 1962, as the valuation of this type of cloth imported from Japan during July 1962.

EXHIBIT 5.—Freight rates on cotton cloth from Charlotte, N.C.

To: Destination	Freight rate per hundred-weight	Shipment via	To: Destination	Freight rate per hundred-weight	Shipment via
New York	\$2.27	Motor truck, ¹	San Francisco	5.99	Freight forwarder ² or motor truck ⁴
New Orleans	2.39	Motor truck, ²			

¹ Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Agent, Motor Freight Tariff No. 9-R, MF-I.C.C. 1186.

² Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, Agent, Motor Freight Tariff No. 514-H, MF-I.C.C. 1179.

³ Freight Forwarders Tariff Bureau, Inc., Tariff No. 6-B, I.C.C.-F.F. No. 54.

⁴ Rocky Mountain Motor Tariff Bureau, Tariff No. 25-B, MF-I.C.C. No. 133.

EXHIBIT B

SUPPORTING STATISTICAL TABLES

Exhibit B-1

U.S. cotton export programs			U.S. cotton textile imports				U.S. cotton export programs			U.S. cotton textile imports			
Cotton seasons	Export arrangements	Export discounts (cents per pound)	Calendar years	Cotton manufacturers (thousands of cotton bale equivalents)	Countable cotton cloth only (millions of square yards)	Cotton yarn (thousands of square yard equivalents) ¹	Cotton seasons	Export arrangements	Export discounts (cents per pound)	Calendar years	Cotton manufacturers (thousands of cotton bale equivalents)	Countable cotton cloth only (millions of square yards)	Cotton yarn (thousands of square yard equivalents) ¹
1952-53	None		1952	67.5	36.3	1,141	1958-59	Competitive bid (payment in kind subsidy)	-----	1958	233.8	142.6	3,850
1953-54	do		1953	92.8	60.3	901	1959-60	Payment in kind subsidy	6.5				
1954-55	do		1954	101.0	73.5	1,086	1960-61	do	8.0	1959	360.0	241.0	6,348
1955-56	Competitive bid (short staple only)		1955	181.2	133.2	653	1961-62	do	6.0	1960	525.5	454.9	69,649
1956-57	Competitive bid		1956	225.0	188.2	865	1962-63	do	8.5	1961	393.1	254.5	63,954
1957-58	do		1957	199.1	122.4	741			8.5	1962	2,671.6	2,471.7	2,102,184

¹ Converted from pounds to square yards by 4.6 square yards to the pound of yarn.² Annual rate based on 8 months, data.

Source: Compiled from data of U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Commerce.

EXHIBIT B-2.—Cumulative monthly totals of the level of U.S. cotton textile imports, short-term Geneva arrangement

[In millions of square yards]

	Percent of base per month, cumulative	Fiscal year 1961 base, cumulative	Actual imports, cumulative	Under or over fiscal year 1961 base, cumulative	Percent actual imports to base			Percent of base per month, cumulative	Fiscal year 1961 base, cumulative	Actual imports, cumulative	Under or over fiscal year 1961 base, cumulative	Percent actual imports to base
October	8	45.4	41.7	-3.7	7	April	58	328.9	448.6	+119.7	79	
November	17	96.4	83.5	-12.9	15	May	67	380.0	514.0	+134.0	91	
December	25	141.8	141.2	-0.6	25	June	75	425.3	572.4	+147.1	101	
January	33	187.1	213.3	+26.2	38	July	83	470.6	626.0	+155.4	110	
February	42	238.1	285.7	+47.6	50	August	92	521.6	689.7	+168.1	122	
March	50	283.5	363.7	+80.2	64	September	100	566.9	753.7	+186.8	133	

EXHIBIT B-3.—U.S. cotton system spindle activity

Cotton crop year beginning Aug. 1	Spindles ¹ active (thousands)	Percent active—		Cotton crop year beginning Aug. 1	Spindles ¹ active (thousands)	Percent active—	
		On 100 percent cotton	On other fibers			On 100 percent cotton	On other fibers
1954-55	20,716	92.4	7.6	1959-60	19,228	91.2	8.8
1955-56	20,557	92.5	7.5	1960-61	18,986	91.0	9.0
1956-57	19,760	91.5	8.5	1961-62	18,761	90.2	9.8
1957-58	19,241	91.0	9.0	1962 August	18,798	89.0	11.0
1958-59	19,166	91.3	8.7	1962 September	18,689	88.5	11.5

¹ Annual spindles active on July 31 at the end of the cotton crop year.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

EXHIBIT B-4.—U.S. manufacturing employment

[In thousands]

Year	All manufacturing industries	(1)	(2)	Ratio of (2) to (1)	Year	All manufacturing industries	(1)	(2)	Ratio of (2) to (1)
		Textile mill products industry	Ratio of (2) to (1)				On 100 percent cotton	On other fibers	
1955	16,882	1,050	6.2	1960	16,762	915	5.5		
1956	17,243	1,032	6.0	1961	16,267	879	5.4		
1957	17,174	981	5.7	1961 (September)	16,323	880	5.4		
1958	15,945	919	5.8	1962 (September)	16,776	874	5.2		
1959	16,667	943	5.7						

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT B-5.—U.S. per capita mill consumption of fibers

Year	Cotton (in pounds)	All fibers (in pounds)	Cotton (in percent of all fibers)	Year	Cotton (in pounds)	All fibers (in pounds)	Cotton (in percent of all fibers)
	(1)	(2)	Ratio of (2) to (1)		(1)	(2)	Ratio of (2) to (1)
1955	26.5	40.6	65.3	1959	24.5	38.7	63.3
1956	25.9	39.0	66.4	1960	23.2	35.9	64.6
1957	23.7	36.4	65.1	1961	22.2	35.7	62.2
1958	22.2	34.3	64.7	1962 (estimate)	22.8	37.5	60.8

¹ Preliminary estimate based on 9 months.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT B-6.—*Cotton consumption: United States and world*

[In thousands of bales]

Year beginning Aug. 1	Total world consumption	U.S. consumption ¹	Ratio of United States to world	Total U.S. population ²		Year beginning Aug. 1	Total world consumption	U.S. consumption ¹	Ratio of United States to world	Total U.S. population ²	
				Year	Number					Year	Number
1954-55	39,863	8,841	22.2	1955	165.3	1959-60	48,356	9,025	18.7	1960	180.7
1955-56	41,209	9,210	22.3	1956	168.2	1960-61	47,986	8,279	17.3	1961	183.7
1956-57	42,956	8,608	20.0	1957	171.2	1961-62	48,173	8,979	18.6	1962	186.3
1957-58	42,914	7,999	18.6	1958	174.1	1962-63	48,200	8,400	17.4		
1958-59	45,664	8,703	19.1	1959	177.1						

¹ Running bales.² On July 1 of each year (in millions of persons).³ Estimate.

Sources: International Cotton Advisory Committee and U.S. Department of Commerce.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

(Excerpts from an address by Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president, ATMI)

What is the two-price system? How did it originate? Can we now be certain that it will be changed? These are questions that are being asked many times every day. Without an expression of personal opinion, let's look at the facts.

The two-price cotton system results from Federal law. There are three principal Government policies which, in combination, are responsible:

1. Since the 1930's the U.S. Government has administered a farm program, under which the price for U.S. grown cotton is supported at an artificial level. The support at present is at least \$42.50 per bale, or one-third higher than the price on the free world market.

2. The Government since 1939 has maintained rigid import quotas on raw cotton, limiting imports of upland types to less than 1 day's supply. Upland cotton accounts for about 98 percent of all cotton used by American mills. Consequently, since our mills are denied access to foreign-grown cotton, they must purchase American-grown cotton at the very substantially higher supported price. It is amazing how few people understand this fact.

3. Because U.S. cotton was priced above the free world price, export markets started declining. Also, the high price of our cotton encouraged other countries to build up their production. So in order to make cotton competitive overseas and discourage foreign production, Congress, in 1956, ordered that the United States should subsidize the price difference, making our cotton available on the world market at or near world prices. This subsidy currently amounts to 8½ cents per pound, or \$42.50 a bale.

The effect of this combination of Government policy is to impose upon the domestic textile industry an intolerably unfair situation that is increasing imports by leaps and bounds, completely disrupting a broad cross section of the textile and apparel market, stimulating consumption of competing products, shrinking an industry that is vital to the economy and security of the Nation, and killing off jobs.

The effect of the imports goes further than the loss of American production and jobs—great as these are. They affect the price earnings and investment structure of our industry to a great degree. On the American mill and his selling agent falls the constant specter of foreign produced goods being offered at below-cost prices, underselling him not because the foreign mill is more modern or efficient, or because it produces a prettier, better styled, more serviceable or more durable product, but solely because the price is cheaper, and cheaper solely because the mill has access to cotton, including American cotton, at one-third less than the domestic mill must pay, and because the foreign mill pays a wage that could not be tolerated, legally or otherwise, in this country.

President Kennedy, in outlining his seven-point textile program last year, directed the Department of Agriculture "to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers."

After long and careful thought the Department decided to try and offset the inequity, so far as imports are concerned, through the imposition of an import fee on the cotton content of imported textile products. You are completely familiar with the history of the section 22 case under which the attempt was made, and lost. We could talk at length about that case, its prosecution, and the factors responsible for the adverse decision. Suffice to say it was bitterly opposed within Government, although the Department of Agriculture performed outstandingly in supporting it.

In commenting on the decision on September 6, President Kennedy included these words:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

"I am therefore requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. Such a program will undoubtedly require enabling legislation.

"Early in the next session of Congress I shall recommend legislation designed to remove the inequity created by the present two-price cotton system."

During the interval since the President made that statement, there has been intensive activity on the subject, both in and out of Government. ATMI has been, is, and undoubtedly will remain heavily involved.

There seems to be a widespread assumption, in some quarters at least, that the desired result is assured. I wish those of us who are so intimately involved with the situation could be that confident. Here are the facts:

Having failed in an effort to offset the adverse differential, the objective now will be to eliminate it. That would mean a return to a one-price system—to make cotton available to American mills at the same price foreign mills pay.

This objective can be achieved only through one of three ways, or perhaps through a combination of two of them:

1. Reduce the support price to the farmer by the difference between the United States and the world price for cotton. Based on current differences, this would mean a reduction of at least 8½ cents per pound, or 25 percent.

2. Repeal the law requiring the export of cotton at world prices, and eliminate the quota on imports of foreign grown cottons.

(I leave to your good judgment the possibilities of the administration supporting, or the Congress enacting, either of these approaches.)

3. The third alternative would involve some type of payment on the domestically consumed portion of the crop, presumably to a merchant or handler, just as such payments are now made on the export portion.

This last approach involves two separate legislative actions. In the first place, enabling legislation is required to permit the Department of Agriculture to make such payments. This legislation must move successfully through the Agriculture Committees of both Houses, and then be favorably approved by each House. In the next place, the required appropriations must move through the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, and then the two Houses.

Historically, there has been strong opposition in these committees and in the Congress to any sort of payment program.

Those of you who have ever had experience in the passage of legislation by the National Congress will immediately recognize the magnitude of the problem involved.

This is not to say that there won't be a massive effort to get something done about this unbelievably unfair situation. But it is to say that anyone who thinks he can predict either the outcome or its timing is living in a completely isolated dream world.

In the meantime, here is all we really know for sure about the cotton cost situation:

1. The support level on the 1962 cotton crop now being harvested, and which will be consumed during the next year, has been fixed by law at exactly the same base level it was last year. Obviously, the farmer will either sell his cotton above the loan level, or put it in the loan.

2. If he puts his cotton in the loan, it remains there until repossessed for sale at a higher level, or until it becomes Government-owned cotton on August 1, 1963.

3. By law, the Government cannot sell cotton from the stockpile below 115 percent of the support price, with the purchaser paying accumulated storage and other charges.

Thus, if any of you can figure any way that a domestic mill can procure cotton, at a price below the limitations just described, between now and the availability of the 1963 crop in the fall of next year, I can take you this afternoon to some mill presidents who will pay you handsomely for the information.

I would have the hope that this would be the last time I would have to stand up here and talk about the textile industry. As an American citizen, I think it is high time that the textile industry has less promises and more assurances. I, again, thank the President for instituting a program after years and years of indifference.

I salute Secretary Hodges and those of the Inter-Agency Committee who have fought to implement this program. Along with others, I am ready, willing, and wanting to be of some help, for

help we must have if we are to prosper, or if we are to survive.

I call attention of the Congress and of the citizens of this country that while we are trying to get the legislation to correct the two-price cotton inequities, and while we are trying to recover from an unjust blow rendered by the decisions of the Tariff Commission, the textile situation is deteriorating. Those whose friendship is apparently based on what they can get out of us, are flooding our markets, ballooning the size of their imports, and using every conceivable trick and loophole to ruin the American textile market.

The two-price cotton system must go, the textile industry must have the relief intended and promised, and I ask the cooperation of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate in our endeavors to this end.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I again commend my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], for bringing to the attention of the House the problem which is still confronting the great textile industry of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been encouraged by indications that the rest of the Nation has become awakened to the problems confronting textiles. I think this is proper, when we realize that the textile industry constitutes the second largest employer of people of any of the industries of America.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said so many times here on the floor of the House, I am privileged to represent the greatest concentration of textile industry to be found anywhere in the world. In my State of North Carolina over 225,000 people directly earn their livelihood in the textile plants.

In recent years some of the signs that we see have given us reason to believe that not only is the textile industry confronted with an emergency situation, but our agricultural economy is greatly threatened. This results from a continuing loss of a domestic cotton market as mills close or turn to synthetic fibers.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a difficult time getting some of our friends who say that they are primarily concerned with the interests of cotton producers to understand that this is a problem which is touching with equal force—and with equal peril—both the cotton farmer and the people who earn their livelihoods at the machines in the textile plants.

I am told by textile people in my district that by reason of the uncertainty as to what we will do here in the Congress the industry and the cotton economy is faced with a very delicate situation. The legislation which is now pending, and the realization that there may be some change of course in it, has resulted in textile mills not buying cotton any further ahead than is absolutely necessary. At the same time, the mills are faced with the problem that the purchasers of the yarn and cotton textile

fabrics will not buy in advance because of the uncertainty of the times. This is something which is sweeping across the entire cotton agricultural and textile picture and unless something is done with real dispatch in the legislative area I am afraid that our Nation is going to experience some real economic losses.

In my own congressional district the people interested in textiles tell me that we are faced with another problem in connection with the present cotton program. They say that it is difficult today to get high quality domestically produced upland cotton. This is something to which I believe the Committee on Agriculture should give immediate thought because it appears that the quality of the cotton now being produced on the eastern side of the country, including the delta area, is not meeting the standards required for fine cotton yarns.

Because of this and the two-price cotton situation daily we learn that additional plants are shifting over to synthetic fibers. The record will show that each passing month the textile industry in America is consuming a lesser amount of cotton than was consumed in the preceding year, in great measure because of the shift to synthetic fibers. There is good reason for this. In the first place the price situation on synthetics is a fairly stable sort of thing. Quality is no problem. Supply is no problem. The same machinery, with minor adjustments, can be used to process the synthetic as is used to process the cotton fiber. And then, too, we see in the industry a greater amount of research and development in synthetics than is being done in cotton.

All of this should, I think, warn the cotton farmers that their economic future is in jeopardy.

The two-price cotton situation is, in my judgment, completely indefensible. It seems to me we have an obligation here in the Congress if we are to serve the economic welfare of our country, in agriculture as well as the textile manufacturing phases of our economy, to find an immediate solution to this problem. Unless we do, the domestic cotton market is going to continue to diminish.

Then, too, we are going to see an increase in the elimination of spindles, such as we have experienced during the past 10 years when over 818 textile plants have closed their doors in this country.

There are many, many other things which are going to happen, in my judgment, unless we find a quick solution of the problem. Recently, as a matter of fact on December 15, 1962, one of my very close friends, the then editor of the Shelby Daily Star, in my district, wrote an editorial as well as a feature story on his study of the two-price cotton situation. The young man who wrote this story was one of the bright young men in the newspaper field in the State of North Carolina. Unfortunately, last Monday morning this fine 37-year-young newspaper editor went to his reward very suddenly. But I believe that what he wrote on December 15 might, if put in the RECORD here today, give light and knowledge to many of our friends who

are not familiar with the plight of the textile industry and the people who work in that industry.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I may include an editorial as well as a news story written by the late Richard L. Shelton, editor of the Shelby Daily Star, on December 15, 1962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The editorial and article referred to follow:

BURDEN OF TWO-PRICE COTTON UNFAIRLY BORNE BY INDUSTRY

The current issue of two-price cotton is vital to every citizen in this country and every citizen should become informed about this situation, even get excited about it.

On the one hand, we have our textile industries employing thousands of our friends and neighbors and adding millions of dollars each year to our local economy.

On the other hand, we have our cotton farmers who, while seeing the stature of their crop decline drastically over the past 14 years, still add over \$3 million annually to the local economy.

The outcome of current discussions on the present price system as regards raw cotton for domestic and foreign consumption will affect both these vital elements and in turn every one of us.

The issue is simply this: For the past several years, the U.S. Government, with the objective of holding up the price and enlarging the market for American cotton has allowed foreign competitors to buy American cotton at the world price, but has required American industries to pay the inflated, supported price. (Currently the difference is 8½ cents per pound.)

Plainly, the result of this two-price structure has been a subsidy to foreign textile industrialists at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Also as a result of this two-price system, American manufacturers have had to turn increasingly to manmade fibers and to decrease where possible their use of cotton.

The objectives of the price supports and the discount to foreign purchasers have been at least in part defeated. The consumption of cotton is going to drop drastically as further inroads into the market are made by the synthetic fibers.

American textile industries continue to bear the burden of a raw cotton price about one-third higher than their foreign competitors.

This situation must be corrected. The President agrees with this view. The U.S. Department of Agriculture agrees with this view. The cotton farmers agree with this view.

The bugaboo is how.

American textile industrialists last year recommended that foreign goods imported into the United States be required to bear an equalization fee based upon the amount of cotton content in their finished goods. At current rates, this equalization fee would be about 8½ cents per pound.

This proposal, which had the support of President Kennedy, would have required foreign competitors of U.S. industries to pay the same raw material price as our domestic industries and at no cost to the American taxpayer.

In the fall, the U.S. Tariff Commission turned down this proposal.

Now, Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles Murphy has declared that his Department will probably support an action by Congress to eliminate the two-price system applied to raw cotton and to establish

a plan whereby American industries can pay the unsupported world price for cotton.

In our view, this proposal has unfairly been termed a "subsidy to American textile manufacturers." Wherever such a subsidy might be applied, it would not be designed primarily to protect the textile industry, but rather to continue a support program on the price the American farmer receives for his cotton.

American textile manufacturers want the right to buy their raw materials at the free enterprise market price. Any Government action that prevents them from doing so is an unfair restraint of free trade and any Government action that removes such an inequity cannot be considered a subsidy to industry.

Unfortunately, this "subsidy" terminology is being given an undue importance. Farmers don't want it said that they will benefit from another Government handout. (But they will.) Original buyers of raw cotton hesitate to accept the subsidy label. (Why?) Many are jumping to accuse textile leaders of asking for a subsidy. (This is not true.)

Congress will resolve the issue and, frankly, it matters little to us where the Government subsidy is applied. We would prefer to see foreign manufacturers carry their proper burden, but if they cannot be required to do so then American industries should not be made to pay for what essentially is a foreign aid matter.

If the only solution is to pay someone the difference between the supported price and the world price, let Congress apply the technique with the least amount of paperwork and bureaucratic manipulation.

Let anyone call this procedure whatever they wish. Whatever it's called, it will be a burden spread equally over all the taxpayers where it belongs, rather than on the textile industry alone.

We shall depend upon our Senators and upon Representative **BASIL L. WHITENER**, who is thoroughly sympathetic with the textile industries, to help remove the inequity of two-price cotton early in the next session of Congress.

And we would hope that our readers would join with us in letting our officials know how they feel about this matter.

TEXTILISTS SEE COTTON PRICE ISSUE AS KEY TO FUTURE OF SOUTHERN MILLS

(By Richard L. Shelton)

Caesar Cone fits his name. He sucks cigarettes since he decided to stop smoking. He speaks in earthy English, pulls no sophisticated veneer over his language, hides not his origin as a Jew and lets anyone close by know exactly where he stands.

Right now, this president of Cone Mills Corp. is mad as a hatter about the two-price system of cotton.

Robert T. Stevens looks the part of a polished, educated business executive. He talks the part, too, and he has considerable ability in parrying the probing question and in getting his point across with the smile of a public relations specialist.

Right now, this president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., is pointing to the two-price system regarding cotton.

These two were the biggest wheels to face some 40 newsmen during a 2-day textile tour early this week sponsored by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute.

Purpose of the tour was twofold: (1) To give newsmen a look at modern-day cotton manufacturing plants and (2) to explain why American textile leaders are getting a raw (cotton) deal.

ATMI staffers Sadler Love, of Charlotte, and his associates, Jack Holland, of Greensboro, Harry Murphy, of Washington, D.C., and John Wigginton, of Clemson, S.C., hosted the tour and they cracked a gentle whip around the headquarters at Greensboro's

newest and ritziest hostelry, the Towne House Motor Lodge.

The two-price system of cotton that Stevens comments upon and Cone screams about can be explained very simply. The United States Government sets the price that American manufacturers must pay for raw cotton and also establishes regulations that prevent American manufacturers from buying more than a tad of foreign-grown cotton.

At the same time, the United States Government permits foreign manufacturers to buy American cotton at the world price and makes up the difference by paying a subsidy (presently about 8½ cents a pound) to the exporters of raw cotton.

Thus, American manufacturers must pay about one-third more for U.S. cotton than do foreign mills.

Cone has a right to scream louder than Stevens. Almost all the production in his sprawling textile empire (including a plant at nearby Cliffside) is in cotton production, while the Stevens company leans heavily toward synthetics.

The dynamic Cone outlines the problem clearly. "Either we get some relief," he claims, "or we're gonna have to close some more mills."

He can illustrate his stand. Holding a child's suit out of a fancy print cloth, Cone noted that the pattern was "lifted" by a foreign competitor, reproduced on a better grade of cotton cloth and shipped back into the States at almost a dollar cheaper per garment than Americans can produce it.

"That's the kind of competition the U.S. Government is forcing down our throats," Cone says, "and if the American people realized it, they wouldn't stand for it."

Stevens says the same thing. He claims the American taxpayers are helping encourage "sweat labor" in foreign lands.

"Americans have always worked for higher living standards and better working conditions for all people," Stevens declared. "But they are supporting exactly the opposite with this ridiculous two-price cotton system."

And what is going to happen if the textilists don't get some relief?

Cone says that cotton mills will close and those who can't shift to production in synthetics will simply go out of business.

"If that's going to help the American cotton farmer, I don't see how," Cone says.

And he brings up another interesting point. "American cotton farmers are not producing cotton for the mills, they're growing it for the Government loan," Cone says.

What he means is that farmers and ginners are not interested in anything but the staple length of the raw cotton and will process the raw cotton for length and appearance and then sit back for the highest Government loan. What kind of cotton results?

"Lousy," says Cone. "It doesn't spin well."

He also complains of the archaic grading system used by the Government. With all the scientific devices available for testing the true quality of raw cotton, Cone complains that the Government still grades it by eye and by hand.

"That's stupid," says Cone.

Stevens is more circumspect about the situation. "We cannot be wholly selfish in the matter," the former Army Secretary says. "We must consider the plight of the small farmer and cooperate in a program that will assure him a fair return for his cotton and still allow American manufacturers to buy the cotton at the same price their foreign competitors can."

What this plainly means is a government subsidy applied at some point between the plow and the production line. Cone and Stevens both object to the term "subsidy" being applied to the textile industry. All manufacturers want, they say, is the right to buy cotton at the same price as others can buy it.

Unless this happens, Stevens says, cotton will die as a major manufacturing yarn and

will be supplanted by the synthetics. When this occurs, Stevens claims, the cotton farmer will then be growing his cotton only for government warehouses and there will be no more American cotton textile industry worthy of the name.

"And it's not far off," echoes Cone.

Hearings before a House Agriculture Subcommittee were held Thursday and Friday of this week on ways to correct the two-price system. Testimony followed the line described above.

All signs point to a final determination in Congress and local textilists who manufacture cotton will be vitally affected by the outcome.

So, apparently, will all who earn their wages at the cotton loom and cotton spindle.

It was a revelation to accompany the newsmen—many of them from northern papers—through the modern cotton textile plants of today.

At Cone's White Oak plant we saw what they said was the largest weave room under one roof in the world—all looms running cotton cloth. We saw the most modern machinery available as the cotton bales were broken open and prepared for the intricate journey from boll to bolt.

At Proximity Print Works, also a Cone plant, we saw cotton cloth receiving complicated and colorful patterns applied by skilled craftsmen, who are truly artists at their jobs. (The complexity of this printing job was truly appreciated by the newsmen, who know the bugs in a press and a deadline.)

Burlington Industries Research and Development Center showed the group how the textile industry spends a considerable sum of money and much time and effort in finding ways to do new jobs with cotton and better ways of doing old jobs, all with an eye to putting the farmers' production to an increased use.

Then, at Stevens' administrative office for its synthetic division, the group saw the most modern computer designed for textile use. It takes orders from a New York office and then channels them through some 18 plants for production, shipping dates, raw material orders, freight rates and final billing—all within a matter of seconds.

Newsmen didn't understand how it works, and we felt that only a handful of computer technicians with Stevens really understand the mechanical brain.

But Stevens executives understand that the computer system replaces tons of file equipment and does paperwork faster than hundreds of clerks.

On the final morning of the tour, we were guided through Dan River Mills in Danville, Va. We saw new machinery resulting from a continuing modernization program that saw \$3 million spent last year.

Textile workers in this area would thrill to the modern slashing machines that apply sizing to yarn in an automatic process three times as fast as older machines.

In another room, we saw German-made quilling machines where only 28 operators supply the needs of over 2,000 looms.

The impact of the tour was plain to the newsmen. We saw literally thousands of southern textile employees, busy in clean, modern plants and all dependent upon the fate of the cotton textile business for their future.

When one translates the problem of cotton textile industrialists into the destinies of this many families, it becomes a very human thing.

That's the picture ATMI execs wanted America's press to have; and at least 40 of us got it.

Mr. WHITENER. May I again say to my friend from South Carolina that I appreciate his having an interest in this problem, which is a great one for his district, which adjoins the district I am

privileged to represent, even though located in another State. I know that all of the people of his district and of my district and of the district of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], who just spoke briefly, will appreciate what he is doing, along with other Members of Congress, in trying to sound a warning to America about this serious problem we are facing.

Let me close by saying this, that those of you who feel that your primary interest is in the agricultural economy might well reevaluate your position. I happen to have in my congressional district the second largest cotton-producing county in North Carolina. I have in my district the greatest textile-producing area in America. I am not saying anything here that I have not said to our farm people, but these people are going to have to realize that they have an interest in bringing about an elimination of this unfair two-price cotton program, if the two great segments—cotton agriculture and cotton industry—of our economy are going to survive. I hope we will find a way that will be satisfactory to a majority of the membership of the Congress and to the people who are so primarily concerned with this problem, as we move along in the coming days.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. He and I have been after this problem for many, many years on many occasions here. He has always been a champion of the people in his district who are dependent on the textile industry.

I might say to the gentleman that, as he pointed out in the remarks he made today, on a recent visit with the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. House of Representatives down into North and South Carolina, we found mill after mill which could convert to rayon within 24 hours.

Now the people who are in the cotton producing States of this Nation regardless of section had best know now unless the two-price differential is corrected, because of the waste factors and other factors, that make rayon so much cheaper per pound in the initial stage of production and also at the usable stage of production in a textile mill that people are going to convert to rayon and they are not going to buy cotton. Then instead of having a 9 million bale surplus in August each year or thereabouts, they are going to have an 18 million bale surplus or a 12 million bale surplus, and we are going to put people out of work and people are going to say, "Why grow this stuff just to send it overseas?" This situation will have a terrific impact on this one part of the great agricultural economy of our country and that is the cotton producing effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman from the Second District of New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND]. I am happy to welcome our new colleague to take part in this effort in behalf of the textile industry of this country, that we have been making here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] in his remarks concerning the impact of textile imports on our economy. As the gentleman has pointed out, and as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, this is a matter which is above party considerations. I want to remind you, sir, it is not a sectional matter either. It is a matter that concerns us in New Hampshire and in New England generally. This is one of the first matters that I have looked into since I have come to the Congress.

I would like to include the following to indicate the importance of this to New Hampshire:

Employment: 13,860.
Rank in manufacturing industries: second.
Percent of manufacturing employment: 16.
Number of establishments: 132.
Annual payroll: \$48,844,000.
Value added by manufacture, annually: \$75,303,000.

The largest segment of the New Hampshire textile industry is concentrated in the production of woolens and worsteds. Woolen and worsted mills in this State produce approximately 57 million square yards of wool cloth per year, equal to 12 percent of U.S. production of such goods and the fourth largest production of any State.

Approximately an equal number of workers are employed in servicing this region's industry with transportation, fuel, chemicals, and related products.

I would also like to include a letter from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers highlighting the crisis in the increase of wool-product imports:

JANUARY 9, 1963.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND: Proposals of some administration officials to attempt to solve the wool-product import problem through tariff adjustments rather than quantitative restrictions are profoundly disturbing. Thus, it is with a deep sense of urgency that I enclose a copy of a letter to Senator PASTORE and Congressman VINSON as leaders of the Senate and House groups vitally concerned with the problems of the U.S. fiber, textile and apparel industries and their effect on the general welfare. As stated in their letter, 16 industry and labor organizations firmly believe that tariff adjustments can neither solve the wool product import problem nor meet the objectives of the President's textile program.

The position of the 16 management and labor groups is solidly behind quantitative restrictions by countries and by categories. The need is urgent. If there ever was a situation in which time was of the essence, this is it because wool-product imports are at record levels with the 1962 volume 80 percent over 1961 and this growth continues.

On behalf of this association, representing wool textile manufacturers throughout the Nation, I urge your full cooperation with Senator PASTORE and Congressman VINSON in their efforts to obtain adequate import curbs.

Respectfully,

EDWIN WILKINSON.

This problem is substantiated by the following memorandum:

WOOL TEXTILES

The rising level of wool textile imports in the postwar period increased in intensity during 1962 after a temporary letup in 1961. Imports in 1962 are 80 percent higher than 1961 and 34 percent higher than the record year of 1960.

Imports as a percent of domestic production, have risen from less than 1 percent in 1947 to over 25 percent in 1962. As a percent of domestic consumption, imports now exceed 20 percent. This compares with the 15 to 16 percent which existed earlier in 1962 when a group of Senators and House Members discussed this matter with the President.

The crisis in the industry has worsened progressively month by month in 1962 and will continue in 1963. Many mills are now on short time, and others have closed. The urgency of the present situation cannot be overemphasized.

Every segment of the industry is being seriously affected.

	Millions of square yards equivalent		Percent increase
	1961	1962 (estimated)	
Tops.....	6.4	11.5	80
Yarns.....	9.2	19.0	107
Fabrics.....	38.2	68.3	82
Knit goods.....	19.6	30.1	53
Woven apparel.....	8.7	21.6	148
Other.....	2.6	2.3	(12)
Total.....	84.8	153.0	80

These consequences were predicted by Senator PASTORE's Subcommittee in 1959, 1960, and 1961. The danger was also recognized by the President. He instituted a Cabinet committee investigation early in 1961 and announced a textile program to restrain imports on May 2, 1961. Procedures were set up to implement the program. An Interagency Textile Administrative Committee, two Labor-Management Textile Advisory Committees—one for wool—were established, cotton arrangements were negotiated, and numerous other activities affecting wool as well as other textiles took place.

Nevertheless, nothing has been done to limit imports of wool manufactures in spite of the rising levels and domestic curtailment in 1962, and in spite of the repeated assurances of the President and other administration officials given to Members of Congress and the industry.

COTTON TEXTILES

International quota arrangements have been negotiated for cotton textiles and apparel which last until 1967. Although imports of cotton goods exceeded the quota levels by 33 percent during the first year it is hoped that stricter administration and enforcement will hold imports at or slightly below the new levels which exceed a billion square yards in the form of cloth, yarn, apparel, and other cotton products.

Legislative efforts to eliminate the two-price cotton system, approved by the administration, will go a long way in improving the import situation if successful.

MANMADE FIBER TEXTILES

No action has been taken to limit imports of manmade fiber textiles although imports in 1962 are running about 50 percent over 1961.

THE ONLY CURE

The Senate investigations and the extensive experience of management and labor lead to a single unanimous conclusion: namely, quotas are essential to control imports of textiles and apparel. To be effective, quotas must be distributed by country and by category of goods. Tariffs, unless discriminatory, alone are not adequate.

The United Kingdom, Italy, and Japan supply 75 percent of the imports of wool goods to this country. The balance comes from numerous sources, including Hong Kong and other eastern countries.

An attempt to control imports by tariff adjustments is doomed to failure because it

is impossible to equalize the selling prices of imported goods from varied sources by a single uniform tariff. Not only do costs of production differ widely between such countries as England and Japan, but numerous systems of export incentives and other devices vary between countries and from time to time.

Because of the tremendous spread between the costs of producing textile items and apparel in such diverse places as Hong Kong and Western Europe, a duty sufficient to control imports from Europe would have no effect on eastern sources. Conversely, a duty high enough to control, say, Hong Kong exports would shut off traditional sources such as England and France and would, therefore, be politically unrealistic. The inadequacy of tariffs alone was recognized in the Cotton Arrangements negotiated at Geneva.

Tariff adjustments would only frustrate the President's program and result in further deterioration of the industry.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT AND THE TEXTILE PROGRAM

The textile program is a domestic program which predates the Trade Expansion Act. The direction and control of the textile program or any part of it should not be turned over to those who will administer the Trade Expansion Act (TEA). To do so would be contrary to representations made to industry and labor and Members of Congress.

Congressional and industry leaders were repeatedly told that, once the cotton arrangements were concluded, wool and man-made textiles import problems would be resolved. This has not been done although negotiations of the cotton textile arrangements were completed in February 1962.

The President established special procedures, including the Cabinet subcommittee, the Interagency Textile Advisory Committee, the Labor-Management Textile Advisory Committee, and the Labor-Management Wool Advisory Committee in 1961 to deal with these matters. Intensive study and work has been performed by these groups and a background of knowledge and talent exists.

To abandon 2 years of work and to transfer the program to a new agency, just does not make sense. If the textile program were transferred to the Trade Expansion Agency it would be generally believed in the industry that the program had been scuttled and that the industry was again considered expendable. This unfortunate feeling already exists in many quarters and can only be corrected by promptly limiting the quantity of imports of wool and manmade fiber textiles by countries and by categories.

CONCLUSION

We believe the textile program should be carried out promptly. This implementation should be under the immediate direction and control of the President who should continue to utilize the existing personnel and machinery and, under no circumstances, delegate it to the Trade Expansion Agency. Active consultation with and advice from the industry should be resumed as contemplated in the existing procedures.

An international agreement or combination of agreements, establishing import quotas by country and category on wool manufactures, should be negotiated and supplementary action to control imports from countries not parties to such agreements should be taken. In the event such agreements cannot be reached promptly, the United States should establish such quotas unilaterally.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to welcome the gentleman and appreciate very much his remarks. I am as near to him as his telephone, and if the gentleman

wishes any information from my office, I am sure he can have it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from the 11th District of North Carolina, Hon. Roy A. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentlemen from South Carolina and North Carolina and New Hampshire for bringing this important matter to our attention. I think it affects the entire Nation. Much has been said about the two-price cotton system here in the last 2 years, but the situation is still with us. It is not right and it certainly ought to be corrected. President Kennedy referred to it as a unique burden that is being placed upon an industry. It is, indeed, a unique burden and I hope that this Congress during this session will do away with that inequity.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from the Third District of North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] if he would like to make some remarks at this time, I am happy to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years it has been my pleasure to represent the Third District of the State of North Carolina. I have come to know the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and he has not only been most interested in this problem but has exerted great energy to solve the problems that he has been presenting so forcefully to us on this occasion. While my district is primarily an agricultural district, we too have some textile manufacturing, but certainly as the remarks on the floor today have illustrated not only the great State of North Carolina but all of the States of the Nation are vitally affected by this import problem that has been presented to us. I think it is high time that the Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle, as has been so ably demonstrated by our newest colleague from the State of North Carolina in his remarks set about to solve the problem of two-price cotton and the problem of imports as it affects the textile industry of this great Nation. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to point out to the Members that figures published recently show that during the month of January alone, ship sailings and ship arrivals to this country from New Zealand and Australia will dump 30 million pounds plus, that is, in one 30-day period, of dressed beef, lamb and mutton on the markets of the United States. I sympathize up to a point with the textile industry of the South and the cotton farmers of the South, but I sympathize a great deal more with the farmers and the processors of the rest of the country who are going to pay through the nose for the passage of that infamous Trade Expansion Act a year or so ago.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to have the remarks of the gentleman. I might remind the gentleman from Iowa that I have fought against other type imports time after time, and so have the people from the textile areas. I have been proud to be among them. They have taken that into cognizance and tried to be available to all other areas of the country and aid the other industries which have been similarly afflicted. We would be happy to have any suggestion from the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I certainly would like to join in the comments of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. I was particularly interested in his remarks as they related to the Tariff Commission. Those of us who represent areas having other industries, such as the glass industry, certainly sympathize with the gentleman's problem. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. I think the gentleman has done a wonderful job. He has put his finger on the heart of the difficulty. Imports have very adversely affected the glass industry which has substantial employment in my State of Ohio, and there is still fresh in my mind the difficulties we have had with the Tariff Commission. Again I commend the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. My attitude toward the Tariff Commission is a very elementary one. I had always understood that the Tariff Commission was created for the purpose of giving relief to industries in this country adversely affected by imports. When we make such a detailed presentation as we did showing the effects of cotton imports on the cotton industry, I thought, and I am sure the gentleman thinks, that they would give relief, for that certainly was the purpose for which the Commission was created.

Many commissions have been created, primarily as an arm of the Congress to do work that the Congress does not have time to go into detail. But as soon as they are set up they declare themselves an independent agency, independent of the purposes of the Congress on some theory that there ought to be "one world," or something like that. And so it has continued through the years. I would not hesitate to call names. I would be glad to have the gentleman write me a letter if I am wrong, because they serve interests other than those of our country.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITENER. I am pleased that the gentleman from South Carolina has pointed out that cotton is losing its domestic market to other fibers. According to information that has been gathered by the National Cotton Council, the Department of Agriculture, and by the textile industry, in 1959 rayon staple fiber then in production was about 9.9 percent of the cotton consumption in the United States. By 1961 this had increased to 11.6 percent of the cotton consumption.

Rayon is just one of the synthetics. We can see here what is happening to the cotton market. I remember as a boy working in the textile plants. One summer I worked in the first plant in our area to do any experimentation with synthetic fibers. I remember very well our opening the first celanese cartons.

We saw a package, something which appeared to be an egg crate. Then we tried to mix a little mohair with it. Textile people would walk through the area, and smelling the alcoholic content of the synthetic celanese said: "This will never work; this is a bunch of foolishness."

Yet today when you go through textile plants you will find they are running nylon and orlon, they are running a synthetic made out of buttermilk, they are running fibers which are made out of the bark of trees, and just about anything you can imagine. They are making yarn now out of nonrubber materials that will stretch like rubber.

All of these fantastic things have been developed in comparatively recent times. Yet some of our cotton people, I think, have been blind to the real threat which this offers to them.

Back in the early thirties a distinguished native of my home county left there to go down to Burlington, N.C., to open up a little textile plant, with the help of some people in Burlington. He started making rayon yarns and fabrics. He was the laughing stock in some parts of the textile industry.

Yet Spencer Love went on to build up the greatest textile organization in the world, Burlington Industries, from this start, primarily based on the development of a new synthetic fiber.

I say again that the gentleman has sounded a note of which our people interested in cotton and agriculture should take note. That is, that synthetic fibers are not referred to in the industry any more as "novelty" yarns. You do not hear that term used any more. When we started out with them in the early 1930's that is how they were denominated—novelty yarns. Today they refer to many of these fantastic new yarns and fabrics as decorative yarns and decorative fabric. This indicates that in the industry it is recognized these new synthetics are here to stay. They are practical and usable, they are not something that is just a creation of some fantastic mind.

So we must take note of this, and I hope the warning which the gentleman has sounded, along with these other splendid gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, will bring some of our agricultural folks to see that this is a broad and important problem.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. STEPHENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding a moment to me.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman from South Carolina in the remarks he has made today and with the other Members who have spoken on the subject as to discrimination with respect to the price of cotton.

I would like to point out one of two members of the Tariff Commission who, I believe, understand the problem, is from the section of the country where cotton is a firsthand problem. I refer to Mr. Sutton. He is from my district. He knows and understands the problem he has ruled in a fashion to eliminate discrimination between types of cotton.

When the opportunity arises for the Tariff Commission to reconsider, I would like very much to urge that they give a greater degree of attention to what the man who knows what he is talking about says on this problem.

I thank the gentleman for letting me associate myself with him.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

I think that Commissioner Shreiber and Commissioner Sutton both decided in favor of the relief which the industry requested, and I salute both of them for that decision.

The reason I made the remarks I did, and I have no apology for them, it is high time in this Nation when people who have been given a great big fat Federal job on a commission shall do the job. I shall never get in the position of cleaning house, perhaps, but if I ever do that is going to be the first premise. A man is on a commission, and whether he is on a commission or sitting in one of these privileged seats here or in the other body, the Senate, or perhaps I should say the greater body, he is still a servant of the people. He is working in the Post Office, or he is on the Tariff Commission. I feel very strongly about it, because the idea of public service to me is such a privilege and such a responsibility that, in my opinion, it should be of a high order and of the highest recognition and of the highest sort of honor.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNNEGAY].

Mr. KORNNEGAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just rise on this occasion to congratulate the gentleman on bringing again very forcefully to the attention of the House the critical situation that exists in the textile field. I commend you, sir, for it and say that I would like to associate myself with your remarks and your call for action, and prompt action, in this matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his continued support, and all of you who have participated in airing this problem.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECTS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once a hydroelectric power project—private or public—is undertaken, markets for con-

ventional fuels will be affected in proportion to the capacity of the water-powered plants. Through the years the coal industry has lost progressively more opportunities for increases in the demand for its product as hydroelectric capacity has risen.

In many cases private industry itself has constructed high-level dams for the purpose of using falling water to generate electricity. Since the TVA was established in 1933 vast volumes of electric power have been subsidized through U.S. Treasury funds. By the end of 1962, 80 percent of TVA's total assets of \$2.4 billion were tied up in power facilities. Elsewhere in the country, particularly in the West, millions upon millions of tax dollars have been expended for the construction of hydro projects. Some of these powerplants have been incidental to necessary flood control and irrigation, and to neglect to construct and operate the powerplants would constitute inefficiency and a waste of natural resources. Other hydro stations have been built by the Federal Government without justification.

In any event, coal, oil, or gas loses market potentials when water is chosen as the power behind electric power. When coal is the victim, railroads and other allied industries must suffer along with miners and investors in coal companies. Understandably, then, the United Mine Workers of America and coal management stand shoulder to shoulder in opposing the use of Federal funds to subsidize competition for their industry. They have experienced a lagging market and heavy unemployment for too long to surrender without protest to the myriad of proposals by Congress and the executive department to create economic hardship through mounting Government appropriations.

American taxpayers have discovered that economic distress cannot necessarily be measured exclusively by the number of coal miners and other workers who are to be displaced when hydroelectric plants begin operation. In keeping with the philosophy of giving economic preference to foreign nations, the U.S. Government has for many years held to a policy of ignoring the needs of our own people in the purchase of equipment for Federal facilities. Two examples of this program are contained in announcements made during the congressional recess and should be made a part of the RECORD. In one case the Interior Department awarded a \$612,659 contract to a Japanese firm for turbines for the Blue Mesa Dam in western Colorado. The other case involved a \$1,138,900 contract to the Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Reorganized, Ltd., of Japan, for a hydraulic turbine at Yellowtail Dam in southeastern Montana. The announcements received little attention, but they are of extreme interest to the many unemployed men and women in communities equipped to manufacture this type of equipment.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that our Federal policymakers become sponsors of a double-barreled attack on America's workers: first the mine workers and railroaders, then electric equipment personnel.

I want my colleagues to understand that my desire to inject a mite of sanity into Government purchasing policies should in no way be interpreted as an unfriendly gesture toward our friends in Japan.

I am confident that the Mitsubishi organization is capable of producing satisfactory turbines, just as other Japanese firms manufacture light bulbs, cigarette lighters, batteries, textile products, and the host of other commodities now flowing into the United States at the expense of our own working people. Nevertheless I somehow question the use of dollars collected from American taxpayers for the destruction of business opportunities in this country. Japan, having received more than \$4 billion in American aid for the revival of its industrial capacity in the years following World War II, is no doubt grateful to be the beneficiary of our unique purchasing plan, although her recent decision on trade with Russia does not indicate that her gratitude extends beyond economic considerations. I refer to Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohira's statement shortly before January 1, to the effect that his government cannot honor a NATO request to halt the export of oil pipes to the Soviet Union.

I can well appreciate the feelings of the NATO countries—

The Foreign Minister said—

But the Japanese Government has not legal power to stop private enterprise from exporting pipes to the Soviet Union. The problem is up to the independent judgment of private enterprise. It is not a legal problem.

The Russians imported more than \$16 million worth of various kinds of pipe from Japan in 1961. This material will be used to construct networks of oil lines from Soviet producing fields to the Sea of Japan as well as to Western Europe. While I have no confirmation of the deal, it is understood that part of the Russian-Japanese agreement is that the pipes—or at least a good part of them—will be paid for with Red oil. Thus, by this handy arrangement, the U.S.S.R. will soon be able to utilize Soviet oil to wash American coal out of Japanese markets.

Interested parties should also take note of the fact that, while Russia is a big importer of Japan's pipe, the United States is the chief buyer of this product. Thus, while America's foreign trade policy permits steelworkers to be displaced by imports of pipe and an assortment of other products, the American Government helps the cause of economic chaos in our country by direct purchase of generating equipment from friends who will soon be able to use more and more Red oil to manufacture these commodities for us. If the 88th Congress wishes to make a quick contribution to economic recovery and in the interest of national security, there will forthwith be enacted an amendment to the Buy American Act that will no longer tolerate the use of tax funds to purchase unemployment.

As to the Russian pipeline buildup, this is a subject which merits individual

attention and treatment. It is my intention to keep Congress notified of developments on the Red oil front. Unless the administration acts to prevent the development of an energy gap among the free nations, Congress should proceed with necessary legislation during the present session.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH UPRISING AGAINST RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, January 23, marked the 100th anniversary of the heroic, albeit ill-fated, uprising of the Polish people against Russian oppression.

It was 100 years ago yesterday that the heroic Poles with tremendous courage attacked a Russian garrison which had been set up illegally in the Polish kingdom.

This uprising, Mr. Speaker, is but another plateau in Poland's 1,000-year history of rebellion against those forces which would destroy the dignity and freedom of men.

The uprising of January 23, 1863, is one of the great chapters of Polish history and stands as a brilliant reminder that even though the Poles may be subjugated by foreign tyrants for long spells, the indomitable spirit of freedom sooner or later finds expression.

Just as 100 years ago the Poles captured the imagination of all of Europe with their heroic uprising against their Russian oppressors, so can we have hope today that sooner or later the Communist rulers of present-day Poland will fall from the weight of their own oppression.

The 1863 rebellion in Poland was sparked by Russia's determination to impose its own language, its own philosophy, and its own rule over the people of Poland. The Russians were determined to convert Poland into a Russian province called Privilanskii Krai or the Vistula River Province.

The Polish population and especially the population of Warsaw responded with protestations. The Russian authorities, in order to repress these protestations, committed violence, including firing at, and killing, some of the people. They also ordered the so-called branka; that is, they rounded up young Poles and unlawfully conscripted them into Russian regiments.

The underground organizations considered this unlawful conscription the signal for an uprising. During the night of January 22, 1863, units of the insurgent army attacked certain of the Russian garrisons, with some success. Such was the beginning of the fight

against the occupying forces. On one side were the well-equipped regular army units; on the other, the insurgent army units, poorly equipped, and having insufficient supplies and inadequate training. Despite these handicaps, the insurgent army units achieved some successes over the Russian Army regiments.

When news of the uprising spread, some Western societies demanded that their governments support the Polish uprising. The Governments of Great Britain, Austria, and France protested to the German and Russian Governments and deprecated the military agreement which had been concluded between the two latter countries. However, Russia had competent agents in the West, then as now, and knew that these protests were not the expression of these governments' intentions but were registered to satisfy public opinion in their countries. Consequently the German and Russian Governments ignored these protests and the Russian Foreign Minister made a statement to the effect that the Polish problem was an internal matter for Russia. Diplomatic intervention was not pursued further.

The Russian Government ordered the so-called pacification. The leaders, including Romuald Traugutt, of the uprising—known as the national government—were hanged. Others were killed by firing squads, deported to Siberia, or submitted to confiscation of their property. A sense of real mourning enveloped the nation. As russification made further advances, the Polish language was banned from offices and schools, of which the administration frequently passed to Russians, and even the University of Warsaw was closed.

Europe was deaf to the cries of the persecuted nations and stood by while the occupying forces used Polish resources to build up their own positions and power. This power, achieved at Polish expense, was used decades later to push the world into the flames of World War I, causing the loss of millions of human lives and a legacy of suffering for the maimed, the orphaned, and the widowed. These were the bitter fruits of the policy of Western Europe at the time of the January 1863 uprising, an uprising which expressed heroic determination on the part of the Polish nation.

We can only pray that free people today can draw a valuable lesson from yesterday's mistakes. The great powers of Europe in 1863 failed to understand that a free Poland is the key to peace in Europe. Just as some policymakers today still naively believe that Poland can endure under communism and are willing to coexist with Poland's present Communist rulers. These misguided architects of foreign policy fail to understand that communism and freedom are incompatible, whether it is in Poland or any other nation of the world.

By paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863, we are at once paying tribute to Poland's defenders of freedom for the past 1,000 years. We can indeed marvel at the fact that the same love of freedom which sparked the rebellion of 1863 continues to flourish in Poland today, even though

that great nation has been under Communist domination since the end of World War II.

Someday, somehow, Mr. Speaker, this spirit of freedom again will find expression in a free Poland.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to lead the Members of the House in the commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day. Due to the schedule of our sessions, we are conducting this observance 2 days later than the normal date, January 22.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. As in previous years, in both the House and the Senate, the elected representatives of the American people take this memorable occasion to express the deep feeling of affinity and common purpose we hold for the captive nation of 45 million Ukrainians. We share with them the ideals of real democracy, national self-determination, and individual liberty and in many ways truly support their undying aspirations for freedom and national independence.

OCCASION FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 14

On this significant occasion of the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I deem it necessary to go beyond the realm of sincere expressions of thought and feelings by advancing a concrete proposal that would aid immensely in the eventual liberation of Ukraine—indeed, all other captive nations—from the imperiocolonialist heel of Moscow. I know that by offering the adoption of House Resolution 14, a measure to establish a desperately needed Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, my proposal for specific and concrete action bespeaks also the desires of numerous Members in this body, who in both the 87th Congress and this new one have joined in submitting similar resolutions. This congressional observance of Ukrainian independence affords us the first excellent opportunity in this 88th Congress to urge the necessary creation of this special committee.

Mr. Speaker, in a move which I believe touches the heart of every Ukrainian patriot—in fact, the hearts of all our captive allies in the Red totalitarian

empire—I take this important occasion to urge the immediate adoption of House Resolution 14, which reads as follows:

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalitarian form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely

subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

THIS 45TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, the national histories of east European peoples are full of miseries and misfortunes, and the history of the Ukrainian people is no exception. Since the signing of a compact between the Russian czar and the Ukrainian leaders in 1654, stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians have not been allowed, except for periods in the 18th century and the brief 2-year period of 1918-20, to enjoy the benefits of free and independent life in their historic homeland. Through the turns and twists of fateful international events, 45 million Ukrainians have not been permitted to be masters of their fate. For too long a period they have been held down under the oppressing yoke of

alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations and indescribable miseries. They have been ruthlessly persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution could compel them to abandon their yearning for freedom. Instead, oppressions and persecutions have united the Ukrainians against their foes, held them together. Then toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit czarist regime was overthrown, and Austria's hold over the western Ukraine was broken, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

This historic event took place on the memorable 22d of January 1918—45 years ago. That day has become a landmark in the history of Ukraine, and remains the brightest spot in their struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately the newborn republic was suffering under severe handicaps. It was surrounded by powerful foes, ready to pounce upon it and put an end to its existence. And that is what happened even before the joy and jubilation had ceased. Before the Ukrainian people had any time to recoup their losses, they were attacked by their inveterate foes, Moscow and its Red army. Early in 1920 enemy forces entered and occupied the eastern part of the country; soon the whole country was overrun and all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed. Then in the fall of that year Ukraine became a satellite of Soviet Russia, and by 1933 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days, for more than 40 years, Ukraine has been submerged in the Soviet Russian Empire, and the Ukrainian people have suffered grievously under Moscow's totalitarianism. For all practical purposes the country is sealed off from the free world. Neither the people of Ukraine are allowed in large numbers to travel abroad, nor are the people of the free world, except under carefully guided Communist supervision, to go to Ukraine. Thus the country has become a large prisonhouse for its people. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every device to deprive the Ukrainian people of this possession, but fortunately they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of Soviet Russian totalitarian tyrannies, the sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian people, in and out of their homeland, have been a boon to the communities in which they lived. In this country they have been noted for their industry, ingenuity and tenacity for hard work in whatever vocation. They have never shunned heavy labor in preference to something less arduous. In this respect their tough and resilient physique, and their tenacious nature have served them well. Hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic, and hardworking Americans of Ukrainian origin have always

given excellent account of themselves in this country. I can say this because I have known many of them in my congressional district, and have seen them at work. In certain parts of Pennsylvania they constitute the core of sturdy and stouthearted laborers who perform heavy but necessary tasks with distinction. These people of stolid character have contributed their full measure to the free and democratic way of life in this great Republic. They have been a positive force in the building of our democratic institutions, and they have always been ready to fight and die for the preservation of these institutions. Today on this solemn occasion, I am happy to join them in the celebration of the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. I wholeheartedly agree with the points recently raised by the president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which are put forth in the following communication:

JANUARY 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Forty-five years ago this January 22 the Ukrainian people, constituting then and now the largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, freely determined itself into an independent national state. By 1920 the Ukrainian National Republic became one of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Today, Ukraine is one of the oldest captive nations in Eurasia, but its long record of nationalism is second to none.

In terms of historical reality and its possibilities, had Western enlightenment and aid supported Ukraine's independence in 1918, the prison house of nations known as the Soviet Union could never have emerged; the mortal threat facing our own free Nation would have been nonexistent. The tragic mistake committed by our leaders then can today be somewhat redressed by our enlightened actions toward the imprisoned nations in the U.S.S.R.—and thus work toward real victories in the cold war.

What can we do? On this 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, here are a few constructive steps that can be taken: (1) Join in this nationwide observance by offering on the floor of Congress your stirring statement of principle and understanding directed at the 45 million Ukrainian nation; (2) enable the Voice of America to broadcast your message to Ukraine; (3) support the issuance in 1964 of a "champion of liberty" stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the 150th anniversary of his birth (the 86th Congress provided for his monument in Washington, which will be completed next year); (4) call for a congressional inquiry into Moscow's widespread persecution of religious groups, its genocide of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches, and the 18-year imprisonment of the Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop Joseph Slipy, the "Mindzenty in the U.S.S.R.;" and (5) establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations—a congressional committee proportionate to the value and meaning of all the captive nations, truly our foremost nonmilitary weapon in the cold war—with concentration on Russian colonialism in the U.S.S.R.

Our continued neglect of Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. only perpetuates the errors of our past. We have a whole new horizon before us. I am certain you will assist in cultivating it for our own national interest.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President, Georgetown University.

SEVCHENKO AND UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. Speaker, concerning the contents of the above letter, I also lend my sup-

port to the issuance of a Shevchenko "champion of liberty" stamp in 1964, the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko. The 86th Congress provided for the erection of a statue in honor of this Ukrainian patriot. Next year the statue will be unveiled here in Washington. It would be most fitting and proper at that time for the Postmaster General to issue a Shevchenko "champion of liberty" stamp. Shevchenko's works and art are a monument to the ideas of freedom and independence; and on this 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence it is most appropriate to summon congressional support for such a valuable stamp.

Last fall it was my privilege to be honored by the eighth triennial convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. It was my pleasure to receive the Shevchenko Freedom Award. At that convention I witnessed the importance of Shevchenko as a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, both fighters for freedom, champions of liberty. The themes of the convention conveyed the central idea of Shevchenko's enduring spirit in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people, who are determined to obtain their freedom and independence. In a telegram to the convention, President Kennedy expressed well and eloquently the attitude of our Government toward the theme of Ukrainian independence.

It reads as follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY GREETES UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA—PROMISES U.S. SUPPORT TO ALL SEEKING INDEPENDENCE

NEW YORK, N.Y.—President Kennedy sent special greetings to the eighth triennial convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America convening at the Commodore Hotel over the Columbus Day weekend, and said that the eventual fulfillment of just aspirations of all peoples to independence "will remain the basic goal of U.S. world policy."

In a telegram addressed to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, President Kennedy stated:

"The convocation of the eighth triennial convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is an inspiring reminder that a major source of our strength as a Nation, and a cornerstone of the American democratic system, is the diversified contribution to American life made possible by the heterogeneous nature of our national, ethnic, religious and racial origins. It is both natural and desirable that, while entering wholeheartedly into their responsibilities as members of the American community, those of our citizens who share a proud common heritage should voluntarily join together in free association to honor that heritage and to advance shared interests. It would be surprising and also contrary to American traditions if our citizens of Ukrainian descent failed to retain interest in their former homelands or to show concern for the fate and future of Ukrainians there. Similar evidences of a humanistic and solicitous approach to the problems of others in foreign countries are typical of the attitudes of those groups of our citizens who feel strong historical or spiritual bonds with particular areas of people abroad. In accord with such sentiments and expressing the will of the American people, the U.S. Government strongly supports just aspirations and rights of all peoples to national independence, governments of their own choosing and the enjoyments of fundamental rights and freedom.

The eventual fulfillment of these just aspirations and the achievement of these rights are and will remain a basic goal of U.S. world policy.

"Please accept my personal wishes for a successful convention. JOHN F. KENNEDY."

Mr. Speaker, when one reads some of the resolutions passed at the eighth triennial convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, he can readily appreciate the feeling and tone of the President's message to that spirited organization. On this 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, I request that the resolutions pertaining to the United States and enslaved Ukraine be printed at this point in the RECORD:

EXCERPT OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH TRIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, HELD ON OCTOBER 12, 13 AND 14, 1962, IN NEW YORK CITY

RESOLUTION III. THE UNITED STATES AND
ENSLAVED UKRAINE

Whereas the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as spokesman for the American citizenry of Ukrainian descent, is seriously concerned with the U.S. foreign policy with respect to the U.S.S.R., a slave empire composed of the many captive non-Russian nations, among which Ukraine, the country of origin of 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent, is the largest and the most recalcitrant nation in its resistance to Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism; and

Whereas the United States of America is the main hope and leader of the free world to which all the oppressed and captive nations behind the Iron Curtain look for guidance and leadership in their political struggle for the right of self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas the many peoples of the world have drawn inspiration and example from American democratic institutions and political equality as exemplified in our system of government, American constitutional liberties and the enjoyment of personal freedom by all citizens regardless of national origin, creed, religion or political belief; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress by a unanimous vote in July 1959, passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, whereby it recognized the right of 22 nations now held in Soviet Russian captivity to full freedom and national independence, a belief fully consistent with the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, as well as with the pronouncements of President Woodrow Wilson on the national self-determination of peoples; and

Whereas, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has consistently and tirelessly pleaded with the U.S. Government and the U.S. Congress to extend all possible assistance to the enslaved Ukrainian nation and all other captive nations through an enlightened policy of liberation, a policy which if applied to the captive non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. would greatly impede the drive of Communist Russia for world conquest, and would strengthen and solidify the aspirations of the captive nations to freedom, self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas in August 1961, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, made a statement to the effect that Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia are "traditional parts of the Soviet state," a statement which is contrary to the known facts of history and which offended and shocked 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent; and

Whereas such a statement made by one of the highest officials of the U.S. Government in effect serves to strengthen totalitarian Russian communism which claims that all

nations within the Soviet Union will eventually be merged into a Soviet (Russian) nation, which would obliterate all the non-Russian nations both within and without the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas the Eighth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian descent fully realizes that the United States of America remains a strong bastion of freedom and the outstanding hope of captive and oppressed people everywhere and that such statements as that made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk tend to weaken and blur the ideological image of America: Now, we do hereby

Resolve:

1. To support fully and unwaveringly the endeavors of the U.S. Government to preserve peace in the world at all costs, but not at the expense of immoral compromises or under the threats and intimidation of Khrushchev;

2. To appeal to the President of the United States and the U.S. Government to repudiate the Rusk letter, which is contrary to historical facts and has created grave damage to U.S. prestige as a freedom-loving nation and the leader of the free world;

3. To fully support the Flood resolution calling for establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, which would be charged with the gathering of unbiased and objective information on all the captive nations, information which would be subsequently utilized effectively by the U.S. Government, thereby preventing, as one salutary result, high U.S. officials from making such drastic blunders as that committed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in the matter of captive Ukraine and other subjugated nations;

4. To appeal to the House Foreign Affairs Committee to reverse its ill-advised course of limiting its hearings to a few captive nations only, which is a practice dictated by mere political expediency rather than by the general interest of the United States and its worldwide prestige as the leader of freedom-loving mankind; reference being made here to the testimony of the Honorable M. A. FEIGHAN before the said committee recently, testimony fully endorsed by the UCCA;

5. To prevail upon the U.S. Government to press an inquiry in the United Nations on Russian Communist colonialism with a rational emphasis on the non-Russian nations, enslaved since the time of the original empire of Moscow; we fully endorse the statement of President Kennedy of last year when he said: "There is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed 'dependent' lies under government installed by foreign troops * * *. Let's debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscite in every part of the globe * * *."

We, likewise, fully endorse the excellent memorandum of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson presented to the U.N. last November and which exposes fully the nakedness of Russian Communist colonialism and its oppressive domination of Ukraine and other non-Russian peoples.

6. We appeal to the U.S. Government to expose Russian Communist genocide perpetrated upon the Ukrainian people and the unbridled persecution of the Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, and appeal to the U.S. Government to bring the case of the criminal persecution and imprisonment of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy before the U.N. and thus expose the relentless Soviet destruction of all religions behind the Iron Curtain;

7. We support the establishment of a Freedom Academy, as proposed by a group of farsighted legislators in Congress, which would be charged with training our psychological warfare experts to the end that they effectively meet the challenge of Russian Communist totalitarianism;

8. We further appeal to the U.S. Government to issue a Shevchenko "champion of liberty" stamp in recognition of his service to humanity and the ideal of freedom, and ideal shared by the American people; and by so doing we would effectively indicate to the enslaved Ukrainians and other peoples that we espouse their cause, inasmuch as behind the Iron Curtain Shevchenko is synonymous with liberty;

9. To prevail upon the U.S. Government to adopt strong and unequivocal measures with regard to Cuba, so that (a) the Monroe Doctrine remain alive and unviolated; and (b) Khrushchev and company be apprised of our firmness in the face of their warlike machinations 90 miles from our shores;

10. To urge the U.S. Government to vigorously espouse the cause of the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain, in like manner that Khrushchev takes up the cudgel of liberation with regard to the colonial people, except that America would undertake a program of support which is genuine, sincere and attuned to the deathless instinct for freedom in the breasts of the enslaved peoples, a craving which accounts for their restlessness, for their continuing struggle, and which stamps them as our spiritual and military allies now and in time to come.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE—A POWERFUL WEAPON AGAINST SOVIET RUSSIAN IMPERIOCOLONIALISM

Mr. Speaker, this is also a fitting occasion for us to reemphasize and markedly underscore the fact that our support, both in word and deed, of the goal of Ukraine's independence constitutes a powerful weapon against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism.

Regrettably, we have scarcely begun to use this and other weapons in attaining to victory in the cold war. As we reflect now on the won and later lost independence of Ukraine 45 years ago, I commend to my colleagues the article written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, on "Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities."

I ask that this article be printed at this juncture of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESSES AND VULNERABILITIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is a professor of economics at Georgetown University. He is the author of the Captive Nations Week resolution—Public Law 86-70—which was passed by Congress in 1959. This resolution provides that the third week of July be set aside each year to remind the world of the nations held in bondage by Russian imperialism. Dr. Dobriansky is also a member of the American Security Council's strategy staff.)

In analyzing Soviet Russia, it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state, an external stimulus is required. There are many deep weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian empire, but so long as they remain untapped they are not, by definition, vulnerabilities. Policies of patched-up containment, evolution and wishful thinking on the coming breakup of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee that Soviet weaknesses shall not become vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the catalyst, is lacking.

The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and

points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonial Moscow. If we should resolve to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it wouldn't and couldn't be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. The best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

A cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction.

There are five major areas for analysis: (1) The ideologico-propaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military-space field; and (5) the party apparatus.

1. We have still to appreciate the central importance of propaganda in the cold war. The Soviet Russians have developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as the equal of the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda are deep and fundamental. After 20 years of indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution. There are many similar examples to prove the utter bankruptcy of Communist ideology when it is put into practice.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception, chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. This requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda. The Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. There are many good opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire. For example, we could easily show the Russian perversion of theoretical Marxism, the emptiness of so-called Communist ideology, the emergence of the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., and the colonial exploitation of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. These are only a few points to establish the Russian mythology of communism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule.

2. The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of

course, Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even greater problems at Stalin's death and during the Hungarian Revolution, but it, nonetheless, continued to build up its composite power.

Yet, beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of the genuine patriotic nationalism of the captive peoples both within and outside the Soviet Union. It is this patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Khrushchev's sensitivity here is shown by his fury at the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Khrushchev and his puppets know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

3. In the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure and increasingly threatening. Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy, but being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as \$12 to \$20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in the economy are many, but most fundamental are the differences in status and real income between the ruling elite and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. This could be transformed into a vulnerability by focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these weaknesses. It would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

4. The U.S.S.R. devotes top priority allocation of resources to the military-space field. Over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Their further development poses great dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying their military power. Today, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with global missiles. He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of "nuclearitis" as an excuse for the absence of a well-defined and developed cold-war policy.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties and will. Moscow is well aware that in all three major wars in this century, the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether tsarist or Soviet, disintegrated early.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward to cold war victory is by attaining and maintaining unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry.

5. The final area for analysis is the party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet

Russian strength, and the vehicle for the subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it has weaknesses that could be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intra-party feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

It is painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I am positive that given an aroused citizenry, the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet Russian Empire will lead us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Guest Editor.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year, more than ever, the importance of Ukrainian Independence Day is related to the struggle of the Ukrainian people and other captive nations of communism to escape the Red yoke and restore freedom to their land. I place special emphasis on this 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day on the efforts of many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle in obtaining approval for a special House Committee on the Captive Nations. On the opening day of the Congress, in conjunction with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], I introduced H.R. 15, identical to his H.R. 14, calling for the creation of this special committee. It is our hope that we will be able to obtain favorable consideration by the Rules Committee in the not too distant future.

Certainly, it is not necessary for me to add extensive remarks to those that will be made by my colleagues, outlining the history of the Ukraine, and the constant struggle in its fight for freedom and rightful self-determination. It is an absolute fact that the spirit of nationalism still beats strongly in the hearts of the people of the Ukraine. This spirit is pro-Western and anti-Communist in its history, philosophy and tradition.

One of the truly great figures in Ukrainian national life was its famous poet, Taras Shevchenko. I wish to direct the attention of the Members of the House to House Joint Resolution 165, which I introduced on January 21, calling for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of this great man on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Eighty-sixth Congress of the United States honored Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's poet laureate, by authorizing the erection of his monument on public grounds in Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas the same Congress provided for a documentary biography of Shevchenko in tribute to the everlasting spirit and works of this freedom fighter of Europe; and

Whereas the unremitting condemnations and attacks by imperialist Moscow and its colonial puppets against these far-seeing acts clearly prove the wisdom of the United States Government in properly claiming this con-

temporary of Lincoln as one of freedom's outstanding lights; and

Whereas in 1961 the President of the United States paid respects to the ideals and immortal teachings of this former serf, whose poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the forty-five million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence; and

Whereas the profound humanism of this champion of liberty was courageously directed against the colonial subjugation of all the non-Russian nations in eastern Europe and central Asia, as well against the suppression of the Jews and the slavery of Negroes; and

Whereas in consonance with the policy of the United States, it is both proper and fitting to advance the aspirations for freedom and independence of all nations by honoring their historic advocates of human liberty, and thus forging indissoluble spiritual ties with the respective peoples; and

Whereas by all evidence the Champion of Liberty stamp series has become an important and essential vehicle of expression in the formation and strengthening of such ties; and

Whereas in 1964 friends of freedom everywhere will be observing the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Shevchenko's birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is requested and authorized to issue a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, fighter for freedom in eastern Europe. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and design and shall be issued for such period commencing with the one hundred and fiftieth Shevchenko anniversary as the Postmaster General shall determine.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly inspired to see the great number of Members here on the floor participating in this observance of Ukrainian Independence Day. While the Soviet Union maintains the fiction of "independence" for the Ukraine and insists on its representation in the U.N. as a puppet state with voting participation, it is necessary for us to emphasize the fact that the Ukraine, like all the other captive nations of the Soviet empire, suffers under the persecution of communism. Its people are deprived of political and economic advances, and they continue to look to us, the leaders of the free world, to collaborate with them in the ultimate restoration of a government of their own choice.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so many Members have asked to participate in this observance, I will limit my remarks, and at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], one of the outstanding freshman Members of the 88th Congress.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding to the newly elected Member from New Hampshire for the purpose of making a statement concerning Ukrainian independence.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic proclaimed its independence. We salute the courageous aspirations of Ukrainians to free their native land from Communist tyranny. Although the Communists have suppressed the independence of the Ukrainians, we know they can never ex-

tinguish the light of freedom burning in the heart of every Ukrainian nationalist.

Anyone familiar with the efforts of the Ukrainian people must be inspired by their relentless struggle to remain free. If we reflect for a few moments on their history, we cannot fail to be encouraged in the global struggle against Communist imperialism.

Following the overthrow of the czarist government in Russia, the Ukrainian leaders saw an opportunity to free their country from foreign domination. These leaders organized a central council in Kiev, since called the first modern Ukrainian Government. Unfortunately, the Red government in Moscow rejected this Ukrainian desire for freedom. Lenin ordered the Red army to attack the Ukraine. Kiev was occupied in January of 1918 and there followed mass executions of Ukrainian leaders.

Since then, the Ukrainian people have suffered under Communist dictatorship. They have known hunger and poverty. They have seen their lands ravaged. They have felt the oppression of Communist dictatorship.

I think this is a proper occasion to remember other formerly independent nations of Eastern Europe. I refer to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Through a tragedy of modern history, they share an oppressing, temporary fate with the people of the Ukraine.

East-Central Europe—half a million square miles and 100 million people strong—lies between the Soviet Union proper and free Western Europe. By every standard, this area should be recognized as one of strategic importance. Just beyond it lie prime strategic areas. To the west there is free Europe, a great concentration of skills and resources, which in Communist plans is a decisive way station in their drive for world conquest. To the east, there is the very heart of the Soviet Union. Within this area live historic nations hostile to foreign rule and an alien pattern of life foisted upon them. From the standpoint of manpower and production, East-Central Europe represents roughly 40 percent of the economic power of the Soviet orbit.

During these opening days of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, we can give hope to the people of Eastern Europe by establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations within the House of Representatives. Such a committee would be a concrete method of collecting and publishing evidence of America's continuing concern for the plight of people subjugated by Communist imperialism. Moreover, such a committee would demonstrate to the new nations of the world that imperialism is an ingredient of Soviet and Communist Chinese foreign policy.

On this Ukrainian Independence Day we rededicate ourselves to the fight for freedom. We have as an inspiration the courage of the Ukrainian people who have for over a thousand years been seeking freedom.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

I am especially pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this opportunity to make these few remarks on Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

January 22 is a significant day in the history of man's freedom because it marks the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On that day 45 years ago an independent Ukrainian state was proclaimed at Kiev and though it was short-lived, it has served as an inspiration to men of good will ever since.

The Ukraine today, of course, is imprisoned within the Soviet Union. That important fact should be recognized by all Americans, particularly those concerned with the conduct of our foreign affairs. The Ukraine is, in a very real sense, a captive nation—a victim of the world's most oppressive colonial system.

We must seize every possible opportunity to remind the world of the plight of the Ukraine. Through the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the forum of the United Nations, the Captive Nations Committee I have proposed, and other means, we must take the lead in exposing the hoax of Soviet imperialism. We must assure the noble people of the Ukraine that they are not forgotten and that we are working and praying for the day when they will once more walk in the sunlight of freedom.

My home community of Rochester, N.Y., has a special interest in this subject, because it has benefited so greatly from the talents and energies and unique attributes of people of Ukrainian extraction. At colorful events during the year, these fine people exhibit their fine cultural heritage of dance and music.

Because freedom is stifled today in the Ukraine it is appropriate for us to observe this anniversary and to speak up for those who are silenced by communism's tyranny. We who live in the free world must encourage the flame of liberty which still burns bright in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Let us resolve, on this 45th anniversary, that we will not rest until independence is restored to the Ukraine and that country once more takes its rightful place in the family of free nations.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in this significant tribute to a great people, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] for giving me this opportunity to share in the commemoration of this event.

The observance this week of the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukraine underscores the importance of the captive nations resolution which many of us in the House have joined in sponsoring.

Although the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, proclaimed on January 22, 1918, lasted only 2 years, the spirit of freedom still burns in the hearts of Ukrainians. It is the duty of all of us who are dedicated to the cause of democracy to nurture that love of independence in the Ukraine and in every other captive nation that now is being ground under the savage boot of Soviet totalitarianism.

Passage of the captive nations resolution, which would establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, would offer dramatic proof to those under the Communist yoke that they have not been forgotten by us in the free world.

I join in saluting the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine. Their independence may have been short-lived, but the flaming spirit of independence cannot be forever kept in check by the forces of oppression. One day, and may it be soon, a new era of freedom will dawn for the people of the Ukraine.

Until that happy day arrives, let us, Mr. Speaker, do all in our power to keep the people of the Ukraine reminded of our interest, our concern, our support, and our sympathy for their noble cause.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I would like to pay special recognition to the gentleman's efforts and to those of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] for their active support of the Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention at this time the spirit of bipartisanship that covers these occasions and the tremendous work and leadership provided by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOR] in this field.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to take part on this floor in helping to commemorate the anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, and to salute both the Ukrainian people and those Americans of Ukrainian descent whose deep love of freedom and deep commitment to American ideals has added so greatly to the progress of our great country.

And once again I want to reaffirm not only my hope but also my conviction that the people of the Ukraine, like the people of the other nations who are now slaves to Communist imperialism, the nations we refer to as captive nations, will soon be free again.

To speed that day, Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced my resolution calling for the establishment of a Captive Nation's Committee of this House. We made some real progress in the 87th Congress in pressing for a separate com-

mittee to handle the special policy problems related to these captive nations like the Ukraine. I hope that in this new 88th Congress we will be able to realize our goal, and thereby make clear that our professions of hope about the eventual freedom of these captive nations are not mere words but are principles deeply underlying our whole policy.

Forty-five years have passed. Mr. Speaker, since that day on January 22, 1918, when the Ukrainian people issued a proclamation of independence and joined the nations of the world as a free and sovereign state. A short 2 years later their freedom was suppressed by the Soviets, but the same courage and hope that ignited their birth of freedom 45 years ago persists today.

The fact that this courage and hope has persisted throughout these four decades of suppression is cogent proof that tyranny and oppression can never erase the desire of spirited men and women for freedom.

For these reasons the Ukrainian people have been a tremendous inspiration to all of us who are working for a world of free and independent states. The American people, including those fine Americans of Ukrainian descent, look forward anxiously and impatiently to the day when the Ukrainian National Republic will again join the free world partnership of nations.

As leaders of the free world, we in America have the greatest responsibility for the development of a free world community. Adoption of our Captive Nations Committee resolution is a necessary step to reassure the people of the Ukraine and other captive nations of our determination to help them in their bid for freedom.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a statement on Ukrainian independence released on Tuesday, January 22, by the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

The statement follows:

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukrainian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for oppressed people everywhere. Therefore, the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people to demonstrate their sympathy with and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

On January 22, Ukrainians in the free world will solemnly observe the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian State and the 44th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into one free and sovereign republic of the Ukrainian people.

For almost 4 years the young and democratic Ukrainian Republic waged a defensive war against the Russian Communist aggression. In 1920 the free Ukrainian State was destroyed and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, which in 1923 became a member of the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow claims that Ukraine and other non-Russian republics of the U.S.S.R. are "free and sovereign" states, and that Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, the Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia.

Its human and economic resources are being exploited by the Kremlin for the purpose of spreading the communization of the world

and subverting the once free nations, as in the case of Cuba, to which Khrushchev and his Communist chieftains had sent their missiles and other offensive weapons which they had manufactured from the economic resources of Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations.

We recall that during the 1960 and 1961 sessions of the United Nations a number of Western statesmen, including Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada, and the U.S. Ambassador, Adlai E. Stevenson, and others, raised their voices in protest against the oppression and enslavement of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia.

Also, the Soviet Government is sending special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stephen Bandera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe to 8 years at hard labor.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which listed Ukraine as one of the captive nations held in enslavement and captivity by Moscow.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Ukrainian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am extremely pleased to note the presence on the floor of the House of a gentleman who is an acknowledged expert among House Members on the subject of captive nations, who has provided tremendous spirit and persistence in developing an appreciation among our officials in the executive branch of the Government as to the value to the United States and the free world of the spirit that still beats in the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain. I am pleased to recognize at this time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous remarks of the gentleman from Illinois whose enlightened and vigorous advocacy of the cause of all the captive nations is well known to Members of the House. I congratulate him for that initiative which he has so ably demonstrated again today.

Mr. Speaker, this 45th anniversary of Ukrainian national independence is an object lesson for the newly independent nations of our times.

All of us know the Ukrainian nation is neither free nor independent today. It is the victim of the new colonialism, the new imperialism of Moscow. Ukraine is not the only victim of Russian imperial tyranny. As is well known, there are no less than a score of once free and independent nations forcibly incorporated into the modern day empire of the Russians. The 86th Congress took special recognition of this fact and the danger it poses to the cause of peace by enactment of Public Law 86-90, known as the Captive Nations Week law.

We observe this 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian national independence because we are dedicated to the principle of self-determination under which all

people and nations have the right to be self-governing and independent. That principle is the foundation of our American political heritage. We cherish it and we share it with all like-minded people throughout the world, those who now enjoy its benefits as well as those who still struggle for its application to their national life. The people of Ukraine have never given up their struggle for the right of self-determination, and we mark this anniversary as a high point in that struggle. They won their fight in 1918, establishing an independent democratic republic, only to fall victim to Russian colonial aggression under the banner of communism a few years later. Today the struggle in Ukraine for national independence is very much alive, and the cause of human freedom is strengthened by that struggle against the forces of imperial Russian communism. This is an appropriate time to take note of some little known but important international considerations in connection with the Ukrainian struggle for national independence.

At the outset the Ukrainian nation made a great contribution to tumbling the ancient and despotic empire of the Russian czars. As a vital part of the national independence movement which swept through the Eurasian landmass during the period 1916 to 1920 the Ukrainian people were in the vanguard of this movement. Four great empires fell before this tidal wave of human and national aspirations—the Austro-Hungarian, German, Ottoman, and Russian czarist empires passed into history. They were replaced by a series of newly independent nations stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea. The old concert of empires which had long been the power factor of this vast area was replaced by popular forms of national government. But this created problems which the victorious Western Allies were ill prepared to handle, the greatest being the rise of a new imperial tyranny in Moscow—communism.

It is important to recall here that the founders of communism as a system of government, the Bolsheviks, first established their power in the Russian nation. In this connection we should never forget that the Russians alone among all the peoples of the broken empire of the czars, failed to produce a national independence movement and remained untouched by this great wave of human hopes and expectations. Contrariwise, the Russian educated class remained fixed to the concepts of empire, rejected by the non-Russian nations of the broken empire, and devoted their energies and resources to restoring the Russian empire. The Bolsheviks adopted the same objective soon after they established their power over the Russian nation. While there were ideological differences between the Russian Bolsheviks and the Russian monarchists, they pursued a common objective—restoration of the Russian empire. While they were enemies, their common enemy was the national independence movement and both waged war against the newly independent nations. It remains a close question today as to which, the Russian Bolsheviks or the Russian monarchists, contrib-

uted the most to the fall of independent government in Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkistan, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, and the Republic of North Caucasus.

History reminds us that the Russian Bolsheviks were victorious in this three-way war. After several years of bloody warfare, terror, and treachery, the new Russian elite class—the Bolsheviks, seized control of Ukraine and other newly independent nations. But this control was uncertain because the mass of non-Russian people in Ukraine and the other nations mentioned continued to demand self-government and national independence. It was in these circumstances that the Russian Bolsheviks set up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1924, in an effort to stem the powerful tide of the national independence movement. Ukraine was proclaimed a Soviet Socialist Republic and forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. But the new Russian elite class were forced to officially recognize the existence of a separate and distinct Ukrainian nation. This was a significant gain for the Ukrainian people because centuries of Russian czarist occupation had denied this recognition and some czars went so far as to issue a ukase proclaiming that "Ukraine no longer exists" as a distinct state. Other czars prohibited teaching and writing in the Ukrainian language in an effort to break the national spirit of that country.

In 1954 on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav, an instrument through which the Russian czars first destroyed Ukrainian independence, a new tactic was used by the Russian ruling class in the U.S.S.R. In connection with that year-long observance, the ideological spokesmen for the Kremlin spent great efforts in claiming that the Ukrainian nation was free and independent. These spokesmen for the Kremlin sought to discredit growing charges in the free world that the Ukrainian nation was a captive nation, submerged by Russian imperialism, forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. and having nothing more than the status of a highly exploited colony of Moscow. On that occasion the propaganda organs of Moscow directed that the Communist regime in all the so-called Republics of the U.S.S.R. prepare suitable festivities and ceremonies noting the national independence of Ukraine. These same propaganda organs officially honored Ukrainian literature, history, customs, and folklore, as evidence that the Ukrainian nation was free and independent. But in all things of Russian origin, there is always a joker and this occasion was no exception. A new definition of the meaning of national independence was announced by the new Russian elite class. That definition states that Ukrainian independence is "national in form and Socialist in substance."

This means that the people of Ukraine are allowed to have their own national flag, but with the hammer and sickle mounted on it, they are allowed to speak and write in their native language, they are allowed to observe some of their ancient customs and traditions, they are

allowed to claim a history, but of course, it is the Russian version of Ukrainian history. But above all else, the term "Socialist in substance" means that the ideals, the hopes, and the aspirations of the Ukrainian people must always be subject to the imperial whims of Moscow. Nevertheless this Moscow interpretation of national independence made in 1954 indicates that the tide of self-determination runs strong in Ukraine and that the new Russian elite class has been forced to adopt new ways and means in an effort to sublimate it and head it off. I suggest that those who doubt there are strong aspirations for freedom and national independence in Ukraine today give careful thought to this analysis which I have given.

I have said that the many newly independent nations which emerged with the collapse of empires following World War I created problems which the victorious Western Allies were ill prepared to handle. Aside from the rise of imperial Russian communism, there was no United Nations forum such as we have today and through which newly independent nations of our day are afforded a degree of protection along with considerable assistance in making permanent their newly won national independence. It will be recalled that the League of Nations was not established until 1920 although the covenant for its establishment was made at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. It was in the critical period of 1918-20 that the newly independent nations of the broken Russian czarist empire were struggling for national survival against the aggression of Russian bolshevism and the forces of Russian monarchy described in many history books as the "White Russians." Those newly independent nations had no established international forum to which they could turn for moral or collective support in firming up their hard-won independence. By a cruel turn of circumstance, they were left to the forces of imperialism and they finally fell victims to it. The newly independent nations of our time might well reflect with benefit on this harsh lesson of history. Doing so I would hope that they would demonstrate a keener appreciation of the plight of Ukraine and the other captive nations and would use their membership in the United Nations in support of the right of self-determination for all the captive nations. The Russian Communists are well aware of these facts just as they are aware of the powerful storm of nationalism that brews within their present empire. The signs of the time should urge the Russian Communists to pay immediate heed to these forces at work within their empire, which can lead to extremely dangerous consequences for them if they continue to thwart human aspirations for freedom and national independence.

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message delivered but a few days ago, underscored the global trend of our times. He stated:

The disarray of the Communist empire has been heightened by two other formidable forces. One is the historical force of nationalism—and the yearning of all men to be free. The other is other gross inefficiency

of their economies. For a closed society is not open to ideas of progress—and a police state finds that it cannot command the grain to grow.

I would only add that it is the historical force of nationalism which denies Communist imperialism the grain to survive, let alone grow.

One further point must be made as we examine the international significance of the Ukrainian national independence movement because it has a critical bearing on the overriding issues of war and peace. It is a fact, though not popularly known, that in the first 3 months of the German campaign on the eastern front during World War II close to 4 million Red army soldiers surrendered their arms voluntarily and refused to fight in support of the modern day Russian empire. These soldiers were not Russians. They were non-Russians, indentured into service in the Red army, from all the captive non-Russian nations of the last remaining empire in the world. All they asked was the opportunity to fight against the Russian Bolsheviks, to be organized as national units, and, with victory, the promise of freedom and national independence for their homelands. The Ukrainians were in the forefront of this movement to restore freedom and national independence to the nations imprisoned by Russian communism. The German field commanders recommended to Hitler that the wishes of these soldiers be honored because it would not only hasten the end of war on the eastern front, but would assure victory. Hitler, in consultation with Himmler and Goering, decided against the recommendation of the German field commanders on ideological grounds, declaring that those soldiers "were non-Aryans and as such unfit to spill their blood for the Reich." The consequences of that decision are now self-evident, particularly after we take note of the vast increase in the size of the Russian Communist empire since the close of World War II and the threat which it now poses to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere in the world.

We have seen the once independent nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. We have seen Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania robbed of their independence and turned into Russian colonies by the Moscow regimes imposed upon them. We have seen Germany, Korea, and Vietnam partitioned by the agents of Russian Communist imperialism. Mainland China, Tibet, and Outer Mongolia have been forcibly linked to the Russian empire and its dreams of world conquest. Yes, we have witnessed the Russian Communist annexation of Cuba and the planting there of Communist seeds of war and aggression in the Western Hemisphere.

From this chapter of history there are several lessons we must learn in our present dealings with the problem of imperial Russian communism. Among those lessons are:

First. That the Russians will never be able to accomplish their ages-long goal of world conquest so long as the hopes of the

people in the captive non-Russian nations for freedom and national independence remain strong. The fear of mass disaffection and desertion which would become a reality should a war occur haunts the men in the Kremlin. They remember the lessons of World War II on the eastern front and want no repeat of that episode which took their empire to the brink of total disaster.

Second. The more we support by political means and associate our destiny with the hopes and aspirations of the people in Ukraine and all the other captive nations, just that much do we reduce the prospects of a war launched by Moscow. We must never permit those human aspirations to weaken or atrophy because if we do, the prospects of war will be immeasurably increased. This truism stands whether we continue to hold a superiority over the Russians in nuclear striking force or fall back into a nuclear stalemate.

Third by strengthening the national independence movement in Ukraine and all the other captive nations, we enhance the cause of peace and speed the day when peace with justice will reign in the world. The desire of the common man behind the iron curtain for individual liberty, freedom, and the dignity of life which national independence can bring is the human force which moves the tide of self-determination which President Kennedy spoke about in his address before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 25, 1961, and which he observed had not yet struck the Communist empire. We act in the highest American tradition when we support those aspirations and we shall be rewarded in their fulfillment by a world at peace.

I join with my American friends of Ukrainian origin and all other Americans in the common hope that we shall remain ever faithful to our American political heritage.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his forceful, forthright and timely remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, January 22 is the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. Though the Ukrainian nation, in the wake of the great cry for self-determination, achieved its goal in 1918, its tragic capture by aggressive communism robbed it of the independence it had heroically achieved.

Lest we forget, it is altogether just that we remember each of its anniversaries of its independence not only as a symbol of our own dedication to freedom, but as our deeper expression of the imperatives of universal freedom in the name of the dignity of man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Ukrainian independence was attained early in 1918 upon the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia. On January 22 of that year the Ukrainians proclaimed their national independence and established a Republic. That act was the culmination of a long struggle which had its beginning in the mid-17th century, when the Ukrainians were forcibly

brought under the autocratic Russian regime. The freedom thus regained represented the happiest climax in the modern history of the Ukrainian people, it proved to be all too brief. The forces of destruction and death, in the form of the aggressive Red Army of Communist Russia, determined to put an end to the Ukrainian Republic, and unfortunately were able to carry out their evil designs. Late in 1920 the Ukraine was invaded by the Communist military forces, and the Ukrainians were brought under the tyrannical yoke of the Kremlin.

Since then the Ukrainians have been suffering under Communist totalitarianism, but even under the most oppressive of tyrannies, these stouthearted and downtrodden people have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their struggle against forbidding odds in the hope that eventually their righteous cause will win out. On the 45th anniversary of their national holiday, the Ukrainian Independence Day, my hearty wishes go to these dauntless and courageous souls.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today, we of the free world mark the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine on behalf of the millions of Ukrainians who are not free to know the wonders of independence. The reign of self-determination in the Ukraine was short lived, but the spark which ignited the Ukrainian desire for freedom in 1918 still burns in the minds of men in every corner of the world. We cannot assume that it has died out in the hearts of Ukrainians just because the power of the Kremlin is dominant in this area.

Above all, though, we Americans want to assure the world that we have not forgotten the plight of those less politically fortunate than ourselves. Our Government is one of laws, not men, and therefore, we are guaranteed certain inalienable rights which cannot be taken away by the whims of leaders who want to perpetuate their own power. Men and the power they generate control the Ukraine today, and change cannot take place simply by the actions of a majority at the ballot box. There are no guarantees that the terrors of Stalinism will not return, though they might now seem forever buried in the history of another age.

On the occasion of the anniversary of the independence of one of the oldest victims of Moscow's imperialism, it is only proper that free men renew their efforts to prove to the world that the U.S.S.R. is a group of republics bound together not by common traits or mutual historic ideals, but simply by the strength of conquest. One of the best means to open the book of the captive nations is to establish a special committee in the House of Representatives to document the history of Russian conquest and the nature of this new imperialism of the 20th century. I want to take this opportunity to join with many of my colleagues in reintroducing to the 88th Congress a House resolution to create such a special committee of our Members.

Let the success of this resolution and the friendship of the American people indicate to the captive peoples all around the world that they are in our thoughts.

constantly and that we do no intend to take any action which would lengthen their subjugation at the hands of the leaders of godless international communism.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate once again the short-lived Ukrainian Republic and the hopes and dreams of the Ukrainian people everywhere. It was 45 years ago today that the liberty-loving Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. After more than 300 years of suffering under the oppressive yoke of alien despots, the Ukrainian people made the most of the opportunity presented by the downfall of the czarist regime in Russia and the ouster of Austria from the western Ukraine. January 22, 1918, became a landmark in the long Ukrainian struggle for freedom and independence. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic was surrounded by powerful enemies from the moment of its birth, each of whom was ready to put an end to its existence. Almost before the jubilation had ceased, the country was overrun by the Soviet Union, and the Ukrainian National Republic was submerged in the Soviet empire.

Since 1920, therefore, the 40 million Ukrainians have not been able to enjoy the normal benefits of a free and independent life in their historic homeland. Once again they are persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming of independence and freedom. But oppression and persecution has united the Ukrainians against their foes and held them together. On this 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we solemnly commemorate the continuing struggle for freedom of a brave and noble people.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 45th anniversary of the independence of a people whose short-lived period of modern-day freedom has been wedged in between centuries of privation and domination by others. During its history, the Ukraine has been overrun and devastated by the Mongols, carved up and partitioned, harshly ruled by Russia's czardom, dominated by the Hapsburgs, and subjugated by the Red army. Throughout these ordeals the spirit of the Ukrainian people has never flagged, and those seeds of independence have been a constant source of nourishment and hope.

Today, the 45 million people of the Ukraine constitute the largest captive nation in Eastern Europe. They fare no better under the tyranny of the Kremlin than their forefathers did under foreign lords. As we celebrate with them the significance of this day, let us share in the confidence that their perseverance will be vindicated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1918, just 45 years ago today, the flame of independence and democracy flickered briefly in war-torn Russia.

The Ukrainian People's Republic, centered in Kiev, proclaimed its independence from the Moscow revolutionary regime, already in the hands of the Bolsheviks.

But even then the Ukraine was in the throes of civil war because a minority within the central rada—council—a minority composed of Bolsheviks and other like-minded radicals, refused to abide by the majority decision for independence and set up a separate government.

The central council in Kiev had contained representatives from all walks of Ukrainian life, including Bolsheviks. Thus the natural democratic instincts of the Ukrainian leaders were exploited by the Bolsheviks in their drive for totalitarian control.

The practice of utilizing democracy, then destroying it, has been repeated over and over. As always, the issue was settled by the sword. Soviet troops swept aside the fragile republic before it could defend itself, and another portion of freedom was devoured.

But the Ukrainian's love of freedom and passion for independence cannot be extinguished by forceful subjugation. Therefore we commemorate this day to remind the Communists that the winds of change are blowing history in the direction of freedom for all men, and to remind ourselves to appreciate and guard the freedom that we now enjoy.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, in an age when European colonialism is in rapid decline in Asia and Africa, it is paradoxical that another type of colonialism, centered in Moscow, should find itself increasingly secure in its socialist control over millions of non-Russian people both inside and outside the Soviet Union.

The 40 million Ukrainian people behind the Iron Curtain represent one of the largest nations ever to fall under the yoke of such colonialism, and it is understandable that the 2 million Americans of Ukrainian background including many from the 24th Pennsylvania District, are among the most fervent and unflinching groups in this country supporting the cause of liberation—of the Ukrainian nation in particular but of all the other captive nations as well.

The fact that Ukrainian independence was short lived does not affect the issue. The Ukrainian people have a long history of ethnic, cultural, and linguistic identity which, together with their centuries of habitation in one geographic area, gave them all the necessary attributes of nationhood. In recent centuries the Ukrainian people had been ruled by the Russian czars and by the Austro-Hungarian empire, but after the downfall of the last czar, a Ukrainian Parliament was formed and it proclaimed the establishment of a free and independent Ukrainian National Democratic Republic on January 22, 1918. Less than 3 years later this new nation was mercilessly crushed by Bolshevik military power, and physically absorbed into the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian people in the Soviet Union since that time were the first to suffer enslavement at the hands of the Communists, thus preceding other people forced into the Communist camp. It is of particular interest that the present ruler of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev, had a direct hand in this

oppression when during the 1930's he was Communist Party boss in the Ukraine, carrying out the tyrannical directives of Stalin.

In physical terms the Ukrainian nation has fallen victim to Soviet colonialism, but the spirit of Ukrainian nationalism and freedom survives in the Ukraine as well as in the hearts of Americans of Ukrainian descent. These Ukrainian-Americans have applied the best of their heredity to loyalty to the United States which has given all of us the blessings of liberty and security. At the same time their personal experiences worked not only for the cause of Ukrainian independence, but for enslaved people everywhere. For they rightly see an identity between the fundamental interests of America and those of the free world; namely, the expansion of freedom and the preservation of peace with justice.

We Americans must keep in mind that the expansion of freedom needs to be worked for through 20th century methods rather than the archaic method of war. Any direct military action for the liberation of the enslaved people would likely result in a global war, as the Red regime would do its utmost to prevent the breakup of its satellite empire, not to mention of the Soviet Union itself.

What can be done and what the free world needs to do is for us to outdo the Communist bloc in peaceful economic and political competition, to defeat the Communists in the struggle for the minds of men, so that the Communist bloc becomes increasingly isolated. At the same time that we shall be stymying Communist expansion internationally, the forces within the Soviet Union which have been pushing for liberalization of the regime are likely to grow apace, especially if the blessings and advantages of freedom are made increasingly evident by the free world.

Thus we collectively, all Americans descended from immigrants, can anticipate that Khrushchev's grandchildren as well as all the captive people in the Communist world will some day live in freedom. For the attainment of that noble objective, I add my most ardent hopes and expectations to yours on this 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in observing the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. It is important that we pay tribute to the great people of the Ukraine and that we observe these ceremonies in the House of Representatives. The brave people of the Ukraine need this demonstration of our faith in those behind the Iron Curtain who wish to be free.

The history of the Ukrainian people during the past 1,000 years is one fraught with struggles for independence against awesome odds. In 1794, the major portion of the Ukrainian people came under Russian rule. With the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, the opportunity for freedom and independence was finally at hand. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian leaders proclaimed their country's independence. The joy of the

people was short-lived, for in 1920 their country was attacked by the resurgent Red Army and overpowered, and the people were brought under Russian rule again—this time under the U.S.S.R. The captivity and enslavement of the 45-million Ukrainian nation are deplored by all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The Ukrainian people have an enviable record of dedication to the principles of freedom and dignity of the individual. When we focus worldwide attention on the Ukraine, we help the cause of freedom and truth; when we in Congress give assurance to the world that we are not forgetting the sad plight of the millions now living in oppression behind the Iron Curtain, we dramatize and call attention to the treachery and the deceit of the Communist system. We know that the people of the Ukraine have not relinquished their desire for freedom; their hopes must be kept alive, and they deserve our encouragement in this tragic period in their history. We hope and pray that the day of liberation for them and all other captive nations will soon be a reality.

This is an appropriate occasion for me to urge the Congress to approve the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Such a committee would vividly symbolize to all the world our determination never to forget the captive nations, their untold sacrifices in their struggle for liberation and independence, and freedom from the Soviet yoke of oppression.

I am happy to sponsor the resolution providing for the formation of such a Committee on Captive Nations which was introduced by our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] and I have introduced an identical resolution to indicate my strong support.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the comments of my colleagues on the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

I think it is important for us to recall each year, for all the world to know, that we do not recognize the right of the Soviet Union to turn free nations into Communist colonies, and we repudiate those Americans no matter how highly placed who feel that the Soviet Empire cannot be dismembered.

On this occasion, I wish to call attention to House Concurrent Resolution 8 and ask leave that the text of the resolution be included as part of my remarks:

Whereas the United States of America is dedicated to the restoration of liberty and self-determination for eight hundred million people enslaved by Communist imperialism; and

Whereas there exists in the hearts and minds of Americans a deep sympathy and understanding for the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Americans to keep alive the traditions of liberty symbolized by the historic national holidays of the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States proclaim the following historic dates as days of observance by the people of the United States in their spiritual union with the victims of Com-

munist imperialism and colonialism: January 22 as Ukrainian Day; February 16 as Lithuanian Day; February 24 as Estonian Day; March 3 as Bulgarian Day; March 14 as Slovakian Day; March 15 as Hungarian Day; March 25 as White Ruthenian Day; May 3 as Polish Day; May 10 as Rumanian Day; May 26 as Georgian Day; May 28 as Armenian and Azerbaijan Day; June 17 as East German Day; August 15 as Korean Day; October 10 as Chinese Day; October 26 as Vietnamese Day; October 28 as Czech Day; November 18 as Latvian Day; November 28 as Albanian Day; December 13 as Turkestan Day.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the two World Wars of this century were among the worst disasters in recorded history. While in both the forces of democracy and freedom emerged victorious over the forces of autocracy and tyranny, they left us with distinctly different results. At the conclusion of the first we witnessed the rebirth and regeneration of many new states in Europe alone, states in which peoples had lost their freedom and were suffering under alien regimes, while at the end of the last war all these peoples in central and Eastern Europe once more lost their freedom and were subjugated to Soviet tyranny.

The Ukrainian people had known the Russians as their overbearing and oppressive taskmasters for centuries, either as callous agents of autocratic czars or as the heartless minions of Communists in the Kremlin. Only for a brief 2-year period they were free and on their own in their homeland. That was the period in 1918-20 when they lived in their newly constituted but hopelessly weak Ukrainian Republic. During those 2 years they worked, fought, and prayed for its survival and success, but in the end its fate was doomed by an inveterate and treacherous enemy, the Red army of Communist Russia. For when the helpless Ukrainian Republic was attacked by that army none of Ukraine's sincere friends could give her the help survival would have required. Soon the whole country was overrun and made part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than four decades, some 42 million Ukrainians have existed in their native land under the oppressive Communist totalitarianism imposed upon them by the Kremlin. But these sturdy and stouthearted souls also hope and pray for their deliverance from their oppressors. On this 45th anniversary we join them in their prayer for their freedom and independence.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this month the Ukrainian people whose devotion to freedom has survived unspeakable adversities, celebrate the 45th anniversary of their independence.

The celebration is muted by sadness because that independence is only a cherished memory in today's world where, as the cause of freedom is extended, millions remain as captives behind the Iron Curtain.

But shining through this occasion is the eternal quest for liberation of the homeland in the hearts of all Ukrainians—those who are enslaved or scattered as fugitives from oppression. That this hope burns hot is an inspiration to all similarly victimized; that this hope is reiterated 45 years after it was real-

ized so briefly is the highest tribute to the unfaltering courage and determination of the Ukrainian people.

For us who know better than most what it means to live under perpetual freedom—denied nothing that will enhance our individual aims and ambitions—compassion for the Ukrainian people is close to the surface of our emotions and we would remind them today of our warm admiration.

Through history, few people have suffered more; few people have waited so long for such a brief emergence from bondage. For centuries the Ukrainians planned, dreamed, and fought for an independent status. They found a real glimmer of hope toward the close of the Russian czarist regime. When it collapsed, they established on January 22, 1918, the first Ukrainian National Republic. In the next 2 years, as they fought to consolidate their independence, they were confronted by the overwhelming force of Russian Communist troops and, in 1920, the new nation was forcibly incorporated as part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. Speaker, I know that when the spark of revolt is ignited behind the Iron Curtain, these people who have never given up, never renounced their ways and their beliefs, will be in the front ranks of the movement. I am sure that day will come—as sure as I am that the aims of godless communism and doomed to defeat wherever freedom-loving people have the heart and courage to oppose them. So I join all Americans in saluting the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian Congress Committee, one of the organizations that speaks for them in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would add to this my hope that we will see the establishment in the Congress of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations which would symbolize America's concern for all captive peoples and by its very existence continue to keep Russia on notice of our opposition to ruthless Communist colonization.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainians, who are among the most-gifted, courageous, and stouthearted peoples in the Eurasian Continent, are also among the most unfortunate ethnic groups in modern history. These hard-working, liberty-loving, and supremely devout Christians had lost their freedom more than three centuries ago, and for that length of time had been struggling against their oppressors, the autocratic czars of Russia. In 1918, when the forces that held them in chains were shattered, they proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. That was done on January 22, 45 years ago. From its birth until its agonizing death at the hands of Communist Russians 2 years later, the newly founded state was faced with insurmountable difficulties. Early in 1920 the country was attacked and then overrun by the Red army; soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the independent Ukraine had ceased to exist.

Since then, some 40 million Ukrainians have for 45 years borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin and have suffered in

ways beyond description. They have been robbed of their worldly possessions, and they have been put to death by the millions. Millions were driven from their homes to the forbidding vastnesses of Siberian wasteland, and there in slave-labor camps they have been forced to work under most abominable conditions for their heartless taskmasters in the Kremlin. During all these years there has been very little change in the sad lot of the Ukrainian people in their homeland. On the 45th anniversary of their national independence they are not permitted to celebrate it there. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians domiciled in this hospitable republic, who have become its loyal citizens, here celebrate that historic event in due solemnity. I am glad to join them in this memorable celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago men who loved liberty proclaimed the Ukraine independent. Within 2 years that independence had been crushed. Today, 45 million persons live in the Ukraine who are not free.

I wish to join with many of my colleagues in the House on this 45th anniversary observance of Ukrainian independence in asserting that this country, like so many others in Eastern Europe, need not remain shackled forever—for wherever freedom has been, there it will one day return. The forces of history stand opposed to tyranny, to the coercion of human beings and their God-given rights.

Taras Shevchenko was a great Ukrainian poet who stirred his countrymen to independence after 1,000 years of domination. He once wrote, in lamenting the absence of freedom in his country:

Songs of mine, O songs of mine,
You are all I have.
Do not leave me now, I pray,
In this dreadful time.

Here today, representatives of the American people go on record that this song is not forgotten, and shall not be so long as the people of the Ukraine, and others like them, remain in bondage.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we gathered here in the august Chamber of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock. We have gathered here under the shadow of the Capitol dome at what might well be called the high noon of freedom. We have listened to the words of freemen, spoken to freemen, in a hall of free debate, and all of us shall vote freely on the acceptance or rejection of the message we heard today.

But freedom does not walk the whole of the earth.

It is not noon over the great nation of the Ukraine. As we walked into this Chamber, it was already 8 o'clock over that great people. Darkness had fallen over then 3 hours ago; the lights in all the villages and cities of the Ukraine had flickered on, to bring some cheer in the darkness of cold night.

But this is not the only darkness that lies over that land. Indeed, the darkness of night is a welcome respite from another darkness that covers that unhappy land, the darkness of slavery.

For the Ukraine today is the greatest in number of all the captive nations of Europe. Forty-five millions of souls are held captive in this land, and the slavery lies heavily upon them.

But there is something that can be done to lighten the load of their chains. In spite of all the works of evil men, in spite of walls, of iron curtains, of all the devilish machinations of men to keep truth from these people, somehow the truth seeps through, or creeps through, or flies through. And if we, today, send to these people the word that we have not forgotten them, that we stand for their freedom with all the vigor that only a free nation can muster, then, at least, we will have given them hope.

The cold hands of Khrushchev lie heavily upon the Ukraine, upon Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. But all that I hear is rejoicing that the Soviets and Red China are in vast dispute. I would as soon rejoice at news that rioting had broken out on Alcatraz, and the prisoners were killing each other. I find little consolation at a quarrel between killers.

We have known Khrushchev for a long time now. First as the "butcher of the Ukraine," later as the "butcher of Budapest." Sir, we may have to deal with this butcher, but I hope that never will it be forgotten by any branch or department of this Government that what he is selling is meat—not truth. Nor should it be forgotten that the blood upon his apron is not the honest blood of cattle but is the blood of the bodies and souls of men—the men of the Ukraine, the men of Hungary, the men of East Berlin, the men of Katyn Forest—the millions of men who have been ground beneath the heels of the Soviet and the tanks of the Soviet.

Tomorrow night in St. Stephens Church here in the Nation's Capital, a mass will be celebrated in the Ukrainian rite. But if this is the only memorial to the peoples of the Ukraine, then something noble will have passed this city by. I do not propose that this shall be so.

It is worthy of note that the first meeting of the Ukrainian National Assembly was held on April 19, the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington. If the spirit of Lexington lives there, I hope it still lives here.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day, and on behalf of the large number of my constituents of Ukrainian birth who now reside mostly in Waukegan and North Chicago, Lake County, Ill., in the 12th Congressional District, I rise to pay tribute to this freedom-loving nation which remains under the yoke of communism.

Forty-five years ago, a band of brave Ukrainians unfurled the banner of freedom to proclaim Ukraine's independence. That event marked the realization of a long-cherished patriotic dream. As the result of the Russian revolution, czarist autocracy was shattered. It was only natural that non-Russian ethnic groups in Russia's loosely held empire should break away, resolved

to set up their own governments. So, the Ukrainians created the Ukrainian Republic. Wartime events and unforeseen postwar international situations proved disastrous to the newly proclaimed Ukrainian state. Even before the war ended, it was attacked by a neighboring people and rendered too weak to withstand the deadly onslaught of the Red army. The unfortunate end came in 1920 when the country was invaded, conquered, and made a part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended a short—but proud—chapter in the 20th-century history of the Ukrainian people.

The Ukraine is the second largest unit in the Soviet Union, and its more than 42 million inhabitants make up more than a fifth of the U.S.S.R.'s population. Since 1920, these millions of stout-hearted patriots have had to accept the oppressive Soviet Government, without enjoying any of the elemental rights which the free societies of the West consider the birthright of all human beings. Appalling and harsh though it is, the sad and tragic truth is that for four decades Russian Communists have ruled the Ukrainians with an iron hand. They have turned the country into a large prison with no semblance of freedom. The masterminds of the Kremlin have seen to it that there are no such Western trappings as inalienable rights in the Ukraine.

Fortunately, neither the tyrants of Moscow nor their minions in the Ukraine have succeeded in extinguishing the spirit of freedom among the Ukrainians. Despite the darkness and the depression, the total misery and unending suffering, hope springs eternal in the hearts of these brave people. So long as that spirit of hope lives—so long as the ideal of national freedom is cherished by the Ukrainians and passed on from father to son and mother to daughter—no dictatorship or tyranny can deprive this nation of their real independence—the independence of their hearts and souls.

In this observance of the 45th anniversary of their independence day, it is our ardent prayer that they will regain their freedom and know peace in their historic fatherland.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

It was in 1918, in the city of Kiev, that the proclamation was made, fulfilling the cherished desires of the Ukrainian people. But, freedom was not to be retained by these gallant people, for within 2 years it had been ruthlessly suppressed by the Communist forces of Russia.

The Ukrainian people have since endured the heavy burden of Communist tyranny, praying for their liberation day. Although freedom has been extinguished for them, we know that the spiritual and moral character of the Ukrainian people cannot be suppressed. Their desire for liberty is as strong as that of our own American colonists.

The Ukrainian nation numbers over 42 million people and is a most important ally of the free world in the struggle against communism. During the past decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have continued to demonstrate

their devotion to freedom and the ideals of independence by maintaining a relentless opposition to Communist rule.

It is with great sympathy and understanding for our Ukrainian friends everywhere, and with steadfast hope for the future, that I join my colleagues today in reaffirming the goal of eventual liberation for all enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, at the close of World War I, the Ukrainian people reached another milestone in their historic development when they established a united, democratic, and independent republic. The event was of epochal significance not only for the Ukrainians, but for the whole of Eastern Europe as well. After almost two centuries of foreign domination by Russia and Austria, Ukraine finally attained its full freedom and independence.

The young Republic, which was prompt to call an all-national parliament, the Ukrainian Central Rada, promulgated a series of liberal laws affecting the social and economic life of the population and assuring all minorities of equal rights as full-fledged citizens, but Ukraine could not enjoy for long the peace and prosperity in freedom.

Although the Red leaders, Lenin and Trotzky, recognized the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine, Bolshevik Russia unleashed its newly organized Red army and in a series of invasions and large-scale battles, succeeded in destroying the young independent state of Ukraine, and impose upon the Ukrainian people by force and terror the oppressive yoke of Russian communism. Even such a marked event as the union of all Ukrainian lands by an act of union of January 22, 1919, a year after the proclamation of independence, could not sustain the Ukrainian people in their effort to preserve their hardly won freedom in the face of the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia. By the end of 1920, the vast Ukrainian lands—with the exception of western Ukraine, Carpatho Ukraine, and Bukovina, and Bessarabia—were subjected to the totalitarian domination of Moscow.

The martyrdom of the Ukrainian people under the Bolshevik regime has been measured by countless crimes committed against them by Moscow. But neither mass executions of Ukrainian patriots and deportations of millions of Ukrainians to Siberia, nor forcible Russification and outright genocide could ever break the determination of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom and independence.

During and after World War II, the vast Ukrainian underground forces, led by the Ukrainian insurgent army—UPA—challenged Moscow's domination by stubborn and systematic resistance to Russia. Even in the Soviet slave labor camps of Vorkuta, Norilsk, Karaganda, Kingir, Mordovia, and Verkhnoye-Umbatskoye, the Ukrainian political prisoners have been bold and recalcitrant defenders of freedom and human decency, and have staged bloody strikes and rebellions that have shaken the entire system of Soviet slave labor camps in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956.

It is the spirit of independence that keeps the Ukrainian underground forces alive even today and the Ukrainian people united against the alien rule of Moscow. In May 1956, the Ukrainian partisans attacked several Soviet military supply trains in the Ukraine. During the Hungarian revolution in November 1956, Ukrainian freedom fighters blew up Soviet supply trains en route to Hungary at the railroad stations of Stanislaviv, Kolomeya, Nadvirna, and Vorokhta in western Ukraine and in Carpatho-Ukraine. At the critical hour in Hungary, many Ukrainians from the Soviet armies not only refused to fight against the Hungarians, but went over to the latter's side with tanks and ammunition and joined the Hungarians in their struggle against the Russians.

At this time, as the Ukrainians the world over commemorate the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, the free world must take cognizance of the plight of the Ukrainian people under Russian tyranny. For all these long years, the Ukrainians were almost alone and unaided in their struggle against Moscow. Russian tyranny, as evidenced in Hungary in 1956, is by no means limited to Ukraine; it threatens to spread to Asia and in the Middle East, and, indeed, to the Western Hemisphere.

In the recent past months we were faced with Russian communism threats very close to our shores. Cuba was to have been the Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere, and that threat is not yet over.

Admiration alone for freedom fighters in Ukraine and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain will not help these people get rid of Russian domination. We must do more than that if we still believe in the principle that all nations, however great, however small, should be free and independent.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be invincible.

We are all fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. On this anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, let us rededicate ourselves to the restoration of liberty and self-determination to all who now suffer behind the Iron Curtain of Red tyranny.

We must extend a hand of friendship to the Ukrainian people and our moral support of their aspirations. We must also join them in prayer that their just cause will soon be realized.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this 45th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic we pause to honor the Ukrainian people around the world who have suffered so long under the yoke of alien tyrants.

When the czarist regime in Russia collapsed, the Ukrainian people realized the fulfillment of their centuries-old dream of freedom and independence within the framework of their ancient national traditions. Their new-found freedom, however, was crushed after only 2 short years as an independent state. The Red army invaded the country, and the free Republic, which was prepared to live in peace and harmony among the nations of the world, was overrun by the imperialistic Communist empire.

Their 2 brief years of freedom, however, have helped to sustain them in the long years since this invasion of their land.

Today the Ukraine is a captive of Communist Russia and its human and economic resources are being exploited by the Kremlin for the purpose of spreading communism around the world. Our public commemoration, here in the Congress of the United States, of their former days of freedom and our sincere sorrow at their present plight gives them renewed encouragement not to abandon their dream of independence.

It is because I feel so strongly that the free world must continue to sustain all the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain in their aspirations for eventual deliverance that I have once again sponsored a resolution, House Resolution 62, to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. I join with Mr. Flood and my distinguished colleagues who have also supported this measure in their hope for favorable consideration during this session of Congress. In our secure and wealthy land which has become a bulwark against tyranny, we must preserve and perpetuate the common dream of all men who desire self-government and individual liberty. The world looks to us for leadership. By establishing this Special Committee on Captive Nations we serve notice on all dictators and Communist puppets that we are resolute in our determination to keep the goals of freedom alive throughout all the world.

We look forward to the day when 42 million Ukrainians, and their neighbor millions in other Communist-dominated countries, will once more be able to celebrate their own national holidays in freedom and independence.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 45th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukraine as an independent national state. Recently, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University, who is chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., sent me a letter which offers constructive suggestions of positive steps that we might take to dramatize Russian colonialism within the U.S.S.R. I commend to the serious consideration of the Congress the proposals as contained in his letter set forth below:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 11, 1963.
Hon. ALEXANDER PIRNIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PIRNIE: Forty-five years ago this January 22 the Ukrainian people, constituting then and now the larg-

est non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe, freely determined itself into an independent national state. By 1920 the Ukrainian National Republic became one of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperial colonialism. Today, Ukraine is one of the oldest captive nations in Eurasia, but its long record of nationalism is second to none.

In terms of historical reality and its possibilities, had Western enlightenment and aid supported Ukraine's independence in 1918, the prison house of nations known as the Soviet Union could never have emerged; the mortal threat facing our own free Nation would have been nonexistent. The tragic mistake committed by our leaders then can today be somewhat redressed by our enlightened actions toward the imprisoned nations in the U.S.S.R.—and thus work toward real victories in the cold war.

What can we do? On this 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence, here are a few constructive steps that can be taken: (1) Join in this nationwide observance by offering on the floor of Congress your stirring statement of principle and understanding directed at the 45 million Ukrainian nation; (2) enable Voice of America to broadcast your message to Ukraine; (3) support the issuance in 1964 of a "champion of liberty" stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the 150th anniversary of his birth (the 86th Congress provided for his monument in Washington, which will be completed next year); (4) call for a congressional inquiry into Moscow's widespread persecution of religious groups, its genocide of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic churches, and the 18-year imprisonment of the Ukrainian Catholic Archbishop Joseph Slipy, the "Mindzenty in the U.S.S.R.;" and (5) establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations—a congressional committee proportionate to the value and meaning of all the captive nations, truly our foremost nonmilitary weapon in the cold war—with concentration on Russian colonialism in the U.S.S.R.

Our continued neglect of Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. only perpetuates the errors of our past. We have a whole new horizon before us. I am certain you will assist in cultivating it for our own national interest.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, Georgetown University.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Ukraine is the largest country in Eastern Europe, and the Ukrainians are by far the most numerous of all national groups in that region, numbering more than 42 million. In many ways the country is the most productive agricultural region in Eastern Europe, and has often been referred to as the breadbasket of the entire area. Its hard-working inhabitants, the solid core of the sturdy East European peasantry, have always tilled their fertile soil tirelessly and ceaselessly, not only for their own well-being but also for their neighbors, and in recent years for their heartless Soviet taskmasters. The very fact that the fair land of Ukraine is fertile and superbly rich in natural resources seems to have been a cause of the misery and misfortune of the Ukrainians. The wealth of the land has aroused the envy and anger of its powerful and greedy neighbors, and that has occasioned its conquest by alien tyrants.

For more than 300 years the Ukraine has been submerged in the huge Russian state, and during all that time both autocratic czars and Communist tyrants have done their worst to suppress and

eradicate what we in the West regard as the best Ukrainian national traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their readiness to sacrifice their all for the attainment of their national goals. Only once in the course of their long subjugation to alien rulers they had the chance of attaining their freedom and independence; that was in 1918. When the czar's autocracy in Russia was overthrown in 1917, and Austria no longer ruled over western Ukraine, Ukrainian leaders seized the occasion and proclaimed their national independence. That was done on January 22, 45 years ago, the day on which the Ukrainian National Republic came into existence, and a new day was ushered in for the Ukrainian people.

That day is a landmark in the recent and modern history of the Ukraine, and remains a significant date in the struggle of the Ukrainian people for their national independence. Unfortunately, however, they were able to enjoy their richly deserved and hard-won freedom only for a short time. The newly created and weak Ukrainian Republic has long ceased to exist. Being surrounded by enemies, its days seemed to have been numbered from the time of its birth. Early in 1920 Communist Russians treacherously attacked the country and overran it. Soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union and the Ukrainian Republic became a mere memory.

The Ukraine remains a province of the Soviet empire, its people suffering under Soviet tyranny. For more than 42 years some 42 million helpless, oppressed, and liberty-loving Ukrainians have existed in a vast prison camp in their historic homeland, surrounded by Soviet secret agents and separated from the free world by the Iron Curtain. Needless to say, they can enjoy none of the freedoms which we in the West regard as our birthright. Under such trying and almost unbearable circumstances they are not allowed to celebrate their independence day. Fortunately there are many hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians in the free world, including a large number of Ukrainian-Americans, who solemnly observe the anniversary of that memorable day. I am glad to join all my Ukrainian-American friends in the celebration of the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my words to those of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives today in commemorating the anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The Ukrainian people have a long and honorable history of dedication to the principles of freedom and the dignity of the individual. Since the birth of the Ukrainian Republic 45 years ago, the people of the Ukraine have born an almost continuous yoke of oppression and suffering. The Ukrainian people are a people who believe as we do, that every man has the right to worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience. They will accept no domination in this sphere just as they will freely accept no domination in the sphere of the type of government which has been

imposed on them. That they have been forced to accept this domination remains a source of sorrow to all free people.

The Ukrainian Republic is unable to celebrate its own independence today but we, as trustees of their cause, can do so for them and let the world know that they have not been forgotten nor their present plight accepted.

On this occasion let the Ukrainian people know that we will plead and fight for them and that their courage and hope will not be in vain. We assure the people of the Ukraine that we are with them in spirit and that we hope and pray that their freedom will be soon restored.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, among the numerous nationalities residing in the city of Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania are many thousands of Ukrainian birth or descendants. While they go about their daily lives amidst the protections and blessings of a democracy, their hearts are heavy for their enslaved countrymen back in the Ukraine. They share with these oppressed peoples the hope that one day the godless and communistic masters will rue their atheist existence and feel the hand of divine vengeance for their crimes against humanity.

They live for the day when the Red horde will be turned back and cast aside. That day may not be too distant as the communistic masters have already started to quarrel among themselves, and as thieves dealing in human bondage, may eventually tear one another apart.

All peoples in central and eastern Europe have had their share of misery and misfortune in recent times, but perhaps none of them have been as unfortunate as the people of Ukraine. During the past 300-odd years they enjoyed freedom and independence only for a brief 2-year period, in 1918-20, while rest of the time they have been subjected to alien tyrannies.

At the end of the First World War, when the autocratic czarist rule over them was shattered, they proclaimed their independence and established their national government in the newly created Ukrainian Republic. Under indescribable handicaps they managed to maintain their freedom and preserve their rather weak state for about 2 years. And then the Republic was treacherously attacked by the Red army, was overrun, and all opposition in the country crushed. Independent Ukraine ceased to exist, and the country became part of the Soviet Union. Thenceforth Ukrainians became prisoners in their homeland under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. They have been robbed of all forms of freedom, except of their spiritual possession. There they still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. In this seemingly unending misery and misfortune that appears to be the sole encouraging fact. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and power in their struggle for their righteous cause, for their freedom and independence.

The Ukrainians are proud of this heritage, and rightfully so. Its roots are solidly planted within those living among us, and will ever remain until the day

when the freedom torch will again burn bright over the fields of the Ukraine.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the anniversary of the short-lived Ukrainian National Republic. On that date 45 years ago, the Ukrainian people expressed their desire to cast off the onerous Russian yoke which had bound them to the czarist empire for 300 years. In spite of Russian dominance, they had nurtured the Ukrainian language, culture, and separate historical tradition—the very ingredients that make a nation. This freedom-loving people desired the opportunity to rule themselves.

But the brave Ukrainians were not long to have their liberty. In 1920 Bolshevik arms and men overwhelmed the war-ravaged Ukraine. The Ukraine became a Soviet Socialist Republic without political or economic freedom in which to develop its own identity. Under the Communist oppressors, famines, purges, and misery swept the land in the thirties. But the Ukrainian spirit was not crushed. It rose again in World War II but could do little against the dual dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin.

As Americans, we can well sympathize with the courageous Ukrainians. At the very time that the Ukrainians were fighting for their survival, President Wilson was receiving the support of the world for his program of liberty and national self-determination as embodied in the 14 points. We have never wavered from these principles. We have always denounced the tyrannical imperialism of Communist governments or any other powers which seek to impose their order arbitrarily over others. We believe that every nation has the right to determine its destiny and to rule itself. The Ukrainians have demonstrated that they desire liberty, equality, and a genuine democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, we join Ukrainians everywhere in commemorating the 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic and the brave Ukrainians under Communist domination who continue to cherish the light of liberty.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people gained their independence after a struggle which had lasted for 300 years. Regrettably, after 2 short years of freedom, their Republic was subverted by war and fractionalism and they began another period of occupation and oppression.

History records that despite hundreds of years of domination by the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, the Ukrainian people maintained their language, their culture, and their hunger for freedom. And they are doing so today in the face of the neocolonial oppression of Communist Russia.

In the year since we last marked this anniversary in the Halls of Congress, there has been a growing awareness throughout the world that the era of Western colonialism has passed, and that the Soviet Union is the last large remaining colonial empire on earth.

Observances such as these help inform the world that there are many captive peoples suffering under Russian colonial oppression, people ruled by force rather than by persuasion, people who constitute by their vast numbers an Achilles heel in Russia's world posture. By their existence and attitudes today, they damage the Soviet bloc. By their will to prevail, they make it possible for us to look forward to the time when the Ukrainian people of Eastern Europe may join us as free people in celebrating their nation's freedom.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. There are well over 2 million Ukrainians and their descendants in the free countries of the world. Approximately 250,000 of these people are recent political refugees and their experiences with tyranny are fresh. Their common goal is the liberation of their native land.

The Ukrainian people are a proud, individualistic, separate ethnic group as distinct and loathsome of communistic oppression as are the other peoples enslaved by the Kremlin. Under the yoke of communism the resistance of the people has shifted from armed struggle to other levels: sabotage on collective farms and in factories, absenteeism, agitation for higher wages, and the like.

The most important ideal the free world can pursue is recognition of the fact that the Ukrainian National Republic exists, that this Republic has not been written off and absorbed into the Soviet Empire with the tacit approval of free people. The spirit of freedom and self-determination is most important in our time. It is a noble goal which cannot be proclaimed for Africa and denied to Eastern Europe. It is universal. As the leader of the free world, America cannot advance the cause of freedom by remaining silent on this occasion.

Our heritage and power makes it fitting that we should salute these gallant people at this time and earnestly hope that our understanding and recognition will hasten the day when they regain their freedom.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, more than 800 million people have been shut behind the Iron Curtain since the end of World War II. Despite heavy oppression, these peoples have been continuing their resistance against the Communist tyrants. The demonstrations by workers in East Germany in 1953, the uprising by the Polish people in 1956, the Hungarian revolution in October of the same year, the anti-Communist revolution by the Tibetan people in 1959, and the anti-Communist movements in various parts of the Chinese mainland—all these are indications of how the captive peoples feel about their rulers. It is imperative that the attention of the whole free world remain focused on Soviet imperialism. We must maintain a continuing American effort to remind the captive peoples that we have not forgotten them.

In this connection it is highly appropriate that we pause in our legislative duties today to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian people on January 22, 1918.

We pay tribute on this occasion to the 40 million Ukrainians who have suffered under the alien yoke of czarist and Soviet despots. Only for 2 brief years between 1918 and 1920, following the breakdown of czarist and Austrian control of the Ukraine, have liberty-loving Ukrainians enjoyed what we would consider the normal privileges of freedom and independence. The Ukrainian National Republic was surrounded by powerful enemies who grasped the first opportunity to crush the independence of the young Republic; in the fall of 1920 the Ukraine was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and since that date the Ukrainian people have endured the hardships, privations and miseries of foreign rule, sealed off for 45 years from the free world. Throughout this period the Ukrainians have clung steadfastly to their national ideals and preserved their fervent love for freedom and independence.

As we pay tribute to Ukrainian independence, we express our solidarity at the same time with all those who live in police states behind the Iron Curtain. We think of Harry Seidel, who was sentenced to life imprisonment on December 29, 1962, in East Germany for the crime which is known as flight from the Republic—in other words, the desire to escape a Stalinist police state and help others reach the free world. Seidel's mother and other relatives have also been arrested and jailed. We think of 1,350 acts of violence committed by East German police and soldiers near the Berlin wall, and 14,000 East Germans who have successfully escaped to the West since the Berlin wall was built. We commemorate all those persons behind the Iron Curtain whose daily hardships continue regardless of the twists and turns of Soviet foreign policy. It is in this spirit that we salute the Ukrainian people and all other captive peoples, reiterating our solidarity with the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the First World War, while causing death and destruction in all parts of Europe, also ushered in a new era to numerous oppressed ethnic groups who for centuries had been subjected to cruel alien regimes. The Ukrainians were among those peoples who regained their freedom at the end of that war.

For some 250 years Ukraine had been submerged in the Russian Empire, and during all that time autocratic czars had done all they could to suppress and choke off all national and traditional Ukrainian traits in the country. But the Russian attempts proved unsuccessful against the determination of the Ukrainians to cling to their national ideals and to work for the achievement of cherished objectives. In 1917 they saw the chance of soon attaining their freedom and on January 22 of the following year they proclaimed their independence. That memorable day is a great landmark in Ukrainian history, to be celebrated annually as a national holiday. Even though the Republic founded in 1918 did not last more than a couple of years, and since its collapse the unhappy Ukrainians have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny

imposed upon them by the Kremlin, yet that short period of freedom has left an unforgettable impression upon the people of the Ukraine. Ukrainians would like to observe that historic anniversary but not all are permitted to do so. To some 42 million freedom-seeking Ukrainians in their homeland that privilege is denied. But we in the free world gladly join in this celebration, Americans of Ukrainian origin, on this 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the troubled age we live in today—at a time when each new advancement of science and technology brings mankind closer together—in an age when the promise of a great and peaceful era of economic well-being for mankind lies just over the horizon, it is a sad day indeed when I must rise on the floor of this House to say an all too few words about the valiant people of the Ukraine—the largest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe. Under normal circumstances the Ukraine would today be celebrating the 45th anniversary of their establishment as an independent national state. I say this is a sad day today because these people rightfully belong alongside the free peoples of the world. It is a sad day but a proud one for the Ukrainian people's never-ending struggle to reclaim their rightful place in the society of free nations. This is an inspiration to all of us.

Very shortly after the Ukraine was established as an independent nation it was overwhelmed by Soviet Russia's imperialism and today is one of the oldest captive nations in Europe. A little knowledge of the history of this brave nation clearly indicates that, despite the fact that it has been subjected by Red imperialism for 43 years, there still beats within the Ukraine homeland and the hearts of its people the never-ending desire to govern their own destinies.

I salute these people and I am certain as I can be that one day in the near future the Ukraine will reestablish itself in the free family of nations.

I hope my words will in some small way give some hope and encouragement to the 45 million Ukrainian people and that the Voice of America will carry not only my words but the words of all those who on this date give encouragement to the Ukraine in the dark days that may still lie ahead.

I support strongly the issuance of a "champion of liberty" stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the 150th anniversary of his birth, and I ask for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations to be established to concentrate on the last great bulwark of colonialism that exists today—the brutal colonialism of the Soviet tyranny. I hope this committee will spotlight the hideous actions of the Soviet Union in this area and hold up to the entire conscience of the world the need for releasing of such Soviet control.

I salute the Ukraine and wish it and its people the freedom they so richly deserve.

Mr. FARBSSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. It pro-

vides us with a poignant reminder that the threat to freedom of all peoples and independence of nations is a continuing one which requires strength and perseverance among the free as well as the oppressed.

The strong tide of national independence movements that began in 19th-century Europe and continues to this day throughout the world has been ruthlessly crushed within the Soviet Empire. The Ukrainian people were among the first to suffer the fate that has befallen millions of others. We must not forget the plight of the people under Communist rule, or take our own freedom for granted. If we keep the ideal of freedom a living reality in our part of the world, history will one day mark down the Soviet Empire as a temporary interlude in man's inexorable progress toward liberty.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the anniversary of the proclamation of a free and sovereign Republic of the Ukraine.

Forty-five years ago the people of the Ukraine achieved their hopes and ambitions by declaring themselves liberated from foreign domination. Unfortunately, their joys were short lived; for the ruthless forces of the Soviet Union soon bore down upon the newly formed Republic and began their conquest with savagery and terror. The valiant resistance was no match for the Communist might. Forced to flee their native land, free Ukrainians established committees in foreign lands to keep alive the fires of freedom and hope. It is these people, the resistance leaders, as well as those who remained behind, whom we salute today.

It is the sincere wish of the people of America that self-determination and liberty, those rights which we in America hold so dear, may once more be enjoyed by Ukrainians throughout the world, that their constitution, proclaimed 45 years ago, will again become the governing force for a free and independent Ukraine.

I am introducing a resolution to provide for the issuance of a champion of liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. Taras Shevchenko's poetry, art, and philosophy have deeply inspired the 45-million Ukrainian nation in its aspirations to freedom and independence.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to join with those of Ukrainian descent and their friends in the celebration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

In today's distracted and divided world one sad human calamity overshadows all others: the tragic sad lot of hundreds of millions of innocent and helpless people suffering under Communist tyrannies. More than 200 million of these have been forced to endure the almost unbearable yoke of the Soviet regime for more than 45 years, and among these unfortunate souls are some 42 million Ukrainians.

One of the happy results of the First World War had been the emergence of the Ukrainian Republic. After suffering under autocratic czars for centuries,

Ukrainian leaders proclaimed the independence of their country early in 1918 and founded the Ukrainian Republic. That was on January 22, 45 years ago. Unfortunately for the Ukrainians and for their friends everywhere, the newborn state could not live long without outside aid. Such aid was not forthcoming to save it from its treacherous foes. Early in 1920 it was attacked by the Red Army, the country was overrun, and the Ukrainian Republic was no more. Soon it was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and became part of that polyglot empire. Since then the people of the Ukraine live in their homeland as in a huge prison camp. As prisoners behind the veritable Iron Curtain and deprived of all forms of freedom, they cannot celebrate their national holiday, their independence day. But hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians who have found refuge in the free world, and especially in this great Republic, celebrate that historic event on its 45th anniversary. I am indeed happy to join Americans of Ukrainian descent in the celebration of that historic anniversary, the Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Ukrainians is the sad story of a large group of gifted, industrious and brave people who have not been allowed to enjoy the fruits of their labor during most of modern times. The ironic twist of history and the cruel realities of geography have kept the Ukrainian people from being masters of their fate in their homeland for three centuries. Except for the 2-year period of 1918-20, national political independence has been denied to them. During those centuries they have endured all sorts of hardships, privation, and misery, and have suffered much, yet they have maintained their national ideals, their desire for freedom and independence. They had longed for an opportunity to regain their freedom, and they had that opportunity soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia. On January 22, 1918, they achieved their independence.

The proclamation of Ukrainian freedom and the founding of the Ukrainian Republic symbolized the realization of a centuries old dream. Its supreme significance was not and is not lost on the liberty-loving and liberty-seeking Ukrainians, and the annual celebration of that day as their national holiday testifies to that fact. It is true that the Ukrainian Republic founded 45 years ago has long ceased to exist, but the idea revived by that supreme act lives in the minds and hearts of all Ukrainians in and out of their beloved and historic homeland. Of course, those living in the Ukraine, under the tyrannical regime imposed upon them by the Kremlin, are not allowed and do not dare to celebrate their independence day. But we gladly do this in unison with all Americans of Ukrainian descent, thus echoing the genuine patriotic sentiments of the Ukrainian people sealed off from the free world behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine and I wish to join with my colleagues here in the Congress in the observance of this

significant anniversary. This special observance again calls attention of the peoples throughout the world that there are still 45 million Ukrainians literally being held captive in Eastern Europe.

On January 22, 1918, the Ukraine was established as a free and independent nation. However, the Ukrainians did not enjoy this precious freedom for very long, because their new Republic was overrun by Communist Russia in 1920 and brought under the tyranny and oppression of the totalitarian state.

Those of us who are charged with preserving and maintaining freedom in the world must continue to provide inspiration and hope for the oppressed peoples of the Ukraine and other subjugated lands. I am sure the American people remain steadfast in their dedication to gaining the right of self-determination for the people of the Ukraine and all other freedom-loving patriots who yearn for independence. We salute them and renew our pledge of support for their great cause.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, modern history of many European peoples presents a series of misery and misfortune, with occasional happy but very brief interludes. Unfortunately that is the general pattern of the history of the Ukrainians during the last several centuries.

Since the middle of the 17th century, except for a brief 2-year period in 1918-20, unhappy Ukrainians have not known freedom in their fair and fertile homeland. Until the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917, they were oppressed by the Russian autocracy. Then on January 22, in 1918, they felt free, proclaimed their national independence, established their Republic, and set to work for its preservation. Late in 1920, however, they sensed the impending menace to their independence. Their inveterate foes, the Russians, appearing now as Communist tyrants, sent their Red army into Ukraine. Helpless and outnumbered, the Ukrainians were no match for their ferocious foes. In the fall of 1920 the country was overrun and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for 45 years, Ukrainians have been suffering under the tyranny of Soviet dictatorship. But they have not given up their ideals and they still cherish their national goal—freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary of their independence day let us hope that they achieve their historic aim in their historic homeland.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker:

What we have in us of the image of God is the love of truth and justice.

Many years before the birth of Christ, a famous Greek orator—Demosthenes—spoke the words I have just quoted.

Many, many years later—in 1776—a band of patriots who had in them this love of truth and justice—struck their first real blow against untruth and injustice. Perhaps they did not fully realize the motivation behind their actions. But out of the ever-present hunger of the human heart they took this action. Out of this grew our beloved United States of America, which has remained since that time a symbol to the enslaved, the down-trodden, the hungry, and the homeless.

What we are commemorating today represents another nation of people—the Ukrainians—who first emerged as an independent nation 45 years ago today. By their yearly celebration of that event, they are keeping the torch high for their people who no longer are independent and free. We gladly join in this celebration with them because we realize the ever-present danger of the Communist menace which took away the freedom of the Ukrainians in 1920, and which—God forbid—could likewise take away the freedoms we enjoy and make us a colony to be exploited and a people to be enslaved.

It is difficult for us to fully realize the heartache and suffering of a captive people. It is even more difficult to realize the terrible emptiness which must fill the hearts of a nation which has been deprived of its religious freedom. The life which the Soviets have offered to the Ukrainians would substitute the love of state for the love of God. Those who have fought against this exchange have been persecuted in the most heartless manner. A cynical freedom which is not free is the gift of the Soviets to the Ukrainians.

The Ukraine, called the breadbasket of Europe, is far too rich in natural resources to have been overlooked by the U.S.S.R. in its ruthless drive for power and domination over the peoples of the world. But its human resources are of even greater importance to the free world. For out of the longing of the human heart for truth and justice this captive nation can one day fashion its freedom. And from this freedom can spring the inspiration for others to strive for their freedom from a pitiless Godless communism.

I have in my State of North Dakota many of Ukrainian descent. I know that their prayers and hopes are for those in the mother country who have been forced to live these past 42 years under the persecution and yoke of communism—and that they wait for a new day to dawn in which the Ukrainian people can once more breath the clean air of freedom, and move and live with the priceless spirit of independence glowing in their minds and hearts. These are the people who can truly express from full hearts the blessings of living in this country. And these are the people who can so eloquently warn us of the danger of the Communist supremacy if we will but listen. And these are the people who can help strengthen our resolve to remain a United States of America—a sovereign Nation—in which all that is good and fine in the human heart can best grow and develop because we have freedom of choice, freedom of worship, freedom to express our feelings without fear, and freedom from the kind of want which countless human beings in many parts of the world are forced to experience. But the greatest of all blessings which God bestowed upon this Nation from its very inception is a free spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks today a letter written to me on January 17 by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Con-

gress Committee of America, Inc. Dr. Zukowsky's remarks express far more eloquently than mine the feelings and aspirations of the Ukrainians everywhere:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., January 17, 1963.
Hon. DON L. SHORT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: On January 22, 1963, 45 years will have elapsed since the historical date of the proclamation of the full independence of the Ukraine. This date is one of the greatest in the modern history of the Ukrainian people, as on that day the historical right of the Ukrainian people to their freedom and national independence was again reaffirmed by the democratically elected Ukrainian Parliament—Central Rada—in their official proclamation. A year later, on January 22, 1919 the Act of Union, was issued, uniting the Western Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic, and establishing the united and sovereign State of the Ukraine.

The young and democratic Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by several European governments, including that of Soviet Russia. It endeavored to pursue its own course in harmony and peace with other nations, but Communist Russia, despite its solemn pledge not to interfere in internal affairs of the Ukraine, attacked the Ukrainian Republic and tried to impose the hateful Bolshevik regime upon the Ukrainian people. For almost 4 years the Ukrainian Nation struggled gallantly to preserve its independence but deprived of military, economic, and diplomatic support by the Western nations, it succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia. In 1920 the free Ukrainian State was destroyed and the puppet regime of the Ukrainian Socialist Republic was installed, which in 1923 became a member of the Soviet Union.

Although Moscow claims that Ukraine and other non-Russian Republics of the U.S.S.R. are free and sovereign states, and Ukraine and Byelorussia are even charter members of the United Nations, the fact is that the Ukraine is a colony of Communist Russia. Its human and economic resources are being exploited by the Kremlin for the purpose of spreading the communization of the world and subverting the once free nations, as is the case of Cuba, to which Khrushchev and his Communist chieftains had sent their missiles and other offensive weapons that had been manufactured from economic resources of the Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations.

During the entire Soviet Russian rule in the Ukraine, Moscow has tried every way to destroy the spirit of the Ukrainian people by persecuting the Ukrainian churches, arresting their leaders and clergy, by forced collectivization, mass deportation, executions, inhuman and cruel genocide, and many other inhuman methods. However, all these efforts have failed dismally, for the Ukrainian people have never submitted to the alien rule of Moscow and continue to wage an incessant struggle for the recovery of their freedom and national independence. Also the Soviet Government sends special agents to kill Ukrainian leaders in the free world, as was the case of Stephan Bandera and Dr. Lev R. Rebet, whose killer was recently sentenced by the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe to 8 years of hard labor.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution which listed the Ukraine as one of the captive na-

tions held in enslavement and captivity by Moscow.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1963, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of the Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian-Communist imperialism. Therefore, the U.S. Congress and U.S. Government can contribute greatly to keeping the spirits and hopes of the enslaved Ukrainian nation high, by approving Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 and House Resolution 718, by favoring action of persecuted Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches, by creating a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, and by issuing a special Shevchenko, champion of liberty, stamp in connection with the forthcoming Shevchenko memorial celebration in Washington, D.C., in 1964. A free and independent Ukraine is in the interests of the United States as well as the entire free world.

The entire world, including the enslaved Ukrainian people, is looking toward the United States of America as the true citadel of freedom and hope for the oppressed people everywhere. Therefore the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an appropriate occasion for the American people and the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy with an understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to freedom and independence.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA,
State Branch of North Dakota.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our other colleagues in marking the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We salute the people of Ukraine.

It is appropriate also that today many of us will introduce resolutions providing for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Ukraine is one of the several captive nations held under Soviet Russians control, and it is the oldest of the European captive nations.

Russian colonialism today has no parallel or equal in all of history. Never have so many nations remained so long under the control of a foreign power. In typical Communist fashion, the Russian Government occupied a number of these captive nations in the face of guarantees as to their sovereignty.

A Captive Nations Committee would be invaluable in the cold war in drawing attention to what has been described as our foremost nonmilitary weapon—the captive nations, Russia's colonial empire.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, let us recall a promise made to the newly formed Ukrainian National Republic by Lenin on December 17, 1917:

We, the Soviet of People's Commissars, recognize the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to separate from Russia or to make an agreement with the Russian Republic for federative or other similar mutual relations between them. Everything that touches national rights and the national independence of the Ukrainian people, we, the Soviet of People's Commissars, accept clearly without limitations and unreservedly.

At the same time, an ultimatum was delivered. The ultimatum put the Ukrainian Central Government on notice that the Ukrainian Central Rada by its failure to recognize the Soviets and the Soviet Government in Ukraine was acting in a bourgeois manner and could not be accepted as an "empowered representative of the laboring and exploited masses of Ukraine." This ultimatum then went on to demand that the Ukrainian Central Rada must bind itself not to allow any military units to go to the Don or Kuban regions without the permission of the Bolshevik commander, that it help the Bolsheviks in their war against the counterrevolutionary movement of Kaledin in the Don, that it stop all efforts to disarm Soviet regiments and the worker's Red Guard in Ukraine and return arms to those units that had been disarmed. The Soviets said that if this was not done within 48 hours, they would declare war upon the Ukrainian National Republic.

Fortunately the Ukrainians rejected this ultimatum and fought to free their country of the Bolshevik scourge. However the Ukrainian Army was driven back under the guns of the Bolsheviks until the central rada decided that it would be necessary to make peace with the Central Powers in order to engage their support in the fight against the Bolsheviks. Once the treaty was signed, the Ukrainians called upon the Germans and the Austrians for military assistance. With the help of the German and Austrian troops the rada was able to return to Kiev and continue the work of constructing a democratic state.

At this time when the Ukrainians were truly beginning to build their sovereign and independent nation, the German military authorities became dissatisfied with the amounts of grain that were being supplied to them in exchange for their military aid.

The rest of the story is well known to the world. After 2 years of struggle, the Ukrainian National Republic became a part of the Soviet Union. The Ukrainian people were betrayed more than once and as they celebrate this 45th anniversary today we still hope to find the opportunity to free the Ukrainian people once and for all from the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, January 22 is very meaningful to all freedom-loving people. It is a day of hope to those of Ukrainian extraction throughout the world and those behind the Iron Curtain in the native land. It also is a reminder that there is no maturing in the Communist ideology as certain "wishes-washy" State Department bureaucrats would have us believe.

The Ukrainians are political prisoners at the hands of the most ruthless and cold-blooded captors known to history. No amount of oratory will change the unfortunate fact that these fine people are denied their God-given right by Russian Communist overlords.

The words of Mr. Khrushchev are meaningless to these fine people. Just a few days ago during their meeting in Germany, Mr. Khrushchev spoke of the Berlin wall and said the Germans should be thankful for it as they receive the

benefits of communism even though the people might not at that time appreciate it. The Ukrainians do not appreciate their wall. The Germans do not appreciate their wall—in truth, Mr. Speaker, none of the people behind the Iron Curtains in a score of countries can like their situations because it defies human nature to live in a state of slavery.

The observations of this anniversary should be significant to us. It is a time for renewed dedication to the hopes and aspirations of these people. It also is a time to realize once more that the same cutthroat band of murderers, thieves and subjugators are in control of the Soviet Union not a benign friendly group of modern-day revolutionaries who are trying to bring about world peace and prevent the Chinese from precipitating war. No State Department propaganda can change these facts. The Ukrainian people are subjugated; their subjugators are Soviet Communists. I hope we can succeed in our efforts to establish a Captive Nations Committee and renew our work and free these wonderful people from Soviet imperialism.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest errors into which we seem to have fallen centers in our all-too-ready acceptance of the enslavement of a free people as a fait accompli. And an even greater error—and one to be roundly censured—is the attitude that nothing must be done to upset a nice diplomatic balance by even suggesting that the Communist enslavement of any nation should be adversely regarded by the United States who acquired its freedom the hard way.

The record will show that the Ukrainian National Republic lost its sovereignty in 1920 in the Communist drive to impose its own brand of colonialism on a weaker people. And certainly the Western democracies must always recall with shame their failure to support independence for the Ukraine in 1918 when a reasonable display of force—at a time when the Allied armies were at their peak—would have kept a free people out of the clutches of totalitarianism.

It is my firm conviction that the fate of the Ukrainians is bound up with the plight of all of the so-called captive nations and it seems imperative that this problem should have more than the lip-service the executive and congressional branches of our Government have been giving it of late. No one wants to unleash a nuclear war that would destroy more people than it would liberate, but it is certainly our responsibility to refrain from conveying—by avoiding the issue—the idea that we condone the suppression of the liberties of any nation or race.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 45 years ago peoples subjected to Russian autocracy joyfully cast aside the heavy yoke of that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. To these peoples the Russian revolution of 1917 seemed to usher in a new day; they all expected to find their freedom in the overthrow of the decrepit czarist regime. At first their most sanguine expectations appeared justified. By the end of the First World War nearly all ethnic

groups in that sprawling continental empire had attained or proclaimed their national independence. The Ukrainians were the most numerous and also the most important of these nationality groups to regain their freedom.

Since mid-17th century the Ukraine had been part of the Russian empire, and during all that time the Russians had tried to eradicate Ukrainian nationalism and national ideals in the country. But their attempts were unsuccessful, and the stout-hearted Ukrainians clung firmly to their traditional national ideals. Finally on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and founded the Ukrainian Republic. Unfortunately the independent state thus established did not last long. For only 2 years the Ukrainians enjoyed their richly deserved freedom; then they were robbed of their prize by their inveterate foes, the Russian Communists. Early in 1920 the country was overrun, and the Ukrainians could not by themselves alone hold off the overwhelmingly superior force of the enemy. Their independent existence came to an end, and their country was then annexed to the Soviet Union.

From then on, for more than four decades, some 42 million Ukrainians have been captives under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day it is fitting that we recall their sad fate. In observing their independence day, the peoples of the free world can do no less than to echo the genuine patriotic sentiment of freedom-loving Ukrainians in their homeland where they are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday, their independence day.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed an independent and sovereign power and the Ukrainian people were declared subject to no other authority. This is the glorious event which we in the Congress of the United States commemorate today. That this proclamation was followed by 4 years of bloody struggle which ended in the subjugation of the Ukrainian people by the Russian Communists in paying tribute to Ukrainian independence nor dampen our hope that sian Bolsheviks must not deter our the Ukraine will be free.

The spirit of independence in the Ukraine is immortal. This was proved after 1709 when following the Battle of Poltava which ushered in Russian domination, all the devices by which czarist Russia endeavored to liquidate Ukrainian Independence failed.

Thousands of Ukrainians were sent north to Russia's "window into Europe," St. Petersburg. Ukrainian artists, educators, legislators, and engineers were expatriated to westernize Russia. Nevertheless, the spirit of nationalism and independence was kept alive in the Ukraine by the peasantry in their folksongs, in their villages, the town bazaars, at church and other social gatherings. Thus, the historical record was preserved and paved the way for the powerful literary and historical revival that took place in the Ukraine during the 19th century.

The Society of St. Cyril Methodius was founded at Kiev in 1847. Its membership demanded freedom of conscience, press, speech, and thought and the abolition of serfdom. Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, asked:

When will we receive our Washington with a new and righteous law?

This movement, which proved the immortality of the Ukrainian spirit of independence was repressed by czarist police. Its members were imprisoned and deported to Siberia. Even the name of the Ukraine was changed to "Little Russia." But the Ukrainian devotion to freedom and independence lived on.

The abdication of the Czar Nicholas II was hailed by the Ukrainians and other captive peoples as a step toward realization of their dream of independence. An all-Ukrainian National Congress expressed firm adherence to the principles of self-determination and insisted that Ukraine, as an independent nation, be admitted to peace negotiations. On July 29, 1917, the Ukrainian Constitution was drafted. On January 22, the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed.

However, the Bolshevik government like its czarist predecessor, had no intention of giving up this rich breadbasket and sugar bowl to the cause of national independence and freedom. After 4 years of bloody fighting, Communist rule, one of unrelenting severity and harshness accompanied by deportation, genocide, purges, was imposed. It decimated Ukrainian intelligence and leadership.

Thus the Ukraine, the largest of the captive countries, was the first to have the Iron Curtain lowered. Thus Communist Russia turned a fair land into a prison house.

The Ukraine, through the immigrants who have come to us, has made a large contribution to our strength, our intelligence, our culture. They have found in our land the freedom and independence denied them in their homeland. They are among the people ready to give the lie to Russian protests of sympathy for national independence and hypocritical protests against colonialism. Today our hearts beat as one with those of the brave people of the Ukraine and we join our prayers with theirs for the dawning of that happy day when freedom shall have come and again a proud and independent Ukraine will reign in righteousness and sovereign dignity.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1963, Ukrainians throughout the free world observed the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian State and the 44th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into one free and sovereign Republic of the Ukrainian people.

The life of the young Republic was short-lived, for within 2 years an invading Russian Army trampled freedom into the ground, subjugated the Ukrainian Nation and enslaved its people. Today it exists as a part of the colonial empire of the Russian Communists.

I am glad to join in this observance to demonstrate to the freedom-loving people of Ukraine that we in America

hope, with them, that the day may soon come when they will have the opportunity to rid themselves of their enslavers and to live once again in peace and freedom under a government of their own choosing.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, January 22, is a day of importance to all of us. On that day 45 years ago, an independent Ukrainian State was established at the ancient capital of Kiev. As has all too often been the case during the history of democracy, the Ukrainian people knew the joys of freedom for a tragically short time.

By November of 1921 the young nation had lost its independence. The reasons were twofold. The opposition of the Soviet Union, both overt and covert, had much to do with the demise of the Ukrainian State. These freedom loving people were to feel the heel of the Soviet armies.

The loss of Ukrainian independence had a second unfortunate cause. That was the actions of the Allied Powers after they had been victorious in World War I. We failed to act when our assistance was needed.

This date serves as a reminder to Americans and to freedom loving people throughout the world that the Soviet Union will pay lip service to the principle of self-determination for all nations while it is actively working to weaken the fruits of self-determination and to further the interests of world communism. This was true of the Ukrainian Nation just as it has been true of numerous other nations since 1921.

January 22 also reminds us of our responsibility to the rest of the world. If we ever act to thwart the cause of freedom for any nation or even if we are apathetic to the desires of a people to be free of the burden of world communism, the cause of freedom and of the United States is weakened.

The spirit of freedom remains alive in the Ukrainian people. I know that all of us share the hopes and prayers of the descendants of the Ukraine that their brethren still behind the Iron Curtain will eventually enjoy the fruits of freedom.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, exactly 45 years ago last Tuesday—January 22—the independent Ukrainian National Democratic Republic was established by a Ukrainian Parliament.

This was the culmination of centuries of Ukrainian nationalist strivings, representing one of the greatest liberations of a people in modern times. For the Ukrainian people, numbering about 40 million, had been oppressively ruled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire and by the tsars of Russia for a long time. They had yearned and worked for their day of freedom, which finally arrived during the chaos attending the early days of bolshevism in Russia.

Unfortunately, less than 3 years later this young Republic was mercilessly crushed by Bolshevik military power, and physically absorbed into the Soviet Empire. The Ukrainian people in the Soviet Union since that time have suffered untold privations, brutalities, deliberately imposed starvation, exploita-

tion, and cultural aggression at the hands of the Communists, in some ways sharing the oppressive experience of all other people in the Communist camp but in many ways suffering much worse.

But the spirit of Ukrainian nationalism survives in the Ukraine as well as in the hearts of Americans of Ukrainian descent. The 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, many of whom live in the bountiful State of Pennsylvania, rightfully pray for the day when the Ukraine will once again be a free and independent nation.

In this they are joined by many millions of their fellow Americans, for, as President Kennedy said in his proclamation of Captive Nations Week a few months ago:

The principle of self-government and human freedom are universal ideas and the common heritage of mankind.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we in the United States, who breathe the air of freedom, remind ourselves that millions of our fellow human beings around the globe do not enjoy the same liberty that we cherish.

Therefore, on the 45th anniversary of the Ukrainian peoples' attempt to free themselves from oppression, it is especially appropriate that we offer a pledge that we will never forget any of man's efforts to build a peaceful world.

On January 22, 45 years ago, when the Ukrainian Parliament issued its Fourth Universal—the document that corresponds to the American Declaration of Independence—people the world over recognized another of man's significant attempts to win freedom and liberty.

On the anniversary of that great event all of us will benefit by rededicating ourselves to the cause of freedom. All of us join in saluting the heroic people of the Ukraine, then and now, who hold freedom to be man's most important goal.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, all peoples have their national goals, and they all work for the attainment of these goals, but not all of them are fortunate in their attainment. The Ukrainians seemed fortunate in doing this, in regaining their freedom in 1918, but it turned out to be a temporary, short-lived freedom.

For more than 250 years the Ukrainians had lived under the oppressive czarist regime of Russia, and during all that time they had tried to regain their freedom. The opportunity came toward the end of the First World War. On January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and founded the Ukrainian Republic. They hardly had time to put their homes in order when the country was attacked and overrun by the Red army in 1920. With the country's incorporation into the Soviet Union, the Ukrainians lost their freedom and became the helpless subjects of Communist tyranny.

Since then some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the Soviet totalitarian dictatorship. Neither their united efforts nor those of their friends have enabled them to better their unenviable lot. What the uncertain future has in store for them it is difficult to predict. The very least we could do on the

45th anniversary of their national holiday, Ukrainian Independence Day, is to wish them patience, fortitude and strength in their struggle for their freedom.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1963, the world marked the 45th anniversary of the proclamation by a national council at Kiev declaring the freedom and independence of the Ukrainian Republic. That historic act was the culmination of a long struggle which had its beginning in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were forcibly brought under the autocratic Russian regime. The proclamation also marked one of the happiest climaxes in the modern history of a nation fighting for its freedom, thus constituting the brightest page in the modern history of the Ukrainian people.

All peoples contain within themselves the noblest of all ideals, freedom and independence, and though not all attain these goals, they are willing to battle all forms of oppression if only to maintain their hope of eventual victory. No other country in our times has demonstrated this more faithfully or more tragically than the Ukraine. We can well imagine that the sweetness of their new-found freedom in 1918, after more than 200 years of tyranny, was all the greater after the tortuous years of hoping and striving. And yet, a mere 2 years later, those 42 million people of the Ukraine were once again swallowed up in the Russian dominance of Eastern Europe and their fledgling Republic was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Late in 1920 the Red Army attacked and invaded the Ukraine, overran it, cruelly put an end to freedom there, and brought the Ukrainian people under the oppressive Communist totalitarian regime.

In the decades which have passed, Ukrainians have been held down by the heartless overlords in their historic homeland. All forms of oppression have been employed. Mass deportations and assassinations have been reported up to this very time. The Soviet leaders have guarded most vigorously against the continual pressure for freedom from the Ukrainian people.

All peoples subjected and brutally subdued by the Soviet Union's totalitarian tyranny have suffered for decades, but it is no exaggeration to say that no people, perhaps at any time in modern history, have suffered for so long and have sacrificed so much in material wealth and in terms of human life, as have the Ukrainian people under the Communist totalitarianism of Moscow. The number of those who died because of the man-made, Stalin-engineered starvation campaigns, may be counted in the millions; and many more millions lost their lives in prison camps and in forced labor camps in forbidding, distant Siberia. Thus the price the Ukrainian people have paid for their survival, for their miserable existence, has been frightfully high.

Today, after suffering interminably under the unbearable yoke of the Kremlin, these people still have faith in their cause, and have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their

struggle with all the means at their disposal, in the hope that eventually their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence, will win out. On this 45th anniversary of their Independence Day, we wish more power to these dauntless and courageous Ukrainians.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate this week the 45th anniversary of the founding of the independent Ukrainian Republic, for on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine proclaimed themselves to be free and sovereign.

Their fight for freedom began in 1846 when a group of young Ukrainian patriots banded together into a secret society to foster Ukrainianism in their native land. The czarist government had subjugated the country in the 17th century and had begun an intensive program to eliminate Ukrainian culture, literature, and language. It was the hope of these 30 men to keep before the people everything that was native to the region.

This small seed, planted in 1846, grew during the years through drought and famine, oppression and terror, until it bloomed at last in 1918. The advent of World War I, coupled with the fall of the czar, gave the Ukraines the opportunity to free themselves from their tyrannical masters. The flower, though, so painfully nourished by the blood of patriots, was soon crushed by the might of the Bolsheviks, swarming from the north. Resistance was heroic but no match for the overwhelming number of Communist troops. Ukrainian nationalism persisted, though, carried by those men who left their homeland to live under the flag of freedom and liberty in other parts of the globe. Their impassioned writings have kept alive the spirit of their land and culture.

The opportunity for freedom appeared once more during the Second World War when German forces freed the Ukraine from the oppressive hand of Russian communism. The German liberators proved to be only conquerors, and as a result, Ukrainian national armies, which had sprung up to overthrow their Communist masters, found themselves waging war against the Germans as well. The war ended with the Ukraine once more under Russian control.

We in America remember these valiant struggles against tyranny. We remember the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian freedom and sovereignty. We salute this proclamation with the hope that the aspirations for an independent Ukraine will again become a reality.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join once again in the congressional commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day. I believe occasions such as this demonstrate to the citizens of the United States and all freedom loving peoples throughout the world the devotion of the Congress to the principles of liberty and our determination to continue efforts to assure these blessings to all peoples. I would also like to commend our colleague, Mr. Floop, for his inspiring leadership in this field.

As one who has visited the Ukraine, I am especially conscious of the importance of this day and of the great

Ukrainian pride and spirit which is living under the dreadful yoke of Soviet imperialism. They have not given up hope of deliverance nor have we ceased to strive and pray for their freedom.

I would like to call to the attention of this House the following eloquent editorial which appeared in the *Hartford, Conn., Courant* of January 23, 1963. I believe that it clearly indicates the awareness of all Americans of the significance of this day and its indisputable place in the annals of the fight for liberty:

THE UKRAINE LIVES IN PATRIOT HEARTS

The democratic Ukrainian Republic, that had hardly a year's existence, has been paying for that moment of liberty and national dignity with four decades of oppression now, and the test is not yet over. Yesterday Ukrainians around the free world observed the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Ukrainian Nation and the 44th anniversary of the union of all Ukrainian lands into one sovereign state.

But the country, and the hopes and aims to which it was dedicated, now exist mainly in the hearts of the Ukrainian patriots. True, it can still be found on the map, and its name is on the United Nations roster. But in moral fact, the present Ukraine in the Soviet Union is but a pawn of that totalitarian government and a creation of communism.

Indeed, within its borders there are still many who remember their proud independence, their democratic spirit as it was in the brief days before Russia shot and starved their nation into slavery. And around the world—particularly in the United States—many Ukrainian hearts burn to restore their country. But like all other countries everywhere that are vassals to communism, this can only be achieved by the united efforts of free nations. On the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, freedom-loving people can best advance this cause by making it an occasion for prayers for all oppressed peoples of the world, and by rededicating themselves to the ideals of individual liberty and self-government, and the will to fight for these and for lasting peace for all.

MR. WIDNALL. It is my pleasure and privilege, Mr. Speaker, to join in the words of praise and hope for the Ukrainian people, who, on Tuesday of this week, celebrated the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Though the freedom of the country and her valiant people was crushed by the Communists only 2 years after its emergence on the world scene, the Ukraine is not forgotten when thoughts of freemen turn to those in bondage.

During this coming year, we will be considering the plight of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain on many occasions. I hope, however, that we do not overlook, in our discussions of the satellite countries, those nations now fully incorporated into the Soviet Union. It is a fact, incomprehensible as it is, that for sometime now a supposedly Ukrainian delegation has been seated in the halls of the United Nations with a vote equal to our own in the General Assembly. No one now is fooled by this posing. The true Ukrainian nation lies in the hearts of the refugees from tyranny and their less fortunate brothers and sisters inside the Soviet colonial empire. One wonders if the new nations of Asia and Africa, as they vote against colonialism ever consider the hypocrisy

of that puppet Ukrainian vote on their side. Can an India, that refused to accept the existence of a 400-year-old enclave of Goa on its subcontinent, totally ignore another colonial possession of a tenth as long duration on the grounds that it is an accomplished fact?

As we honor Ukrainian independence with words, may I urge my colleagues to take action as well. The resolution offered by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, which would create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, seems to me to be a logical and necessary first step to concentrate our efforts and attention in the future.

In addition, may I add my compliments to the many expressed over the years to Radio Free Europe, a voice of freedom going behind the Iron Curtain. The efforts of this organization to provide the captive peoples of Eastern Europe with the truth during the height of the recent Cuban crisis are particularly commendable. Here again is an opportunity for free peoples to encourage and enlighten the men and women of the Ukraine. In this spirit of dedication may we then join together to honor the Ukrainian nation.

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic although the true Republic was short lived. After they had been proclaimed as a new nation, just 2 years later their country was overrun with bloodshed and strife by the Communists consolidating their rule of fear in Russia.

However, even the past 41 years of Communist suppression has not broken the spirit of the Ukrainian people, for they are still trying to maintain their firm belief in the right to national freedom. Together with the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, we shall look to the day when the now largest nation under Communist control in Eastern Europe, will once again be a truly free nation. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which is dedicated in assisting the U.S. Government in combating communism is working diligently toward this goal.

On this then, the 45th anniversary of their independence day, I take this moment to commend and salute the people of the Ukraine.

MR. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago last Tuesday the Ukrainian people won for themselves at last the freedom they had sought and struggled for. The valiant fight of the largest non-Russian group in Eastern Europe, a fight that had taken so many thousands of her brave citizens over many generations, was at last over. Freedom was theirs, they had their own nation, their own government.

Yet, their joy at independence was short lived, for within hardly more than 2 years, their nation was swallowed up by the monstrous Red government. The Ukraine thus became one of the very first of the captive nations of the Communist drive for world domination.

Yet, the date of January 22 remains sacred to the Ukrainian people who still live in their beloved homeland and to those descendants and relatives who live

in and contribute to America. Oppressed, enslaved though this rich, peace-loving nation may be, her people—and all lovers of freedom everywhere—live in the hope, and with the prayer, that decency shall again prevail, that the nation will once more be ruled by her own government, duly elected by her own people.

The Ukraine stands as more than just a single nation for all the world to see. To be sure, it is a rich land, whose fertility and mineral wealth is responsible for a large percentage of the agricultural and industrial product of the Red government that rules the Ukraine. But more than just a rich land, populated by peace-loving and hard-working people, the Ukraine stands as an example of what communism is and does. Let those nations who are now free, but who would invite into their government the Communists, look to the tragedy of this noble and historic nation.

Before we began our business in this Chamber today, we were led in prayer by a distinguished member of the clergy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, the Very Reverend Walter Bukata, whose parish is from my hometown, Newark, N.J. I am sure that we all join with Father Bukata, his parishioners at the Church of the Holy Ascension, and all people with Ukrainian blood in their veins, here and throughout the world, in the prayer that the oppressive, murdering rule of the Reds will be overthrown, and the Ukraine will enjoy the blessing of freedom and independence for which her people have fought for all but 2 of the past 300 years. Let us so pray, and let our prayers be heard around the world.

MR. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for reserving time to address the House on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Flood, has been keenly interested in the plight of the Ukrainian people. Their tragic state, their aspirations for freedom and self-determination, deserve our utmost consideration.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the news was received that a group of Ukrainian peasants and farmers forced their way into the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. They told a tale of denial of religious freedom and other civil liberties at the hands of the Communist government.

Their plight has evoked well-deserved sympathy from freedom-loving peoples of the world. More than that, we can applaud the courage of that little group of Ukrainians who dared defy the terror of their totalitarian police state.

Their example should be a reminder to us that the fire of freedom still burns bright in the hearts of the millions of men and women behind the Iron Curtain. History has demonstrated that the undaunted human spirit cannot be suppressed.

Let us remember this as we pay tribute to the brave people of the Ukraine who have amply demonstrated their determination to regain independent national

status. Let us pledge ourselves anew to the task of working toward a better world where all peoples can find peace, freedom, and justice.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, during the last several centuries the long history of the Ukrainian people entered a period full of calamities and tragedies. Since the middle of the 17th century the Ukrainians have been subjected, except for a brief period from 1918 to 1920, to alien rulers in their homeland. After suffering under the autocratic czarist regime of Russia for some 250 years, they were freed from the chains of that regime by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and early in 1918 they proclaimed their national independence. Ukrainian leaders instituted a democratic form of government and proclaimed the Ukrainian Republic. During the next 2 years Ukrainians worked heroically to rebuild their war-torn country and to make it a safe haven for its people. Unfortunately they had neither the time nor the means to accomplish these difficult tasks because their foes were preparing to put an end to the new state. In 1920 the country was attacked, invaded, and overrun by the Red army which viciously put an end to the Ukrainian Republic. Soon the country was completely overrun and was made part of the Soviet Union, and so it remains to this day.

For nearly 43 years, the Ukrainians have suffered under Soviet totalitarianism. Some 42 million stout-hearted and patriotic Ukrainians have been unsuccessful in their continuing attempt to free themselves from Soviet tyranny because with their bare hands they have been facing the ferocious might of the entire Soviet Union. The freedom-loving people of Ukraine have not, however, abandoned their struggle for independence. They have been carrying the fight for freedom on, and still carry on with all the means at their disposal, hoping and praying that their righteous cause will eventually win. On the 45th anniversary of their Independence Day I join millions of Americans in wishing the Ukrainian victims of Soviet treachery fortitude and power in their struggle against the forces of totalitarian tyranny.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 45th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine is an event that demands commemoration here in the House of Representatives, the oldest continuous free representative assembly on earth. So I consider it a privilege to join with our colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Ukraine, both here in the United States and in their captive homeland, and to their love of personal freedom and national independence which has survived centuries of persecution and oppression.

The people of Ukraine have a special claim to our understanding and support. Not only do they seek for themselves what we have found and firmly established here and what we proclaim to be an inalienable right of all peoples—that is, government by the consent of the governed—but we have also been the beneficiaries of the approximately 2 million people of Ukrainian ancestry who

have brought to this country the spiritual qualities and the human values of an old and distinctive culture.

In the congressional district which I am privileged to represent, I have seen at first hand the importance of the contributions being made daily by our fellow citizens and neighbors of Ukrainian descent. Because of their friendship, I have obtained a closer, more personal appreciation of the dedication of Ukrainians everywhere to the goals of individual liberty and national self-determination.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of those of our colleagues who were not present at the opening of our session this noon to the fact that the prayer today was offered by the Very Reverend Walter Bukata, pastor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of my neighboring city of Newark. On my own behalf and that of my many constituents who know and admire Father Bukata, I am delighted to welcome him to the House of Representatives on this memorable occasion.

Mr. Speaker, Ukraine is the largest and one of the oldest of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. Yet, the period of her independence as a nation during the 20th century is the shortest, the 2 years between 1918 and 1920 during which Ukrainians fought for and won their freedom from Russian monarchists only to have it torn away by the Russian Communists. Thus it is that Ukrainians know, perhaps better than most, the evils of imperialist tyranny and despotism, whether of the tsarist variety or the godless brutality of communism. To have refused to succumb, to have kept alive the dream of freedom and the light of independence in the face of almost permanent persecution, is worthy of our deepest admiration and gratitude.

Unfortunately, Ukraine is sometimes omitted from the lists of the so-called captive nations of Eastern Europe, possibly because this brave nation was forcibly incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Whatever the explanation, however, this must be considered one of the real ironies of modern history. For Ukrainians have not freely subordinated their consciousness of nationhood to the iron demands of the Soviet state. On the contrary, it was only because of their undeniable claim to nationality and their determination to fight for it that Soviet Russia was led to concede the Ukrainian people the status of a republic with the false hope of independence it implied. The hypocrisy, of course, was compounded when Soviet Russia obtained a seat in the United Nations for its puppet government of Ukraine.

But make no mistake about it, the 40 million Ukrainians now living in captivity and their countrymen everywhere know all too well that Ukraine is not free or independent. Nor have they given up the struggle for what is theirs in justice, despite the difficulties, the dangers, and the discouragements. We salute them for their courage.

On this occasion, however, we should do more than salute a people's courage, more than indicate our understanding of

their problems, more than pledge our support in general terms. We owe them action, effective action, even though we recognize the limits of our own national power. We cannot arbitrarily or single-handedly change the face of the map or even raise the iron curtain, but there are concrete and positive steps we can take to advance the cause of freedom.

Among them, Mr. Speaker, we can establish the proposed Select Committee on the Captive Nations here in the House and thereby help equip the Congress to deal with developments in Eastern Europe more expeditiously and effectively. The hearings held last year on the captive nations by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs indicates the real usefulness of such a group whose full-time attention could be devoted to this critically important subject. Consequently, I have today introduced again legislation to create a Captive Nations Committee.

We can also act to strengthen the U.S. Information Agency and its Voice of America with regard to the quality, frequency, and scope of its programming behind the iron curtain.

We can broaden and increase exchange programs and other means of contact between the people of the captive nations and our own people.

We can do a better job of reminding the rest of the world as frequently as practicable that the United States, as a matter of fundamental principle, refuses to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and continues to insist upon the right of every people to political liberty and national self-determination.

We can expose at every opportunity—especially in the forum of the United Nations—the ugly record of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, a record of subjugation, discrimination, economic exploitation, and military domination, a record that deserves the official condemnation of that world body.

These and many other actions can be taken which would give to the Eastern European policy of our Government the emphasis this important area requires. In keeping with our own ideals and in justice to those who have suffered for freedom's sake, we can do no less.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the House has taken note of the fact that January 22, 1963, marked the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It is most appropriate that the observance of this event should have been held in the House of Representatives where for several years now our membership has joined in commemorating this great event in history.

We are all aware of the very significant history of this great country of the Ukraine the long bitter struggle of its loyal, faithful people, their persistent, determined fight against oppression, and their unflagging determination to enjoy the blessing of free, representative government.

I am proud indeed to congratulate the entire Ukrainian people, and their loyal descendants and relatives in this country, upon the birthday of their great Nation. Although the shadows of tyranny

and oppression surround them, they have demonstrated in the past that they will never lose heart and that they will never give up their aspirations and struggles to be free men and women.

Today they are the largest captive nation in Eastern Europe—45 million people who worship God and love freedom. Our great Nation will never forsake them and others like them who are suffering from cruel, Soviet bondage.

If we and the rest of the free world continue our efforts for peace and freedom, tomorrow may bring to the Ukraine and all other subject nations the blessings of freedom and governments of their own choice.

It is for us in the House to intensify our efforts for this great cause and never to lose an opportunity to indicate our support, encouragement and effective measures of assistance for the Ukrainian people and all other people who are suppressed by the great Red octopus that is endeavoring to strangle the free world.

This is an appropriate time to speak in behalf of the Special House Committee on Captive Nations which has been urged so eloquently and appropriately by our dear, most talented and distinguished friend, Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, the great American from Pennsylvania. A committee of this kind could render a great service to those behind the Iron Curtain, and to the sacred cause of freedom, and I hope that the day is not far distant when such a much needed Committee of the House will be authorized, and will commence to function effectively, in behalf of personal liberty, democracy, and freedom.

Who knows but that such a committee headed by that great statesman and patriot, DAN FLOOD, might be the final leverage required to swing the world pendulum of liberty over to the side of justice and humanity and usher in an era of liberation and individual freedom that would bring enduring peace, democracy and happiness for all mankind.

God save the Ukraine.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member desiring to extend his remarks on the subject I shall speak about may have permission to do so following my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints of which I am proud to be a member has contributed significantly to our American way of life. Throughout the years there have been many outstanding church members elected to public office from both political parties. It is well known that these officials have served with distinction and moderation while displaying their unquestionable loyalty to this great Nation of ours.

A good example of the bipartisanship of the church membership in the State

where the church headquarters is located is the fact that Utah is represented by two Senators who are both active and devoted members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints but who are stalwart members of opposite political parties.

Believing as I do in a complete separation of church and state, I welcome at this time this demonstration of the political independence which exists in Utah.

However, during the past few months many members of the church, including myself, have been concerned at the tactics of the John Birch Society in attempting to use the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to further their objectives.

This practice has been deplored by devoted members of the church of both political parties. For this reason I was delighted to read in the *Deseret News*, the official church newspaper, this statement by the first presidency on the Birch Society:

FIRST PRESIDENCY STATEMENT—CHURCH SETS POLICY ON BIRCH SOCIETY

The First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Thursday issued a signed statement setting forth the stand of the church on "political questions in general and the John Birch Society in particular."

The statement is as follows:

"The following statement is made to correct the false statements and unwarranted assumptions regarding the position allegedly taken by the leaders of the church on political questions in general and the John Birch Society in particular.

"The church recognizes and protects the right of its members to express their personal political beliefs, but it reserves to itself the right to formulate and proclaim its own doctrine.

"We believe in a two-party system, and all our members are perfectly free to support the party of their choice.

"We deplore the presumption of some politicians, especially officers, coordinators, and members of the John Birch Society, who undertake to align the church or its leadership with their partisan views.

"We encourage our members to exercise the right of citizenship, to vote according to their own convictions, but no one should seek or pretend to have our approval of their adherence to any extremist ideologies.

"We denounce communism as being anti-Christian, anti-American, and the enemy of freedom, but we think they who pretend to fight it by casting aspersions on our elected officers or other fellow citizens do the anti-Communist cause a great disservice.

"We again urge our bishops, State presidents and other officers of the church to refuse all applications for the use of our chapels, cultural halls, or other meeting places for political meetings, money-raising propaganda, or to promote any person's political ambitions."

DAVID O. MCKAY,
HENRY D. MOYLE,
HUGH B. BROWN,
The First Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, since the issuance of this courageous statement of the first presidency, I have received many compliments from my colleagues, constituents, and acquaintances on the wisdom demonstrated by the church leadership in setting the record straight on the Birch Society and in underscoring for all the church's encouragement of participation in either political party.

Typical of the reaction to the church's announcement is the following editorial from the Idaho State Journal in Pocatello, Idaho, entitled, "The Church Speaks Out":

THE CHURCH SPEAKS OUT

The First Presidency of the Latter-day Saints Church showed good judgment this past week when it expressed disapproval of the John Birch Society and disavowed any connection with that extremist body. The three members of the first presidency, David O. McKay and Counselors Henry D. Moyle and Hugh B. Brown, were careful to point out that church members are entitled to hold any political belief they wish, but they were firm in their statement that the church does not and cannot support a group which uses questionable methods to fight communism.

Whether the pronouncement will discourage membership in the Birch Society is another matter, but it clearly puts the church on record against extremism, and that is commendable. It thus joins many other groups and individuals of many political persuasions who have seen the dangers of the Birch Society tactics and have denounced it. And it should halt once and for all any attempts to gain prestige for the Birch cause by associating it with the church.

The First Presidency made very clear their view of communism by denouncing it as "anti-Christian, anti-American and the enemy of freedom." But rightly and firmly they assailed Birch methods by asserting that "they who pretend to fight it by casting aspersions on our elected officers or other fellow citizens do the anti-Communist cause a great disservice."

Here, undoubtedly, they were referring, among other things, to the society's ridiculous charges that former President Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles had been taken in by the Communist conspiracy and were its unwitting tools. Such wild allegations, if widely spread and believed, can only create suspicion and mistrust at a time when calm and confidence are needed. The highest Latter-day Saints Church authorities obviously share this view with many of their countrymen and have spoken out accordingly.

It is encouraging to know that the Birch Society cannot now count the Latter-day Saints Church among its friends, if it ever could. The more friends the society loses, the better off the country will be.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with this excellent statement by the first presidency of the church and with the outstanding editorial in the Idaho State Journal.

For the record I would like to state here that I am very much aware of the Communist menace as I believe most people in our country are. As a Member of the Congress, I have spent a great deal of time working on legislation aimed at defeating Communist purposes. And, only last month I attended a special course on Communist strategy at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute.

I, along with other Members of the House, am earnestly working to do my part in fighting communism, but I am convinced, as is our Latter-day Saints Church First Presidency, that the John Birch Society is a poor and undemocratic way to demonstrate our opposition.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years in the Rocky Mountains States and elsewhere there has been an attempt to imply that the Latter-day Saints—Mormon—Church approves the extremist activities of the John Birch Society

and its radical doctrines. As one who is proud both of his church—Latter-day Saints—and his party—Democratic—I have been disturbed by the efforts of some members of my faith to involve their church in political and temporal affairs. In this setting I think it was highly appropriate that the First Presidency of the Latter-day Saints Church set the record straight January 4, 1963, and I commend my colleague [Mr. HARDING] for calling this statement to the attention of the House.

The Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, Ariz., recently commented favorably on this statement in an editorial of January 19, 1963.

Under unanimous consent I ask that the editorial be printed at this point:

MORMON LEADERS CLEAR THE AIR

As an example of forthright, needed action to counteract rumors, the statement of the highest leaders of the Mormon Church in Salt Lake City opposing any effort to link their church with extremist ideologies is superb.

There have been several efforts in the last two general elections to drag the Mormon Church, by implication, into campaigns. Unfortunately, in two Arizona races of a Mormon against a Mormon, there was an effort on the part of one of the candidates to make his own churchmen believe that the other candidate was not as patriotic as he should be. The effort failed.

Then came the incident when Ezra Taft Benson's son, Reed Benson, tried to coordinate the Utah activities of the John Birch Society. Ezra Taft Benson not only is a high Republican but an apostle of the Mormon Church. Thus some people might have assumed that the church hierarchy approved of Reed Benson's activities had it not been for the statement made by the church president, David O. McKay, and his two counselors, Henry D. Moyle and Hugh B. Brown. These three make up what the church terms its first presidency.

"We deplore the presumption of some politicians, especially officers, coordinators, and members of the John Birch Society, who undertake to align the church or its leadership with their partisan views," the first presidency's statement said.

"We believe in a two-party system, and all our members are perfectly free to support the party of their choice."

That is considerably different from looking at one party as though its members wore halos and had wings, and the other as though its members' feet were cloven and horns sprouted from their heads.

The first presidency also said: "We denounce communism as being anti-Christian, anti-American, and the enemy of freedom; but we think they who pretend to fight it by casting aspersions on our elected officers or other fellow citizens do the anti-Communist cause a great disservice."

Amen.

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN DOMICILIARY CARE AT BATH, N.Y., VETERANS CENTER

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the people in western New York State, part of which I now have the honor to rep-

resent in this House as a result of last year's redistricting have been greatly disturbed in recent weeks by the information that the Veterans' Administration is projecting a drastic cut of some 300 beds this year in the domiciliary care facilities now being provided to our elderly and retired veterans at the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.

We are deeply disturbed by what this cut will do to the treatment which our aged veterans in western and central New York have a right to expect. The VA has suggested that these veterans be hospitalized instead in East Orange, N.J., at some new so-called restoration center.

But, Mr. Speaker, these veterans who seek domiciliary care at Bath are not, it seems to me, proper candidates for the only kinds of rehabilitation services which the New Jersey facility could reasonably be supposed to provide. They want, and deserve, a place where they can live out their lives with dignity and self-respect and in their own home area, not hundreds of miles away.

I oppose the projected VA move at Bath. I intend to oppose it in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and on the floor of this House. I am glad to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Ontario County, which is in my new district, on January 3, 1963. I am proud to have the support of this great board in my efforts to oppose the action of the Veterans' Administration.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 14—BATH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER

Whereas the central offices of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., has announced a cutback on bed capacity of 500 beds at the Bath Veterans' Administration Center; and

Whereas there is a waiting list bearing the names of 212 veterans who have been refused admission as of November 19, 1962; and

Whereas the Bath Veterans' Administration Center is the only domiciliary in the entire northeastern United States. It serves a 10-State area with a total population of 45 million of which approximately 9 million are veterans. If the Federal Government fails to provide these much needed facilities, these veterans will become charges of their local communities; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors petition our Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, and urge him, in the best interest of veterans and our county, to exert his influence to prevent the reduction of this vital service; and, further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman STRATTON, Representative of the 35th District.

ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in every generation a few men emerge who profoundly affect the course of history. I believe that to future historians, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover will be remembered not only by the popular title of "Father of the Nuclear Navy," but also as the

man who more than anyone in our generation has been responsible for the renaissance of our naval striking force. Admiral Rickover's dedication to strengthening the defense of our country, and indeed, the whole Western World through the development of the nuclear powered submarine, has brought to our country a great measure of national security. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have supported Admiral Rickover in his important work and have watched his zeal and dedication with admiration.

Last month in Troy, N.Y., Admiral Rickover received the Uncle Sam Sesquicentennial Medallion from the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam. This committee is comprised of representatives of Troy's service clubs, community associations, fraternal units, and religious, educational, financial, and industrial interests.

In this connection, I would like to place in the RECORD the citation that Admiral Rickover received from the Troy committee on December 21, 1962, as well as a news story and an editorial which appeared in the Troy Record on December 22, 1962, which carries in it some profound observations from Admiral Rickover's statements at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, N.Y., where he accepted the award.

I would before concluding my remarks make note of the fact that on Sunday, January 27, Admiral Rickover will observe his birthday. I am certain every Member of the House joins me in extending to him sincere good wishes on the occasion.

The citation, news story, and editorial are as follows:

SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALLION PRESENTED TO
VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY

Samuel Wilson, born in Menotomy, now Arlington, Mass., on September 13, 1766, and who died in Troy, N.Y., July 31, 1854, must have been your spiritual forebear. A patriot since boyhood, he fought in the War of the Revolution; his father and oldest brother responded as Minutemen to the call to arms by Paul Revere. The period of Sam Wilson's life, 1766 to 1854, witnessed the birth and progress of the United States. Sam Wilson and his family—like yourself, Admiral Rickover—in their lifetime personified those qualities that helped to found and to preserve this Nation.

Because you fought to protect and preserve the United States of America against her enemies by pioneering in the development of our nuclear Navy which now acts as a mighty deterrent force against the potential aggressor;

Because you became the father of the U.S. nuclear Navy through your work as head of the Naval Reactors Branch of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and as head of the Nuclear Power Division of the U.S. Navy;

Because you have fought valiantly to establish better scholastic standards for students and teachers; to boost Federal aid to public schools, colleges, and universities; to do away with frills in our public schools that too often cut into academic subjects;

Because you have fought to give children of ability unlimited educational opportunities, so that America will be educationally competitive in a time of crisis;

Because your efforts in defending American freedom and in preserving the American way of life by fighting for better education for American youth, have reawakened America to her great national purpose as

expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights;

We present you the Uncle Sam Sesquicentennial Medallion.

THOMAS I. GERSON,

Official Uncle Sam historian; Legislative Chairman; Director of Education; for the Executive Committee of the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam.

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Record, Dec. 22, 1962]

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE HAILED AS DETERRENT TO ATOMIC WAR

"Our nuclear submarines are a deterrent force that speaks louder than words," Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover said last night when he received the Uncle Sam Medallion from the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam.

"What most people don't realize is the fact that a potential aggressor, before attacking the United States, will seek to knock out the submerged platforms of the Polaris submarines which can raze his country in a matter of minutes, before he even tries to hurl missiles at the mainland," according to Admiral Rickover.

The medallion presentation was made by the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam on behalf of the residents of the Tri-Cities. The ceremony took place at the Schenectady Naval Reactors Office of the Atomic Energy Commission, located at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory (KAPL) in Niskayuna. KAPL is operated by the General Electric Co. in cooperation with and under the technical direction of the Naval Reactors Branch of AEC, with the mission of designing and developing nuclear propulsion plants for Navy vessels.

PRESENTED BY GERSON

The medallion was presented to Admiral Rickover by Thomas I. Gerson, official Uncle Sam historian, in company with Representative Leo W. O'Brien, of Albany, Mayor Neil W. Kelleher, of Troy, Representative Samuel S. Stratton, of Schenectady, Mayor Malcolm Ellis, of Schenectady, Stanley W. Nitzman, manager of the Schenectady Naval Reactors Office; and Kenneth A. Kesselring, general manager of KAPL.

The citation accompanying the medallion, likened Admiral Rickover's leadership in developing the nuclear Navy and in campaigning for improvements in the education of American youth to the patriotism and dedication of Samuel Wilson, who, during the War of 1812, gave the symbol of Uncle Sam to America, representing a people who love freedom so much that they are determined to protect it, not only for themselves, but for free men everywhere.

CITATION IN PART

The citation read in part: "Because you, Admiral Rickover, fought to protect and preserve the United States of America against her enemies by pioneering in the development of our nuclear Navy, which now acts as a mighty deterrent force against the potential aggressor; because you became the father of the U.S. nuclear Navy through your work as head of the Naval Reactors Branch of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and as head of the Nuclear Power Division of the U.S. Navy;

"And because you have fought valiantly to establish better scholastic standards for students and teachers; to boost Federal aid to public schools, colleges, and universities; to do away with frills in our public schools that have too often cut into academic subjects; because you have fought to give children of ability unlimited educational opportunities so that America will be educationally competitive in a time of crisis; because your efforts in defending American freedom and preserving the American way of

life by fighting for better education for American youth have reawakened America to her great national purpose as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, we present you the Uncle Sam Sesquicentennial Medallion."

[From Troy (N.Y.) Record, Dec. 22, 1962]

POLARIS SUBS MAKE LAND SAFER

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, father of our nuclear Navy, reaffirms the second strike strength of America's submerged nuclear weapon potential when he says that the Polaris submarines "make the land safer."

Speaking at ceremonies at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory in Niskayuna where he received the Uncle Sam Sesquicentennial Medallion from Congressmen, Tri-cities officials and the Troy Area Committee for Uncle Sam, Admiral Rickover said this Nation's Polaris submarine forces does two things: "It deters attack on us; also it forces an aggressor to throw his missiles on to the oceans and not on to the land, where our people are."

This second function is not generally understood by the American public, said the Navy's pioneer of submerged nuclear weaponry. "Nearly everyone knows," he said, "that our Polaris submarines constitute a deterrent to war—that an enemy attacking us knows that he will inevitably be destroyed. But there is still one other point. As long as this deterrent exists, the enemy must first find and attack these submarines. * * * Therefore, his attack must be launched on the oceans and not on the land. This very important fact is not understood by the American public."

There is no overstatement in Admiral Rickover's observation. Certainly an enemy attack against the continental United States would be useless unless there was a first attempt to sink this country's nuclear submarine fleet. It is this 100 percent second strike power of the Polaris submarine fleet that helps to give the United States superiority over the Russians.

The submerged Polaris submarines, each with 16 nuclear-tipped missiles, each within range of the enemy's targets, would raze such targets in a matter of minutes, before the enemy even tries to hurl missiles at the mainland. It is comforting to know that as long as our hidden Polaris platforms continue to increase, their whereabouts not known to a potential enemy, we have a deterrent force that speaks louder than words.

TAX-FREE POWER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very fine speech given by T. E. Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co., at a meeting of the Pocatello Chamber of Commerce at Pocatello, Idaho, on the 15th of August 1962. This speech aptly discloses why "Tax-Free Power Is Not the Answer."

Mr. Roach's speech concerns the proposed extension of the Bonneville Power marketing area to southern Idaho.

To spend \$100 million of the taxpayers money to provide subsidized power to an

area now fully supplied at reasonable rates is totally unwarranted. Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks and include Mr. Roach's speech:

TAX-FREE POWER IS NOT THE ANSWER

(Speech by T. E. Roach, president, Idaho Power Co., August 15, 1962)

I welcome the opportunity to speak to the Pocatello chamber membership about Idaho Power and about problems in Idaho that have a direct bearing upon the future of your various businesses as well as Idaho Power's. Pocatello comprises an important part of our service area and we have the same concern for its growth and expansion as each of you. This is evidenced by the fact that Idaho Power has been a member of the Pocatello Chamber of Commerce since its organization and has had an active part in all of its constructive efforts. We are represented in Pocatello by Milt Sargent, division manager, and his community interest is well known to you by reason of the fact that he is currently serving as vice president of the chamber. Before him, Larry Brainard, a director of Idaho Power, served as chamber president and helped spark special industrial interest. Before Larry's time, Don Brown and others have responded to all important civic calls. Beyond that, our industrial development department under Orland Mayer has been active over more years and spent more money in that field than any other organization in the State, including other chambers of commerce and even the State of Idaho.

This is tangible evidence of our continuing interest in and concern for the importance of constructively contributing to the economic development of the area.

We are proud of our almost 50-year record of never letting the area down in the assurance of ample, low-cost power supply, no matter the size of the demand. Because we have a substantial stake in the economic welfare of the State, we have an understandable concern over any misinformation that might adversely affect the area's economic reputation or that of our company.

Despite the fact that our service area has enjoyed an unbroken record of sound and expanding economic progress—as well as a phenomenal increase in power supply unmatched anywhere in the West—we hear with some regularity, but particularly in an election year, that our economy is decadent, and the only cure is Federal power. In glowing terms, a picture is painted of the great industrial development and prosperity that will accompany the introduction of a tax-free power supply.

This well-planned effort to decry and downgrade the economic status of the State for the purpose of creating a political strawman is a disservice to the area and gives to outsiders a wholly unwarranted impression which is detrimental to constructive efforts being put forth to attract new business to the State.

Are these pronouncements accurate? Is Government power the vital ingredient? The answer is clearly found in a direct comparison of those areas which have been served by Bonneville and those in Idaho, which have been supplied with power by taxpaying enterprise. Let us look for a few moments at some of the principal yardsticks which measure the economic status of Idaho with that of Oregon and Washington.

IDAHO COMPARES FAVORABLY

1. Unemployment is one of the very sensitive barometers of economic health and, on this point, it is enlightening to note that the U.S. Department of Labor lists 36 areas of substantial unemployment in the Northwest. Fourteen of these are in Oregon, including Portland; 16 are in Washington, including Spokane and Tacoma; and only 6 are in Idaho, these being in north Idaho.

Not a single area in southern Idaho is mentioned.

Significantly, all of these unemployment distress areas are within the Bonneville marketing area, and you who are familiar with the north Idaho economy are aware that being in the Bonneville marketing area has brought little economic comfort to it.

2. The same Department of Labor figures show that employment in nonagricultural establishments between 1950 and 1960 increased 19 percent in Idaho, 16½ percent in Oregon, and only 6½ percent in Washington.

Even in the category of "strictly manufacturing," this same Department of Labor source shows the gain in employment between 1950 and 1960 was 38 percent in Idaho, 25 percent in Washington, and 6 percent in Oregon.

Thus, from an employment standpoint, Idaho has definitely made greater progress than either of our two adjoining States to the west, where Bonneville dominates the electric power supply.

3. On the score of increased per capita personal income, Idaho led both Oregon and Washington for the decade 1950-60 with an increase of 43 percent as against 42 percent for Oregon and 40 percent for Washington. For the year 1961, Idaho was up 3.2 percent, compared to Washington's increase of 2.7 percent and Oregon's 1 percent. These figures are from the U.S. Department of Commerce.

4. That Idaho compares favorably with our sister States to the west in value added by manufacture is also disclosed in the U.S. Department of Commerce report for 1958 (the latest), which compares the 5-year period 1954-58. Here Idaho's percentage of increase was 35 percent, or double Oregon's 18 percent, and only slightly below Washington's 40 percent, which was greatly influenced by the volume of work at the Boeing plant in Seattle.

5. Another sound test of economic health is comparative debt and tax levels. Here again Idaho stands out with a State bonded debt per capita of only \$9.88, compared with \$151 for Washington and \$188 for Oregon.

In terms of annual tax burden at the State level, Idaho again finds itself in better shape, with total 1961 taxes per capita of \$102, compared with Oregon's \$111 and Washington's \$164.

6. In the 7-year period 1955-61 the new industries locating in southern Idaho and eastern Oregon totaled 116. They furnish employment to approximately 5,500 people.

We do not have comparable data for Oregon and Washington on a statewide basis, but we do have the industrial development record for Bonneville over the past 10 years. That record shows in 10 years Bonneville has added a net of exactly two industrial customers. They lost the Kaiser Aluminum plant at Tacoma and added the Harvey Aluminum Co. at The Dalles, the Hanna Nickel Co. at Riddle, and Anaconda Aluminum Co. at Columbia Falls, Mont. The Harvey and Hanna installations in Oregon were Government-sponsored projects, whose output goes into the already heavily overburdened Government stockpiling program.

Certainly, a comparative record of this kind provides no warrant for deprecating, downgrading, or holding up to scorn the economic and industrial growth of Idaho compared with Oregon and Washington; and more particularly, it does not demonstrate that tax-free, subsidized Federal power contains within itself any magical formula for industrial growth.

Probably the most accurate and positive comparison of economic progress is found in the area increase in use of electric power. Here again the answer is crystal clear that by this yardstick the area served by Idaho Power has made greater economic progress than either Oregon or Washington. In the 18-year period 1943 to 1961, Idaho Power's

average load has increased 8½ times, while that of Bonneville has increased only 5 times. If we compare only the last 10 years, Idaho Power Co.'s growth has been 250 percent, while that of Bonneville in the same period has been only 190 percent.

This evidence would seem to demonstrate conclusively that so-called cheap Government power is not a guarantee of industrial and economic growth—but let us go one step further and see if rate per kilowatt-hour is the all-important consideration.

INDUSTRIAL POWER RATES

Except in a very few manufacturing activities, the cost of power represents less than one-half of 1 percent of total production costs. The exceptions are found mostly in the fields of electrometal and electrochemical reduction, where cost of power is an appreciably greater percent of total cost. Certainly, taxes and labor costs are much more important and controlling in most industries, and particularly those furnishing substantial employment in relation to power needs.

Over 35 percent of Bonneville's output goes into the electrometal and electrochemical industry, and of this amount 83 percent goes into the production of aluminum. As I pointed out earlier, however, there has been no increase in this particular field except for the additions of Anaconda, Harvey Aluminum, and Hanna Nickel, the latter two being Government-subsidized undertakings. Moreover, all of the aluminum plants are now, and for some time have been, operating at less than full capacity. Additionally, these types of industries, requiring large blocks of power and employing comparatively few people, do not contribute purchasing power in proportion to their power requirements, as compared to a well-balanced group of average industries. It was this fact that caused a representative of the Governor of the State of Washington to comment, "an aluminum plant takes one million kilowatt-hours of power to keep one man busy cracking the crust in potlines." Why should such industries be singled out for special Government subsidy in the form of tax-free power?

Closer to home is a comparison in the electrochemical field. Over the past 10 years, the quantity of electrical energy supplied by Idaho Power to FMC has increased 4½ times. Victor Chemical Co. at Silver Bow, Mont., on the other hand, started elemental phosphorus operations with Bonneville power in 1952, and despite the availability of Bonneville's rates, has not increased its operation a single pound beyond its initial capacity. On the basis of this evidence, what justification is there for the loose and generalized statements that Government-subsidized power is any assurance of industrial growth or economic prosperity? Indeed, on the contrary, the evidence points to exactly the opposite conclusion.

On the subject of rates, I hope it will be of more than passing interest to this audience to know that the rates of Idaho Power for large industrial operations requiring relatively large quantities of power, such as in the production of elemental phosphorus, are substantially lower than that of any other taxpaying utility in the United States, and approximately the same as the rate of TVA for this type of service, despite the inclusion in our costs of a heavy tax load—a burden not carried by any public agency.

GOVERNMENT POWER IS SUBSIDIZED

Bonneville's freedom from taxes and access to tax-free capital funds represents a direct rate advantage of 48 percent. If Idaho Power were relieved of that part of its costs, its large industrial rate would be less than that of Bonneville. To put it another way, relief from that tax burden, as is enjoyed by Bonneville, would permit Idaho Power to lower all of its rate schedules by 48 percent, or with that annual tax relief it could

pay off all its outstanding bonded indebtedness in 8½ years, or all of its outstanding capital securities including stocks in 11½ years.

Tax exemption would be fine for Idaho Power, but what about all the various State and local functions of government and school operations dependent upon that tax money for support of these essential functions?

TAX REVENUES ARE VITAL

Idaho Power is today the State's largest taxpayer, with its payments spread over 27 counties. Sixty percent of our property taxes go to the support of our public school system. As one editor expressed it recently, "many counties in Idaho could not maintain their services without the property taxes paid by Idaho Power."

Since World War II, Idaho Power has created over \$300 million in new taxpaying property, which has increased its annual State and local taxes from \$670,000 to over \$5 million or eight times. If an industrial plant prospect came along, proposing to spend only one one-hundredth of that amount in a new plant, he would be greeted with open arms and a brass band by all levels of government, and certainly by the chambers of commerce in the area; yet an investment of a hundred times that amount by Idaho Power has created hardly a ripple in these same circles. Had Bonneville built these power facilities with taxpayers funds instead of Idaho Power, not one dime of additional taxable wealth would have been created. Local and State taxes, as well as Federal taxes, presently being paid by Idaho Power on these facilities would have been added to your tax bill instead.

For increased power facilities over the next 6 years, we expect to spend another \$140 million of taxpaying capital, providing, of course, that our plans to create these new power facilities are not stymied by the recent proposal to bring Bonneville lines and power into the area to take away from Idaho Power the market it has served so well over a period of almost 50 years. The bringing of Bonneville power into the area would, of course, force the abandonment of much of this proposed expenditure and correspondingly destroy the future tax revenues it would have created.

A COSTLY PROPOSAL

To bring Bonneville lines into this area would cost a minimum of \$40 million—and, of course, to develop such tax-exempt power facilities would require tax money, the only purpose of which would be to eliminate the building of taxpaying electric units.

At a time when the overall burden of State taxes is so heavy, when Government spending is mounting at a rapid pace, when extreme measures are being proposed to insure every possible dollar of tax collection, and when the Pocatello Chamber itself is spearheading a drive for a sales tax to ease the burden of State property and income taxes—at such a time it is strange indeed to hear of proposals for spending millions upon millions of these hard-to-get tax dollars for the purpose of building a tax-destroying Federal power empire in southern Idaho.

Even more strange is it to see such a program being proposed for execution by Bonneville, which for the 4 years ending June 30, 1961, and without the burden of taxes, has lost \$40 million in its operation. It is reliably reported to have lost another \$18 million for the fiscal year just ended, or a total loss of almost \$60 million in a 5-year period. Such a suggestion evidences a complete disregard for the economic realities of the Bonneville financial predicament and its inadequate power supply situation.

IDAHO IRRIGATION WOULD LOSE

Not only would such an action do great and permanent damage to the present and

future tax income of the State—while benefiting only a few public agencies and perhaps a high consumption industry or two by enabling them to become tax evaders—but it would do great and lasting harm to the State's irrigation resources and future expansion. This would inevitably follow from the substitution of Bonneville as the marketing agency for Bureau of Reclamation power at rates substantially below current Bureau rates, thus greatly decreasing the revenues available from Bureau power sales and earmarked for support of irrigation projects in the area. To answer that no concern need be felt on this score because Bonneville would assume that responsibility is small comfort in the face of the already enormous and mounting losses reported by Bonneville.

Irrigation benefits cannot be paid from admitted losses by Bonneville. Hard dollars are needed—and if not forthcoming from Bureau power sales, they must come either from increased payments by the irrigators themselves or from the taxpayers generally.

Attempts to attach irrigation projects to Bonneville power revenues will not be popular nor approved by our neighbors to the west. This is best evidenced by the refusal of Congress in just the past few weeks to saddle Bonneville revenues with the irrigation benefit responsibility of the Mann Creek project near Weiser, sponsored by Congresswoman PFrost, and the Baker project in Oregon, sponsored by Congressman ULLMAN. On top of that, Oregon's leading daily newspaper—The Oregonian of July 29—carried an editorial entitled "Irrigation Albatross," reading in part as follows:

"The gimmick of attaching irrigation projects to Bonneville power revenues in order to make irrigation feasible cuts at the heart of the BPA rate structure. We don't know all about some of the other arguments in a minority report of the House Interior Committee opposing the Baker project bill and another project in Idaho, but we do know that saddling of these projects on Bonneville revenues threatens to harm the entire Northwest."

So you can be sure that Bonneville customers in Oregon and Washington have little interest in Idaho irrigation.

PRESENT COORDINATION BEST

The Bureau of Reclamation power system, on the other hand, is designed to operate for the advantage of the irrigator, and the maximum irrigation benefit is realized through the integration of that system with Idaho Power's interconnected system. This coordinated operation has been in existence since 1923, and by reason of a recent contract arrangement has provided the Bureau with 30,000 kilowatts of added power capacity for the further benefit of the irrigation program. As a matter of fact, Idaho Power's coordinated and cooperative arrangement with the Bureau, and the guaranteed market we provide for the Bureau's surplus power in the summer months, is the key to the financial soundness and payout ability of many of our irrigation projects—all of which would be destroyed if Bonneville should replace the Bureau as the marketing agent.

At stake, therefore, is not only existing irrigation project feasibility but also that of all future irrigation projects dependent upon power revenues for financial aid.

FEW GAIN—MANY LOSE

What argument or justification then can be advanced for urging Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho, other than the desire of a few to obtain preferential treatment in avoiding a fair share of the taxes that Idaho Power must include in its costs, and which the schools and other necessary local agencies of government must have in order to carry out the necessary functions essential to the welfare of our State and its people? And after all, can Bonneville power be developed and

supplied at a cost less than that of an investor-owned company such as Idaho Power?

To be sure, Government power may be sold for less, but does it really cost less? The engineering design of a hydropower plant requires a precise quantity of excavation, concrete, and man-hours of labor no matter who does the building and who owns it. Over a given distance of transmission the same miles of conductor, number of towers, and man-hours of labor are required, irrespective of the owner. When it comes to efficiency in building or operating, I think the record is clear that Government operation of anything has not been done as efficiently as it has in private business. Nor can Bonneville build and operate electric facilities as efficiently and economically as Idaho Power. Where then is it possible for Government costs to be less than those of private business operation? The only area, of course, is in the privilege it enjoys of avoiding, as part of cost, the legitimate and necessary taxes we must all pay as our share of supporting Government functions, and the taxes evaded by any one of us must be made up by the rest.

BONNEVILLE HAS NO FIRM POWER

Not only is Bonneville unable to produce and deliver power at a cost level less than Idaho Power—except as it evades its legitimate tax obligation—but it has, by its own admission, no firm power for sale. In its most recent published advance program, it shows not only a shortage or deficit in firm power supply in its present marketing area of 200,000 kilowatts in 1965 but a continuing and growing deficit in each year thereafter, reaching an overall deficit of 1.3 million kilowatts in 1970. From what source, then, is it going to find power for distribution in southern Idaho that would justify spending 40 million tax dollars for transmission lines into this area? In a statement to the Bonneville Advisory Council last October, Bonneville Administrator Luce stated that "we are short on firm power to the extent that we cannot make offerings to new industries." By its own figures, and by the statements of its Administrator, Bonneville has no dependable power to offer southern Idaho.

Idaho Power, on the other hand, has never failed its service area in the adequacy of power for any need and any quantity, as witness the obligation it took on and met in supplying the rapidly increased requirements of FMC. To serve this load alone, Idaho Power has a total of \$40 million of taxpaying capital committed.

Not only has Idaho Power met all power demands today, but it is preparing to continue to meet them in the future with \$140 million worth of added taxpaying facilities in the 6 years ahead—that is, unless Bonneville's entrance into southern Idaho attempts to substitute tax-free dollars for Idaho Power's taxpaying dollars. Incidentally, the entire aluminum industry in Washington and Oregon, which consumes the lion's share of Bonneville's tax-free power, actually pays less State and local taxes than does Idaho Power alone. And, if you took the time to check the property tax records in Bannock and Power Counties, you would find that Idaho Power Co.'s property tax payments were over three times that of our largest consumer of electric energy.

What southern Idaho needs is not more tax-free property in the State, but more taxpaying businesses, such as that of Idaho Power, to help meet the ever-increasing revenue demands of our schools and local and State government units. And what we need at the national level, with our enormous Federal debt and ever-mounting cost of Federal Government, is a curtailment of unnecessary and wasteful spending.

You can be sure that the appropriation committees of Congress, when the facts are presented to them, will not look with much favor upon allocating \$40 million of your tax

money to Bonneville for a wholly unnecessary transmission line which can only add to the already large annual Bonneville operating loss.

CABINET DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS IS VITALLY NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of this 1st session of the 88th Congress I submitted a bill, H.R. 1798, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Veterans' Affairs, to be headed by a Secretary of full Cabinet rank.

To my mind, this legislation is so important and the need for it so great that I hope many of my colleagues will join with me in urging early hearings and action by the Committee on Government Operations, which now has the bill before it for consideration.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would give to the new Department of Veterans' Affairs full jurisdiction over all present functions of the Veterans' Administration as well as over all other veterans' operations now handled by other departments and agencies.

H.R. 1798 would give appropriate recognition to the fact that veterans and their families now constitute almost half the population of the United States. It seems only reasonable that the Federal agency which perhaps more directly affects the lives of more of our people than any other should have equal standing in the executive branch with departments of much more limited scope and responsibility.

Veterans' Administration programs and operations are indirectly linked with the economy and welfare of the United States.

A Department of Veterans' Affairs, under a Secretary of full Cabinet rank, would put the operations of veterans' programs on a broader horizon and in closer touch with existing departments, which would unquestionably prove mutually advantageous to all concerned, especially to all those the Veterans' Administration serves, and, above all, to the American people.

The size and scope of VA are worth our attention as we consider this bill.

With 176,000 employees, the Veterans' Administration is exceeded in size only by the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department. It is the largest, by far, of the many independent agencies in the executive branch.

Consider these facts:

First. The VA's current budget of \$5.4 billion annually is exceeded only by the budgets of the Defense, Agriculture, and Treasury Departments—and the Treasury Department is in the top three only because it makes the interest payments on the national debt.

Second. The VA provides services for 22,275,000 veterans and their families—a total of more than 81 million people, including 78.5 million veterans and members of their families and over 2.5 million survivors of deceased veterans.

Third. The agency's Department of Medicine and Surgery operates the largest single medical program in the world. Last year it gave 41,500,000 days of hospital care, costing \$875 million, to 700,000 veterans. The daily average of patients receiving hospital care was 114,000.

Fourth. The VA's network of 169 hospitals is the largest in the world. VA research staffs are engaged in 6,800 separate medical research projects.

Fifth. Three of every seven men and women who win medical degrees in the United States receive training in VA hospitals, as well as 1 of every 10 professional nurses.

Sixth. The VA handles 6 million life insurance policies, with a face value of over \$40 billion.

Seventh. Under the VA loan program, there have been 6 million home, farm, and business loans totaling more than \$53 billion.

Eighth. The agency has paid disability and death compensation to more than 4,700,000 veterans and dependents.

Ninth. The VA operates the Nation's largest guardianship program, involving more than 511,000 children and incompetent beneficiaries.

These are only a cross section of the vast activities of the Veterans' Administration. The ubiquitous nature of the agency's role is not properly reflected in its present status as an independent agency.

The magnitude of the administrative functions, the scope of interest, as well as proper recognition of America's fighting men and their families more than justify the establishment of a Cabinet Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early, positive action on this bill.

BOARD ON PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIALS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation providing for the establishment of a Board on Presidential Memorials in the Nation's Capital, which is the result of a recent request by Secretary of the Department of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

This new Board which my joint resolution would establish would serve as a screening agency for proposals for statues, monuments, and other structures. Legislation for the same purpose was introduced in the last Congress by two leading Democrats, Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, and our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

In a recent letter to the Speaker of the House the Secretary of the Department of the Interior asked that this legislation be introduced in this Congress and explained the need for it in these terms:

Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are 96 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National

Capital Parks System. A number of others have been authorized but not yet constructed. In the 86th Congress alone seven public laws were enacted authorizing the construction of memorials. At least 17 bills were before the 86th Congress and 8 before the 87th Congress to authorize the construction of memorials on parklands in the Nation's Capital. It is evident that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials, sound guidelines for the control of this use must be formulated, a comprehensive plan must be developed, each proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be steadfastly followed. In fact, such a plan offers the only assurance that sites will be available for future memorials that in all respects merit a location in the parks.

We recommend the establishment of the Memorial Board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital Parks System. The Board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem, and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective.

The debate over monuments and living memorials is not a new one, and the merits of living memorials as against memorials in bronze, marble, and granite have been urged for centuries. Long before Secretary Udall recommended the action I have today responded to, the philosophers were debating the issues involved.

Marcus Cato is reputed to have said: I would rather have men ask, after I am dead, why I have no monument, than why I have one.

Pliny the Younger considered monuments "superfluous" and said of them that:

If our lives deserve it, our memories will endure.

Euripides held to the view that: The monuments of noble men are their virtues.

Actually, history proves that throughout most of recorded time monuments and living memorials have been about equally popular. The Taj Mahal and the pyramids, the fountains, and the monuments are visible proof of the popularity of monuments as are the 96 memorials of the monument or statue type which Secretary Udall has called our attention to.

On the other hand, the opera houses and theaters, the great cathedrals representing many faiths are among the more enduring and significant embodiments of the living memorial concept.

So it is clear that the issues which are central to the legislative proposal urged upon the Congress by Secretary Udall are important to our time, just as they have been considered important by every great nation in the world throughout recorded history.

The major newspapers in the Nation's Capital, as well as the New York Times and other newspapers, and magazines as well, have grown increasingly critical of the memorials proposed by Members of Congress for our past Presidents and other leaders, and the suggestion has been increasingly heard that living memorials for our past Presidents make

a lot more sense than many of the plans for memorials currently being pushed.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], has pointed out that:

Unless plans for a living memorial or memorials are vigorously pushed, the Nation's Capital will be overrun with statuary and resemble a graveyard.

At the same time he introduced legislation providing that the National Cultural Center shall, with its various facilities, such as auditoriums, libraries, and art galleries, be a living memorial to all past Presidents.

In the Washington, D.C., Daily News, January 10, 1961, Peter Edson, the widely syndicated columnist for the Newspaper Enterprise Association, wrote as follows:

The proposal to combine the two Roosevelt memorials and possibly others into the Cultural Center was a somewhat natural development. It has met with a generally favorable response.

"I think it is a marvelous idea," says Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, one of the principal sponsors of the Cultural Center authorization legislation. "I think it would provide much more appropriate memorials to these two great men."

One other criticism frequently given to Washington's cemetery art is that the city is already too full of monuments to the past and what it needs is more recognition of the future.

The answer to this offered by the new idea for the Cultural Center is that it is a concept big enough to honor a dozen Presidents—or all of them.

Miss Betty Beale, nationally syndicated columnist, wrote in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of January 13, 1961, that:

Apropos of the new interest in making the monument to F.D.R. a living memorial by incorporating it in the National Cultural Center, Mrs. Francis Biddle said that her husband originally had suggested making the memorial into a living one and had met with objections from some of the Congress.

How anyone could object to making an auditorium in the National Cultural Center a memorial to a President of the United States, with his greatest words engraved, not on some outdoor stones for a comparative few to see, but on the walls within where hundreds would see them at one time is hard to understand.

The chairman of the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, U.S. Navy, retired, some time ago urged that one of the units of the National Cultural Center be named in honor of one of our past Presidents.

Additional light on the subject of monuments versus living memorials may be found in a book by Camillo Sitte, a Viennese, who wrote a book called "The Art of Building Cities." It was translated from the German a number of years ago by Charles T. Stewart. Mr. Sitte pointed out that:

The fundamental difference between the procedures of former times and those of today rests in the fact that we constantly seek the largest possible space for each little statue.

Mr. Sitte added that ancient cities were able to accommodate the many sculptured treasures that still testify to

their achievements and glory because the early Greeks and Romans—erected their monuments by the sides of public places instead of in the center.

In addition to introducing the legislation requested by Secretary Udall I have added to it two amendments of my own which would provide living memorials to two great Democrats, President Woodrow Wilson, and President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Memorials to both President Wilson and President Roosevelt are under active consideration at this time by the Congress, as well as by Commissions created by the Congress. The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission was given a congressional directive in the authorizing legislation to consider both a monument or statue form of memorial, as well as a living memorial to President Wilson.

The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission recommended a monument-type memorial which was criticized heatedly throughout the country in such derisive terms as "instant Stonehenge," and "giant bookends," and finally was overwhelmingly rejected last fall by both Democratic and Republican Members of the House of Representatives. Leaders in the move to reject the "instant Stonehenge" memorial to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt were our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The joint resolution I have introduced, the text of which I shall include as part of my remarks, provides that one of the three auditoriums of the National Cultural Center, in which both President and Mrs. Kennedy are so deeply interested, would be built on the 27-acre tract of land reserved by the Congress for the F.D.R. Memorial. This tract of land lies between the Lincoln Memorial and the Jefferson Memorial and my joint resolution further provides that the auditorium built on the F.D.R. Memorial site would be known as the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Festival Hall of the Performing Arts in recognition of President Roosevelt's lifelong interest in the arts.

I make this proposal for the following reasons: The complex of roads which are now being built around the 10-acre site set aside by the Congress for the National Cultural Center will make access to it by foot extremely difficult and hazardous. Tunnels to the National Cultural Center may have to be provided to accommodate pedestrians, just as tunnels are already in the works to expedite and make safe pedestrian traffic to the Lincoln Memorial.

The great concentration of pedestrian traffic at certain hours when the National Cultural Center's three auditoriums are in full use in my opinion renders the use of the present site untenable as the location of the National Cultural Center.

Shifting the National Cultural Center south of the Lincoln Memorial from its present site north of the Lincoln Memorial would still keep it on the Potomac River, and has the added advantage that

the F.D.R. Memorial site south of the Lincoln Memorial is not contemplated as a location of a bridge and road complex such as is certain to strangle the National Cultural Center if it remains in its present location.

Congress was not adequately advised, insofar as I have been able to discover, and I have gone over the hearings held by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House, as well as the Senate and House debates, of the size and damaging effect which the complex of roads now being built around and under the National Cultural Center site would have on the National Cultural Center. Nor do the printed hearings and the House and Senate debates show that any thought or attention was given by the appropriate officials in 1958, when the legislation was under consideration by the Congress, of the impact which the maze of roads surrounding the National Cultural Center site would have in preventing the full and proper development of the National Cultural Center.

My joint resolution provides, in addition, that:

The Congress shall determine whether additional auditoriums of the National Cultural Center shall be built (1) on the site set aside for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, or (2) on lands adjacent to or near Pennsylvania Avenue in order to contribute to the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue and the renewal of the downtown business district of the Nation's Capital where existing public transportation, restaurants, shops, and business firms in general can best serve the needs of those attending the art programs of the National Cultural Center, and the Congress shall take full recognition, in making such determination, of the long-established practice in other nations of locating their theaters, and opera, and music halls and auditoriums in the heart of the business districts of their major cities. The 10-acre site set aside by the Congress for the National Cultural Center shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be utilized for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

The new uses provided by this section of my joint resolution for the sites reserved by the Congress for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, and the National Cultural Center, will make unnecessary the destruction of several independent small business firms, including the nationally famous Pennsylvania Dutch Watergate Inn; will render unnecessary the appropriation by the Congress of several millions of dollars to acquire additional lands to round out the present National Cultural Center site; and, furthermore, will be of material assistance in implementing the Congressional understanding, at the time the National Cultural Center's authorizing legislation passed the House and the Senate, that the National Capital Planning Commission would not spend more than \$650,000 in acquiring the land for the National Cultural Center.

I would call the attention of the Members of this House to House Report No. 2623, 85th Congress, 2d session, which accompanied S. 3335, the National Cultural Center Act, and particularly to the following language from page 3 of such House report which was filed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr.

JONES] for the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives:

The site selected is in an area of street and highway development, and adequate routes of ingress, egress, and parking areas can be developed as the plans proceed. The bill provides that the site be provided by the United States, which would be the only Federal expense involved. The National Capital Planning Commission estimates the cost of acquiring the additional private property in the proposed site not in Federal ownership as \$650,000, and proposes to utilize funds appropriated under the Capper-Cramton Act for that purpose.

It is reported that the President will shortly submit legislative recommendations to amend the National Cultural Center Act in a number of respects, and that he will also include a budget request for \$2 to \$3 million to purchase the lands required to round out the National Cultural Center site. The Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center have indicated to the Public Works Committees of the Congress that the lands which were estimated to cost \$650,000 in 1958 will cost more than 3 times that sum on today's market. There have been estimates in the Washington, D.C., newspapers that it will cost the Federal Government \$2 to \$3 million to acquire the lands needed to complete the present site of the National Cultural Center in order to make it suitable for the National Cultural Center design of the architect Edward D. Stone, and inquiries have convinced me that the President's budget request will include between \$2 and \$3 million for this purpose.

What I am suggesting, in my legislation, is to swap or trade the uses which the Congress has provided for the F.D.R. Memorial site and the National Cultural Center site, thereby saving the \$2 to \$3 million in appropriated funds which the President will shortly ask the Congress to provide to round out the National Cultural Center site.

What is needed, I would suggest, is a bit of horse trading, for here a good trade could be made which would benefit every taxpayer in the country.

I am sure there are many farmers in Iowa and elsewhere who would be delighted to come to Washington at their own expense to show officials how to make such a swap or trade.

In the early days of our country, barter and trade was the commonly accepted way of doing business.

Our tradition and our history is replete with trades. There is, in fact, the historic trade of a number of items of nominal value for the island of Manhattan—certainly one of the more famous barter agreements in American history.

If our leaders find it impossible to make this trade, how can we count on them to work out our country's entry into the Common Market in competition with skilled European Economic Community traders?

There is another point I would like to make at this time, and that is that the National Cultural Center site is several times as large as the sites of the famous memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and, in addition, it is well known that President Roosevelt

himself, despite the well-meaning but misguided efforts of some of his friends, always wanted a simple memorial.

Certainly, the 10 acres reserved by the Congress in 1958 for the National Cultural Center would be more than ample for a simple memorial since it is, as I say, several times as large as the sites of the Washington Monument, and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials.

In my opinion the present site of the National Cultural Center has been very much oversold, for because of the road maze which is being built around it, it is the worst site in the Nation's Capital from almost every point of view for the purposes of a National Cultural Center.

It is definitely far inferior to the 27-acre site reserved by the Congress for the F.D.R. Memorial, for if located on the F.D.R. Memorial site the National Cultural Center would be in a parklike setting, and it would not be strangled by a maze of roads.

The present National Cultural Center site is definitely far inferior to the federally owned land near the U.S. Treasury Building on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th Street and 15th Street which was the site of one of Washington's finest theaters for many years.

It is definitely inferior to the site, even, of the Capitol Theater at 1326 F Street NW., in the heart of the business district of the Nation's Capital and near the city's finest restaurants and shops.

Furthermore, it may cost as much as \$3 million to complete the purchase of this definitely inferior site, whereas the Senate and House Public Works Committees stated that it would not cost more than \$650,000 to acquire the lands needed to round out the National Cultural Center site.

With the present road complex being built around the National Cultural Center site—a road will even run directly under the National Cultural Center—this site would be a bad bargain if it did not cost 1 cent of appropriated funds.

The Congress should, therefore, examine this matter thoroughly when it receives the budget request of the President for acquiring additional lands to round out the National Cultural Center site.

The third major provision of my joint resolution would implement a proposal in which President Kennedy himself has been widely reported as interested in personally. Several of his top aids have, in fact, made speeches and written letters stating that the President strongly favors the establishment of a national music and art competition and prize, and has received pledges of enough private contributions to make it possible.

Accordingly, my joint resolution would provide for such a national music and art competition and prize, which would be known as the President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Competitions and Prizes in recognition of President Wilson's well-known interest in music, particularly, and that there is no greater international language than the arts.

The finals of the President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Competitions would be held in the Nation's Capital, be

limited to young artists, and be open to young artists from other nations under such conditions as the President may establish.

Van Cliburn, a young Republican from Texas, achieved international recognition and fame as the result of winning a piano competition in Moscow at which time he was embraced and bussed by Premier Khrushchev.

Personally, I am sick and tired of waiting until young American artists are discovered by Europeans or Russians before they can obtain a hearing in the leading concert halls of the United States.

I think we are mature enough as a nation, and educated enough as a people, to know the difference between a good musician and poor one.

I do not think we need or should continue to rely entirely on the judgment of Europeans and the Russians as to what is good or mediocre in the arts.

We do not have to have "made in Europe" labels on our automobiles, house furnishings, furniture, and clothes, and I do not see why we have to have an "approved in Europe" or an "approved in the Soviet Union" label on our young American artists.

Iowa's college and university music and art departments are just as good, and often better, than any music or art conservatory in Europe.

Our symphony orchestras are certainly better than European symphony orchestras, and, with some encouragement and support at the national level, such as my joint resolution would provide, could make a major contribution to the encouragement and support of young performing artists, and composers.

American art museums and galleries could perform similar functions in the encouragement of young artists and the establishment of high artistic standards.

American libraries, on and off college and university campuses, could encourage young American writers.

That our symphony orchestras, art museums and galleries, libraries and our colleges and universities have done really so little in these areas of stimulation and support of young artists, composers, authors, architects and so on should be a cause of national concern.

However, the Congress itself, and the White House, have not done what they could or should in this matter, and you will recall the words of President Eisenhower in his 1955 message on the state of the Union:

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities.

The National Collection of Fine Arts in 1938 was given a major program to encourage American artists, but has failed almost completely to carry out this national program which the Congress authorized at that time.

The National Cultural Center, likewise, was given broad statutory authority by the Congress in 1958 to encourage American artists in the field of the performing arts but has done nothing at all in this area.

The White House has become so alarmed by this failure that August Heckscher, a former editor of the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune, and now Special Consultant to the President on the Arts in the White House Office, wrote to our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1963, page 121—in part as follows:

Up until now, we have not had the personnel or the organization necessary to create such a festival as you have in mind. The National Cultural Center would seem a normal channel through which this could be done—perhaps working in cooperation with the President's Consultant on the Arts. I do hope that the National Cultural Center will begin activities of this sort even before its buildings are completed.

I think it is astounding that the richest nation in the world, the leader of the entire free world, and the present administration, which has received international acclaim for its deep and abiding concern with the arts on the society pages of every newspaper in the world, should lack the personnel and the organization necessary to arrange for and hold biennial competitions in the arts such as many relatively poor nations in Europe have carried on for decades.

It is because I have become convinced that it is high time that we established competitions in the United States to rival those in Europe and the Soviet Union in which a number of young Americans have won top prizes in recent years that I have provided in my joint resolution for the President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Competitions and Prizes.

I include at this point in my remarks the text of my joint resolution and I invite all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are interested in these matters to join me as cosponsors of this measure:

H.J. Res. 181

Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Board on Presidential Memorials in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a Board on Presidential Memorials in the Nation's Capital (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "Board"). The Board shall prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Committees of the Congress broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land of the National Capital Parks System through the media of monuments, memorials, and statutes. The Board shall examine each proposal for the use of said park land for memorialization purposes, including the importance of the person or event concerned, and shall make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the proposal.

Sec. 2. The Board shall be composed of—

(1) three members to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(3) the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives;

(4) the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts;

(5) the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission;

(6) the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and
 (7) the Director of the National Park Service.

The memberships filled by the President shall be as follows: one for a term of one year; one for a term of two years; and one for a term of three years. The President shall appoint successor members to hold office for three years, and shall designate a member of the Board to serve as its Chairman. The members of the Board shall receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel when engaged in discharging their duties as members.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at least one of the auditoriums of the National Cultural Center shall be built on the twenty-seven-acre site reserved by the Congress for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, and shall be known as the "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Festival Hall of the Performing Arts", in recognition of the lifelong interest of President Roosevelt in the arts. The Congress shall determine whether additional auditoriums of the National Cultural Center shall be built (1) on the site set aside for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial or (2) on lands adjacent to or near Pennsylvania Avenue in order to contribute to the redevelopment of Pennsylvania Avenue and the renewal of the downtown business district of the Nation's Capital where existing public transportation, restaurants, shops, and business firms in general can best serve the needs of those attending the art programs of the National Cultural Center, and the Congress shall take full recognition, in making such determination, of the long-established practice in other nations of locating their theaters, and opera, and music halls and auditoriums in the heart of the business districts of their major cities. The ten-acre site set aside by the Congress for the National Cultural Center shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be utilized for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial.

SEC. 4. (a) The President, acting through the Special Consultant to the President on the Arts in the White House Office, in cooperation with the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Director of the National Cultural Center, shall arrange for competitions to be held at least every other year to be known as "The President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Competitions" in each of the major fields of the fine arts. The competitions in the fields of the performing arts shall be held in cooperation with the National Cultural Center, and the competitions in the other major fields of the fine arts shall be held in cooperation with the National Collection of Fine Arts. The competitions shall (A) be limited to young artists, and (B) be open to artists from other nations under such conditions as the President may establish.

(b) The President, acting through the Special Consultant to the President on the Arts in the White House Office, shall establish national music and art prizes, to be known as the "The President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Prizes" which shall be awarded with suitable ceremonies in connection with "The President Woodrow Wilson Music and Art Competitions," and which may include other benefits in addition to monetary awards to assist outstanding young artists in their chosen careers.

(c) The President shall create such interagency committee as in his judgment may be of assistance in carrying out the purpose of this section. The provisions of section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 134; 31 U.S.C., sec. 691), shall be applicable to any interagency committee created pursuant to this section.

(d) The Special Consultant to the President on the Arts shall be appointed by the President, and shall be on the staff of the

White House Office. The compensation of the Special Consultant to the President on the Arts shall be at the rate of \$21,000 per annum.

(e) The President, acting through the Special Consultant to the President on the Arts in the White House Office, shall enter into an agreement with the owner of the Capitol Theater, at 1326 F Street NW., in the District of Columbia, in order to assure that the Capitol Theater shall be available for a period of at least five years for use by the United States in carrying out the purposes of this section. This agreement includes an option on the part of the United States to renew for a like period of time or until the National Cultural Center is built and in operation.

LARGEST DEMOCRATIC RALLY IN GEORGIA HISTORY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of January 22, 1963, in Atlanta, 1 week after the inauguration of Georgia's young and vigorous Governor, Hon. Carl E. Sanders, Democrats were called to order by the Georgia Democratic Party chairman, J. B. Fuqua, at the largest and most successful rally since the gathering at the same Biltmore Hotel to launch the candidacy of our own Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL for President.

After the courts entered the political arena pursuant to the Tennessee reapportionment case, Georgia Democrats were required to hold numerous primaries and were faced with election costs deficits. They bailed themselves out handsomely in this response keynoted by a call for party unity and harmony by Governor Sanders.

This fine address, in honor of Democrats and on the occasion of the annual tribute to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, should be entered on the records of the Congress.

I add a personal note to remind all Democrats in America that party unity, in order to be maintained, must be a matter of meeting each other halfway and not an expectation that Georgia Democrats abandon all their beliefs.

The address by Gov. Carl E. Sanders follows:

We meet here this evening in a spirit of dedication, and rededication. Dedication to the future. And rededication to the principles of our founders Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Last summer, as a Democratic candidate for the State's highest office, I promised you and the other Democrats of our State that I would work for a strong grassroots Democratic Party in Georgia stemming from the 159 county executive committees; a strong, continuing governing structure with permanent rules and regulations; a majority vote for State officers; an effective voice for all voters in the party councils; the right of every citizen to have his vote counted honestly and fairly, and not to be deprived of his franchise through any kind of trickery.

As the titular head of your Democratic Party at this great occasion, let us renew these pledges together.

We are Democrats. And, my friends, we are solvent Democrats.

I am happy to report to you tonight that our party, the party of the people of Georgia, is again debt free. Let us keep it that way.

We support the Democratic Party, its nominees, the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

We pledge—you and I—to fight within the ranks of the party to provide leadership away from the radicals, reactionaries and rabble rousers who would divide and destroy our party.

This is a time for unity—and, never before have we been more united in what our founder, Thomas Jefferson, termed "common effort for the common good."

By your presence here tonight, we proclaim to the world that we are true to the principles of our founders and have been tried and proved in times of trial and tribulation.

As loyal Democrats, we will not support, we will oppose, we will fight vigorously, any third party movements, splinter candidates, keeping the nominees off the ballot.

Nor will we tolerate any other device, artifice or scheme to thwart the will of Georgia democracy.

The Democratic Party from time immemorial has been the party of the people in Georgia. And through our unified efforts and leadership, it will remain the party of the people in Georgia. We will not see our party split and dissolved. Instead, it is our purpose to make the Democratic Party of Georgia a continuing, vital, vibrant, responsive force in Georgia's future. The need today is for proper perspective and a realization of true values.

Crippling internal strife will wreck a State, it will destroy a nation.

We seek today in Georgia, as patriots have sought throughout the history of our Nation, a government dedicated to the true principles of a Republic, determined to be representative of our people, and democratic in its effects.

In every instance, your purpose and mine, is to place with the Georgia voters at home on the local level control over their destiny to determine for ourselves what governmental policies best suit our needs.

The Democratic platform for our administration during the next 4 years can be summed up in five words: "better government for all Georgians."

The new political day which has dawned in Georgia has brought into the light the informed citizen who thinks for himself. It is to this man and to this woman that we now must appeal for support. To win in the future we must sell ourselves and our platform. The time has passed when we could take victory for granted solely on the basis of offering ourselves as Democrats.

To insure our Democratic position of leadership, we must offer positive programs and qualified candidates. This is the only kind of an appeal which will gain the support of the people—one made to their reason, not to their passions.

There has never been a more eloquent summation of the governmental philosophy of our party than that stated by Jefferson in his first inaugural address.

It was therein that he called for: "Equal and exact justice to all men, peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, support of the State governments in all their rights, preservation of the general government, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person, and trial by juries."

Above all else, Jefferson possessed a vision of free government for a liberty-loving people and put together the combination of

farmers and craftsmen who founded our Democratic Party.

It remained for Andrew Jackson, however, to mold this loose force into a disciplined political party, and he did so with all of the purpose and strength with which he had earned public acclaim and adoration as a colorful military hero.

It was Jefferson who established the basic Democratic philosophy of: "Equal rights for all and special privileges for none." But it was Jackson who gave voice to the party's continuing role as the protector of the little man and the champion of the underdog. "Old Hickory" was also the man who committed the Democratic Party at one and the same time to upholding State rights and preserving the Federal Union.

No Jefferson-Jackson Day observance would be complete without paying our respect to some of the Republican Party leaders.

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I cite to you our Nation's whole history in making a judgment on the unbroken performance of our party as contrasted with the failure of its competing party.

With but a few exceptions, the Republican king-makers have shown a consistent disposition toward patronizing special, selfish interests in making their nominations. The public interest, the public welfare has been relegated to the rear in their choices.

After the great war in 1918, it was Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—a complete failure of leadership, stagnation and isolationism, trade slackened, unemployment rose, our defenses went to pot. Unbridled hysteria stalked the land, innocent people suffered. Stark depression and fear gripped our people. The American people paid, and paid dearly. We want no more of that. We want no more of the slogans which never came to pass.

Hungry children cannot eat slogans.

Our people can understand that it took successive Democratic administrations to recover from the unparalleled corruption of the Harding era, to recover from the "do-nothingness" of "Silent Cal," and to recover from the pathetic leadership vacancy of the Hoover depression days.

Leaders of the opposition party have shown their disposition time and again to offer nothing more than more of the same.

The American people in 1960—the Democrats of California in 1963—assigned that great television debater and good loser, Richard Milhous Nixon, to a secret political graveyard somewhere in Beverly Hills, Calif. They sent him to that mysterious Valhalla where all of the jumbo elephants of the GOP go after their defeat.

In this new day, the faces are different, but the ties to the same old special interests are the same.

Awaiting in the wings for their cues are three triple threats: the most eligible of them all, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, the suave Barry Goldwater, and the automaker-turned-Governor, George Romney.

Every voter at the grassroots can understand this: None of the prospects has anything for Georgia, cares anything about the South, or has anything to offer the Nation as a whole. The patrons of special privilege who served up Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover are now dishing out Goldwater, Rockefeller, and Romney, "the Rambler." Nelson's making all the noise, Barry's captivating the college boys.

Yes, my friends, we have much to be thankful for. We are proud to be Georgians. In the future, Georgia will need—she must have—militant Democrats who value their citizenship and party membership, who work at both, who do not take either for granted, and who recognize and appreciate their responsibilities.

I challenge every loyal Democrat here tonight to stand up with me now in a unified pledge to do our best for our party, for our State, and for all our people.

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S BOOK "A STUDY OF COMMUNISM"

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, we citizens of these great United States are most fortunate in being able to go to bed at night and sleep with the full confidence that no agent of a foreign nation can disturb us and separate us from our family to be hauled up before some dictator's tribunal on some trumped-up charge.

This situation and our wholly justifiable confidence is due in very large measure to the unrelenting watchfulness and ability of the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation, 60 minutes of each and every hour of each and every day, year in and year out, under the very capable and completely dedicated direction of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. Words at my disposal are entirely inadequate for me to express my own personal appreciation for the life and dedicated service of J. Edgar Hoover in behalf of all that is very precious to each of us as citizens of this great Nation. Not only has Mr. Hoover dedicated himself to all that is good and precious to each and every American citizen, but he has recruited and surrounded himself with the most able and unselfish men and women in our Nation who are not only unusually well trained and competent, but who are also deeply inspired by Mr. Hoover's personal example to maintain the same high standards of service to our Nation that he demands of himself.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize my own deep personal appreciation for the life and service of Mr. Hoover and all the personnel under his supervision in protecting and preserving all that is so precious to each of us as citizens of our great United States.

Mr. Hoover has not only demonstrated his ability and the ability of the personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in countless ways, but he has also been willing to share with each of us his knowledge and the history of the ideologies which are constantly trying and seeking to undermine and destroy our American way of life. Mr. Hoover is the author of several books which should be "must reading" for every American, the most recent of which is titled "A Study of Communism." The forces of communism represent one of the greatest threats to our Nation and to our American way of life. We, as citizens of our great Nation, can combat these evil forces of communism only by being well informed as to how they work and by cooperating fully with the agencies of our own Government.

Mr. Hoover could add greatly to his own personal financial wealth through the profits and royalties on his books. But such a course would be completely foreign to the policies and patriotic standards of devotion Mr. Hoover has

always set for himself. Consequently, any and all profits and royalties which would accrue to Mr. Hoover's personal wealth are given to various charities. Therefore, Mr. Hoover receives no monetary benefits from his books and receives only the deep personal satisfaction of making a further contribution to the life and best interest of our Nation.

My good friend and fellow citizen, H. K. (Bud) Crowl, president of Radio Station WAVI in Dayton, Ohio, and his editorial staff have not only brought Mr. Hoover's book "A Study of Communism," to the attention of their listening audience on numerous occasions but they have also been very instrumental in making nearly a thousand copies of this book available to the educational institutions in Dayton, Ohio, through some of our patriotic and public spirited citizens.

Mr. L. M. Berry, chairman of the board of the L. M. Berry Co., which produces and publishes the "yellow pages" in the telephone directories of many States and communities throughout the Nation, has furnished 500 copies of "A Study of Communism" to the University of Dayton. We are very fortunate to have four important divisions of the General Motors Corp. in Dayton Ohio, and each of these divisions is under the capable leadership of men who are not only dedicated to their own responsibilities but who are also dedicated to the best public service in behalf of our area and the entire Nation. These four important divisions of General Motors in Dayton—Frigidaire, Delco, Delco Moraine, and Inland—have purchased and furnished 400 copies of "A Study of Communism" to the Dayton Board of Education, and Radio Station WAVI, through its president, H. K. (Bud) Crowl, has provided an additional 50 copies of this very important and valuable book to the Dayton Board of Education for use in our Dayton schools.

It has seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that the devoted service, work, and unselfish ability of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in behalf of the best interest of our Nation should be brought to the attention of all thinking citizens at every opportunity. Likewise the willingness of public spirited and patriotic citizens like Mr. L. M. Berry, all the personnel of the four divisions of General Motors in Dayton, and the owners and management of Radio Station WAVI in Dayton should be appropriately commended for making nearly a thousand copies of Mr. Hoover's book, "A Study of Communism," available to the educational community of our Dayton, Ohio, area. The reading and study of "A Study of Communism" by the youth of our Dayton area cannot help but have an important part in undergirding and strengthening the confidence, belief, and appreciation of our young people in all the sound principles and concepts which have made our United States the greatest Nation in the world.

NATIONAL PASSPORT POLICY

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American Government should, so far as possible, encourage our people to travel. Close and friendly relations with the other countries of the world and a deeper understanding of the world can be gained for this country by continuing and increasing the flow of American visitors traveling to all parts of the world. Such visitors are often called ambassadors of good will. This is not entirely correct, however, for while there may be certain parallels between the actions of our diplomats and our traveling American public, the people who venture to other countries on their own have a chance for the type of person-to-person contact which, by the nature of the official duties of the diplomat, are unmatched. Our visitors abroad have the chance to, and do, make the close personal contacts which, more than any treaty, can insure international friendship.

It should be the job, then, of our Government to facilitate in every way the flow of Americans to the other countries of the world where people are anxious to know more of us and to meet us. As a step in that direction, I have today introduced a bill to establish a national passport policy and to reorient the administrative functions of the Department of State in this area to the greater accomplishment of this policy. It calls for a recognition of the beneficial effects of travel upon our international relationships; it seeks a minimization of travel restrictions and impediments.

At the same time that it calls for an emphasis on travel and an elimination of the burdensome formalities that accompany international travel, this bill recognizes the clear and present danger which the international Communist conspiracy poses to this country and to the free world and it makes specific provision for limitations of the right to travel in cases in which this would work to the detriment of America or where such travel would be dangerous to the individual.

I believe that much can be done to encourage Americans to travel abroad and make the kind of contacts that help cement a free and harmonious world. This bill, to establish a national passport policy and to establish an administrative mechanism to support this policy, would help us achieve the goals which are possible through friendly international travel.

AVERAGING TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the taxpaying citizens of

this country have an economic cycle which is closely related to the calendar year—they are paid a set number of times a year, bonuses which they receive are annual and, generally, the calendar year can be considered their economic year as easily. For this reason, and for administrative convenience, the functions of tax collection revolve around the calendar year.

Certain variations from this are allowed. Individual or corporate taxpayers may choose a different 12-month period for their tax year, for example. The chance for such variation is very small, however, for those whose economic cycle does not fit into a 12-month pattern. In many of the creative fields, one income-producing work may be the product of 5 weeks of labor or 5 years. Ideally, taxation should be based upon the actual economic cycle of each individual taxpayer. Practically, even though the vast majority of taxpayers do fit into the normal 12-month economic pattern, this would be an administrative impossibility.

There should, however, be some provision made by which recognition could be given the fact that a particular taxpayer's economic cycle does not fit the normal pattern. It is for this reason that I have today introduced a bill which provides for an expansion of the now very narrow provisions by which a taxpayer may average his taxable income. What this tax averaging mechanism does, briefly, is permit one who has a fluctuating income from year to year to even it off, for tax purposes, over a certain number of years. Thus, an individual might make only \$2,000 a year for 4 years while engaged in an undertaking from which he eventually will realize \$50,000 in the fifth year. He would be able to take the whole \$58,000 he earned over the period in question and report for tax purposes an income better representing the return for each year's work.

The bill which I have proposed would do that. It would retain the idea of tax measured by yearly income, which is necessary for administrative purposes, but it would allow a certain amount of flexibility in spreading back peak income over the years in which it was earned and thus lessen the tax disadvantage which faces those whose income is subject to fluctuation. My bill is based on a 6-year period. If an individual's income in any 1 year is 150 percent of his average income over the 5 preceding years, he could take that amount over the 150 percent and spread it back over the preceding years. He would, in effect, reopen his returns for the earlier years to report an additional amount of income and compute how much further taxes he owes on the previous years' returns. This would allow him to pay at a much lower rate in our graduated income tax schedule. After exercising this option, he would then have a new annual basis for the computation of his average annual income and he could use this system for income averaging the next year if, once again, his income amounted to 150 percent of the average of his 5 immediately preceding years' income.

The necessity which we face of computing on some set period of time puts in the tax system an inequity which bears heavily on those whose economic lives do not correspond to 12-month periods. While perfect individualization of taxing is not possible for these taxpayers, permitting a system of averaging taxable income would be of real benefit in overcoming the inequity which they face.

NEW PROCEDURE FOR CONGRESSIONAL CONTEMPTS

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the necessary powers of this, or any other, legislative body is to protect itself against acts designed to undermine and contravene its functions. The means by which the American Congress protects itself is through the invocation of the contempt procedure, a process which calls to the attention of the Congress the act which threatens it and provides for punishment of the offender either through the courts or before the bar of the House against which the contempt has been directed.

Most contempts today arise from actions of those called before committees of the Congress as witnesses. These actions range from refusal to cooperate to active obstruction of the committee's work. There is no need to call attention to the importance of our committee structure and the fact that the detailed legislative and investigative work which is done by the Congress is accomplished through committees. This is all clearly understood. The point to which I wish to address attention is the procedure by which contempts are brought to the attention of the parent body, the House or the Senate, by committees which have encountered such witnesses.

At present, it is the practice for the committee which has been the subject of the act of contempt to serve as first judge of the matter. It is the committee itself which reports the matter to the parent body, acting at once as victim and prosecutor. I question the soundness of this form of proceeding and I have introduced a bill to change this procedure. Basically, this bill provides a screening committee to which the complaint of contempt is brought and it is this screening committee, not the committee which has been subject to the action complained of, which would act as the agency reporting the matter to the parent body.

This new procedure commends itself because it places in the hands of an impartial body the investigation of the charge of contempt and does so in a manageable way. Surely the House or Senate could be considered impartial bodies to investigate the charge, but considerations of time prevent this and there is no practical way in which outside witnesses could be heard on the

question of guilt if the entire House or Senate heard the matter. There is real question if the committee which complains of contempt can properly be charged with the responsibility of impartially weighing the evidence to determine if a contempt should be reported to the parent body.

This committee to investigate contempt charges would be named by the presiding officers of the House and Senate respectively and would serve as a special committee. The committee would have seven members and be divided four to three along party lines. The creation of this committee, and its operation in the important area of protecting the Congress and its proceedings from the interference of those wishing to undermine its effectiveness, would provide a strong safeguard of the rights of those charged with contempt and would make more meaningful this type of protection for the Congress.

VISIT OF BETANCOURT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, following up my remarks made in the House on January 10, 1963, "Is Venezuela Changing?" I would again like to call attention to the scheduled visit of President Betancourt of Venezuela, February 19 or 20, 1963.

You can believe Betancourt is coming to the United States and will be received with great fanfare and ceremony. He will no doubt have his hand out for more money from the United States and more areas for doing business with our country.

I resent this visit and will certainly oppose, where I have a vote, the giving of any money or aid to Betancourt. I will do this just as long as he retains control of properties and investments of U.S. citizens and investors. I believe this is the time when President Betancourt should be informed in no uncertain terms, that any aid to Venezuela will be based upon the return of American-owned property, to the rightful American investor. If he does not wish to do this than he should be informed that proper compensation should be awarded to the investors of all this seized property.

I shall use whatever means at my command to call this to the attention of the House when any legislation comes to it and a vote is needed. I am also sending a copy of this statement to the President of the United States and hope that it may have some effect on him and the decision he will make.

UNESCO GENERAL CONFERENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the 12th General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in Paris, November 7 to December 12, 1962, produced a number of significant results from the standpoint of U.S. interests. Along with my distinguished colleagues, Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, and Congressman Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire, I had the pleasure of attending the Conference as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation, and I feel privileged to bring several observations to the attention of this House.

In my surveillance of the U.S. mission to UNESCO, I was deeply pleased with and inspired by the excellent leadership afforded the U.S. delegation by Chairman Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and Vice Chairman George V. Allen, Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. Their very effective team included Delegates Mildred McAfee Horton, Walter Kotschnig, John H. Morrow, and Alternate Delegates Herbert W. Hill, Eugene Jacobson, Robert A. Kevan, and Joseph B. Platt. The accomplishments of our UNESCO team are due to the hard and effective work of each member of the U.S. delegation.

Early in the Conference, Mr. Rene Maheu, of France, was elected Director General of UNESCO for a 6-year term.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

I should first like to emphasize the highly constructive nature of this Conference from the standpoint of the United States. Despite the time-consuming procedure and long-drawn debates, which are characteristic of all large international meetings, there were several solid and very important achievements. Assistant Secretary Battle, in his firm and businesslike opening speech, made five significant points. He called for:

First. Reduction in the number and length of conferences and meetings called by UNESCO;

Second. Gradually curtailing subventions to nongovernmental organizations;

Third. Phasing out or terminating UNESCO support to major projects, institutions, centers, and other activities which UNESCO initiated with the intention of supporting for only a limited time;

Fourth. Eliminating competition with other U.N. specialized agencies and duplication of their efforts; and

Fifth. Abandoning activities such as tendentious publications, and those seminars, meetings, and other projects which lead to polemics rather than scholarly results.

In its major actions the Conference reduced a proposed budget which threatened to exceed the bounds of prudence. A highly dubious plan for financing a

major new operation completely outside previously accepted priorities was dropped. The usual Communist efforts at political exploitation of the Organization's program and of the Conference itself were contained and largely defeated. Finally, positive steps were taken toward a much needed revision of the procedures of the Secretariat.

I regard as highly significant the initiative taken by the United States throughout the Conference. Our Government has not always given UNESCO and its program the priority of attention necessary to place us in a position to lead. On this occasion, however, the U.S. Government had planned for the meeting with great care and, in the preparation of U.S. positions, had drawn widely upon experts from many agencies and organizations, as well as the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. The U.S. determination to bring this work to fruition produced results.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the progress achieved at this Conference is only partly secured. If the United States is to consolidate present gains, we must continue to give UNESCO affairs the attention they merit. Only thus will the constructive steps initiated at the 12th General Conference be followed by the necessary subsequent steps. And such perseverance is essential if we are to earn and maintain the complete respect and confidence of our world neighbors.

MAJOR ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

Political issues: The Conference was complicated, as expected, by Soviet bloc attempts to gain political advantage from the proceedings. These attempts were outweighed by the efforts of free world delegations, including our own, which succeeded generally in defeating Soviet moves to turn program discussions into propaganda, and succeeded specifically in defeating Soviet bids to seat Communist China and to admit five Communist-front organizations as observers to the Conference. A Soviet draft amendment to have non-United Nations members admitted by a simple majority "on report of the Executive Board" was also voted down.

The Soviet bloc, in attempting to distort the 1963-64 program and budget, pursued the usual lines of emphasizing large youth conferences and festivals, pressing semantically and out of context the subject of disarmament—with its ready appeal to uncommitted and underdeveloped countries—reiterating clichés on colonialism—a subject which today, outside the Communist bloc, has little relevance.

An energetic Cuban effort to scrap the successful working agreement between UNESCO and the Organization of American States was soundly defeated.

The Executive Board was enlarged from 24 to 30 members, in recognition of the expanded UNESCO membership. In the election of the 18 new members to fill Board vacancies—12 of which were caused by expiring terms—the Soviet bloc was able to pick up only one new seat. This 30-member Board, which supervises the UNESCO program between

sessions of the biennial general conference, now has three Soviet bloc countries represented—U.S.S.R., Poland, Romania. The Cuban nominee for Board membership received the fewest votes of all the candidates.

PROGRAM ISSUES

The budget ceiling: A major issue of the General Conference, if not the major issue, was the challenge for the UNESCO program of the United Nations development decade. The General Assembly of the U.N., in designating the 1960's as the decade of development, called upon each member agency of the U.N. family for bold and imaginative thinking to bring about a reorientation of effort, wherever required, to meet the needs of economic and social development. In the case of UNESCO, there was much to be done in accomplishing this redirection. I am pleased to report that the overriding importance of educational development was recognized by the Conference, and that that recognition is reflected in the program for the coming biennium.

In addition to the need to reorient UNESCO's program, it had become apparent to the United States and to other countries that a number of marginal activities should be eliminated to provide a sounder basis for future growth in the most essential areas. Accordingly, the United States and the United Kingdom persuaded the executive board to recommend to the General Conference a \$38 million budget ceiling for the biennium 1963-64, a 17-percent increase over the preceding biennium. This was in contrast to the Director General's \$40.8 million budget recommendation, which was supported by most of the developing countries. The Conference, after considerable debate and deliberation, voted to adopt a \$39 million budget, a compromise in which the United States concurred, recognizing the necessity of providing for certain unforeseen mandatory budget increases in the personnel field.

The Nubian Monuments campaign. Another major issue of the Conference arose over the means of financing the campaign to save the monuments of Nubia—in the United Arab Republic and the Sudan—threatened with inundation as a result of the construction of the Aswan High Dam. The United States vigorously opposed the proposal that UNESCO contribute some \$30 million plus interest for the preservation of the temples of Abu Simbel with funds to be obtained by the Organization through bank loans and repaid by means of assessments against member states as part of future regular budgets.

The United States has supported the voluntary campaign through contributions of \$2.5 million in Egyptian pounds for the preservation of lesser temples and the equivalent of \$1.5 million for archeological expeditions to the areas. President Kennedy has also signified his willingness to request, at the proper time, congressional authorization to use the equivalent of \$6 million in U.S.-owned Egyptian pounds for preservation of the cluster of monuments on the Island of Philae, where work cannot be begun until the new level of the Nile has been fixed.

The U.S. delegation took the position that a special project of such magnitude as the Abu Simbel undertaking should not become a part of the regular program of UNESCO, thus receiving priority over the program for educational development, as would automatically occur in resorting to a bank loan. The proposal for a mandatory program was rejected by the Conference, but it was agreed that renewed efforts should be made by UNESCO and member states to raise the necessary funds through voluntary contributions.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

In addition to reorienting its program to the challenge of the U.N. development decade, the United States recommended that UNESCO make a thorough review of its administrative and management capabilities. The review, to be conducted with the help of outside experts, would study UNESCO's organization, personnel practices, methods of operation, and management. This recommendation was adopted by the General Conference, and I feel that it is a major step toward increased operational efficiency and economy. The results of this study should insure that UNESCO is fully equipped for the tremendous tasks we want and expect it to assume for the remainder of the development decade.

The Conference also agreed to reconsider the respective responsibilities of the Secretariat, the executive board, and the General Conference. The present alignment of functions results in an excessively long General Conference session—5 weeks—each biennium, and the proceedings are complicated by a heavy traffic of member state proposals imperfectly screened under present provisions. Our delegation felt, rightly I believe, that a healthy climate of international give and take should be possible with less lost motion.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

UNESCO has already made great progress in bringing together many countries for consideration of their educational needs. In line with educational priorities of the United Nations development decade, the Conference approved the establishment in Paris of an International Institute for Educational Planning, a stepped-up attack on illiteracy, and expanded experimental programs in educational techniques and school construction designed to cut costs without sacrificing quality.

The new International Institute for Educational Planning, which met with the unanimous and enthusiastic endorsement of the Conference, will help fulfill an urgent need when it comes into being July 1. Responding to the growing demand from developing countries, it will assist these countries in devising educational planning techniques and integrating them with national economic and social planning.

The initiative of U.S. scientists led to Conference approval of an effort to develop international cooperation in scientific hydrology leading to an International Hydrologic Decade beginning in 1965. An intergovernmental meeting in

1964 will adopt an international program in scientific hydrology. At the same time, UNESCO will offer fellowships and organize training courses so that a wide range of countries will be able to participate in this program once it is adopted.

With all that the United States has done and is doing for the cause of world peace, we know that it will take more than one nation or bloc of nations to attain this goal. It can be achieved only by the cooperative efforts of all nations. So, too, with the pressing problems of ignorance and poverty which still plague mankind. UNESCO has played and will continue to play a central role in solving these problems. Advances were made at this Conference toward eliminating marginal activities and refocusing the program to permit the attainment of maximum progress toward UNESCO's goal, but there is much more to be done. We, in the United States, can contribute to the worthy goals of UNESCO by recognizing the importance of this unique organization and giving it the full measure of support which it deserves.

BIPARTISAN GROUP OF 124 HOUSE MEMBERS SUPPORT ANTI-BACK-DOOR SPENDING RESOLUTION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, on behalf of 123 Members and myself, representing both political parties, I have requested the chairman of the House Committee on Rules to hold a hearing on House Resolution 57 and other companion anti-back-door spending resolutions.

A copy of my letter requesting this hearing, together with the names of Members joining in support of such a hearing, follows.

Meanwhile, I want to emphasize that it certainly seems fair and proper when so many of its Members are requesting it that the House of Representatives should have an opportunity to consider this proposal. If so, I am confident that the majority sentiment is in favor of such a change in rules of the House so that no bills containing language authorizing loans or advance contractual obligations which ultimately becomes a charge on the Treasury would be in order unless reported by the committee having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Five House Members have indicated their support of this resolution since the letter was transmitted. The text of the letter reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1963.
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to request a hearing on H. Res. 57

and other companion resolutions to change House Rule XXI of the Rules of the House so that any language in bills authorizing loans or advanced contractual obligations which ultimately become charges on the Treasury would not be in order for House consideration unless such bills were reported by the committee having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Such a resolution to change the House rules has the joint bipartisan support and sponsorship of 119 House Members. Of these 119 Members, 93 are introducing a similar resolution to House Resolution 57 and the balance of 26 Members have authorized me to list their names as supporting it. The complete list of these Members is appended.

Also there are 12 other Members who joined me in the 87th Congress in urging this change of rules and I am confident these Members will likewise want their names included as active supporters of this resolution.

When a total of 119 House Members of both political parties have taken affirmative action in support of a resolution it certainly would seem that the Rules Committee should feel some obligation to allow the House itself to consider this proposal.

Respectfully,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

MEMBERS JOINING IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE
RESOLUTION 57

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT, HON. BRUCE ALGER, HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON, HON. LESLIE C. ARENDTS, HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK, HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY, HON. WALTER S. BARING, HON. WILLIAM H. BATES, HON. JAMES F. BATTIN, HON. FRANK J. BECKER, HON. PAGE BELCHER, HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT, HON. E. Y. BERRY, HON. JACKSON E. BETTS, HON. FRANK T. BOW, HON. W. E. BROCK, HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL, HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL, HON. DONALD C. BRUCE, HON. JOHN W. BYRNES, HON. ELDOR A. CEDERBERG, HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER, HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, HON. PAUL B. DAGUE, HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE, HON. ROBERT DOLE, HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN, HON. JOHN DOWDY, HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING, HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, HON. PAUL FINDLEY, HON. O. C. FISHER, HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR., HON. ED FOREMAN, HON. JAMES G. FULTON.

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY, HON. MILTON W. GLENN, HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL, HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING, HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, HON. H. R. GROSS, HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER, HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY, HON. JAMES A. HALEY, HON. DURWARD G. HALL, HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, HON. JAMES HARVEY, HON. RALPH HARVEY, HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR., HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, HON. WALT HORAN, HON. FRANK J. HORTON, HON. CRAIG HOSMER, HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON, HON. BEN F. JENSEN, HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS, HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN, HON. CARLETON J. KING, HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL, HON. JOHN KYL, HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD, HON. DELBERT L. LATTA, HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, HON. ROBERT MCCOLORY, HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, HON. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, HON. CLARK MACGREGOR, HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLARD, HON. DAVE MARTIN, HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., HON. CATHERINE MAY, HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL, HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER, HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR., HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON, HON. ANCHER NELSEN, HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN, HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, HON. JOHN R. PILLION, HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, HON. RICHARD H. POFF, HON. ALBERT H. QUIE.

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID, HON. BEN REIFEL, HON. JOHN J. RHODES, HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON, HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, HON. DON L. SHORT, HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER, HON. EUGENE SILER, HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., HON. H. ALLEN SMITH, HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER, HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON, HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, HON. VERNON W. THOMSON, HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK, HON. JAMES B. UTT, HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR., HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON, HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, HON. BOB WILSON, HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD, HON. JOHN WYDLER, HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER.

THE CONGO: A CASE STUDY IN
INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. WIDNALL. The recent history of the Congo situation, Mr. Speaker, can best be described as a sorry mess. I find little to rejoice in from this country's quiet resignation to the United Nations actions which are at variance with the principle of self-determination. Even less to our credit is the active support given, in contradiction to the American ideal of self-determination, to the subjugation of the state of Katanga.

Even the remarks of the outstanding scholar of our day in the world of African affairs, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, have fallen on deaf ears. The same people who have praised this distinguished American in the past, have now, when it suits their needs, ignored his pleas. The fact that they cannot bring themselves to answer directly and publicly the points made by Dr. Schweitzer is a lucid commentary on the bankruptcy of their actions.

Presumably the Katangan question is now settled by force of arms, and President Tshombe will be allowed to remain at the head of a provincial government. Considering the past episodes, I feel less than sure that this will be the case, now that the same self-serving champions of anticolonialism on the African Continent have begun to demand Mr. Tshombe's head. A case study in international political expediency appears to have been deliberately prepared for future historians, as the following editorial in the January 7, 1963, edition of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly so vividly points out:

DISGRACE IN THE CONGO—THE UNITED STATES HAS BETRAYED BOTH ITS INTERESTS AND ITS PRINCIPLES

A good diplomat, so the old saying goes, is a man who is willing to lie for his country. By this definition, more ancient than honorable, the United Nations and those who speak in its name have displayed an unswerving devotion to duty. Despite eyewitness accounts, later confirmed by independent investigation, the U.N. stubbornly denies that its troops ever committed atrocities in the

Congo. In a newly published book, "To Katanga and Back," Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien, who led the U.N.'s abortive assault on Elisabethville in September 1961, debunks the official version of what happened as a "historical inaccuracy which puts the U.N. in every sense in a false position. False literally, first and worst of all." In the latest outbreak of fighting, the global organization has rallied to its customary standard of truth. Last week frontline correspondents for the Associated Press, United Press International and Reuters bitterly protested to Secretary General U Thant against U.N. "censorship and duplicity."

By word and deed alike, the U.N. thus has flouted what the Founding Fathers called "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind." The same contempt for Western values has spawned the naked aggression against Katanga, a lawless act to which the Government of the United States, to its enduring shame, has become an accomplice. The aim of the unholy alliance, the American people have been told, is to unite the Congo under a central government which, possessed of the wealth of Katanga, will be viable and friendly. The facts, however, suggest otherwise. First, to judge by even the censored communiques, sabotage has erupted throughout the breakaway province; if it persists, the hoped-for rewards of conquest may go up in smoke. More to the point, the Congolese regime, which no longer commands a majority in Parliament, happens to be not pro-Western but pro-Communist.

As a policy, then, the war on Katanga is ill advised. It is also wholly immoral. For while the State Department has a conveniently short memory, a few observers still recall that U.N. troops were stationed in Katanga only upon the conditional consent of the local authorities. Each of the three U.N. military moves thus was launched in clear-cut violation of a solemn pledge. Moreover, despite the best efforts of bland apologists to obscure the issue, nobody can seriously doubt that Katanga enjoys as great a right to independence and to the fruits of its labors as, let us say, Burundi or Upper Volta. On this score we have the testimony of a resident of Africa for nearly 50 years, a man named Albert Schweitzer. Wrote Dr. Schweitzer in an angry letter to the Premier of Belgium: "It is inconceivable that we find in our day a foreign nation at war with Katanga in an effort to force it to pay revenues to the rest of the Congo. Reason and justice demand that this foreign state (i.e., the United States) and the United Nations withdraw their troops from Katanga's territory and recognize and respect in future the independence of this country."

For over 2 years, to be sure, justice and reason have been in short supply in Léopoldville, Washington, and New York. In July 1960 when Belgian rule came to an untimely end, the newly created Republic of the Congo plunged into an orgy of rapine and destruction. In the circumstances President Moise Tshombe of Katanga, from his capital at Elisabethville, declared that he was seceding from chaos. He proceeded to set up a separate state of his own—one which, however, held the door open to a Congo confederation. Instead of grasping this offer, the United Nations, which sent troops to the Congo to restore law and order, determined to expand and pervert its original mission. Gradually it made its primary objective the ending of the so-called Katangan secession. In September and December of 1961, heavy fighting broke out in Elisabethville. To the end of his life, Dag Hammarskjold held that the action was purely defensive. We now know, from Conor Cruise O'Brien, that the code name for that offensive was Operation Smash.

Smash has remained the U.N. aim. Last August U Thant devised his famous plan for Congo unification. Under it Katanga was

to turn over half of its mineral revenues and its military forces to the central government. In return, the Congo was to get a new federal constitution purporting to give Katanga some measure of autonomy. Instead of allowing peaceful negotiations to proceed, however, the U.N. threatened to employ economic sanctions or force if Tshombe failed to come to terms. Last month U.N. arms were further strengthened, and the first shot became only a matter of time. Now, citing provocations which recall those staged by Adolf Hitler, the U.N. has launched what one correspondent, with unconscious irony, has called a blitzkrieg, not only against Elisabethville, but also against Katanga's great mining installations at Jadotville and Kolwezi.

Equipped, thanks to U.S. generosity, with armored cars and rocket-firing jets, the U.N. troops may well gain their objectives. Victory, however, is likely to yield bitter fruit. For the defenders, as they have threatened, have begun to destroy the mining and smelting properties; powerlines have been sabotaged, bridges blown up, and other strategic facilities crippled. Last Friday, Union Minière closed down all its installations in Katanga. Even if the mines escape complete destruction, their future in a Congo unified at gunpoint, under the authority of the discredited, Communist-leaning central government of Cyrille Adoula, seems dubious at best.

For whatever Washington may choose to pretend, both the Leopoldville government and the U.N. forces on the scene are actively hostile to Western interests. Ethiopian troops, Barron's has learned, have compelled residents of Elisabethville to hang on their walls pictures of the late Red-tainted rabble-rouser, Patrice Lumumba, and to join the Lumumbist party. U.N. correspondents disclose that Indonesian paratroopers who spearheaded last week's advance were accompanied by their Soviet instructors (does anyone recall the Russian technicians in Cuba?). As for the Adoula regime, it has allowed Communist embassies in Leopoldville, closed by its predecessor, to reopen. In recent months the Soviet diplomatic corps has increased from 10 men to 100, while the Russian ambassador, according to one U.S. diplomat, has been acting as if he was running the show. The war in Katanga, says the State Department, aims to keep communism out of the Congo. While the faceless men at State may be the last to learn the sorry truth, communism even now is flourishing in African soil.

The wisdom of U.S. policy thus is obscure. Its total lack of principle is all too plain. On this score Barron's rests its case with Albert Schweitzer. "The colonial empire of the Congo no longer exists. There are left two distinct branches of this empire composed of peoples and tribes who, from the time of colonialism forward, have opposed each other. Neither of these two parts of the Congo has rights vis-a-vis the other part; neither has obligations toward the other. They are *** absolutely independent entities. It follows that no war waged by one of the above parties against the other for purpose of subjugation has the slightest justification in law. It also follows that no foreign state can pretend to have the right to subject one part of the Congo to the other part." By supporting the assault on Katanga, the Kennedy administration has jeopardized U.S. security and compromised U.S. traditions. One day it will be called to strict account.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 21, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2400, proposing new guidelines for the establishment of a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, within Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

I am as convinced and as determined as ever in my opposition to such legislation as S. 2153, and the revision thereof, S. 3528, which were bills introduced in the 87th Congress. Those bills proposed to create a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore on a basis which would be far too broad and sweeping in scope, which would be unnecessarily expensive, and which would deprive and take from private owners important, vested property rights without just compensation.

For too long a time now, the threat of such sweeping, destructive legislation as S. 2153 and S. 3528 has been hanging like an ominous cloud over the Sleeping Bear region. This cloud has severely depressed the economies of Leelanau and Benzie Counties. It has brought serious hardship to a number of families.

Realizing the difficulties which confront many of my constituents, I believe it is imperative that this prolonged Sleeping Bear controversy be brought to a head and resolved in this session of Congress.

After much deliberation and study, and after many discussions with constituents, I believe that H.R. 2400 sets forth sound and reasonable guidelines for establishment of a national park in the Sleeping Bear area.

Even though legislative action on this subject will probably be considered first in the Senate, I believe that introduction of this particular bill at this time can, and should, serve two important, useful purposes:

First. By contrast, H.R. 2400 will sharply focus attention upon, and underscore again, the serious inequities and fundamental defects in the earlier legislation; and

Second. I earnestly believe and hope that this new bill will point the way to a speedy and sensible solution of this controversy on a sound basis that can bring the benefits of a national park to the many, with the least possible damage and disruption to the fewest people.

The principal and fundamental differences between my bill and the earlier legislation are as follows:

First. Acreage is reasonable. Under my bill, H.R. 2400, the park area would comprise about 37,000 acres, and would include North Manitou Island. Of the 77,000 acres designated in the earlier proposal, my bill would include about 23,000 acres.

The area of the park, as proposed in my bill, would conform more closely to the original recommendation submitted in 1959 by the Advisory Board on National Parks.

The size would also compare favorably with the Cape Cod National Seashore—

26,666 acres—and with the Cape Hatteras National Seashore—28,500 acres.

Second. Confines park to undeveloped Lake Michigan shoreline area. My bill would include the Sleeping Bear Dunes, the D. H. Day State Park, and all the land and Lake Michigan shoreline to the south thereof which lies west of Highways M-109 and M-22, except Empire, down to and including the Benzie State Park. Accordingly, my bill would accomplish the purposes which have been proclaimed by the National Park Service, that is, to preserve for posterity the beautiful Sleeping Bear Dunes as well as a significant portion of the diminishing undeveloped Lake Michigan shoreline.

It is obvious that these lofty and worthwhile objectives can be accomplished without including expensive, highly developed inland lake areas.

My bill would include the North Manitou Island, which was excluded by the earlier legislation. That beautiful island—which is one of the Sleeping Bear's two cubs—is largely undeveloped and it could be acquired at a minimum of cost. Those who are genuinely concerned about future needs for camping and recreational opportunities should be interested in having this area set aside now, instead of waiting until it also becomes a highly developed, expensive, private resort area.

Under my proposal, approximately 50 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline would be preserved, whereas S. 2153 would preserve about 45 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline.

Third. A great saving for taxpayers. The acquisition cost to the taxpayers under my bill is estimated at \$2 to \$3 million, compared to an estimated acquisition cost of \$12 to \$16 million for S. 2153 and the revised version thereof. Of course, this tremendous saving is possible under my bill because the acreage is smaller and because the included land is largely undeveloped.

The earlier legislation met solid opposition because it threatened nearly 1,600 improved private properties, many of which are permanent, year-round homes.

My proposal would affect about 90 owners of improved or developed property. This is less than 6 percent of the number included in the earlier legislation.

Fourth. Developed property not subject to condemnation. Under my bill, the owners of improved or developed property would continue to own, occupy, and enjoy their property without threat of condemnation. The Federal Government could acquire from the owner, by paying just compensation therefor, only two limited interests in such improved property: First, a scenic easement requiring that the general character and condition of the property be maintained; and second, an option to purchase such property if and when the owner, or his heirs, should ever desire to sell it.

Fifth. Protection for owners of undeveloped property. Unimproved or undeveloped property within the park area would be subject to condemnation, requiring payment of fair market value. The Secretary of the Interior would be

required, as soon as funds are available, to proceed expeditiously to acquire such property.

If the owner and the Park Service are unable to agree as to fair market value, then the owner would be able to request the Federal district court to appoint three qualified, independent appraisers. All costs of such appraisal would be borne by the Government.

Sixth. Payments in lieu of taxes. After acquiring title to any real estate within the park area, the Federal Government would be required to make payments in lieu of taxes to an affected school district or other local taxing authority so long as any prior bonded indebtedness remained outstanding.

When a school district floats a bond issue, and investors purchase the bonds, they do so relying upon the taxability of the real estate situated within the school district. When the Federal Government thereafter takes title to a portion of that real estate, and removes it from the tax rolls, I believe it is only fair and reasonable that the Government be required to make payments in lieu of the taxes which otherwise would be assessed until such time as the bonded indebtedness is paid.

Seventh. Hunting and fishing within the park area would be permitted under my bill in accordance with the laws of Michigan. Under H.R. 2400, any exceptions therefrom would require approval by the Michigan Department of Conservation. The earlier legislation required only that the Secretary consult with the Department before making exceptions.

Eighth. Advisory Commission. The earlier legislation would have provided for an Advisory Commission of 10 members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. H.R. 2400 provides that the 10 members would be named as follows: Two by the Benzie County Board of Supervisors; two by the Leelanau County Board of Supervisors; and four by the Governor of Michigan, two of which would be members of the Michigan State Conservation Commission. The two remaining members would be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. Instead of allowing the Secretary to designate a chairman, my bill would empower the commission to name its own chairman by majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the sponsors of the earlier legislation, as well as the Department of the Interior, will see fit to adopt the concepts and guidelines of my bill.

If they will do so, I pledge my wholehearted support and cooperation in an effort to establish as quickly as possible a beautiful Sleeping Bear National Park which can be an important new asset for the region as well as the whole State.

While I would not claim perfection for the legislation, on the other hand, I wish to serve a clear and emphatic notice that the fundamental principles underlying my bill cannot be compromised.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of H.R. 2400 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit, inspira-

tion, and recreational use of the public a significant portion of the shoreline of Lake Michigan that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park (hereinafter referred to as "the park").

SEC. 2. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park area shall include the Sleeping Bear Dunes, the D. H. Day State Park, the Benzie State Park, North Manitou Island, South Manitou Island, together with certain land and water lying between Lake Michigan and State Highways M-109 and M-22, which park area is more particularly described hereafter in section 11.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall not be authorized to acquire by condemnation any improved property (as hereinafter defined in section 4) except that the Secretary shall be authorized to acquire by condemnation, if necessary, with payment of just compensation, the following limited interests in improved property: (1) a scenic easement (in the nature of a covenant running with the land) which requires the owner thereof to maintain the character and condition of such property and to use such property only for the purposes for which it was being used on December 31, 1962; and (2) an option (in the nature of a covenant running with the land) providing that before the owner sells any right, title, or interest in or to any of such property to another purchaser, the United States shall have a prior right to purchase such right, title, or interest at a price equal to that offered in good faith by any other prospective purchaser.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, transfer from another Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, any real property or interest therein within the boundaries of the park area as described in section 11 of this Act.

(c) Any real property or interest therein owned by the State of Michigan or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired under this Act only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the Federal agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached building which is used as a dwelling, or is used for a commercial purpose that is compatible with, and does not impair the usefulness or attractiveness of, the park, construction of which building was begun before December 31, 1962; and such improved property shall include so much of the land on which such building is situated (such land being in the same ownership as the building) as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the continued use and enjoyment of such building, together with any structures accessory to the same which may be situated on the lands so designated. In every such case, the amount of land so designated shall be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as such building. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of use in which the building and land have customarily been enjoyed.

(b) Within ninety days after a written request therefor is made to the Secretary by the owner of any commercial property, the Secretary shall furnish to such owner a certificate indicating whether, and under what conditions, if any, such commercial property is deemed to be "improved prop-

erty" within the meaning of this Act. If the owner is not satisfied with the Secretary's determination, as evidenced by such certificate, then the owner may institute a proceeding in the Federal district court, within whose jurisdiction the property is situated, for the purpose of amending or setting aside such certificate.

SEC. 5. (a) Any property, or interest therein, acquired by the Secretary under this Act (other than by gift, transfer, or exchange) shall be acquired at not less than its fair market value.

(b) With respect to any property, or interest therein, which the Secretary is authorized under this Act to acquire by condemnation, no condemnation proceeding shall be instituted unless the Secretary shall have notified the owner of such property of his intention to acquire such property by condemnation. If within sixty days from such notice the owner of the property shall so request, the United States district court, within whose jurisdiction such property is situated, shall appoint three qualified persons who shall make an independent appraisal to determine the fair market value of such property and report such amount to the parties concerned and to the court. All costs of such appraisal shall be borne by the United States. Thereafter, if the owner and the Secretary are unable to agree on a purchase price for such property, the Secretary may institute proceedings for its condemnation.

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as funds are available the Secretary shall proceed expeditiously to acquire all property, other than improved property, which he is authorized by this Act to acquire.

(b) If, and at such time, as the owner of improved property may offer such property for sale to the United States, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to such offer and the Secretary shall purchase such property if offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value. In the event the owner and the Secretary cannot agree as to the fair market value, then, if the owner so requests, the United States district court, within whose jurisdiction such property is located, shall appoint three qualified persons who shall make an independent appraisal to determine the fair market value of such property and report such amount to the parties concerned and to the court. All costs of such appraisal shall be borne by the property owner.

SEC. 7. The United States shall make payments to local subdivisions of State government (including school districts) in lieu of real property taxes upon property which was subject to local taxation before acquisition under authority of this Act. Such payments shall be equal to the amount of taxes, and shall be paid at such times, as would be required if title to such real property were held by a private citizen. Such payments in lieu of taxes shall not exceed the amount of taxes payable for debt retirement purposes which would have been assessed if such property had remained in the same condition as when acquired by the Secretary. This section shall not authorize payment by the United States of any amount in lieu of taxes after any and all bonded indebtedness which may have been incurred by such local subdivision prior to the effective date of this Act shall have been paid in full.

SEC. 8. In administering the park the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan: *Provided, however, That the Secretary, with the approval of the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment.* The Secretary may, after consultation with such department, issue

such regulations, consistent with this section, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "commission").

(b) The commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of four years, as follows:

(1) Two members to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors of Benzie County and two members to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors of Leelanau County;

(2) Four members to be appointed by the Governor of the State of Michigan, at least two of whom shall be members of the Michigan State Conservation Commission; and

(3) Two members to be appointed by the Secretary.

(c) The commission by majority vote shall designate one member to be chairman. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the commission on all matters relating to the establishment, development, and operation of the park and the commission is authorized from time to time on its own initiative to submit to the Secretary such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

Sec. 10. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496).

(b) In developing the park the Secretary shall locate public use areas in such places and in such manner so as not to diminish the value or enjoyment of privately owned improved property situated within the park area.

Sec. 11. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park shall comprise those certain parcels or tracts of land and water situated in the counties of Leelanau and Benzie, State of Michigan, which are more particularly described as follows:

(1) Beginning at the point of intersection with the shore of Lake Michigan of the east line of section 20, township 29 north, range 14 west, forming the northeast corner of the D. H. Day State Park:

thence south along the east border of said State park one-half mile, more or less, to the point of intersection with the north right-of-way of State Highway M-109; thence west along the north right-of-way of said State highway one-half mile, more or less, to the junction of said State highway with State Highway M-209; thence south along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-109 1½ miles, more or less, to the point of intersection with the south line of lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west;

thence west along the south line of said lot 1 to the northeast corner of lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west; thence west long the north border of said lot 1 to the northwest corner of said lot 1; thence south along the west border of said lot 1 and the west borders of lots 2 and 3 of said section 31 to the southwest corner of said lot 3; thence east along the south border of said lot 3 to the point of intersec-

tion of the west right-of-way of State Highway M-109; thence southeast along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-109 one-half mile, more or less, to the point of intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west;

thence south along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-109 2 miles, more or less, to its junction with State Highway M-22; thence southwest along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 one-half mile, more or less, to its point of intersection with the east-west quarter section line of section 17 of said township 28 north, range 14 west;

thence west along said east-west quarter section line of said section 17 and the east-west quarter section line of section 18, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the east-west quarter section line of section 13, township 28 north, range 15 west, to the shore of Lake Michigan;

thence northerly along the shore of Lake Michigan to the point of beginning; also

(2) Beginning at the point of intersection with the shore of Lake Michigan of the south line of lot 1 of section 25, township 28 north, range 15 west;

thence east along the south line of said lot 1 to its meeting point with the west line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west; thence north along the west line of said section 30 to the northwest corner of said section 30; thence east along the north line of said section 30 300 feet, more or less, to the point of intersection with the south right-of-way line of State Highway M-22; thence east along the south right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 1,500 feet, more or less, to the point at which State Highway M-22 turns southeast;

thence southeast along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 three-fourths of a mile, more or less, at which point State Highway M-22 meets the west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 30; thence southwest along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 to the point at which State Highway M-22 meets the north-south quarter section line of said section 30; thence south along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 500 feet, more or less, to the point of intersection with the south line of said section 30;

thence south along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 as said State highway passes along the north-south quarter section line of section 31, township 28 north, range 14 west, to the south line of said section 31 at which point the said State Highway M-22 intersects the Leelanau-Benzie County line into Benzie County;

thence south along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 as said highway passes along the north-south quarter section line of section 6, township 27 north, range 14 west, and along the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 27 north, range 14 west, and along the north-south quarter section line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west, to the point of intersection of the said north-south quarter section line with the south line of said section 18;

thence west along the north right-of-way of said State Highway M-22, as said State highway passes along the south line of said section 18, 1,320 feet, more or less, to the point at which State Highway M-22 turns southeast; thence along the west right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 1 mile, more or less, to the south line of section 24, township 27 north, range 15 west; thence west along the north right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 to the point of intersection with the west line of said section 24;

thence west along the north right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 2 miles, more or less, to the west line of section 27, town-

ship 27 north, range 15 west; thence southwest along the west right-of-way to said State Highway M-22 to the point of intersection with the north-south quarter section line of section 33, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence west along the north right-of-way of said State Highway M-22 1½ miles more or less to the west line of section 32, township 27 north, range 15 west;

thence north along the west line of said section 32 to the southeast corner of section 30, township 27 north, range 15 west; thence west along the south line of said section 30 and the south line of section 25, township 27 north, range 16 west, to the southeast corner of said section 25; thence north along the west line of said section 25 one-half mile more or less to the point of intersection with the shore of Lake Michigan; thence northeasterly along the shore of Lake Michigan to the point of beginning; also

(3) North Manitou Island; also

(4) South Manitou Island.

Sec. 12. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the park which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 13. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DID WE SELL OUT TO KHRUSHCHEV ON CUBA?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we all recall that President Kennedy made a pledge to Khrushchev of "no invasion" of Cuba. Then Secretary Rusk stated that the "no invasion" pledge would not be honored. Now a very disturbing article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in the January 18 issue of the Long Island Daily Press, tells us that the President, himself, on New Year's Eve categorically stated that there would be no invasion of Cuba.

The American people have a right to know to what extent our interests have been sold down the river. Is this another Yalta?

The article follows:

IT'S STILL A SECRET, BUT J.F.K.'S POLICY IS: NO CUBAN INVASION

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON. That "no invasion of Cuba" offer President Kennedy made to Premier Khrushchev is in full effect.

The Kennedy administration has no plans to drive Castro and his Soviet-supported Communist regime from Cuba, and is doing little if anything to help others develop effective resistance against them.

The President himself revealed this profoundly significant backstage policy in his widely discussed for-background-only press conference in Palm Beach, December 31. It was this lengthy question-and-answer discussion that precipitated an international flap when a London correspondent, a close friend of the President, was permitted to quote some of his remarks.

The full transcript of this press conference is still officially banned to U.S. newsmen.

But it can now be disclosed that the President repeatedly threw cold water on the use of force to eliminate Castro and his Communist rule. The overall impression rising from the President's comments is that he has no policy or consequential plans to rid Cuba of its Red masters.

"It is not our intention under present conditions to invade Cuba," the President said in response to an early question, "or to begin a war against Cuba, providing Cuba lives in peace with its neighbors, or providing that Cuba does not engage in aggressive acts."

This pronouncement by the President is directly counter to what Secretary Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at a closed-door meeting last week. In response to questions, the State Department head informed the Senators that the United States has not ruled out the possibility of invading Cuba.

In the President's 2-hour-long background talk with the newsmen, he amplified his no invasion views with the following:

"So I think that all we can set down now is a general attitude of the United States toward Castro, which I think we have indicated, our opposition to Castro and also an indication of our willingness to support any free choice that the Cuban people may make following Castro, to hold out a hope to the people of Cuba, in and out of the Government, that the United States would be sympathetic to a change within Cuba. We cannot, it seems to me, under present conditions, go further than that."

"Are we ready to provide any more help to those inside Cuba who may be anti-Castro?"

"As I say, the United States is not planning to support an invasion of Cuba," replied the President. "We have made that clear. There may be other things."

"Is this what you are trying to do," asked a reporter, "to let the Cuban people know that if they get something on their own, we are all for it?"

"I don't think," said the President, "that we want to be in the position of looking as if we are encouraging a—I think I would have to limit myself to saying that the United States is opposed to the regime, that it is not planning to invade Cuba, providing Cuba, itself, conducts its policy within the limitations which we have given."

"But we are also anxious that the Cuban people and those within and without the armed forces of Cuba and the government, who desire a Cuba which is not closely tied to the bloc, who may desire a Cuba which is different from the pre-Castro Cuba, that the United States is sympathetic to that."

"I can't tell what is going to happen in Cuba or in the Caribbean. This is all we can do, it seems to me, at the end of this year. Nobody can predict."

About half of the President's lengthy background talk with the 30-odd newsmen was devoted to Cuba. This subject dominated the discussion.

The President did not claim a U.S. victory. He admitted Castro is still in full control, that the island is a Communist ideological and military stronghold, that thousands of Russian combat troops are still there, and that powerful Soviet rockets abound there.

"The situation in Cuba is not satisfactory," the President conceded.

At the same time, he contended an important psychological victory was scored when Khrushchev agreed to withdraw his ballistic missiles and nuclear-armed IL-28 bombers.

Following is the way the President expressed this theory in the still-secret transcript of the press conference:

"As it was moving, it could have been perhaps not decisive, but a very, very great

Communist victory if it had turned out the way they had hoped. Having missiles in Cuba, as I say, would have appeared to have been—well, I think it would have been comparable to the breakthroughs, like sputnik, which I think was a great Communist victory, with very great implications for the 1950's, and I think this would have been even more substantial in its psychological impact all over the world. I think it would have given the impression that the balance of power was really moving with the Communists.

"I am not sure that the Chinese might have held back as much as they did. I think a great many other things would have happened other places if they had been successful in Cuba. So I think it was a major strategic effort and could have had the most far-reaching strategic implications."

Other significant remarks made by the President in response to questions were:

"No force can carry out a successful invasion of Cuba if the United States is not involved in it. No other countries can engage in an invasion of Cuba because it would be a major military effort."

"I don't know whether the Russians were sent there as a support for the missile effort. These military units have not been withdrawn. Whether they are there to support the Communists as an internal police force or as support for any action we might take, I don't think anyone can say, and probably their purpose may be changing."

"We had that plane (U-2) lost on Saturday, and I think we were moving into a higher degree of escalation. If that had happened again on Sunday, then I—I don't know what the reason was for that, whether that was deliberate. But in any case, if there had been a further firing on our planes Sunday, I think we would have had a much more dangerous situation by Monday or Tuesday."

"No one can sit here today and say what is going to happen in Cuba. No one could say 6 months ago that what has happened in the last 6 months was going to happen. So I don't think we are able to lift the curtain on Cuba and say that this is going to happen month by month."

"I would say that I believe Cuba is going to be non-Communist sometime."

UNDER SECRETARY BALL SHOULD BE CENSURED

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, last night at a dinner in New York, in honor of Mr. Jean Monnet, Under Secretary of State George Ball indirectly but intentionally insulted President de Gaulle by saying of the honoree:

He has *** never been tempted into the unhappy error—induced by a nostalgic longing for a world that never was—of seeking to recapture the past. He has not sought to unfurl ancient banners, reinstate old forms, revive the vanished symbols that beglamored the centuries gone by.

President Kennedy has been quite concerned about our relations with France; he should be more concerned about the big mouth of his Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same George Ball who kept from the Congress and the public secret recommendations he had made to the President for unlimited trade with Soviet Russia and the Communist bloc, giving them the same kind of consideration we would give friendly countries in our trade. This is the man who wanted our high-priced labor to compete with slave labor throughout the world.

I, too, am disturbed by the high tariff Common Market Community of which France is a moving factor, but my displeasure at these economic tactics of the President of France does not justify an affront to him by a State Department subordinate who always speaks so courageously when referring to Khrushchev.

Mr. Ball should be immediately censured by the President for his lack of manners.

CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues appreciate, it is all too rare to find a balanced view being expressed on the subject of congressional travel, or—as some prefer to call it—"junkets" overseas.

The elements of such a balanced view include, in my judgment, a recognition of the need for travel and personal contact by Members of Congress having special responsibilities for legislation in connection with which the travel is authorized.

It is equally important, however, to recognize the right of the public to specific information about the legislative purpose of such travel and about the expenditure of public funds, including counterpart funds, by those engaged in the travel.

In an editorial on January 16, the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., commented on the subject of congressional travel abroad and did so in a particularly evenhanded and constructive way. I am sure our colleagues will find it interesting and I ask that it be included, following my remarks, at this point in the RECORD.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to require more detailed reporting of expenditures made by congressional committees, subcommittees, Members, and employees in the course of official travel outside the United States. The bill would make it necessary to identify individual expenditures of public funds rather than group such expenditures together under oftentimes misleading or unrevealing headings.

Unless Congress regulates itself more effectively, Mr. Speaker, we shall only invite the suspicion, cynicism, even the disrespect of the people we represent. As essential as it is to legislate on an informed basis, it is even more important to retain the respect of the people. So I suggest that the Daily Journal's concluding thought, that "freeloading can be eliminated without harming legitimate missions," should lead us to take corrective action.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO MAKE JUNKETING RULES

Business resumed barely hours ago on Capitol Hill and hence every Senator and

every Representative is anxious to be on the floor, in committee, or available at the office. This then is an especially good time for talk of a manner and means of supervising, if not curtailing, the expenditures of taxpayers' dollars on oversea junkets. Nobody will be going abroad right now, unless it is important and an excuse has been issued.

Junkets are presumed to be the special gravyboat of Members of the Congress. They go overseas on committee assignments, they go on counterpart funds, they go as observers. Critical taxpayers also suspect a few go on a vacation ingeniously devised, for expense account purposes, as national business.

All the rumors, insinuations, and timid charges about this type of conduct make expedient a better accounting system on Capitol Hill. Certainly a Senator or a Representative, a member of a committee dealing with matters which have an international aspect or defense or foreign aid, can have abundant legitimate reason for onsite examination of an installation or aid project.

Also, those who have that legitimacy of purpose should not be bashful about disclosing it and revealing the cost, even for wives and staff members. A reticence among those who have no genuine excuse is understandable, but an accounting still is in order.

Unless the Congress drafts a few reasonable rules and votes them into effect in these days when nobody has the urge to travel, nothing will be done, until the next long recess. Then stories about American Congressmen bobbing up here and there will be back in the dispatches.

The Congress need not be niggardly in the rules, and travel that will improve legislation or make foreign aid more effective should be encouraged. Freeloading can be eliminated without harming legitimate missions.

"I AM PROUD OF THIS HOUSE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, one of my close and most cherished friends, Mr. John I. Burton, attended the opening session of the 88th Congress in the House of Representatives on January 9. After this historical occasion, he set forth his impressions on that day and I am very happy to bring them to your attention.

I believe Mr. Burton's comments are indeed timely and feel you—and each and every Member of the House—will be interested in reading them. May we forever be "proud of this House":

"I AM PROUD OF THIS HOUSE"—SPEAKER MCCORMACK

The star-dials hint of the noon. People, preponderantly men, mill around in the corridors outside the high doors leading to the House Chamber. There is an obvious gaiety abroad. Hands are clasped in no simulated friendship, and the greeting, "Happy New Year," is the universal password. Several young men—boys—stand around and offer

a polite "Can I help you?" to anyone who seems uncertain about what to do. A solitary police officer strolls amiably about, and points out stairs and elevators to those who ask. The assembling men greet the doorkeepers and the officers as warmly as they do their colleagues. A few news photographers stand around, and occasionally a light bulb flashes. Surely one must have stumbled into the wrong place. This looks like a bunch of slightly overgrown college students coming back after the holidays, or perhaps it is the annual Elks convention.

No, it is really and truly the Members of the House of Representatives of the 88th Congress of the United States entering upon the legislative tasks which await them in this year of our Lord, 1963. But no fanfare, no formal attire, no dignified strut, no retinue of sycophantic attendants. These men look like any business, professional, or social group. As, indeed, they are. In them reposes power personified. But that fact is not revealed by their appearance or their behavior. This is a veritable and practicing democracy, let me remind you. It is also a successful one, and there is no need for pomp or circumstance to cover up an all-too-evident impotence.

So we move one floor above to the galleries. These are packed with humanity. The doormen strive vainly to squeeze in one more individual on the last square inch of space. Here women are in the majority; largely, perhaps, the mothers, wives and daughters of the men sitting in the curved tiers of seats below. They are experiencing the thrill of watching their menfolk assume the duties of high office. All gaze intently downward.

A few lazy raps of the gavel bring a reluctant pause to the chatter on the floor. The Clerk calls a certified roll to ascertain how many legally chosen Members are present. Four hundred and thirty-three answer their names; a quorum is present, and the first order of business is the election of a Presiding Officer. Again the long list of names is called. In answer, the Members call out "McCORMACK" or "HALLECK," depending on political affiliation. Then both the candidates are conducted to the Speaker's desk. "I am not surprised by the result of this election," says Mr. HALLECK. Then he goes on to speak of his opponent as a warm personal friend, and praises his conduct of the office of Speaker in the preceding Congress. Mr. McCORMACK is equally generous in response.

The Members rise to take the oath of office: "I do solemnly swear * * *." Several small children cling to the hands of their parents on the floor, and some of them apparently take the oath also. The presence of children on the floor while Congress is in session is nowhere authorized in the ritual. But somehow it is more symbolic of the stability of government than any other procedure either authorized or unauthorized. Some of these children may in their turn be elevated by their contemporaries to the office of Members. Until that day comes, they will be unlikely to appear on the floor again while the House meets. Nevertheless they will carry to their graves the proud memory of the fact that "I sat with my daddy as he was sworn into the 88th Congress."

This is the long and somewhat boring ceremony by which the 88th Congress was initiated. Immediately a flood of resolutions and bills was turned loose. No less than 582 numbered bills fell into the hopper before twilight fell. Only a few of these will ever emerge from the committees to which they were referred and appear again on the floor of the House for action. But each will be given consideration by somebody, as will the 20,000 to 30,000 others that will follow them during the life of this Congress. The

opening of Congress is an inspiring event. But the task to which the Members commit themselves is laborious, long, and tiresome as the opening rollcalls. They will, in a sense, be on duty every hour of every day during the coming 2 years, barring the intervention of the "old man with the scythe" in particular cases.

Each Member of the House speaks for some 300,000 or more free and independent American citizens who are well aware of his responsibility to them. A few weeks ago he submitted himself and his qualifications to their judgments. That is the only road by which a man may enter the House of Representatives; there is no back door of appointment. The electorate had no inhibitions in examining every detail of his public and private life, his character, his principles of action, his plans for his country and his district. Probably he had an opponent vigorously condemning everything he stood for. A majority of those qualified to vote expressed their approval, and he has appeared for induction into office. Now he speaks for all of them, for those who approved him and equally for those who did not approve. It is his duty to interpret and promote their peculiar interests, as well as the interests of the whole Nation. Those interests involve matters of Government policy, of economic well-being, of social progress, perhaps of individual aspirations. He must weigh carefully every scrap of evidence he can find, reconcile conflicting desires and opinions, and make a decision. From his decision there is no appeal during the life of this Congress. Therein lies power.

That power extends beyond the borders of this farflung Nation to some 2 billion people inhabiting the whole world. What he does may affect the destinies of all of them. His vote may give rein to the four horsemen of the Apocalypse and spread ruin, desolation, and death over vast territories. Contrariwise, that vote may promote industry and science and enlightenment and justice and health among millions who have never enjoyed these benefits of human accomplishment.

Somebody has thought it important to check the religious affiliations of the Members of the House. A great variety of faiths is found to be represented, all in the Judaic-Christian tradition. No atheists are listed. Evidently the consciences of these individuals who speak for us in the House are in working contact with that Supreme Intelligence which pervades all nature. They will differ violently over plans and programs and details of execution. But the end toward which they drive is the same for all—a better world. And their link with the infinite assures us that the means by which they attempt to attain that end will be stamped with a universal morality.

It is the habit of Members of Congress to speak of one another as the "distinguished" member. Some may attempt to find a trace of irony in this appellation. But they are, in fact, "distinguished." They are a select body, chosen by a rigorous process of elimination. They have been subjected to every test for competence that can be devised, and they have survived the tests. Eminence in any field consists in being set apart from others by character or attainment or ability. In order to carry the title of Congressman, a man must meet this criterion.

Says the newly reelected Speaker of the House: "I am proud of this House." Mr. Speaker, the American people concur in your sentiments, with a fierce pride in our system of government and in its operation and maintenance. Nobody on earth has anything to equal it. It is true that during the coming months the Congress will be cursed and ridiculed more often than it will be commended. It will be too hasty or too dilatory

for some of us, too spendthrift or too penurious, too much given to stupidity or too engrossed with supersophisticated solutions for simple problems, too much to the political right or the political left—or hopelessly in the middle of the road. Nevertheless, so long as this House exists in its present form, it is impossible that freedom shall ever perish from the face of the earth.

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER SPOTLIGHTS DANGERS OF BANKING CONCENTRATION IN ADDRESS TO INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call attention of the Members to the outstanding address given on Monday of this week by the Honorable Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, before the Independent Bankers Association. In that speech, the able Senator, one of the Nation's outstanding students of the monopoly problem, points to the dangers inherent in growing concentration in the banking field.

I have great respect for the Senator, and great admiration for the fine work he has done as chairman of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee in focusing attention on some of the many problems that monopoly is causing in America. I am most gratified that in his speech before the Independent Bankers Association he devoted considerable space to the chain banking study I issued a few weeks ago.

Of course, Senator KEFAUVER has been well aware of the dangers of banking concentration. I recall many years ago he was chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of our House Small Business Committee, and issued a report entitled "United States Versus Economic Concentration and Monopoly." That report, one of the best sellers of all time, pointed to many dangers of banker control. So it is quite in keeping for the Senator to remind the country once again of the dangers of growing concentration in our financial community.

Without objection I wish to insert at this point excerpts from Senator KEFAUVER's address:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION, WISCONSIN DIVISION, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

You have asked me to talk to you today about some of the things that threaten the health of our banking system.

There are many signs that all is not well: We have fewer banks; the big banks have gotten bigger; some of the biggest evidently have become linked by stock and loan deals that appear to skirt Federal and State restraints on branch banking.

It all adds up to this: a gathering into the hands of a few, more and more of the private reins over the Nation's economic power.

Not only does it represent an affront to the basic philosophy of free, competitive enterprise; it also spells trouble for the independent banker, other small businessman and the consumer.

We used to have a lot of banks. Back in 1921, when our population was much less, we had 30,000 banks. Just about every town had at least one bank and, in many cases, several.

The banking system of those days drew its vitality from vigorous competition among a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed and locally managed.

Small businessmen had many sources of capital. They knew their bankers, and their bankers knew them. Between them, they formed a basis for healthy community economic development.

Today, the picture is very different. Instead of 30,000 banks, we have less than half that number. Hundreds of towns have become bankless. Many others are served by only one bank in place of the two or three which existed in the 1920's. In the larger cities, we have more bank branches but fewer trees.

The depression, of course, saw a lot of banks go under. Nearly 800 disappeared in 1931 alone through consolidations and absorptions. Between 1940 and the early 1950's, however, the rate of attrition by this route remained below 100 a year. Then it began going up again. Since 1950, the number of banks vanishing by way of merger and consolidation has been verging on 2,000. Indeed, 1955 saw the disappearance of 232—the greatest number in 35 years.

No change in this trend is in sight. The latest annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation indicates that in 1961 mergers, consolidations and acquisitions absorbed 133 banks, operating 423 banking offices, with aggregate resources of nearly \$6 billion.

Few of the banks swallowed up in the past decade have been weak and unsound—the kind needing rescue in the depression pattern. Most of them were strong, efficient, profitable—and competitive—plucked at the peak of their earning power.

A large percentage of these mergers involved one or more giant banks with assets of \$100 million or more. Many others were in the \$50 million class. These mergers have spread across the land.

Some have attracted more attention than others. In New York City, the Nation's banking mecca, the peak year of 1955 witnessed the three largest bank mergers in our history in terms of total deposits. None of the parties in these consolidations could hardly be classed as "struggling" or "weak."

Now comes other evidence of economic concentration in banking. It is contained in a report on chain banking just published by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives.

The report is confined to the 200 largest member banks in the Federal Reserve System. Among these are three here in Milwaukee: First Wisconsin National, Marine National Exchange and Marshall & Ilsley.

The study on which this report is based was carried out under the distinguished chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. In this new Congress, Representative PATMAN has taken over command of the House Banking and Currency Committee which will, he tells me, undertake to correct any abuses which are apparent from this and subsequent reports.

In general, this report reveals two things: First, a network of links among the top stockholders of the larger member banks of the Federal Reserve System and, second, a large volume of bank loans secured by stock in other banks.

Links through common stockholders were found particularly in such financial centers as Hartford, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland.

Moreover, according to the report, certain of these links center in insurance companies, others in savings banks, and still others in nominee holdings of the large commercial banks.

While the report does not indicate any stockholder links involving the three Milwaukee banks, it does show that each of them is controlled almost exclusively by a holding company.

For example, more than 99 percent of the stock of First Wisconsin National is owned by First Wisconsin Bankshares Corp.; the Bank Stock Corp. owns 99 percent of the stock of Marshall & Ilsley. Ninety-eight percent of the stock of Marine National Exchange is owned by the Marine Corp.

But control by each of these Milwaukee holding companies extends far beyond Milwaukee.

In addition to First Wisconsin National, I am advised, the First Wisconsin Bankshares Corp. owns two other Milwaukee banks as well as banks in Eau Claire, Fond du Lac, Madison, Oshkosh and Wauwatosa.

Bank Stock Corp. owns two other Milwaukee banks besides Marshall & Ilsley. And in addition to Marine National Exchange, the Marine Corp. owns two other banks in Milwaukee, one in South Milwaukee and others in Cudahy, Green Bay, Neenah, Oak Creek and Peewaukee.

As we all know, Wisconsin prohibits branch banking but permits holding companies to own banks. It would appear from the Patman Report, however, that what is forbidden by the one is permitted by the other.

The next step after this Patman Report is a study to determine who controls the bank holding companies. I will be interested, as I know you will be, to see whether there are any links among those which own Wisconsin banks.

But it is already clear from this report that links of another kind exist among Wisconsin banks, and these raise other questions about concentration and control.

A major revelation of this study, as I have noted, is the vast number of loans, made by the largest Federal Reserve member banks, which were secured by at least 10 percent of the stock of another bank.

Of particular significance is the fact that most of this bank stock loan activity has occurred in States—including Wisconsin—where branch banking is prohibited. There is also extensive bank stock loan activity across State lines.

I note, for example, that First Wisconsin National has made 18 loans in which 10 percent or more of the stock in other Wisconsin banks was pledged. In one case, 70 percent of the bank's stock was put up.

The report shows that Marine National Exchange has made six such loans, and in one case 66 percent of a bank's stock was pledged as security.

But that's not all. The report cites 15 instances in which at least 10 percent of the stock of Wisconsin banks was used to secure loans from banks in other States—two in Minneapolis and two in Chicago.

A host of questions arises from all these findings. We may fairly ask, first of all, whether lending activity of this kind is contrary to congressional policy expressed in the Bank Holding Act of 1956.

Why do so many of these loans involve banks in areas where branch banking or bank holding companies are prohibited? Why have so many been made across State lines? Why have so many been for such large amounts—in the millions?

Is this the answer: To evade Federal and State laws restricting branch, holding company, and chain banking? If so, then we need to tighten up these laws.

As independent bankers, you need no reminding of the evils that these laws are intended to prevent. When banking becomes concentrated, when bank credit—the life-blood of industry and commerce—falls under tighter control, the result is general economic concentration.

You know how this can work. The local independent banker is interested in promoting local enterprise, in bringing employment opportunities to his community. He does not have to clear with a home office in some remote metropolis.

But take away the independent local banker, and what happens to the small businessman? If he has to turn to the chain bank or one belonging to a holding company empire, he runs a big risk of being turned down as a competitive threat to the bank's more well established accounts. The result is a stifling of local enterprise.

We know that since World War II, our industrial economy has become significantly more concentrated in the hands of a few large corporations. This is borne out particularly by a report on manufacturing concentration recently issued by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

Between 1947 and 1958, according to this report, the share of total industrial output held by the 200 largest companies, in terms of value added by manufacture, rose 27 percent. In 1947, their share was 30 percent; by 1958, it had risen to 38 percent.

It is quite clear that we need to bring all available weapons to bear against this trend toward concentration in our economy. Where the law is inadequate, it should be improved. Where it is adequate, it should be enforced. And where questions remain, they should be fully explored.

Some segments of the business world look on any increase in Government activity against monopoly or concentration as business of harassment. It represents nothing of the kind; rather, it is the American way of demonstrating that we intend to preserve our charters of economic freedom. Without these charters, the antitrust laws, we would not be the world's strongest economic nation.

The time for businessmen to worry is when our antitrust laws are allowed to wither, in the presence of a clear need to strengthen and enforce them. The people in the antitrust agencies are protecting our free enterprise system, and in this they deserve support, not condemnation.

I do not need to remind this audience that nothing like our antitrust laws exists in the nations of the Communist world; such laws simply are not needed where governmental fiat substitutes for the forces of the free market.

On the other hand, we must constantly keep in mind these two things: That our free enterprise system could not exist without the antitrust laws; and that to preserve this system requires vigorous enforcement as well as constant reexamination and strengthening of the antitrust laws.

Strong antitrust laws are the best friends that our economic system has. They are the businessman's best friends. I hope we all remember that.

Thank you.

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. MICHEL, to vacate his special order for today and reschedule it for January 31.

Mr. HARDING, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. LINDSAY, for 1 hour on Thursday, January 31.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 1 hour on Thursday, January 31.

Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. Bow), for 15 minutes on Tuesday, January 29, on the life and accomplishments of William McKinley.

Mr. PRICE, for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. WELTNER), for 5 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. WELTNER), for 60 minutes on January 28.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ASHBOOK), for 10 minutes today.

Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. ASHBOOK), for 30 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech of Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. HOSMER and to include a table.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. MOSS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ASHBOOK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McLOSKEY.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALTER in two instances.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MORRISON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, to-

gether with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	\$8,073.35
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	8,953.26
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	8,953.26
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	8,139.84
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	4,863.16
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,863.16
Peggy J. Lamm	do	4,631.71
Martha S. Hannah	do	4,447.32
Jane C. Wojcik	do	3,959.96
Robert C. Bruce	Assistant counsel (from Sept. 1, 1962)	2,923.00
George F. Missbeck	Printing editor (from Sept. 9, 1962)	3,264.01
Lee Smith	Staff assistant (from July 23, 1962)	2,248.54
John H. Mercer	Staff assistant (through Aug. 31, 1962)	792.66
Adele Downey	Staff assistant (through Aug. 31, 1962)	631.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$175,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

43,747.07

Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1962

8,658.62

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962

52,405.69

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962

22,594.31

1 An additional \$25,000 was appropriated by H. Res. 728, July 25, 1962, thereby making total appropriation \$75,000.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1963.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director	\$9,082.14
Paul M. Wilson	do	9,082.14
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	9,009.81
Samuel W. Crosby	do	1,069.99
Jay B. Howe	do	8,828.90
Ross P. Pope	do	8,828.90
Robert M. Moyer	do	8,828.90
Frank P. Sanders	do	8,828.90
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	8,828.90
G. Homer Skarin	do	8,828.90
Robert L. Michaels	do	8,710.75
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,472.37
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	7,381.96
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	7,110.64
Francis G. Merrill	do	6,257.90
Earl C. Silsby	do	6,257.90
Samuel R. Preston	do	5,554.91
Keith F. Mainland	do	5,052.76
Lawrence G. Miller	Assistant editor	4,740.11
George A. Urian	Clerical assistant	4,010.59
James E. Moore	do	4,010.59
Stephen B. Miller	do	4,010.59
Austin G. Smith	do	3,489.50
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,395.22
Mabel E. Hammett	Clerk-stenographer	3,489.50
Grace W. Birne	do	4,010.59
Viola W. Grubbs	do	1,028.94
Patrick M. Hayes	do	4,010.59
William J. Neary	do	3,176.87
Harry E. Reynolds	do	4,010.59

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mary L. Schwarzmann	Clerk-stenographer	\$4,010.59
Mary M. Smallwood	do	4,010.59
Jeanne C. Smith	do	4,010.59
Suzanne S. Thomas	do	3,176.87
Phyllis N. Troy	do	3,802.19
Mary F. Wilson	do	3,179.82
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority	8,286.29
James S. Bersie	Clerk-stenographer	3,176.87
William J. Baroody, Jr.	do	4,010.59
Alice Beach	do	3,697.96
Josephine Birdsall	do	4,010.59
Allah F. Dickson	do	2,075.89
Jessemme A. Falls	do	3,665.96
Catherine L. Kennett	do	3,217.14
William B. Gunger	do	2,799.82
Clara B. Posey	do	4,010.59
Paul D. Quinn	do	3,176.87
Virginia E. Stevens	do	2,968.45
Dorothy E. Sweeney	do	4,010.59
Silas Taber	do	3,176.87
Janice Newsom	do	2,711.71

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 \$254,587.09
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 254,587.09

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William B. Soyars	Director, surveys and investigations staff	\$7,549.25
Leonard M. Walters	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff	7,228.31
Rowland C. Halstead	do	7,020.17
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,541.61
William T. Roy	Consultant	3,000.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Agriculture, Department of:		
Dorick, Stanley J.	Investigator	\$6,323.24
Wride, Charles	Editorial assistant	2,260.71
Air Force, Department of the:		
Brown, R. M.	Investigator	3,678.00
Tuomey, J. C.	do	1,331.68
Army Audit Agency, U.S.:		
Lowcher, Anthony T.	do	4,004.37
O'Leary, Lawrence J.	do	1,714.21
Wagner, Kenneth G.	do	3,187.66
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Burke, J. J.	do	5,626.37
Bureau of the Budget:		
Falick, Lawrence	do	3,337.61
Civil Service Commission:		
Beecher, Richard S.	do	1,110.14
Coltrin, M. J.	do	3,979.37
Commerce, Department of:		
Shearer, Ross A.	do	6,392.40
Stiewig, Nathan	do	2,807.50

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Corps of Engineers:		
Crossman, C. C.	Investigator	\$2,594.79
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bronstad, T. A.	do	5,986.72
Carson, W. D.	do	5,124.48
Conroy, L. E.	do	5,411.84
Debuck, H. L.	do	140.16
Franklin, R. M.	do	6,286.08
Garrett, C. F.	do	5,002.24
Geiermann, F. H.	do	4,026.16
Grealy, F. P.	do	5,082.88
Health benefits fund:		
Hutchison, L. S.	Investigator	759.76
Kaack, M. R.	do	5,885.28
Lanphear, R. L.	do	4,351.76
Law, W. C.	do	6,286.08
Leen, M. P.	do	4,765.44
Life insurance fund:		
Lipscomb, W. P.	Investigator	375.92
Lueders, L. M.	do	152.16
McDowell, L. L.	do	4,594.88
McTaugh, H. B.	do	6,502.88
Magee, E. H.	do	5,846.80
Murphy, P. J.	do	3,602.88
Neasey, E. J.	do	3,249.28
Nold, C. S.	do	5,598.40
O'Brien, A. R.	do	4,736.80
Reproduction of staff exhibits:		
Retirement fund:		
Roberts, R. R.	Investigator	7,728.49
Smith, M. A.	do	5,715.92
Turner, P. A.	Stenographer	2,716.32
Vahey, E. W.	Investigator	6,899.68
Watkins, H. D.	do	5,927.44
Federal Communications Commission:		
Evans, John	do	3,602.88
General Services Administration:		
Donahue, L. F.	do	5,304.89
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Cassidy, T. J.	do	3,394.40
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Rachlin, H. H.	do	1,680.00
National Bureau of Standards:		
Gautier, W. K.	do	3,927.86
Navy, Department of the:		
Rosen, Emanuel	do	1,072.00
Wilkenloh, C. E.	do	2,962.32
Post Office Department:		
Larson, W. D.	do	2,078.19
Small Business Administration:		
Harvith, A. J.	do	4,006.92
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Johnson, J. M.	do	2,640.91
Kvavan, Sven	do	3,958.85
Veterans Administration:		
Kosinski, A. L.	do	5,993.84
Travel and miscellaneous expense:		
do	do	3,677.27
do	do	72,038.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$600,000.00
Total amount expended from July 1, 1962, to Dec. 31, 1962 326,756.95

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 273,243.05

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	\$9,082.14
John R. Blandford	Counsel	9,055.02
Philip W. Kelleher	do	9,055.02
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	9,055.02
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary	4,813.10
Berniece Kalinowskl	Secretary	4,813.10
L. Louise Ellis	do	4,813.10
Edna E. Johnson	do	4,041.42
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,651.03
M. Jane Binger	Secretary (to Dec. 1)	3,018.38

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 78 AND 79, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	\$9,082.14
Sam A. Nunn, Jr.	Assistant counsel	3,842.63
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	4,531.71
Jane Wheelahan	do	3,615.02
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,397.79
James Josey	Messenger	2,005.29
Mildred Cox	Secretary (from Sept. 16)	2,152.23

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 79) \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 83,003.27

Amount expended from July 1, 1962 to Jan. 1, 1963 30,261.04

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961 to Jan. 1, 1963 113,354.31

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1963 36,645.69

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John E. Barriere	Majority staff member	\$9,082.14
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member	9,082.14
Robert R. Poston	Counsel	9,082.14
Thomas Graham, Jr.	do	9,082.14
Helen L. Rogers	Deputy clerk (resigned Nov. 15, 1962)	3,963.83
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk (secretary to minority Dec. 1, 1962)	5,355.94
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman	6,206.26
Mary Elizabeth Mehler	Secretary to minority (resigned Oct. 15, 1962)	2,394.32
Clark Warburton	Economist (e.o.d., Sept. 24, 1962)	5,012.95
Roger J. Brown	Editor	6,179.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$205,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 120,212.44

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	\$55,586.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962	175,799.12
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962	29,200.88

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 504,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth W. Burrows	Housing economist	\$8,393.52
Royal L. Coburn	Minority counsel	8,398.05
James F. Fitzpatrick	Clerk (July 15 through Aug. 31, 1962)	450.24
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,609.63
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Deputy staff director	8,979.18
Helen B. O'Bannon	Research assistant (e.o.d., Oct. 1, 1962)	1,864.71
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,957.07
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,382.40
Frances M. Yeakle	do	3,522.99
Balance from 1961		\$20,564.10
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		100,000.00
Amount expended January through June 1962		40,225.94
Balance as of June 30, 1962		80,338.16
Amount expended July through December 1962		51,992.42
Balance as of Dec. 31, 1962		28,345.74
Outstanding bills (approximate)		3,500.00
Balance		24,845.74

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	\$9,009.79
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	8,286.29
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	6,115.84
Clayton D. Gasque	Assistant clerk	5,554.91
James T. Clark	Associate counsel	7,721.08
Ann L. Puryear	Assistant clerk	4,335.90
Ellen M. Coxeter	do	4,120.03
Patricia Ann Dempsey	do	3,088.30
Richard J. Cardnay	File clerk	507.00
James M. Earnest, Jr.	Assistant clerk	1,259.79
Amount available under H. Res. 159		\$10,000.00
Amount expended		321.93
Balance available		9,678.07

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Chief Clerk	\$9,082.14
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff Director	9,082.14
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,082.14
Howard G. Gansner	Chief counsel for labor-management	9,082.14
Livingston L. Wingate	Associate counsel for labor-management (ending Dec. 16, 1962)	8,401.72
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force	9,082.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	9,064.04
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant to the chairman	4,375.36
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant	4,375.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,375.36
Amount of expenditures previously reported		\$219,709.32
Amount expended from July 1, 1962, to Dec. 31, 1962		76,002.54
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962		295,711.86

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
(INVESTIGATING STAFF)

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. McCord	General Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY): Ruth P. Ebersole, assistant subcommittee clerk	\$7,721.08 3,088.30
Boyd Crawford	General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative CARL D. PERKINS): Hartwell D. Reed, Jr., counsel	7,721.08 3,088.30
Roy J. Bullock	Gertrude L. Moser, secretary	do
Albert C. F. Westphal	Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative EDITH GREEN): John F. Morse, director	9,082.14 5,921.40 4,391.22
Franklin J. Schupp	Betty R. Pryor, subcommittee clerk	2,083.62
Robert F. Brandt	Muriel Greenhill, assistant director (ending Sept. 15, 1962)	3,062.92 4,120.03 2,885.07
Harry C. Cromer	William F. Gaul, assistant director (effective Sept. 16, 1962)	7,721.08 3,088.30
Philip B. Billings	Mary June Wall, administrative assistant	do
Marian A. Czarnecki	Joanne M. Clark, secretary	do
June Nigh	Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT): Edmund D. Edelman, counsel	do
Helen C. Mattas	Adrienne Fields, secretary	5,146.55
Harvey B. Cohen	Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative HERBERT ZELENKO): Mollie D. Cohen, administrative assistant	5,146.55
Loriece Hackney	Loriece Hackney, staff assistant (Sept. 1 to 30, 1962)	616.58
Denis A. Weinstock	Denis A. Weinstock, staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Sept. 30, 1962)	5,875.08 3,604.17
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative FRANK THOMPSON): John D. Hawke, Jr., counsel (ending Dec. 15, 1962)	1,069.44	
Mary E. Corbin	Mary E. Corbin, secretary	904.33
Susan Lieba Gordon	Susan Lieba Gordon, assistant clerk (ending Oct. 15, 1962)	646.08
Carla Otten	Carla Otten, assistant clerk (ending Aug. 31, 1962)	do

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

\$155,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

92,802.35

Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1962

37,417.65

Balance available

130,220.00

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962

24,780.00

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

Full committee staff:

Jeanne Thomson, administrative assistant	\$4,427.48
Corrine Annette Huff, receptionist	2,577.63
Tamara J. Wall, assistant counsel (ending Dec. 31, 1962)	4,635.90
H. Roy Partridge, Jr., assistant clerk (Aug. 6 to 31, 1962)	180.95
Johnnie L. Graves, administrative assistant (ending Nov. 25, 1962)	3,079.27
James J. Saxon, assistant clerk (ending July 31, 1962)	217.14
John M. Henshaw, assistant clerk	220.35

Investigative task force:

Leon Abramson, chief counsel	7,721.08
Arnold F. Block, investigator	2,008.97
Manuel Casiano, investigator	2,160.20
Odell Clark, chief investigator	6,432.38
Olive M. Gibbons, secretary	3,088.30
E. Zelda McNeal, clerk	3,085.02
Charles L. Mitchell, special investigator (effective Aug. 1, 1962)	3,359.65

Alfredo Vidal, investigator

Investigative task force:	1,742.77
John M. Young, consultant (ending July 31, 1962)	833.45
David Hepburn, investigator (effective Dec. 1, 1962)	615.50
Stanley E. Michels, special counsel (Oct. 1 to 31, 1962)	952.74
Minority staff:	

Beverly Pearson, secretary	4,120.03
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	16,182.28
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	633,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	465,353.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	164,509.79

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962

629,862.83

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962

3,137.17

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	\$9,082.14
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant	8,978.15
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	8,978.15
Franklin J. Schupp	Investigator consultant	8,896.75
Robert F. Brandt	do	8,752.07
Harry C. Cromer	Staff consultant	8,548.55
Philip B. Billings	Special assistant	7,381.96
Marian A. Czarnecki	Staff consultant	8,236.59
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	7,205.60
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	6,179.14
Harold L. Hashagen	do	6,047.98
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	5,953.06
Mary Medsger	do	3,687.52
Doris B. McCracken	do	4,681.04
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	4,052.29
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$155,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		92,802.35
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1962		37,417.65
Balance available		130,220.00
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962		24,780.00

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to January 3, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1, 1962, to Jan. 3, 1963:
 Full committee (expenses) \$1,075.41
 Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee
 Military Operations Subcommittee 42,944.29
 Government Activities Subcommittee 39,332.12
 Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee 35,234.36
 Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee 46,255.57
 Special Donable Property Subcommittee 36,579.81
 Special Government Information Subcommittee 17,099.33
 Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems 33,008.86
 Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board 13,682.52
 Total 11,897.87
 277,110.14

Salaries, full committee, July 1, 1962, to Dec. 31, 1962:

Christine Ray Davis, staff director 9,082.14
 James A. Lanigan, general counsel 9,082.14
 Miles Q. Romney, associate general counsel
 Earle J. Wade, staff member 7,305.09
 Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member 6,477.58
 Ann E. McLachlan, staff member 4,738.76
 Patricia Mahieux, staff member 4,586.23
 Charlotte C. Bickett, staff member 4,372.75
 Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff 3,854.97
 J. P. Carlson, minority counsel 8,286.29
 Total 7,617.05

Expenses, July 1, 1962, to Jan. 3, 1963:

Full committee—Travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies, etc., total 1,075.41
 Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:
 Elmer W. Henderson, counsel 8,692.10
 Arthur Perlman, investigator 7,431.67
 Daniel A. Kavanaugh, legal research analyst 4,590.50
 Veronica B. Johnson, clerk 4,144.77
 Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer 4,144.77
 Domingo E. Ulbarri, clerical staff (Nov. 1, 1962 to Jan. 3, 1963) 674.46
 Henry Coopersmith, staff member (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1962) 900.48
 Expenses 12,365.54
 Total 42,944.29

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:
 Herbert Roback, staff administrator 9,239.51
 John Paul Ridgely, investigator 6,037.82
 Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney 5,453.84
 Robert J. McElroy, investigator 4,716.23
 Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer 4,186.12
 Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer 4,186.12
 Expenses 5,512.48
 Total 39,332.12

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:
 Edward C. Brooks, staff administrator (July 1 to Dec. 16, 1962) 7,283.75
 Phineas Indritz, counsel 8,429.87
 Ernest Cornish Baynard, associate counsel 6,302.51
 Daniel L. Power, investigator 4,191.42
 Irma Reel, clerk 3,979.39
 Tanner T. Hunt, Jr., investigator (July 1 to Oct. 16, 1962) 1,768.30
 Expenses 3,279.12
 Total 35,234.36

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:
 James R. Naughton, counsel 8,107.87
 Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member 8,107.97
 Herbert B. Warburton, minority counsel 7,749.04
 George O. Serini, investigator (Aug. 20, 1962 to Jan. 3, 1963) 4,651.78
 William Donald Gray, research analyst 4,716.23
 Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer 4,186.12
 Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer 3,974.07
 Joan C. Montgomery, clerk-stenographer (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1962) 961.44
 Expenses 3,801.15
 Total 46,255.57

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:
 John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel \$7,800.00
 Walton Woods, investigator 7,431.67
 M. Joseph Matan, counsel 7,325.84
 Charles Rothenberg, investigator 6,773.82
 Phyllis Seymour, clerk 4,186.12
 Millicent Y. Myers, clerk-stenographer (Aug. 20, 1962 to Jan. 3, 1963) 2,391.62
 Expenses 670.74
 Total 36,579.81

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN, chairman:
 Ray Ward, staff administrator 8,890.81
 Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer 3,762.04
 Clara Katherine Armstrong, clerical staff 3,777.94
 Expenses 668.54
 Total 17,099.33

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator 8,429.87
 Jack Howard, professional staff member (July 1, to Dec. 31, 1962) 6,703.66
 Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel 5,913.62
 Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel (Aug. 25, 1962, to Jan. 3, 1963) 2,616.01
 Helen K. Beasley, stenographer 4,186.12
 Catherine L. Hartke, stenographer 4,186.12
 Expenses 973.46
 Total 33,008.86

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 Sidney McClellan, professional staff member 7,174.04
 Francis J. Schwoerer, staff member 5,235.73
 Expenses 1,272.75
 Total 13,682.52

Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:
 David Glick, counsel 8,107.87
 Marguerite A. Gleason, stenographer 3,549.97
 Expenses 240.03
 Total 11,897.87

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (H. Res. 70-592, 87th Cong.) 1,040,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 692,907.77
 Amount expended from July 1, 1962, to Jan. 3, 1963 277,110.14

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to Jan. 3, 1963 970,017.91

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1963 69,982.09

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
 Chairman,
 Committee on Government Operations.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$9,082.14
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,834.10
Mary F. Stolle	do	4,010.59

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$30,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 16,984.11
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 667.22

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 17,651.33

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 12,348.67

OMAR BURLESON,

Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff: Sidney L. McFarland	Professional staff director and engineering consultant	\$8,602.82
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel	8,286.29
John L. Taylor	Consultant on territorial and Indian affairs	8,286.29
Milton A. Pearl	Consultant on mining, minerals, and lands	8,286.29
Clerical staff: Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	7,381.96
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	4,114.82
Penelope P. Harvison	Clerk (resigned as of Dec. 31, 1962)	4,114.82
Virginia E. Bedsole	Clerk	3,906.38
Patricia B. Freeman	do	3,508.56
Susan A. Whitener	do	3,284.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$60,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 39,531.77

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 6,607.26

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 46,130.03

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 13,860.97

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
 Chairman.

JANUARY 3, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff: W. E. Williamson	Clerk	\$9,082.14
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	7,535.67
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	4,708.87
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,387.13
Joanne C. Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,958.48
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,958.48
Mary Ryan	do	3,958.48
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,750.08
Professional staff: Andrew Stevenson	Expert	9,082.14
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	9,082.14
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	9,082.14
Martin W. Cunningham	Aviation consultant	9,082.14

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1962, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 56, H. RES. 68, H. RES. 500, 87TH CONG.			C. Revision of the laws, 1962:	
Employee	Position	Salary				Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....	\$217.17
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 108 and H. Res. 165:						Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....	20.00
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	\$4,280.00					
Margaret J. Robinson	Staff assistant	8,024.04					
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	3,958.48					
Catherine C. McLees	do	3,958.48					
Thomas D. Conway	Special counsel (H. Res. 420 and H. Res. 439):	9,027.85					
John W. Kreuzburg	Messenger (from Sept. 14, 1962):	1,356.65					
Robert Hughes Crank	Messenger (to July 15, 1962):	181.29					
Walter E. Williamson, Jr.	Messenger (Aug. 16 to Sept. 10, 1962):	302.15					
David Lee Cathey	Messenger (July 16 to Aug. 15, 1962):	362.58					
Gordon M. McNulty, Jr.	Clerical assistant (July 2 to 31, 1962):	350.49					
Patricia Ann Marsh	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31, 1962):	725.16					
Special Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies:							
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	Chief counsel	9,027.85					
George W. Perry	Associate counsel	7,381.96					
Herman Clay Beasley	Subcommittee clerk	7,434.04					
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,299.88					
Rex Sparger	Special assistant	6,179.14					
Robert E. L. Richardson	Staff attorney	5,171.91					
Lurline Wilbert	Clerical assistant (to Aug. 31, 1962):	1,479.56					
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	3,750.08					
Betty J. Lantrip	Stenographer-clerk	3,645.85					
Louise B. Ferebee	do	1,874.59					
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$585,000.00					
Amount of expenditures previously reported		232,975.19					
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962		100,816.93					
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961 to Dec. 31, 1962		333,792.12					
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962		251,207.88					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 15, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	\$9,082.14					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
William R. Foley	General counsel	9,082.14					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	9,082.14					
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	8,752.07					
Stuart H. Johnson, Jr.	do	8,752.07					
Garnett J. Cline	Assistant counsel	6,568.03					
William H. Copenhaver	Associate counsel	5,664.33					
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	4,114.82					
Anne J. Berger	do	5,844.53					
Jane C. Caldwell	do	4,219.05					
Frances F. Christy	do	5,355.94					
Helen Goldsmith	do	5,052.76					
Velma Smedley	do	5,554.91					
FUND FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS							
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):							
Unexpended balance June 30, 1962			\$99,076.49				
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962			21,055.19				
Balance Dec. 31, 1962			78,021.30				
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:							
Unexpended balance June 30, 1962			45,898.64				
Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962			8,761.60				
Balance Dec. 31, 1962			37,137.04				
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 15, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	\$9,082.14					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	8,467.17					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
Ned P. Everett	Assistant counsel	6,640.36					
W. B. Winfield	Chief clerk	8,390.53					
Francis P. Still	Assistant clerk	5,176.88					
Ruth A. Brookshire	do	4,114.82					
Edith W. Gordon	Secretary	4,114.82					
Vera A. Barker	do	4,114.82					
E. M. Tolleson	Minority clerk	4,948.53					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					
Lillian L. Hopkins	Assistant clerk	5,392.27					
John B. Price	do	4,635.90					
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,635.90					
Elsie K. Thornton	Secretary	4,396.69					
Blanche M. Simons	do	4,026.92					
OREN HARRIS, Chairman.							
JANUARY 10, 1963.							
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE							
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:							
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:							
Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period	Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures			Total gross salary during 6-month period	C. Revision of the laws, 1962:
Charles E. Johnson	Staff director	\$9,057.06					Unexpended balance June 30, 1962.....
George M. Moore	Counsel	9,057.06					Expended July 1-Dec. 31, 1962.....
B. Benton Bray	Professional staff member	8,376.76					
John H. Martiny	Associate counsel	8,303.52					
William A. Irvine	Staff member	7,951.64					

Amount of expenditures previously reported \$83,182.34
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 24,010.93

Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 107,193.27

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 17,806.73

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Margaret R. Beiter	Staff director	\$9,082.14
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	9,082.14
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	8,752.07
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	9,082.14
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,477.58
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,381.96
Helen A. Thompson	do	6,025.39
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,355.94
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,635.90
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	3,145.61

SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1962,
PURSUANT TO H. RES. 136, 87TH CONG.

Durward G. Evans	Subcommittee clerk	\$5,052.76
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	5,052.76
William B. Short, Jr.	do	5,052.76
Peter M. Gentilini	Subcommittee clerk (through Nov. 30, 1962)	4,592.36
Milton Weil	Staff assistant	5,146.55
Ella S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant	4,251.31
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	3,677.08
Flavil Q. Van Dyke, Jr.	Minority clerical assistant	3,385.31
Murray S. Pashkoff	Investigator	2,577.63
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger (through July 31, 1962)	509.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$178,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 128,462.13

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 43,336.35

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 171,798.48

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 6,201.52

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 136, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	\$9,082.14
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	8,390.30
Robert L. May	Minority counsel	8,430.99
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	7,201.06
Robert A. McElligott	do	7,201.06
Salvatore D'Amico	do	6,658.44
George M. Martin	Administrative assistant	7,662.31

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 136, 87TH CONG.—continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	\$7,987.86
John N. Dinsmore	Investigator	6,794.11
James P. Kelly	do	6,658.44
Sherman S. Wilse	do	6,568.03
George E. Burgess	do	5,921.40
John P. O'Hara	do	5,921.40
A. Courtney Hayden, Jr.	Investigator (through Aug. 17, 1962)	1,299.03
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	Investigator (as of Nov. 1, 1962)	1,833.74
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	4,224.24
Harry A. Samberg	Research assistant	4,120.03
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,708.38
Jean H. Cameron	Staff assistant (through Aug. 31, 1962)	1,163.96
Dolores K. Dougherty	Staff assistant	3,593.73
Sara L. Vollett	do	3,192.48
Sylvia H. Report	Minority staff assistant	3,088.30
Bruce B. MacIntyre	Research assistant (through Aug. 31, 1962)	900.68
Shirley R. Knighten	Staff assistant	2,577.63

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$772,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 442,089.11

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 151,245.86

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 593,334.97

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 178,665.03

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION—SALARIES PAID, JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1962, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 433, 87TH CONG.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ruth M. Heritage	Chief clerk (through Aug. 31, 1962)	\$2,185.88
Rosalyn P. Woodmansee	Acting chief clerk (as of Sept. 1, 1962)	4,169.53
Henry H. Krevor	Chief counsel	8,752.07
Robert J. Bolger	Minority counsel (as of Oct. 1, 1962)	4,334.97
Joe W. Ingram	Associate counsel	6,690.12
Roy Markon	Associate counsel (as of Oct. 1, 1962)	3,230.60
Dorothy S. Martin	Secretary	4,641.13
Ruth Butterworth	Minority staff assistant	4,380.55
Florence C. Waters	Research assistant	4,120.03
Merliah R. Buckley	Staff assistant	3,281.08
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger	2,636.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 59,645.49

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 51,017.13

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 110,662.62

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 39,337.38

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 21, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Clerk, standing committee	\$6,929.76
Mary S. Forrest	Assistant clerk	5,052.56
D. E. Lukens	Minority clerk	4,740.11
T. K. Leachman	Messenger (Aug. 1—Sept. 18, 1962)	695.76

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS
TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel	\$9,082.14
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	9,082.14
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	9,082.14
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	7,978.82
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	3,765.70
Jane J. Zetty	Secretary (July 1-Dec. 8, 1962)	3,287.19
Eva F. Lopez	Secretary	3,765.70
Emily Dodson	do	3,765.70
Carol F. Rodgers	do	3,604.17
Patricia B. Harford	Secretary (Dec. 31, 1962)	350.33

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Raymond Wilcock	Staff consultant	\$8,535.02
Richard P. Hines	do	7,978.82
W. H. Boone	Technical consultant (Aug. 6-Dec. 31, 1962)	6,458.11
Katherine V. Flanigan	Assistant clerk	4,740.11
Joseph M. Felton	Publications clerk	3,343.59
Denis Quigley	Assistant publications clerk	1,957.35
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	3,604.17

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$300,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 148,603.01

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962 67,312.74

Total amount expended from Feb. 28, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962 215,915.75

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962 84,034.25

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Appell, Donald T.	Investigator	\$7,730.11
Jory, Juliette P.	Recording clerk	5,844.53
McNamara, Francis J.	Director	8,264.70
Nagel, Isabel B.	Secretary to counsel	4,010.59
Purdy, Rosella A.	Secretary to general counsel	4,823.48
Tavenner, Frank S., Jr.	General counsel	8,824.74
Turner, Anne D.	Chief of reference and files	5,889.72
Veley, Lorraine N.	Secretary to investigators	3,802.19
Watts, Vera	Secretary	3,531.17
Investigating committee:		
Alario, Robert J.	Investigator	7,291.51
Arens, Margaret Ann.	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1962)	750.48
Armijo, Doris Joe	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 10, 1962)	700.37
Baldwin, Beatrice P.	Clerk-typist	2,759.98
Benedict, John R.	Research analyst	4,635.90
Brown, Frances Rosalyn.	Information analyst	2,770.36
Burke, Gerard F.	Clerk-typist	2,399.67
Butler, Daniel	do	2,551.56
Carson, Charlotte B.	Research analyst	3,567.66
Collins, Raymond T.	Investigator	5,156.99
Courie, Kathleen	Clerk-stenographer	4,114.82
Cullen, Theresa J.	Clerk-typist	2,283.93
Cunningham, Annie.	Information analyst	3,828.20
Curl, Jean W.	Clerk-stenographer	3,088.30
Edinger, Elizabeth L.	Editor	4,109.59
Edmondson, Carol A.	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 4, 1962)	1,360.14
Ellsweig, Rochelle	Clerk-typist (appointed Sept. 17, 1962)	1,154.33
Fantozzi, Ettorina	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Sept. 1, 1962)	1,444.77
Francis, Emily R.	Information analyst	2,551.56
Fritz, Kathleen	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 4, 1962)	378.28
Gittings, Helen M.	Research analyst	4,740.11
Goldblatt, Herbert	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1962)	600.32
Gredocky, Betty A.	Clerk-stenographer	2,885.07
Holtom, Katherine R.	Research clerk	2,771.39
Huber, Walter B.	Consultant	7,381.96
Kelly, Maura Patricia.	Research analyst	3,051.80
King, Olive M.	Editor	4,583.78
Kocis, Evelyn M.	Secretary to director	3,140.40
Lewis, Charlotte Ridgeley.	Legal research clerk (resigned Nov. 30, 1962)	2,768.54
Margetich, William	Investigator	3,666.70
Miller, Ashley M.	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1962)	600.32
Moll, Brenda J.	Clerk-stenographer (appointed July 9, 1962)	2,710.62
Muffley, David E., Jr.	Clerk-typist	2,832.96
Muller, Jane S.	Information analyst	3,072.68
Nittle, Alfred M.	Counsel	7,205.60
Pfaff, Alma T.	Editor	2,874.63
Phillips, Katharine	Switchboard operator	2,629.75
Josephine S. Randolph.	Research clerk	2,968.45
Russell, Louis J.	Investigator	6,025.39
Salathe, Doris	Clerk-typist	2,317.09
Stiles, Lela Mae	Information analyst	3,114.35
Shaw, Doris P.	do	2,780.84
Sturtevant, Albert D.	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 10, 1962)	700.37

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigating—Con. Sweeny, Donald L.	Research analyst (appointed July 16, 1962)	\$4,260.53
Tredway, Sarah Ellen.	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 1, 1962)	480.26
Valente, Mary Myers.	Secretary	4,625.49
Umanast, Geraldine M.	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 15, 1962)	906.45
Walsh, John C.	Counsel (resigned Aug. 31, 1962)	1,792.72
Wetterman, Neil E.	Investigator	4,912.18
Wheeler, Billie	Secretary	2,042.13
Yohe, John A.	Staff member	5,664.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$681,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	493,419.10
Amount expended from July 1, 1962 to Jan. 1, 1963	171,759.26
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961, to Jan. 1, 1963	665,178.36
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1963	15,821.64

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Chairman.

JANUARY 14, 1963.		
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS		
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:		
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:		

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	\$9,082.14
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	9,082.14
John R. Holden	Professional staff member	6,376.79
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aid	6,658.44
George W. Fisher	Clerk	9,082.14
Jack Z. Anderson	Professional aid	686.37
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	6,477.58
Helen A. Biondi	do	5,311.18
George J. Turner	do	4,427.48
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	4,427.48
Joanne Doyle	do	3,802.19
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	6,916.18
Michael J. Davis	Clerk-messenger	1,057.74
John D. Dunmas	do	398.84
William F. Ikard	do	362.58
Wilma Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	3,802.19
Audrey J. Lyle	Secretary	1,130.20
Ruth E. Wilcox	Clerk-stenographer	2,065.17
Kay N. Small	do	2,864.21
Mildred Blackwell	do	1,395.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	78,005.05
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	31,513.36
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962	109,518.41
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962	40,481.59

OLIN E. TEAGUE, Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1963.
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	\$9,082.14
William H. Quealy	Minority counsel (P)	9,082.14
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P)	8,919.35
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P)	8,919.35
Raymond F. Conkling	do	8,544.05
Alfred R. McCauley	do	8,494.33
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C) (from Sept. 1, 1962)	2,524.90
Virginia Butler	Staff assistant (C)	4,839.10
William Byrd	do	2,473.09
Frances E. Donovan	do	4,734.92
Ann Fadeley	do	3,192.47
William Goodrich	do	5,146.55
Olga Kay Greene	do	4,114.82
Grace Kagan	do	4,839.10
June Kendall	do	5,201.74
Elizabeth Ruth	do	4,271.13
Eileen Sonnett	do	4,093.96
Susan Taylor	do	5,455.43
Irene Wade	do	4,510.82
David West	do	3,614.16
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk (C)	3,430.26
Walter Little	Document clerk	3,453.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,506.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	4,269.46

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1961, to Dec. 31, 1962

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962

WILBUR D. MILLS, Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1962.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles S. Beller	Counsel	\$7,330.46
Katherine C. Blackburn	Research analyst	4,239.14
Herman J. Blubaugh	do	620.57
Jean H. Cameron	Secretary	2,322.21
Miriam M. DeHaas	Secretary-stenographer	1,000.26
Jean W. Fender	Administrative assistant	4,626.13
Justinus Gould	Counsel	7,969.85
Helen C. Hitz	Secretary	3,666.62

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harrison F. Houghton	Chief economist	\$8,429.87
Katharine F. Johnston	Secretary	1,849.15
Gertrude Jonson	do	3,406.85
Sylvia U. Keel	do	3,666.62
William M. Kennedy	Research analyst	1,755.70
Barbara Wright McConnell	Secretary	4,292.16
Richard L. Mitchell	Counsel	4,191.42
Harry Olsher	Consultant	6,247.77
Margaret Fallon Palmer	Research analyst	4,028.09
Gregg R. Potvin	General counsel	8,567.78
Audrey Redwine	Secretary-stenographer	3,058.68
J. Brooks A. Robertson	Staff director	9,165.93
Joseph A. Seeley	Counsel	7,330.46
Baron I. Shacklette	Chief investigator	8,155.28
Audrey R. Smith	Research analyst	4,239.14
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,626.13
Penelope Walcott	Secretary	3,499.77
Ned L. Wernet	Research analyst	4,800.47
Aiva Wood	Stenographer	36.15
Carole M. Xander	Secretary-stenographer	1,794.31
Total		124,916.97

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$580,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	396,760.54
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	147,802.64
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1961 to Dec. 31, 1962	544,563.18
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962	35,436.82

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1962.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1962, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred Halford	Staff director	\$7,150.00
A. Courtney Hayden, Jr.	Consultant (Sept. 27-Oct. 11, 1962)	500.00
Blanche R. Plant	Stenographer-clerk	3,802.19
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$50,000.00	
Amount of expenditures previously reported	35,837.55	
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962	11,706.33	
Total amount expended from Sept. 7 to Dec. 31, 1962	47,543.88	
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1962	2,456.12	

A. PAUL KITCHIN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1963.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1962

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 4-month period from September 1, 1962, to January 3, 1963, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John Warren McGarry	Chief counsel	\$7,000.00
Hal Gerber	Associate counsel	7,000.00
John J. McGovern	do	3,000.00
Paul R. S. Yates	Investigator	3,177.13
Ruth M. Heritage	Clerk (appointed Sept. 1, 1962)	4,579.95
Gillis W. Long	Consultant	476.76
Barbara Bourgeois	Secretary	1,419.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

Total amount expended from Sept. 1, 1962, to Jan. 3, 1963

27,832.01

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1963 (approximate only; all bills not yet received)

7,167.99

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

263. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

264. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

265. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

266. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

267. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a report of the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts, which have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072. Accompanying these amendments is the report of the Judicial Conference of the United States, submitted to the Court for its consideration pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

268. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 44th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Las Vegas, Nev., October 9-11, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

269. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, agreements concluded during December 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

270. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

271. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the 12th Annual Report of the Director of Selective Service for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 10(g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

272. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

273. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 and the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, in order to provide for insuring rural housing loans and market assistance thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

274. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the First Report of the Secretary of Labor relating to the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans and the Department of Labor's Activities under the act for the preceding calendar year, pursuant to section 14(b) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

275. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the renovation of housekeeping quarters No. 23 at the Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

276. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 17th annual report of the Agency's operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 377, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

277. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 298; 43 U.S.C. secs. 351-355, 357-360)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

278. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

280. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report of the administrative tort claims paid by the Department of Justice during fiscal year 1962, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

281. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning positions in the U.S. General Accounting Office in grades 16, 17, and 18 of

the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to section 503 of the act of July 31, 1956, chapter 804, 70 Stat. 762; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

282. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to define the term 'child' for lump-sum-payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

283. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 2459. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 2460. A bill to authorize a comprehensive program for the maintenance of a healthy mining industry in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2461. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 2462. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to issue certain regulations concerning air traffic at New York International (Idlewild) Airport in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2463. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend section 307(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require flight restrictions with respect to aircraft operating from certain airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the unmarried child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2466. A bill to give the former owners of certain property of the United States located in South Dakota the right to repurchase that property when it is no longer needed by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2467. A bill to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 2468. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain tract of land in Houston, Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2469. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2470. A bill to provide that certain subcontracts may be entered into only in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 2471. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 2472. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2473. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime compensation for substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2474. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time and overtime for certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2475. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2476. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2477. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2479. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2480. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits or widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2483. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce benefits in certain cases where the recipient becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection of certain information with respect to the medical profession; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases", approved August 11, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 2486. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2487. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2488. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 (or \$3,600 in the case of a widow with minor children) the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 2490. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2491. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2492. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a further period for presuming service connection in the case of war veterans suffering from chronic functional psychosis and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 2493. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to prevent detriment to American shipping by declaring as the policy of the United States that foreign vessels which trade with Cuba or certain other Communist countries may not participate in the carrying of cargoes under programs of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 2495. A bill to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton, to

authorize the Secretary to permit cotton-growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2496. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2497. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 2498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that special equipment for disabled individuals shall not be subject to the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2500. A bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2501. A bill to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2502. A bill to provide for the remission or cancellation of an indebtedness due the United States by enlisted members of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2503. A bill to provide medicare for dependents of reservists who die in a training status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2504. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, with respect to technicians of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2505. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code to provide benefits for nonregular members of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard disabled from disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, with respect to the system of courts-martial for the National Guard not in Federal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2507. A bill to clarify the deferred or exempt status of persons who enlist in the reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to provide Federal support for defense forces established under section 109 (c) of title 32; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2509. A bill to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the investigation by a military department of certain aircraft accidents and for the use of reports resulting from those investigations in actions for damages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2511. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of a uniform and the presentation of a flag of the United States for deceased members of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2512. A bill to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while at-

tending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining retirement age excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 2517. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2519. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical, and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the averaging of income derived from literary, musical, and artistic compositions and copyrights by the individuals whose efforts created such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2521. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to provide for the disclosure of certain communications received by Government agencies from Members of Congress with respect to adjudicatory matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2522. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 2523. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the operation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness), and to reduce corporate normal taxes as of January 1963 (instead of July 1963 as presently scheduled); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2525. A bill to vest in Congress the exclusive authority to set rates of postage for fourth-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2526. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 2527. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 2528. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 2529. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2530. A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2532. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that the standard time established thereunder shall be the measure of time for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 2533. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide maximum benefits for individuals who, although deaf and mute, have acquired insured status by continuing in covered employment or self-employment during their working years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2535. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide that owners of surface rights to certain real property, the subsurface mineral rights to which are owned by the United States, shall have the right to purchase such mineral rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2537. A bill to permit State officers who are appointed by their Governors, subject to legislative approval, to participate in political activity without loss of Federal funds; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 2538. A bill to amend section 124 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer the counties of Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton from the Galveston to the Houston division in the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2539. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2540. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2541. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, so as to provide a spouse a full annuity regardless of age under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2542. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2543. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2544. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall be not less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 2545. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2546. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 2547. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2548. A bill to amend title V of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that each veteran treated in a Veterans' Administration facility shall, upon request, be assigned to a ward in which all patients are of the same race as the veteran making the request; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to permit judicial review of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 2550. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to Veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 2551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 2552. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and

874, 81st Congress, which relates to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2553. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 2554. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relates to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 2555. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2556. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the tenure, salary, and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 2557. A bill to prohibit certain improper and undesirable practices relating to the Federal-aid program, and for other purposes designed to protect the public interest and investment therein, and to prohibit indirect financing of primaries and elections out of Federal funds appropriated for highways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2558. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2559. A bill to establish a national policy relating to U.S. citizens' travel abroad; to establish a service within the Department of State which shall be responsible for the direction, administration, and execution of passport and travel documentation for American citizens and nationals in the United States and abroad; to prescribe procedures relating to the issuance of passports; to establish terms of validity of passports; to establish fees for passports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 2560. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2561. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a National Highway Academy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2562. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized use of the name, emblems, insignias, designs, and descriptive and designating marks of the New York World's Fair 1964-65 Corp., and to provide penalties and remedies therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2563. A bill to authorize the establishment of a youth camp recreation program to assist those organizations which have for their purpose the providing of healthful outdoor and camp training for indigent children and to inculcate the principles of Americanism and loyalty to the Republic in these children who are its citizens of the future; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2564. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality

and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase to 40 cents per hour the minimum wage applicable to blind workers and to provide for periodic increases beginning January 1, 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2566. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2567. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to provide a broadened program in the field of mental health and illness of grants for prevention, research, training, salaries, facilities, survey, and construction of facilities for treatment of the mentally ill and mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2568. A bill to amend the act of July 5, 1946, so as to prohibit the sale in the United States of articles of foreign manufacture bearing certain trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2569. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2570. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men, and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources to timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local public service programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2571. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2572. A bill for the relief of the city of Arnold, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2573. A bill to authorize modification of local participation in flood control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 2575. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 2576. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the

12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2578. A bill to promote the conservation of wildlife through the issuance of a national wildlife refuge stamp as a requirement for use of national wildlife refuges; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 2579. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and Secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and non-voting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 relating to certain reports required of expenditures by committees, members, and employees of Congress and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2581. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2582. A bill to equalize all rates of wartime disability compensation and to provide for payment of additional compensation to veterans with dependents when rated less than 50 per centum in degree on the same basis as for those rated 50 per centum or more in degree; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2583. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2584. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 2585. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 2586. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2587. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H.R. 2588. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 2589. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2590. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the designation of individuals to receive survivor annuities under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2591. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2592. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 2593. A bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 2594. A bill to amend sections 204a and 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, under certain circumstances, to deny, revoke, or suspend operating authority granted under part II of the act, or to order divestiture of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2596. A bill to amend section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate certain valuation requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend section 204(a)(3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2598. A bill to amend section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act to eliminate certain valuation requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., and the New Orleans City Park Improvement Association, for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2600. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 2601. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 2602. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the entry of certain members of religious orders as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 2603. A bill to provide disaster loans to fishing vessel owners and operators adversely affected by failure of the fishery resource, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 2604. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 2605. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employ-

ment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874 to extend their application to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 2607. A bill to designate the Grand Forks Air Force Base hospital as the Lerom Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 2608. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 2609. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make stability of prices an explicit part of the economic policy of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 2610. A bill to provide for a conservation program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2611. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 2612. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Sequoyah, the famous Cherokee Indian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2613. A bill to amend section 532 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the marriage date requirements applicable to the payment of pension to widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2614. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2615. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2616. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2617. A bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2618. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2619. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to provide specific authority for the participation of Federal savings and loan associations in the national effort to provide adequate housing facilities for the aging; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2620. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations to include the specific power to invest in certificates of beneficial interest issued by urban renewal investment trusts;

to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2621. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin special 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and principles of the Honorable Sam Rayburn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2622. A bill to relieve certain organizations from liability for the so-called cabaret tax which they incurred before July 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2623. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2625. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2626. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a child who is an invalid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2627. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to require periodic reports to the Congress concerning action taken to carry out the policy of the Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 2628. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to prohibit the use of foreign lumber and other wood products in any construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS (by request):

H.R. 2629. A bill to authorize the chartering of organizations to insure conventional mortgage loans, to authorize the creation of secondary market organizations for conventional and other mortgage loans, to authorize the issuance of debentures upon the security of insured or guaranteed mortgages, and to create a joint supervisory board to charter and examine such organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 2630. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2631. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2632. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 2633. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 2634. A bill to provide for an expanded program of rabbit research; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2635. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 2636. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2637. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide education and training for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 2638. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of certain seriously disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2639. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the death of a veteran suffering from certain severe service-connected disabilities shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2640. A bill to amend section 314(r) of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of an aid and attendance allowance to veterans suffering service-connected blindness in connection with deafness; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2641. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2642. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2643. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2644. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend for 2 years the provisions thereof which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2645. A bill to repeal the retailers excise tax on handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for certain amounts set aside by a taxpayer for the higher education of prospective college students in his family, and a tax credit for certain amounts otherwise paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2647. A bill to provide for payment on interest on overtime compensation owing to employees of the Alaska Railroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 2648. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2649. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2650. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 2651. A bill to extend for 1 year the period during which responsibility for the

placement and foster care of dependent children, under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, may be exercised by a public agency other than the agency administering such aid under the State plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 2652. A bill to amend paragraph 1101 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free importation of certain wools for use in the manufacturing of polishing felts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 2653. A bill to authorize expanded programs of research in marine natural history by the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEROUMANIAN:

H.R. 2654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2655. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2656. A bill to establish a Domestic Peace Corps to provide opportunities for dedicated American citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 2657. A bill to prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce articles imported into the United States from Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 2658. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2659. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional income tax exemptions for taxpayers, spouses, and dependents who are students at the high school or college level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 2661. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 2662. A bill to establish an Office of Federal Administrative Practice and to provide for the appointment and administration of a corps of hearing commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable in the case of a taxpayer or spouse who is a woman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2664. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2665. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and

the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2666. A bill to increase, in the case of children who are attending school, from 18 to 21 years the age until which child's insurance benefits may be received under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 2667. A bill to provide that lease agreements for the construction of post-office buildings must require observance of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2668. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to include the Virgin Islands as an eligible recipient of matching grants for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 2669. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 2670. A bill to permit wheat grown in connection with vocational education in agriculture programs to be marketed without payment of penalty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 2671. A bill authorizing construction of a bank protection project on the Guyandot River at Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 2672. A bill for the relief of the borough of Port Vue (McKeesport), Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2673. A bill to repeal Executive Order No. 11063, issued November 20, 1962, purportedly relating to equal opportunity in housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2674. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 2675. A bill to extend for 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain transportation expenses paid by him in connection with the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 2677. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2678. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to

authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2679. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 2680. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2681. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 2682. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 2683. A bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2684. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2685. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 2686. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 2687. A bill to amend section 204 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for payment of war claims of individuals who were citizens of the United States at the time of the enactment of the 1962 amendments to the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 2688. A bill to amend paragraph 1101(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the duty-free importation of certain wools for use in the manufacturing of polishing felts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2689. A bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 2690. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2691. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of

treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for his own education or for the education of other individuals at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual to deduct, for income tax purposes, the expenses incurred by him for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 2695. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 2696. A bill to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 2697. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to establish the Department of Rural and Suburban Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a champion-of-liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to enable the Congress to function effectively in time of emergency or disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH (by request):

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the dissolution of marriages contracted in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of

its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Board on Presidential Memorials in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution designating May 15 of each year as National Teachers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 185. Joint resolution designating the third week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of March 2, 1931, in order to provide for the printing of the proceedings of the national encampments of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train II by the Archivist of the United States, and for the other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct a modern stern ramp trawler to be used for research purposes and authorizing the appropriation of funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution to provide for three civilian Commissioners for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution clarifying the responsibility of the Joint Committee on the Library with respect to historical exhibits and objects, and other antiquities located in the U.S. Capitol Building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the offering of nonsectarian prayers or any other nonsectarian recognition of God shall be permitted in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics in the legislative branch of Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to create a special joint committee to investigate the Bay of Pigs invasion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer for a cure for cancer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from Soviet occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution providing for free elections in the Communist satellite countries of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the purpose of U.S. foreign policy is victory over communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution to designate "bourbon whisky" as a distinctive product of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Res. 164. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 165. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 166. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Res. 167. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection a, of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 168. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to increase the period for which printed committee hearings and reports on general appropriation bills must be available before such bills may be considered in the House; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 169. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 170. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARSTEIN:

H. Res. 172. Resolution favoring an international agreement for a suspension of nuclear weapons tests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 173. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 174. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection a, of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 175. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCCLORY:

H. Res. 176. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 177. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. Res. 178. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 179. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the Rules of the House or the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 180. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Res. 181. Resolution to amend rule XXIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a method for the consideration of bills providing for home rule in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 183. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 184. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 185. Resolution amending rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Res. 186. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H. Res. 187. Establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 188. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection a, of rule XI and clause 4 of rule

XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Res. 189. Resolution amending clause 2, subsection a, of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 2698. A bill for the relief of Maj. Richard B. Beal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Irma Ceruti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Lourdes C. Villareal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Miss Patricia Simy Benbaruk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Sarantos Moundroukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Terence Montague; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Efstratios Moundroukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lionello Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Naja Nessrallah, his wife, Samira Nessrallah, and their minor sons, Kozhaya Nessrallah and Mansur Nessrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Berta Drose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Stephen and Simone Grignet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Christopher Hing Kui Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Grace and May Ning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Marie Attias Ezagui and Rahma Attias Ezagui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Graziella Pasquale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Granato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Eleni Papastolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2719. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Schlaak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2720. A bill for the relief of Arturo Marciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Matilda M. Schwarzmier and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2722. A bill for the relief of Josiah Prema Das; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2723. A bill for the relief of Domenico Antonelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Siegel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 2725. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mario DeSimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 2726. A bill for the relief of John F. Wood of Newport News, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Warren J. Green of Fort Monroe, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Lambrecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Santa Pisicciotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Domenico Di Simio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 2732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Fuchs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Iacobelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michael Stone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 2736. A bill for the relief of William C. Jessup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Lim Ok Sook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2739. A bill for the relief of Emma Hoffmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H.R. 2740. A bill for the relief of Dinka Maria Hraste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 2741. A bill for the relief of Tom You Hong, Wai Kuen Wong (also known as Alice Tom), and Peter Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 2742. A bill for the relief of Sarolta Hoffmann (Sarah Hoffmann nee Presser); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 2744. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosa Torres-Alverez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 2745. A bill for the relief of A. T. Leary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Despina Georgeton (nee Despina Dilioglou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2747. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. W. Gwin, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Cecil Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2749. A bill for the relief of Gengiz Mohamed Nazim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2750. A bill for the relief of Pacencia Ilagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 2752. A bill for the relief of Staja Stojanovic and Milka Stojanovic, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 2753. A bill to authorize suits against the United States to quiet title of certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOUGH:

H.R. 2754. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Heung Joo Kim (also known as Jim H. Kim); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 2756. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong) and Lyn Fong Y. Hom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Faustino M. Gayo, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Nawab Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Josef Buchholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Krsto Kolega and his wife, Bozica Kolega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Alajandro B. Catli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2763. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the Burnham Chemical Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dionysius I. Macatiag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Mirko Jaksic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lois Ella Levien Hammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2767. A bill for the relief of Esther Khoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Yeng Burdick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 2771. A bill for the relief of Gerda Christoffersen Hilliard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2773. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Hernando-Perez de Lucero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2774. A bill for the relief of George Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Gee Poon Yin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2776. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the New Mexico Boys' Ranch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 2777. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lena Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos G. Kyriakouli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2779. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Benedyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 2780. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kalergis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2781. A bill for the relief of Miltiades Troumpouci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2782. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Basile Kladis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL (by request):

H.R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Joaquin Fontes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Angela D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Bruno Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2786. A bill for the relief of Kazimerz Topor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joak Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Dr. Asu Ram Jha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Ginteburg Schleifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2790. A bill for the relief of Owen L. Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Santa Giannalva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Theodore C. Marrs, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2793. A bill for the relief Elko Ueda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 2794. A bill for the relief of Sale Kurg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 2795. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Balbastro Silla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Luisa Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Konstantina Papanelopoulou Petreanu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 2798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Vaseilenak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 2799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2800. A bill for the relief of Anna Virginia Young (also known as Anna Virginia Young Shuk Yin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2801. A bill for the relief of Donald A. MacMasters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2802. A bill for the relief of Alexei Bogdanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2803. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jay McClean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 2805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumi Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mitsue Sugimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Yehuda Licht and his wife, Bella Licht, and their minor children Yizhak (Yitzhat) and Smadar (Snadar) Licht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Fortunato Di Piazza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 2810. A bill for the relief of Dr. Young Joe Ahn Han (nee Young Joe Ahn); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 2811. A bill for the relief of Vernon E. Linth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 2812. A bill for the relief of Anne Marie Gevas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2813. A bill for the relief of Francis Quan and Janet Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2814. A bill for the relief of Mirjana Tomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 2815. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Geidl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2817. A bill for the relief of Yaeko Kasahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2818. A bill for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2819. A bill to provide for a cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic guidance and gyroscopic stabilization of aircraft and missiles made by Garnett J. Dye and offered to the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 2820. A bill for the relief of Toufic Renna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Puller, U.S. Marine Corps (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

22. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of Augustus C. Wallace and others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

23. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jay Creswell, Orlando, Fla., relative to a redress of grievance relating to submitting a draft of the Universal Exchange of Good Works Act of 1963; to the Committee on Appropriations.

24. Also, petition of Frank F. Pascoe, Empire Typographical Conference, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., relative to supporting President Kennedy in his stand on the Communist build-up of weapons in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

25. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., relative to requesting that legislation be initiated requiring that every increase in appropriations over the previous year's must be covered by taxation laws adequately paying for said increase in appropriations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Hon. Jose E. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 24, 1963

MR. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was particularly pleased to note in a recent press release issued by the Office of Emergency Planning of the Executive

Office of the President that a certificate of appreciation award was presented to the Honorable Jose A. Benitez, Deputy High Commissioner, Pacific Trust Territory, for the invaluable service rendered by him in connection with the rehabilitation of the Territory of Guam, following typhoon Karen of November 11, 1962.

This honor by the Government of the United States was conferred upon Mr. Benitez by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Mr. Benitez, present during the storm which was one of the severest in the history of Guam, was commended by

Mr. McDermott for "his on-the-spot actions and subsequent counsel and guidance which were invaluable to Federal officials working to restore and rehabilitate the territory" which comprises some 70,000 people.

Many of us will recall that there were many casualties as a result of this storm and over \$100 million of property damage.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Benitez, who was appointed Deputy High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in March 1961, was exceptionally well qualified to render such assistance in the Guam disaster because he has held important ad-