RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 19 minutes, p.m.) the Senate took its recess, under the previous order, until two o'clock, November 27, 1963, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 85:8; I will hear what God the Lord will say, for He will speak peace unto His people.

Almighty God, as we again assemble for prayer, in these strange and sad days, we earnestly beseech Thee that we may hear and heed Thy voice speaking peace unto His people.

Antinomian, and often discouraged as we face the unknown future, may we not forget that Thou wilt help in all the far-off yesterdays, drawing us to Thyself by Thy grace for our reavement.

As we go forth to seek the harvest of each new day, may our minds and hearts be blessed with Thy divine spirit, which alone can deliver them from all thoughts and feelings of hatred and violence and remove the iniquities and revilings which divide soul from soul. May the President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all our people be drawn together in one high and holy aspiration to know Thy truth and to do Thy will faithfully.

O Lord, support us all the day long of our troublous life, until the shadows lengthen and the evening comes and the busy world is hushed and the fever of life is over and our work is done. Then in Thy mercy grant us a holy rest and peace at the last.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. Res. 226

Resolved, That the Senate has learned with profound sorrow and deep regret of the tragic death of the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late the President of the United States, and a former Representative and former Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

Resolved, That in recognition of his illustrious statesmanship, his leadership in national and world affairs, and his distinguished public service to his State and the Nation, the President be authorized to appoint a special committee, to consist of all the Members of the Senate, to attend the funeral of the late President at noon today.

Resolved, That the Senate hereby tenders its deep sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their sad bereavement.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the late President.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late President, the Senate do now adjourn.

WORK PLANS UNDER THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 31, 1963.

HON JOHN W. McCORMICK, Speaker;
The House of Representatives;

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on October 30, 1963, transmitted to you the following work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans.

The work plans involved are:

STATE, WATERSHED, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

Texas: Big Creek, No. 3971, 87th Congress.
Minnesota: Crooked Creek, No. 1204, 88th Congress.
Colorado: Indian Wash, No. 1899, 87th Congress.
Minnesota: Joe River, No. 1204, 88th Congress.
Arkansas: Mud Creek, No. 1204, 88th Congress.
Tennessee: Thompson Creek, (supplemental), No. 895, 88th Congress.
Tennessee: Weatherford-Bear Creek, No. 1204, 88th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY, Chairman.

A DAY TO BE SET ASIDE LATER TO EULOGIZE OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the Members that we plan to set aside a full day at a later date on which Members may eulogize our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a tabulated statement of the appropriation bills for the session, together with a comparison with the budget estimates.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include down-to-date tabulation of the appropriation bills of the session and corresponding budget requests.

The only remaining regular appropriation business to be reported to the House is the foreign aid bill—still awaiting the necessary authorization legislation— involving budget requests of $4,840,030,000. $184,669,965 has been cut from the $2,180,472,456 of supplemental budgets in this session for the fiscal year 1963.

At the close of business on December 2, 1964, the table discloses four bills signed by the President, disposing of $61,918,577,000 of his budget requests for appropriations. They are Interior, Tennessee Valley Authority, Office, Labor-HEW, and Defense, and they were cut by $2,229,577,000. And, in the aggregate, they are below comparable appropriations for fiscal 1963 by $358,000,000.

The conference agreement on the legislative bill is pending in the Senate, having been adopted by the House at a figure $13,926,000 below the budget requests but, owing to some nonrecurring construction items, about $18,000,000 above last year.

The agriculture bill is in conference.

The District of Columbia and Independent offices bills are awaiting conference.

Three other bills—State—Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, the military construction bill, and the public works bill are being preceded in procedure.

The House has cut $5,420,333,026 from the $91,817,467,145 of budget requests considered in the 11 regular bills for fiscal 1964, and will allow the budget requests in the aggregate on the foreign aid bill. It now seems a certainty that Congress will conclude the appropriations business with a very substantial cut below the requests and also below last year's appropriations. And we are determined, in collaboration with the other body, to continue to do everything we can to conclude the work as expeditiously as circumstances permit.

No review of the aggregate probability of total appropriations for the session can omit the approximately $12,000,000,000 representing a round amount because it does not stand still—of appropriations recurring automatically for fiscal 1964 under permanent law. That is not in the conference, nor do we have to follow because it requires no annual action by the Congress. The principal expense is the interest on the national debt, tentatively estimated at $850,000,000 for January, but more recently figured to approximate $10,500,000,000.

The substantiating details are in the following table:

---

**Congressional Record — House**

**November 26, 1963**

---

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1963

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Budget estimates to House</th>
<th>Date and report number</th>
<th>Amount as reported</th>
<th>Amount reported compared with budget estimates</th>
<th>Date passed</th>
<th>Amount as passed</th>
<th>House action compared with—</th>
<th>Budget estimates</th>
<th>Amount reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.J. Res. 284</td>
<td>Supplemental, Agriculture</td>
<td>$806,172,000</td>
<td>Feb. 20</td>
<td>$806,172,000</td>
<td>Feb. 20</td>
<td>$806,172,000</td>
<td>Jan. 27</td>
<td>$806,172,000</td>
<td>$806,172,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 6517</td>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>1,641,077,106</td>
<td>Apr. 5</td>
<td>988,756,506</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>1,486,698,156</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>1,486,698,156</td>
<td>$804,685,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works acceleration</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>$-804,685,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>(1,141,077,106)</td>
<td>(1,141,077,106)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(1,141,077,106)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(1,141,077,106)</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>(1,141,077,106)</td>
<td>$-804,685,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 1963 supplementsal</td>
<td>2,149,177,106</td>
<td>1,468,756,506</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>1,468,756,506</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>1,468,756,506</td>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>1,468,756,506</td>
<td>$804,685,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| H.R. 5879 | Interior | 206,000,000 | Mar. 28 | 206,000,000 | Apr. 2 | 206,000,000 | Apr. 2 | 206,000,000 | $7,000,000 |
| Loan authorization | (12,000,000) | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | $7,000,000 |
| Contract authority | (12,000,000) | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | Apr. 2 | (12,000,000) | $7,000,000 |
| H.R. 5886 | Treasury—Post Office | 1,146,077,106 | Apr. 4 | 1,146,077,106 | Apr. 4 | 1,146,077,106 | Apr. 4 | 1,146,077,106 | $206,000,000 |
| H.R. 5888 | Labor—HEW | 5,739,489,009 | Apr. 12 | 5,449,489,009 | Apr. 12 | 5,449,489,009 | Apr. 12 | 5,449,489,009 | $606,000,000 |
| H.R. 6754 | Agriculture | 6,365,755,000 | June 5 | 5,976,457,000 | June 6 | 5,976,457,000 | June 6 | 5,976,457,000 | $389,298,000 |
| H.R. 6958 | Loan authorizations | 12,000,000 | June 5 | 12,000,000 | June 5 | 12,000,000 | June 5 | 12,000,000 | $0,000,000 |
| Legislative | (12,000,000) | (12,000,000) | June 5 | (12,000,000) | June 5 | (12,000,000) | June 5 | (12,000,000) | $0,000,000 |
| H.R. 7063 | State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary | 2,159,000,000 | June 14 | 2,041,000,000 | June 16 | 2,041,000,000 | June 16 | 2,041,000,000 | $106,000,000 |
| H.R. 7179 | Defense | 49,214,377,000 | June 21 | 47,000,000,000 | June 26 | 47,000,000,000 | June 26 | 47,000,000,000 | $-1,521,279,000 |
| H.R. 7431 | District of Columbia | 259,500,000 | July 8 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | $-1,521,279,000 |
| Federal payment | 259,500,000 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | $-1,521,279,000 |
| Loan authorizations | 259,500,000 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | July 9 | 259,500,000 | $-1,521,279,000 |
| H.R. 9217 | Independent offices | 14,658,888,000 | Oct. 10 | 14,658,888,000 | Oct. 10 | 14,658,888,000 | Oct. 10 | 14,658,888,000 | $-1,555,860,000 |
| H.R. 9139 | Military construction | 1,958,400,000 | Nov. 14 | 1,958,400,000 | Nov. 16 | 1,958,400,000 | Nov. 16 | 1,958,400,000 | $-1,555,860,000 |
| Public Works | 4,561,747,000 | Nov. 15 | 4,561,747,000 | Nov. 17 | 4,561,747,000 | Nov. 17 | 4,561,747,000 | $-1,555,860,000 |
| Total, 1964 appropriations | 91,017,407,145 | 86,414,466,119 | Nov. 17 | 86,414,466,119 | Nov. 17 | 86,414,466,119 | Nov. 17 | 86,414,466,119 | $-4,000,000,000 |

1 Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964 (subject to change—probably upward).
2 Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.
3 Includes $500,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury. 4 Excludes Senate items.
### The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Nov. 26, 1963—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Public Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget estimates to Senate</td>
<td>Date and report number</td>
<td>Amount as passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 SUPPLEMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.J. Res. 284</td>
<td>Supplemental, Agriculture</td>
<td>$308,172,000</td>
<td>Feb. 25 (No. 9)</td>
<td>$308,172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 517</td>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>1,123,300,456</td>
<td>Apr. 24 (No. 115)</td>
<td>1,183,300,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works acceleration</td>
<td>(300,000,000)</td>
<td>(450,000,000)</td>
<td>(90,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>(1,183,300,456)</td>
<td>(1,183,300,456)</td>
<td>(1,183,300,456)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 1963 supplements</td>
<td>2,106,472,456</td>
<td>1,183,300,456</td>
<td>+$63,616,616</td>
<td>+$49,992,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 APPROPRIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 579</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>985,099,000</td>
<td>May 22 (No. 151)</td>
<td>985,099,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorization</td>
<td>(300,000,000)</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract authority</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td>(600,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 580</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6,265,285,386</td>
<td>May 2 (No. 116)</td>
<td>6,265,285,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury—Post Office</td>
<td>8,461,450,000</td>
<td>8,461,450,000</td>
<td>8,461,450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor—HWES</td>
<td>5,790,490,000</td>
<td>Aug. 1 (No. 203)</td>
<td>5,790,490,000</td>
<td>Aug. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6,306,775,000</td>
<td>6,306,775,000</td>
<td>6,306,775,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorization</td>
<td>(450,000,000)</td>
<td>(450,000,000)</td>
<td>(450,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>180,256,456</td>
<td>180,256,456</td>
<td>180,256,456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 769</td>
<td>State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary</td>
<td>301,253,000</td>
<td>Sept. 17 (No. 850)</td>
<td>301,253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 769</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>46,014,397,000</td>
<td>Sept. 17 (No. 850)</td>
<td>46,014,397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 761</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>(329,962,000)</td>
<td>Nov. 6 (No. 222)</td>
<td>(329,962,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 827</td>
<td>Federal payment</td>
<td>35,899,000</td>
<td>Oct. 15 (No. 222)</td>
<td>35,899,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 867</td>
<td>Independent offices</td>
<td>14,546,086,000</td>
<td>Nov. 18 (No. 846)</td>
<td>14,546,086,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 942</td>
<td>Military construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 9149</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 1964 appropriations</td>
<td>83,181,000,450</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, all appropriations</td>
<td>83,181,000,450</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, loan authorizations</td>
<td>83,181,000,450</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, contract authority</td>
<td>83,181,000,450</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td>79,670,978,989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Conference report not yet acted upon by Senate.
Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.
Note.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.
CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 809) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of October 30, 1963 (Public Law 88-163), is hereby amended by striking out "November 30, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1964."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker. Can the gentleman say whether this will be the last continuing resolution or will we go into the year of 1964 with another resolution?

Mr. CANNON. It will be the last resolution. It provides for the period ending January 31, 1964.

Mr. GROSS. From the gentleman's long service in the House of Representatives, has this sort of situation ever been obtained when Congress closed out any previous experience such as this?

Mr. CANNON. This is the longest time for which continuing resolutions have provided within immediate recollection.

Mr. GROSS. Can we be sure these present appropriation bills that are pending and in conference will be cleared by January 31? Can the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, give us any assurance about that?

Mr. CANNON. No one can predict with certainty what the House and the Senate will do.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. It is a sad commentary on the legislative process when 6 to 7 months of a fiscal year are permitted to elapse without appropriations having been made for all agencies and departments. These continuing resolutions continue spending at rates established in a fiscal year which ended June 30, 1963. This is wrong and I am opposed to it.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2267) to amend Public Law 88-72 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, a bill identical to H.R. 8971, which has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is this bill to be passed by unanimous consent, or is this unanimous consent to consider the bill?

The SPEAKER. This is unanimous consent to consider the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Chair. The SPEAKER. If the request is granted the bill will be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the joint resolution of October 30, 1963, (Public Law 88-163) be amended by striking the figure "$172,659,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$190,507,000."

SEC. 2. Section 101(d) of Public Law 88-72 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Project 64-d-6, 16, occupational health laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,650,000."

"Project 64-d-11, high temperature chemistry facilities, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $1,355,000."

"Project 64-d-12, plutonium research support building, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $655,000."

"Project 64-d-13, radiochemistry building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $5,500,000."

"Project 64-d-14, hazards controladdition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $1,000,000."

"Project 64-d-15, plant engineering and services building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $650,000."

"Project 64-d-16, west cafeteria addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $255,000."

"Project 64-d-17, craft shop addition, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $200,000.

"Project 64-d-18, development laboratory, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $3,780,000."

"Project 64-d-19, explosive facilities, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $540,000."

"Project 64-d-20, classified technical reports building addition, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $500,000."

"Project 64-d-21, control point additions, Nevada Test Site, $650,000."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker. The bill before us now, S. 2267, provides an authorization of $177,945,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for 12 new construction projects necessary for the implementation of the safeguards enumerated by the President in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

This bill, and its identical companion, H.R. 8971, was considered by the joint committee in hearings held on October 31, 1963. The committee's report in the opinion that this bill represents an important first step in the implementation of the safeguards proposed in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

For the most part, these projects are necessary for the maintenance of strong weapons laboratories. The committee is convinced that the maintenance of these facilities at the highest level is necessary in order to attract and retain those competent scientists who can help to assure U.S. leadership in the nuclear weapons field.

In addition, the project is also of great importance in maintaining ready for the resumption of atmospheric testing. In justification for project 64-d-13, a radiochemistry building at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in Livermore, Calif., the AEC stated:

This project is needed to provide immediate improvements to the physical plant of the laboratory with a view to insuring a high level of nuclear weapons research and development progress, coupled with the resources to resume underground testing in the atmosphere on short notice.

Finally, this bill provides facilities which will help to assure a comprehensive and aggressive underground nuclear testing program, which was another important safeguard outlined in connection with the treaty. Project 64-d-21, which provides for additions to the control point facilities at the Nevada test site, will help to increase the rate and efficiency of our underground weapons testing and improve the collection of test data.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, this bill is only a first step. Much more remains to be done. In view of the extreme importance of the safeguards program to the national security, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy intends to maintain a close and continuing surveillance over the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense in this area.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy without dissent. It was passed in the other body last Thursday. I urge its prompt approval by the House in order to provide funds necessary to maintain the funds involved in the Appropriations Committees of both Houses and the Congress.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the consideration of this bill by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was in detail. The recommendation of the joint committee was unanimous. The other body has passed the bill.

The reason for it being brought up at the present moment is that this authorization must be made so the funds involved in the public works appropriation bill now under consideration by the other body.

Ordinarily, a continuing resolution was not an effective device. However, the subject matter of this supplemental authorization has to do with those safeguards which the Joint Chiefs of Staff and which everybody felt required under the circumstances and conditions of the nuclear test ban treaty.
I think it is well that we recall what those safeguards are because the responsibility for implementing them is not alone with the Department of Defense and is not alone with the Atomic Energy Commission nor does it rest alone with the President. The responsibility rests also with the Congress of the United States. It is my impression that in the light of the admitted risks and hazards of the test ban treaty four safeguards would be required.

The first safeguard for the national security of the United States was the continuing conduct of comprehensive underground nuclear test programs.

The second safeguard was the maintenance of the vitality of our nuclear laboratories and insuring they are manned by top flight scientific personnel in order that nuclear technology in the United States should not fall behind.

The third was the maintenance of an adequate detection system to monitor any possible violations of the treaty as well as to monitor insofar as possible whatever nuclear programs and tests are on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

The fourth safeguard, Mr. Speaker, was that this Nation should maintain a readiness to resume testing in the atmosphere, should the event occur that the national security of the United States became endangered.

Obviously, this authorization does not include all that is necessary to implement the safeguards. It deals with four installations at the Los Alamos scientific laboratory, four at the Livermore radiation laboratory, three at the Sandia base, and one at the Nevada test site. The total amount is in the sum of $17,945,000. It is not known yet what total expenditure is involved in the maintenance of these safeguards to national security. What is necessary yet to be spelled out in detail. Obviously, the sum of $17,945,000 is not that sum which ultimately will be required to protect the United States. I am not here to calculate it. I believe that the sum for capital investments will involve something close to $1 billion. This authorization is only a little more than a fraction of 1 percent of that amount.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

But this authorization for an appropriation of nearly $18 million is a direct byproduct of the limited nuclear test ban treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct. But it is only a small part of what we will have to spend. I would have hoped that by this time we would have spent out in detail what is needed by us. It is only in the vigorous underground testing program, what is needed to keep our nuclear laboratories vigorous and topnotch scientists and what improvements need be made in our detection system, and what is required for an adequate readiness to resume atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. Unfortunately, those things have not been de-
November 27, 1963, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?
There was no objection.

ADMISSION TO HOUSE CHAMBER ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1963
The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, it is a Chair announcement that on Wednesday, November 27, 1963, the day set for a joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

COPIES OF REPORT TO ACCOMPANY CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963
Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.
The Clerk reads as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 572
Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, two thousand additional copies of H. R. 7152, proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963, 88th Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF NOVEMBER 25, 1963
Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I feel I should advise the membership of the House that it has been decided by the Joint Committee on Printing that by reason of the unusual format of yesterday's Record an additional printing will be ordered from the Government Printing Office. Tomorrow morning, each Member will have delivered to his office 50 additional copies of yesterday's Record. If there are requests for more copies, office calls should be made to the Congressional Record Clerk in the Capitol. He has been instructed to comply with reasonable requests as long as the extra supply is available.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?
There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO CAPITOL POLICE FOR THEIR DEVOTION TO DUTY
Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?
There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during these days of tragedy and grief the American people have responded in fullest patriotic measure to the challenge to rededicated service to our country in the spirit and in the pattern of the angel of peace and human understanding who moved among us and we touched his garment, and now is enwrapped in the immortality of history, forever, an inspiration to mankind in the climb to loftier peaks of contumacy, dignity, and brotherhood.
I think it not amiss to make some mention here of the part of our Capitol Police, especially in the long hours of the night, when men, women, and children came from many sections of the country to pass, with tears and prayers, by the caskets of President Kennedy lying in the rotunda of the Capitol. The Capitol Police worked around the clock, and their many courteous and helpful attentions to our constituents did not go unnoticed. They did their part in full when the heart of all our people was broken and in a common grief, we were being drawn closer together than ever we had been.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO JOHN F. KENNEDY
Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 2 years, 10 months, and 6 days ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was inaugurated as the 35th President of the United States. Perhaps no other person has already become one of the classic expressions of dedication to our Nation's ideals, he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."
Now, John Kennedy is gone—struck down in the service of the country he loved so well.
The tragedy of this untimely loss has caused an unprecedented outpouring of grief, not only from his countrymen, but indeed from all the peoples of the world. So much has been said—so little can be done. The assassin's bullet cannot be recalled. But the Congress can act for the Nation in fitting recognition of the supreme sacrifice made by our Commander in Chief in our Nation's service.

To this end, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the President of the United States to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in recognition of his peerless leadership as Commander in Chief, his heroic courage as a pioneer of new frontiers of freedom, his gallant and unfailing devotion to the service of his country, and his everlasting contribution to the cause of world peace.
The language of the resolution is not original with me, but is identical to a bill introduced on April 19, 1945, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable John W. McCormack, now Speaker of the House of Representatives, and passed by the House on April 21, 1945.
The report of the Committee on the Judiciary, dated April 26, 1945, reads as follows in its entirety:
The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 696) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, after consideration, report the same favorably to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.
The language of this bill, although written 18 years ago upon the occasion of another President's untimely passing, is—by remarkable coincidence—a perfect expression of the reasons why this award should be made. Its allusion to "new frontiers of freedom" was almost prophetic. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to express in this manner the highest sentiment of our esteem for our fallen President.

SCHOLARSHIP FUND IN NAME OF THE LATE PRESIDENT
Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?
There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days all American citizens have felt a hopefulness in this period of great national tragedy. So many have asked "What can I do?" "How can I help?" Just yesterday Nina Totenberg, the president of the Kennedy Club in Oregon, phoned and through her tears asked for advice on what they might do to help carry on the program President Kennedy had started. They had a few hundred dollars in their treasury and they were so anxious that somehow, somewhere those funds would be invested in something—something—something—in something living and vital. We talked of his visits in Oregon, of things which he had said and recommendations that he had made. And to Mrs. Elizabeth I suggested that through the joint efforts
of private groups and Congress, scholar­ships might be established that would be known as the John Fitzgerald Ken­nedy Memorial Award for Academic Ex­cellence. And that a contribution to this kind of a program would be a fitting testimonial in honor of the memory of our President.

His words still ring so clearly “an in­vest­ment in education is at the same time the most profitable investment that society can make.” What it can confer—the future of any country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens is dam­aged, and irrepairably damaged, when­ever any of its children is not educated to the fullest extent of his capacity.”

As we turn now to the future, we should be mindful that “the future is what men make of it.” I am introduce­lagislation to establish a program of scholarships for academic excellence in memory of our late President. The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Award for Academic Ex­cellence will consist of a $1,000 scholarship and certificate to be awarded to the young men and women of this Nation who each year rank highest in academic excellence in their high­school or college. This is a very difficult con­dition. This will help them and encourage others to appreciate and obtain the “life treasures of our open society” which were so eloquently described by our late President.

And let us never forget that “Education is the cornerstone in the arch of freedom and progress.”

PURPOSE OF THE BANKING SURVEY: BEING MADE BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Sub­committee on Domestic Finance of the House Committee on Banking and Curren­cy is making a rather extensive sur­vey of the banking system, utilizing ques­tionnaires which have been developed over a period of months with the help of experts in the Federal bank supervisory agencies and with the help of many pri­vate bankers.

With these surveys we hope to fill in some rather fundamental gaps in our knowledge about the banking system. Many of these gaps are of little importance and being made to revise the banking laws in ways that would bring about important changes in the organization and struc­ture of the industry; and these proposals rest, I think, on assumptions, suppositions, and theories as to what the present facts are.

Naturally, however, when we get down to considering legislative proposals which are so important in their implications for the banking system—and for the success or failure of many individual banks—we feel the need to have facts rather than just suppositions.

These banking questionnaires have, of course, aroused a great deal of interest in the banking community and in the financial world. For this reason I thought it might be appropriate to insert in the Congressional Record a recent speech of mine discussing the pur­poses, progress and problems of this survey. This speech was made to a convention of the Iowa Bankers Association, at Des Moines, on October 21, 1963, and is as follows:

PURPOSES OF OUR BANKING SURVEY

(An address delivered in conjunction by Representative Wright Patman, Demo­crat, of Texas, chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Rep­resentatives, Des Moines, Iowa, October 21, 1963)

It is a wonderful experience to be in Iowa at this bountiful season of the year. And it is both an honor and a deep pleasure to meet with the Iowa Bankers Association.

A few months ago I made a speech in which I said I thought there should be more bank failures. This was at the dedication of the new building which houses the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in Washington, where a lot of Federal Reserve officials were present.

Right after the speech, some of the examiners sent me a message that if I really wanted more bank failures, they could help me out.

I got their message, and I think the bank examiners also got my message. But from the letters and editorials my remarks in­spired, I judge that my message went over the heads of a great many bankers. The point I was making is that I feel the bank examiners should interfere a little less in the loan and investment decisions by the banks, and I was trying to bring the more freedom to the good judgment of the bankers in their decisions.

I would regret deeply the failure of any bank. But I think we would all regret it more if the banks lost all opportunity to fail. Where there is no opportunity to fail, there is also no opportunity to really succeed.

Let me add that I intend no reflection upon the FDIC examiners or the other bank examiners. They are highly competent men and deep down I admire the Bank. But I do not think that they can manage the affairs of the banks as well as the private managers can; and even if they could, it would be wrong for them to do it.

I have no doubt that my life insurance company knows more about the personal habits that I may have than I do. If they sent an agent around to tell me what time to go to bed and what to eat, they could no doubt save me some money on the insurance premiums. But none of us wants that kind of insurance.

I wish I were realistic enough to think that all government intrusions into the banking business could be removed, but because of the complexity of the economic system, as provider of the Nation’s money supply, this is not the case.

So let me make it the outset that the bank­ ing survey which our committee is making is an entirely friendly survey, though it is also one of serious import. We have been told that the American bankers are very apprehensive about our questionnaires. A few, not many, but a few have expressed a fear that they may be used to evolve a plan to push out the small independent banks and replace them with large national or regional chains. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I think I can speak for every member of our committee when I say that we are far from persuaded that the American economy would benefit from the disappearance of the small banks. I am positive fully that the hometown banks of America have served long and well the people and business of our country’s small towns and cities. We believe that these banks are an im­portant element in the banking system—gentlemen—have a right to a completely fair chance to survive and prosper and to con­tinue to serve your local communities.

What we are all interested in is doing a good job of our very heavy responsibility for our country’s banking. What is it that we want, gentlemen—all of us—is to maintain the solvency and liquidity of the banking system—and the laws which will permit your banks to better serve the needs of your communities for the safe, sound and liquidly operation of these banks—not to bring about bank failures.

Experience has taught us that unrestricted entry into banking is not compatible with a healthy banking community. No serious stu­dent of banking would suggest, I think, that anybody and everybody should be allowed to open a bank, at any time and at any place, as he may open a retail grocery.

It has now been a hundred years since Congress established the office of the Comptroller of the Currency and vested him with powers to charter national banks. And it has been evident that many states have been chartering State banks.

With Government controlling entry into banking, we may be sure that competition might be stifled. Thus the histor­ic mission of Government bank chartering is to avoid two pitfalls: entry into banking which would lead to wholesale failures and troubles for the whole economy; and bank entry, bank failures, bank losses or a tendency toward a monopoly in banking.

The necessary counterpart of Government regulation of entry is, of course, Government supervision of mergers. Bank mergers also have repercussions in the overall solvency and liquidity of the banking system and its ability to serve the community in general. In addition, there has been a tendency for Government intrusions into the banking sys­tem which carry with them other necessary Government regulation. One of these, the Federal Reserve System, is necessary for an elastic supply of money and credit which does not also lead to runaway inflation in periods of economic boom, or to a general collapse of the money supply in times of business recession.

Another is the FDIC, which has done what the Federal Reserve is not able to do; namely, to prevent unwarranted losses of confidence on the part of depositors, leading to bank runs and unnecessary failures which formerly had chain reactions throughout the banking system.

Yes, I am afraid that we must reconcile ourselves to the fact of Government regu­lation of banking; but we cannot afford to reconcile ourselves to bad regulation, or to out-of-date and inappropriate banking laws. This brings me to the topic I was asked to discuss this afternoon, which is the purpose of the banking surveys being conducted by our Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Wall Street Journal, in a feature story on October 4, said this: "The commercial banking industry, tradi­tionally one of the most conservative ele­ments of the business community, is in a state of ferment that may lead to some significant changes in long-honored policies and practices." "The ferment is not a state of "ferment" is perhaps a little too intoxicating. But there can be no doubt that change and ferment are part of the banking industry. During the past 3 years commercial banks have increased their time and savings de­posit business 30 percent, for example. During the past 7 years commercial banks have increased their time and savings de­posit business 30 percent, for example. Naturally, the bankers are seeking investment outlets for these funds, and perhaps the time has come when we have restricted their investment opportunities.
But more fundamental pressures are at work. We are in the throes of adapting new technologies. And they are undermining the rigors of adapting to the changing requirements of businesses and consumers for banking services, as well as to the competitive pressures of newer types of financial institutions. Tremendous pressures are at work in changing the structure, or organization, of the banking system. We have to face up to the question whether the trend of the past few years of the growth of independent unit banks or toward large-scale branch banking, chain banking, and hold­ing companies is under stress; and since the Philadelphia Journal has called it, has led to a number of studies of over $2 billion. In 1963, the total of approximately 147 applications for permission to merge, were approved and turned down only 7.

Some very profound changes in the structure of banking have already occurred since the reaction of the Clayton decision, the merger provisions of the Sherman Act, and several others. Many of the proposals asking for legislation to permit him to over­ ride the studies and reports I have referred to. They are thoughtful documents, well written, but they contain recommendations and conclusions based mostly on opinions, because the writers did not make the facts available. It did not have the means to collect the facts.

These proposals for changes in the banking laws put conscientious legislators on a very difficult spot. Certainly we are being asked to think with most serious matters. Much of this legislation will affect the opportu­ nities of many banks to survive. But more than that, it will affect the economy of the Nation, because no industry, no service, and no line of business plays such a vital role in the economy as banking.

Surely we cannot act without having suf­ ficient evidence that we are doing what is right and that we are doing it. Nor can we long refuse to act. A shoe that doesn’t fit can ruin your foot. A poorly regulated banking system today requirements can stifle banking and injure the economy.

It hardly needs to be said that while I am talking about Federal banking laws, changes in the Federal laws almost inevitably result in changes in the State laws. In a nutshell, then, our committee needs information; and we very much need your help in supplying us with information, not only in the form of statistics but by writing to us, calling us, or coming to see us. No body of men sitting in Washington can possibly know all that should be known about local conditions in order to formulate wise policies. This is why we welcome all the help and guidance we can get from you. We are not against change. In a dynamic economy, change is inevitable. But in a democracy, we must ask ourselves from the people themselves and not from officials who occupy seats of power in some bureaus.

Let me digress for just a moment to thank all of you who found the time, from what I know to be a full schedule, to answer our questionnaire. We think those of you who are representatives of the banking industry who gave us so much help in developing our ques­ tionnaire do that want to thank you in particular to thank you in particular to thank you. Mr. M. Monroe Kimbrel, president of the American Bankers Association; Mr. Norris E. Hartwell, president of the National Asso­ ciation of Supervisors of State Banks; and Mr. S. E. Babington, president of the Inde­ pendent Bankers Association, as well as the highly competent staffs of these associations. Now let me talk more specifically about the purposes of the questionnaires.

These questionnaires require some work. So, in order to minimize the workload on the people who are going to answer the questionnaires, the select samples of the banks, repre­ sentative of all parts of the country, all sizes of banks, and all banking structures. A total of approximately 5,000 banks, not all banks, but those are the sample.

While making the survey on a sample basis reduces the time it will take to compile the data, it also makes it more imperative that each bank in the sample cooperate in filling out the questionnaires carefully and accurately. If just a few banks give careless answers or neglect to answer, the whole sam­ ple is vitiated. Banking is a fact of life. In the banking industry, other banks will be wasted, the banks, and more of the banks from this are now in. The response has been very good indeed—almost 100 percent perfect. The second questionnaire will be mailed to the banks this week.

The first questionnaire deals with man­ agement-succes­sion problems. The second deals with banking serv­ ices and, more particularly, correspondent banking.

The first questionnaire asks a great many seemingly intimate questions about the ages of the directors of the bank, the amounts of the balances, whether or not there are retirement plans and, if so, what kind, the background and training of the management personnel, and other questions in the low echelon. It asks questions about the training and recruitment practices of the banks.

I think that the reasons for these ques­ tions will be obvious to you when you think about them. Conflicting views have been widely aired over the reasons for bank merg­ ers, large-scale bank or holding company banking versus independent banking, and so forth.

One of the reasons most frequently given for bank mergers is that the small bank cannot attract enough capital, or afford management with the diversity of skills that a bank needs. Another alleged reason for large-scale bank groups is that independent banks is that they are unable to provide for a succession of good management at a lower management expense.

And still another popular notion is that small banks are unable to attract adequate capital to meet their loan requirements if they are to maintain the local community. Another questionnaire dealing with the banks’ public relations is related to this question of adequate capital.

We know that in many instances the public reports made by the banks are extremely poor. We do not believe that small banks could not make loans to businessmen who disclose to them so little of their affairs. So I wonder how we can expect local people to invest in bank stock without more adequate information about the operations of the bank.

Failure to make proper disclosures in public reports raises the investment risk of owning bank stock. Where disclosure is poor, investors in bank stock are taking a chance with a shoe that doesn’t fit, and I am sure they are investing in a less liquid asset. This means that when a bank finds it necessary to sell its stock, the investor must do so at less than fair value, and thus dilute the equity of the previous owner. I am not talking about small banks. We are talking about large banks and large banks have the resources to make reports of a particular type. But we would like to know, and I am sure you would like to know, what the experiences of the different kinds of banks are, on this matter of raising capital.

The second questionnaire deals with corresponding banking services is also intimately related to the differing views which have been expressed as to the need for large­ scale branch banking similar, perhaps to the nationwide branches of grocery stores.

You have all heard it said that branch banking is needed in order to keep the mobility of credit that modern industry and commerce require. Greater mobility is essential. People and corporations require funds may flow from one region of the country to another, with the changes in the sea­ sons, and management-stressful credits demands. Under this arrangement, we hear, the local branches would channel their money into the checking accounts at the home­ quar ters office could handle the credit needs of some national merchandising chain whose headquarters and retail stores are located in its own community.

We are also told that the independent local bank is frequently too small to meet the loan demands of the large customers located in its own community.
We are told that a small, independent bank cannot have the specialized investment analysis that are needed to determine whether or not a local loan application is sound. This is said with particular reference to the outlying country where the bankers have been specialists in agricultural matters but know little about the new industries and service establishments moving in.

Then, it is frequently alleged that the small, independent bank cannot secure customers the quality and variety of services that the branch banks offer. Yet, the same banks, claimed for wide-scale branch banking are enumerated, some of us oldtimers recognize these as the selfsame banks, ready to think correspondent banking supplied.

Let me point out that correspondent banking—if the claim made for it is true—is a very peculiar arrangement which makes banking unique among all the lines of American business. It is an arrangement by which the banking industry can consist of many thousands of locally owned establishments, and still enjoy all of the efficiencies that a single bank would have to be associated with wide-scale operation and concentrated control of an industry.

As the correspondent banking gave high mobility to loanable funds, not just within a State, as the Comptroller of the currency would have it, but across State lines as well.

Country banks put those funds they may find idle at a particular time on deposit with the correspondent banks, and the city banks put their surplus funds on deposit with the banks in the market centers. Conversely, the funds then flow back to the regions and communities where they are most in demand at the moment.

As more and more decisions affecting our everyday lives are made in board rooms of Wall Street or Chicago, we are in more and more trouble—more big government and big labor—and less local self-reliance. How can we manage our local problems then become a nation of clerks and hired hands?

With specific reference to banking, it seems to me that the local banks should all be locally owned and locally managed.

As more and more affecting decisions of our lives are made in board rooms of Wall Street or Chicago, we are in more and more trouble—more big government and big labor—and less local self-reliance. How can we manage our local problems then become a nation of clerks and hired hands?

With specific reference to banking, it seems to me that the local banks should all be locally owned and locally managed.

Now, with your indulgence, I would like to close on a note which may seem unrelated to the subject. I was invited to talk about the current banking situation. We are hearing an awful lot these days about what is wrong with America. We don't hear much about what is good in America. This is most disturbing.

Certainly, no society at any time anywhere has ever enjoyed so much of the material abundance that we have. We have reason to doubt that any society has ever had more of its people engaged in wholesome public and private enterprises directed to enhancing the intellectual and spiritual values of society. Surely it would be hard to find any other current-day society where so many people give their hearts and their labors to the betterment of their communities, their nation, and even their world neighbors.

Let us not forget that we still have the greatest country in the world. And we are all working—all of us—to make it still greater.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE INVESTMENT FREEDOMS OF THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION FTBRUM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency now has pending several bills which would lift restrictions imposed by Federal Reserve Board regulations on the investments of national banks, Federal savings and loan associations, and other institutions subject to Federal law.

The pleasure of discussing some of the provisions of the bills which would increase investment freedoms for Federal loan associations before a meeting of the National League of Insured Savings and Loan Associations at Honolulu on October 23.

Since this matter may be of interest to executives of many of the savings and loan associations whose members we are happy to see at the meeting, as well as to Members of Congress, I would like to insert this speech in the Congressional Record as follows:

Aloha: It is always a pleasure to see my good friends in the savings and loan business, anywhere at any time. But in the beautiful State of Hawaii it is a double pleasure.

While flying out here, I was reminded of the story about the two ladies taking their flight. Upon arrival at their destination, they sought out the pilot and told him, "Please don't go faster than sound because we don't want to feel that we are moving so fast.

As the ladies found out, neither speed nor distance makes things different. And so it is with the savings and loan industry.

Today, the savings and loan business is served by more than 7,000 savings and loan associations, through which more than 3,300,000 savings and loan associations. Credit for the success in building public confidence in the savings and loan industry is due to the savings and loan community, including you and the other operators of savings and loan associations.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has also played an important role in the development of the savings and loan system. As I have heard many of you say, the savings and loan business would not have grown to its present heights without the Bank Board, the Federal savings and loan system, and the nationwide system of the Federal home loan banks.

Over the years we have had some exceptionally fine men on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, but I believe we have never had one to equal Mr. Horne.

No Government regulatory agency has ever worked harder to carry out its mandate from the Congress. Furthermore, Mr. McConnell, during the past year and a half, was worked diligently to secure for the savings and loan business the legislation needed to better serve the nation and home ownership. Mr. Horne, who has only recently become a member of the Board, did a wonderful job as our Small Business Administrator and I know he will give to the savings and loan industry the same loyalty and tireless effort that we have always enjoyed.
as the former president of a large middle western mutual savings bank. He too is an advocate of the savings and loan industry. The Bank Board, however— as you know—is a supervisory agency. It is responsible for looking over your shoulder to make sure that your operations are conducted in such a way that thrift and home financing are balanced with the prudent exercise of business. Let me put it that way, while at the same time allowing private management of savings and loan associations freedom to exercise their energy and ingenuity.

There is no question in my mind but that young people of the future will lend or grow. But the growth you have already attained carries with it new responsibilities. I do not urge you to adopt any new conventionalism, or to settle down into a rut of only tried and true practices. Trial and error experiments with new ideas and new services are the essence of a growing enterprise.

But I do suggest that some of the more flamboyant advertising I have seen recently—giveaway prizes, come-on dividend rates, and so on—is not well conceived to inspire public confidence in a financial institution, in the savings and loan industry generally.

As you know, the administration has recommended that the Home Loan Bank Board be given "standby" controls over dividend rates paid by the Federal savings and loan associations. The bill does not apply to the savings and loan associations. The House passed the bill, and it is important to accept; one of the reasons being that experience has taught us that when an agency has "standby" controls there seems to be an irresistible compulsion to put these controls into active operation. I would hate to see support given to this proposal, by reason of the unsound practices of a few associations.

I must urge you to encourage savings, of course. But there is a question whether a dividend rate war actually encourages savings.

Mr. Speaker, the FDIC, in cooperation with the Home Loan Bank Board, made a survey to find out why people save. They sent questionnaires to a great many people, and the results indicated the reasons why they save. The Foundation then tabulated all of the reasons given and issued a report.

A great many people said that they saved for a rainy day, or for their old age. Others said they saved to put their children through school. Others said that they saved in order to buy a car, a house and so on, for all the reasons familiar to you. I don't think it is any news to say that apparently no one thought to say he saves because of the dividend rate or interest rate he can get on his money.

I suggest, therefore, that the kind of people who put their money in savings and loan associations are concerned first and foremost with the safety of their savings, not with the dividend rate. Such people are going to wonder, as I wonder, whether a savings and loan that pays 6 percent rate at the present time is worth the investment that money in sound enterprises.

Let me turn now to the legislation before the House. While there may be a variety of loan associations each want new or broadened lending authorities to permit them to take advantage of the investment opportunities available in our growing, changing economy. And quite naturally this reflects itself in a number of proposals for change in existing laws. I might add that these proposals have generated some spirited rivalry and differences of opinion among various segments of the financial community.

There is a story about a little boy who had kicked his brother in the stomach. "I'm only seven, you're twelve," said the stomach, "why do you have to kick me?" "Because," said the boy, "I can." Like Tommy, some segments of the financial community are quick to see the others' faults—a condition which makes life a little more difficult for a congressional committee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the record carry a condition that the safety of savings and loan associations should be measured by two standards: One is better service to the public; and the other is a better balance between savings and investment in our economy.

As you know, our committee has just completed extensive hearings on a bill which would increase the lending authority and flexibility of both savings and loan associations. Without giving a final judgment on the merits of all the proposals in this bill, I must say that some of our proposals seem to have great merit, on the basis and standards I have just mentioned. First of all, I must acknowledge a basic difference. The savings and loans today, and of the other financial institutions too, is that they have a surplus of funds and a deficit of good investment outlets. It would be good for the entire economy if these idle funds were put to work. A higher rate of investment would increase employment and step up the rate of economic growth.

One of the proposals which the committee has before us is to permit the Federal savings and loans to make loans on household furniture, appliances, and other consumer durables, only associated with the home. Increased sources of financing for consumer durables of this type should prove advantageous both to the individual consumer and to the savings and loan associations.

A second proposal is to permit the Federal savings and loans to invest in the obligations of State and local governments. It should be advantageous to the savings and loans to help finance municipal improvements, such as roads, streets, and water and sewage systems, etc., because such improvements are frequently necessary to develop suitable building sites for more homes.

Third, the bill would also permit college education loans. Since the savings and loans specialize in the business of managing the family's savings, it would seem appropriate that they be permitted to help finance the children's college education. Because education pays off very handsomely in increased earnings over the working life of the individual, and because education is also one of the ways additional opportunities will benefit the Nation as well as the individuals involved.

Another proposal would permit investment in mobile homes. I must confess my surprise at learning how tremendously the mobile home business is growing, and how many families are now living in such homes.

During the committee's hearings, the distinguished chairman of your legislative committee, Mr. Arthur Courshon, of Miami, Fla., made a brilliant and most persuasive statement in favor of these provisions of the bill, as well as the other provisions which are a little more complicated. I should think that if these associations are frequently needed by the public in this legislation it can be enacted.

While mentioning the most impressive abilities of Arthur Courshon, I would like to add a word about your very wonderful representatives in Washington, Ken Heisler, Karl Katter, Dick Finney, and Joe Tame, and Bill McKenna. These fellows are most able, most pleasant, and always obliging on inquiries from Missouri. Mr. Speaker.

Let me come now to another most interesting legislative proposal which has been before this committee. It is the proposal to create an international home loan bank, or some similar instrumentality, which would be set up to help bring about the right kind of savings and loan associations in the underdeveloped countries, especially in Latin America. This would be a most public-spirited idea. As one of the advanced capitalist countries, we have had the good fortune of learning that economic advancements come through savings. Also we know that in the long run there is no real hope for economic development in the less developed nations, except as these people generate income. And quite naturally this reflects itself in a number of proposals for change in existing laws so that the United States could perform for these people than to make available the talents, wealth, and skill that this country, developed in the management of more than 6,000 savings and loan associations, to show the way to other countries as to how to organize and encourage local savings.

Stimulating local savings will bring about a great many benefits. It is not a Bilderberg no middle class; and it will create public support for stable currencies, against the runaway inflation which is the tendency in so many countries. Helping in this way will also help stem the flight of local capital from these countries.

Ultimately, too, this is the only solution to our own foreign aid burden.

While it is not entirely clear from the testimony given to our committee that Government sponsorship or Federal contributions to this proposed program are necessary, it would actually be a public-spirited idea, clear in everybody's mind, I think, that the general thrust of this proposal is most desirable.

It is an inspiring idea—even an exciting idea—to consider extending the savings and loan movements to our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. I am thinking for just this kind of means of improving yourselves. You are to be congratulated for advancing such a far-sighted and warm-hearted idea.

It is such imagination and spirit as this that has always won you friends in Congress and among the general public.

It is the kind of imagination and spirit that we must manifest if we wish for your continued success. Aloha.

WHY PHYSICIANS SUPPORT HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include unanimous consent on the following:

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on the Budget, have recommended an attack upon the Physicians Committee on Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security and a leaflet, entitled "Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security," which was mailed to Members of Congress.

This attack is surprising. The physicians whose names are attached to the leaflet include some of the most distinguished and best known doctors in our Nation.

Among them are two Nobel Prize winners, Dr. Arthur Kornberg and Dr. Dickinson W. Richards; a recipient of the American Medical Association's Distinguished Service Award, Dr. Michael E. DeBakey; a recipient of the American Hospital Association's Distinguished Service Award, Dr. E. Michael Bluestone; two former presidents of the American College of Physicians, Dr. David P. Barr and Dr. A. W. F. Harmon; and a holder of the Theobald Smith Award in Medical Sciences of the American Association.
for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Irving M. London—to mention just a few of the prominent some of these doctors in the course of their professional careers.

Another of these distinguished physicians is Dr. Benjamin Spock, author of "Baby and Child Care," a book which has received much acclaim and which has been used by millions of parents throughout the Nation.

The New York Times of May 21, 1962, entitled "An Opinion Poll for Medical Care for the Aged" (King-Anderson bill). The paid advertisement was signed by 545 New Yorkers, 144 of whom were M.D.'s.

I congratulate the members of the physicians committee for speaking out on this issue. Their action is good for America and good for medicine. It would be a mistake for our Nation and the medical profession if there were no dissent among doctors on a matter so vital to the health of America.

Since a majority of their colleagues disagree with them, I congratulate them on making their views known publicly. Their courage is exactly what one would expect of leading men and women in any field, as the members of the committee are in medicine.

I also want to congratulate them on the high merit of their leaflet. It is not abused to call attention to so much of the material against hospital insurance for the aged through social security is. It does not predict the downfall of the Republic, the end of our free enterprise system, or the need for a more moderate and bristly stone. It is a soberly written statement of how some physicians feel about this important legislation.

Yet this statement has come under attack in the Congressional Record as containing "inaccurate and misleading statements." I disagree. I find that the information in the leaflet is correct and supported by official Government statistics. In addition, the information presented in the leaflet is corroborated by the report just issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly entitled, "Medical Assistance for the Aged: The Kerr-Mills Program, 1960-63."

I would like to discuss some of the leaflet's points which came under attack in the Congressional Record.

First. The leaflet is attacked because it concluded that the insurance today available to the elderly is "either woefully inadequate or too expensive for the older person to afford."

In the attack on the physicians committee leaflet, it is argued that some 10 million aged have purchased private health insurance policies. But the Wall Street Journal of October 22, 1963, hardly a supporter of the social-security-based hospital insurance legislation, reported that less than 1 million of the 17 million aged have insurance which provides adequate protection against high-cost illness. This conclusion is supported by all the evidence which I have seen.

Second. The leaflet is attacked because it concludes that the Kerr-Mills program, although helpful in many ways, is inadequate to the whole needs of people aged with health care. In refutation of this very balanced and accurate conclusion, it is argued in the Congressional Record that the Kerr-Mills program helps only the people who are eligible for medical aid under a public assistance program. This is not so. It is argued that only 30 percent were transferred from other programs. What is not said is that other people who met the requirements for aid assistance went directly to the medical assistance for the aged program so that the States got the full advantage of the most favorable possible Federal grants. Over half of the recipients meet the Social Security tests of total indigency, and these tests are not generous.

A recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly states:

Even the most conservative of critics would have to concede that, through September 1962, probably well over one-half of all eligible persons were admitted in behalf of persons previously receiving or eligible for medical aid under a public assistance program.

The leaflet is also attacked because it states that Kerr-Mills helps is available only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced. Actually, the leaflet's contention is correct. Let me cite an example chosen, not from a low-income State, but from the State of New York which pays one-third of all the MAA benefits in the Nation. In New York, a couple with no income and no assets except a life insurance policy with cash value of $2,500 would be ineligible for MAA—1 repeat ineligible. The couple would first have to cash in their policy and pay all medical expenses before they could be eligible for MAA. If this action is not using up one's assets before help is obtained, we do not know what does not discourage those who have carefully saved and provided for the future as best they can, I do not know what does.

Third. The Congressional Record statement asserts that 2 million persons received medical care under the old-age assistance program. Therefore, it concludes they should have no fear of health costs.

Yes, 2 million indigent elderly persons do get medical care through OAA. But let us look for a moment at what this means. In the State of Alabama, for example, people living on old-age assistance can get physicians' services only in the 30 days after discharge from a hospital and at no other time. Furthermore, they can only be hospitalized for acute illness or major injury. Even then, they cannot be hospitalized for more than 30 days in 1 year.

If an OAA recipient is sick twice in one calendar year, there is nothing the program can do for him. Unfortunately, sickness is no respecter of calendar years.

Fourth. The Congressional Record attack on the physicians committee leaflet states that the AMA, county medical societies, and Members of Congress have made efforts in recent years to help the elderly. The evidence is that many have been denied medical care because they could not pay for it. And that these efforts have been futile. This is a self-serving argument. I would like to suggest several places to look: for example, among the people who are turned away by public assistance because their illnesses are not yet emergencies, or among those whom physicians, hospitals, nephritis, or cardiovascular diseases who are turned away by public assistance until their cases are extreme.

Fifth. The leaflet is attacked because it points to the use of unsafe facilities
for the care of recipients of Kerr-Mills benefits. The American Medical Association and the King-Anderson committee have asserted that the physicians committee leaflet was attacked. But a careful analysis of each reveals the same story. The physicians committee at this point in the Record and in theCHASES on this subject.

There are many other points on which the physicians committee leaflet was attacked. But a careful analysis of each reveals the same story. The physicians committee at this point in the Record and in theCHASES on this subject.
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States with Kerr-Mills programs may be interested to know that inasmuch as administering them in some instances in a manner actually endangering the health and safety of the aged, this charge, like other charges in the pamphlet, is not documented. So far as Kentucky is concerned, elementary principles of fair play should dictate that the state's experience with Kerr-Mills administrative costs should be examined on the basis of current facts. Administrative costs are reported to be running under 5 percent.

The statement is simply not true that Kerr-Mills assistance is permanently reduced and income are permanently reduced. All the State laws are designed to conserve the recipient's minimum resources and no State requires permanent reduction of income. Resource and income limits are measures of eligibility, intended to assure that tax funds will not be dissipated on those able to finance their own health care. The aged who are eligible suffer no loss of income from the operation of the Kerr-Mills program. On the contrary, their incomes are preserved, not reduced.

A number of States have gained experience with Kerr-Mills programs, have increased the resource and income limits and thus brought benefits to greater numbers of the aged.

The charge that relatives with "modest incomes" may be taken to court is patently a misrepresentation. None of the States with Kerr-Mills programs functioning in January this year had relative responsibility laws. None of these laws is designed to force those with "modest incomes" to contribute to support of relatives. Their own incomes and financial obligations are taken into consideration in determining their ability to assist. It is interesting that the pamphlets say relatives "may be taken into court." Constitutional requirements require that it must be concluded that the sentence is intended to frighten the uninformed.

The pamphlet describes the hospitalization program proposed in H.R. 3920 and S. 880 as insurance, with benefits to be paid as "a matter of earned right." Everyone familiar with the Social Security law knows that current taxes pay current benefits and that an individual's payroll taxes are not set aside for his future benefits. The Internal Revenue Service considers social security benefits as gifts from one group of taxpayers to another and are therefore not taxable. The "earned right" contention implies a contract between recipient and the Government. There is no such contract, no such lawful reasoning. More than 17 million aged who would be entitled to benefits of this legislation immediately, for example, could not claim an earned right, since they would have paid nothing under the program. Furthermore, the $27 million would comprise the majority of eligibles for many years to come. More important to this argument, however, is the assumption that Congress would be foreclosed from amending the law, once enacted, to reduce benefits. This, of course, is nonsense. The Social Security system rests, not on actuarial soundness and financial obligations, but on the power of Congress to reduce benefits as an alternative to increasing taxes if the program runs into serious financial trouble.

The pamphlet has in other respects been careless with facts, stating that the proposed legislation would "permit voluntary solvency of all current beneficiaries" and that such funds would perform certain administrative functions. Congress, the writer must be aware, is not likely to sit back and allow private organizations to perform such functions. It would "utilize State agencies in planning, in determining priorities, in providing services and in consultation to the providers" and would guarantee free choice of physicians.

Private organizations could not on their own initiative step in and perform administrative functions. They could enter the field, however, by providing services and then only by agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on his terms, and those terms not involved in all the functions mentioned only on the Secretary's request.

Free choice of hospital is guaranteed to all the aged eligible for benefits, despite the language of the legislation. Services would be available only in those institutions participating in the program under agreement with HEW. Free choice, as used in this pamphlet and in the legislation, could be guaranteed to the patient only if every hospital and every nursing home and every home nursing agency was forced to participate.

One final observation should be made. The physicians committee for health care for the aged through social security has by submitting this pamphlet to Members of Congress become directly engaged as an organization in lobbying. Has it complied with the law and registered as a lobbyist?

I find no record of this.

I shall have more to say about this physicians committee when I complete my investigation of its memberships' extensive participation in Federal research grants programs and in other programs utilizing Federal funds.

TRIBUTE TO THE TELEVISION INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish, as my first act following this sad weekend, to pay tribute to the broadcasting industry of America for their comprehensive and sensitive coverage of this most tragic event of our century. Criticism of this industry is all too frequent and commendations are rare but commendations are certainly in order for bringing the story of this tragic death and burial of our beloved President to all corners of America and to the world. Their presentation of this story proved to the world that they have matured. Almost without exception, the manner of their coverage was in the best of taste.

I particularly wish to pay a special tribute to the men and women of the three great networks for their sympathetic handling of this event without becoming overemotional but, at the same time, always presenting the tragic aspect of the occasion.

We all recall the charges against this industry and statements with reference to the "vast wastelands," many of which I have agreed with in the past, but I am proud to say as one individual, and as a member of Congress, that the events of the past 4 days have proven that this great industry has finally grown to adulthood and has contributed an outstanding service to America and to the world. I believe it can truly be said that this was television's finest, though saddest, hour.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

Mr. MUTLER. 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. MUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few days have sufficiently demonstrated that President Kennedy is dead. The one among us here in Washington that has suffered a loss greater than ours, however, is the гражданинка who was the wife of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Yesterday's New York Herald Tribune expressed the admiration that all of us have for her in a brief editorial that follows:

PROFILE IN COURAGE

This Nation will not soon forget the remarkable conduct of Mrs. John F. Kennedy. Her calm, her bearing, her endurance throughout the painful pageant of removing her husband's body from the White House to the Capitol spoke eloquently of her inner strength.

The decision to bring little Caroline and John along certainly added to the ordeal, but not to the anguish of personal involvement for the children it was a wise and wonderful thing to let them participate in this deeply sorrowful historical moment.

Once again Mrs. Kennedy showed the poise and grace that marked her days as First Lady. She has written her own "Profile in Courage" in a way to make her country infinitely proud.

THE BITTER FRUIT OF HATE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the fiendish and brutal assassination of President John F. Kennedy is the ugly and bitter fruit of passion, violence, and suspicion of our country which has grown in our country in recent years at a dangerous and alarming rate. It is difficult to understand how even a madman could commit such a hideous crime. As the President said in his farewell address to the American people, the President of our country who had the love and affection of countless millions of people at home and throughout the world.

Perhaps the best answer was given by historian Harry Steele Commager in discussing this tragic event over nationwide television, Professor Commager said that a pervasivce climate of fear, violence, and suspicion has been created in this country since the end of World War II

As a result of these frightenments of an endless cold war, more and more Americans have been ready to preach hatred. But, the professor pointed out:

It is impossible to preach hate and distrust ceaselessly and then to say, when violence occurs, we didn't really mean it. The atmosphere had been created in which some one on the fringe could act.

I have seen evidence of growing bitterness and hate in mail I have received. I have seen it in violent pamphlets and books, and on pages of the Congressional Record. It was evident on the
pages of a big Dallas newspaper on the day the President died.

The tragic events of the horrible weekend of November 22 should awaken the American people to the dangers of propa-ganda which is being broadcast by the hate network in hundreds of cities, the manipulation of events to create distrust, fear, and hatred of public officials and representative government.

Much of the money that funds the hate network is borrowed from Dallas, the scene of recent violence and other events of which the city cannot be proud.

The President's death leaves an emptiness in the hearts of all Americans that cannot be filled. Knowing him as I did, I felt that no other President in all of our history possessed so many good and high qualities for leadership.

He was extremely brilliant and well informed on every important issue. He was dedicated, sincere, kind, and courageous. His greatness will grow with passing time as the goals he envisioned are achieved and the acts of those high ideals he held for justice and opportunity for all. It was my privilege to know him as a giant among men and as a friend.

I will always cherish the memories of my associations with him, and of being a part of his team and his administration in seeking the enactment of legislation that the people and the Nation need to meet the challenge of these changing and dangerous times.

With consent of the House, Mr. Speaker: The following is a letter to the editors of the Sunbury Daily Item, and includes excellent editorials in honor of our martyred President:

[From the Milton (Pa.) Standard] The haters of the world have won a battle but not a war.

In the derangement, the assassin who killed the President of the United States may inadvertently have made as great a contribu-tion to world peace as any man in the past 19 centuries: he has filled all mankind with revulsion to the end result of hatred.

In this century, the name of the most contemptible of redneck 'nigger haters'; he has struck anguish to the heart of the most bigoted political partisan; he has created equal; his heart desires and the slain President, John Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

A glowing light that penetrated areas of darkness on the American scene and was suddenly extinguished, leaving only the hope that the problems so clearly reflected will be attacked with new vigor and with new resolve. The rudest, most brutalizing of East-West tensions are chief among these. And they pose no small task for his successor. Also they challenge the best efforts of a Congress that has been shamefully addicted to evasion of responsibility and deferment of decisions.

It is one of our fondest American democracies that the man chosen by vote of the majority to head the Government thereby becomes subject to criticism by any other living person is subjected to the slings and arrows of disappointment from those whom he has summoned to share his burdens, and also to the criticism of nominal supporters as well as partisan opponents. And this is not to say that differences based on honest convictions are indicative of disrespect or pointless partisanship.

The tragic death of John F. Kennedy has brought into sharp relief the imperative and necessary that he now assumes is great and to assume that he now assumes is great and to succeed in leading this country in his new assignment which is undoubtedly the most difficult of any on earth.

Mr. Johnson is a good man, experienced in the ways of Congress, informed of his country's policies and knowledgeable in foreign affairs. He will undoubtedly make a good President.

Our task, as a Nation, is to demonstrate to the world that we are a united people, dedicated to our ideals. This is our job—let us do it as well as our late President did his.

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to the request of the gentleman from Sunbury (Mr. WICKERSHAM) and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WICKERSHAM)?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following touching editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of November 27, 1963, on the untimely and tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy:

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

His own best memorial will live in his own mind and in the hearts of the people. He will be a great man, serving as a memorial to us, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capitol corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than this, this memorial to him, to the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the Nation a number of things that the beholding world has taken as our own. The cultural center, named in honor of John F. Kennedy, is a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more

L. B. JOHNSON

A SAD DAY

The President's death yesterday leaves an emptiness in the hearts of all Americans that cannot be filled. Knowing him as I did, I felt that no other President in all of our history possessed so many good and high qualities for leadership.

He was extremely brilliant and well informed on every important issue. He was dedicated, sincere, kind, and courageous. His greatness will grow with passing time as the goals he envisioned are achieved and the acts of those high ideals he held for justice and opportunity for all. It was my privilege to know him as a giant among men and as a friend.

I will always cherish the memories of my associations with him, and of being a part of his team and his administration in seeking the enactment of legislation that the people and the Nation need to meet the challenge of these changing and dangerous times.

With consent of the House, Mr. Speaker: The following is a letter to the editors of the Sunbury Daily Item, and includes excellent editorials in honor of our martyred President:

[From the Milton (Pa.) Standard] The haters of the world have won a battle but not a war.

In the derangement, the assassin who killed the President of the United States may inadvertently have made as great a contribu-tion to world peace as any man in the past 19 centuries: he has filled all mankind with revulsion to the end result of hatred.

In this century, the name of the most contemptible of redneck 'nigger haters'; he has struck anguish to the heart of the most bigoted political partisan; he has created equal; his heart desires and the slain President, John Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

A glowing light that penetrated areas of darkness on the American scene and was suddenly extinguished, leaving only the hope that the problems so clearly reflected will be attacked with new vigor and with new resolve. The rudest, most brutalizing of East-West tensions are chief among these. And they pose no small task for his successor. Also they challenge the best efforts of a Congress that has been shamefully addicted to evasion of responsibility and deferment of decisions.

It is one of our fondest American democracies that the man chosen by vote of the majority to head the Government thereby becomes subject to criticism by any other living person is subjected to the slings and arrows of disappointment from those whom he has summoned to share his burdens, and also to the criticism of nominal supporters as well as partisan opponents. And this is not to say that differences based on honest convictions are indicative of disrespect or pointless partisanship.

The tragic death of John F. Kennedy has brought into sharp relief the imperative and necessary that he now assumes is great and to succeed in leading this country in his new assignment which is undoubtedly the most difficult of any on earth.

Mr. Johnson is a good man, experienced in the ways of Congress, informed of his country's policies and knowledgeable in foreign affairs. He will undoubtedly make a good President.

Our task, as a Nation, is to demonstrate to the world that we are a united people, dedicated to our ideals. This is our job—let us do it as well as our late President did his.

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to the request of the gentleman from Sunbury (Mr. WICKERSHAM) and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WICKERSHAM)?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following touching editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of November 27, 1963, on the untimely and tragic death of our late President, John F. Kennedy:

A KENNEDY MEMORIAL

His own best memorial will live in his own mind and in the hearts of the people. He will be a great man, serving as a memorial to us, summoning us to seek our finest nature and to fit it to the difficulties and dangers of our time.

Our own best act of remembrance must continue to be the faith we keep with his imperatives.

But the heart desires and the slain leader deserves a more tangible, more specific memorial, a physical place in the Nation's Capitol corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

There can be no more fitting memorial than this, this memorial to him, to the National Cultural Center.

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the Nation a number of things that the beholding world has taken as our own. The cultural center, named in honor of John F. Kennedy, is a singularly personal leadership, without which it could hardly have achieved its present development.

Mrs. Kennedy, from whom we have learned to bear loss with dignity, was even more
The people of the United States will insist upon a permanent memorial in honor of their 35th President, and I believe that it should be located in or near the Nation's Capital where he labored most effectively in their behalf. I know that many people have definite thoughts as to the type of memorial that should be created. President Kennedy was a man of varied interests and talents. It will take time and study by experts in many fields to arrive at a decision as to a memorial that would best preserve for future generations the image of President Kennedy. Perhaps a cultural center might be appropriate. In any event, we should lose no time in authorizing a start on this study.

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S NEWS MEDIA ON REPORTING THE MOST TRAGIC WEEK IN OUR HISTORY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the request by the majority leader (Mr. ALBERT), I shall withhold my eulogy to President Kennedy at this time until the day officially proclaimed here in the House for paying tribute to our beloved President.

Perhaps it is just as well that the majority leader requested postponing the official tribute to President Kennedy until a later date. Surely our hearts today are still too overcome with grief to be able to put in its full perspective the glory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Nor can one fully assemble today a description which would do justice to the magnificent demeanor of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. President Kennedy was the recipient of an outpouring of emotion across the land which could have led to all sorts of bizarre consequences.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was to a great extent television which, through its dignified, albeit compassionate, reporting of the fast-breaking events that managed to help America retain its composure and its sense of balance.

There was no fanning of the fire; no coaching of those already on the precipice in their rage against this abhorrent act; no hysterical inciting of a population already deeply embittered by the operation of pressures which would benefit the average citizen of this country and bring peace to the world.

We shall retain our pride in his achievements. His conviction which has lasted firm foundations upon which future generations may build.

In his great inaugural address, which we heard with pride less than 3 years ago, President Kennedy said that all work on national problems would not be finished in the first 100 days of his administration—but he urged the Nation to begin that work upon the complex problems which he described.

It will be to his eternal credit that in the brief space of time allotted to him he did a nobler beginning.

In the words of Whitteker:

And now he rests; his greatness and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife
And death has ended, to calm completeness
The statute of his life.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission, which I believe would be the planning and construction of a suitable memorial in honor of the martyred President of the United States.
Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of a whole ocean of emotion dramatically captured by the press photographers and reporters.

Each of those men and women has given a new dimension through their inspiring conduct, both in the press, on radio, and on television. They have insured that our Nation, into infinity, will always present the most compelling argument for a free press.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to even begin to single out individuals for honors, but I should like today to mention one whom I believe we can all agree stands as the first lady of American Journalism.

It is no surprise that the First Lady of American Journalism, the widow of our beloved President, would invite Miss Mary McGrory to the White House Monday for a personal thank you.

Miss McGrory's stirring portrayal of Mrs. Kennedy during her great ordeal has gripped the Nation since last Friday.

The depth of warm understanding which Miss McGrory's portrayal makes us all proud of American Journalism. I should like, Mr. Speaker, at this point to include Miss McGrory's classic portrayal of Mrs. Kennedy's ordeal. This is the kind of writing Pulitzer awards are made of.

To the men and women of America's journalism profession, both to those who work with the written word and those who work with the new magic of electronic journalism, I extend my heartiest commendation for a job exceptionally well done.

As Americans have been able to understand more fully last weekend's tragic events because of the tremendously capable men and women who report the news. Mr. Speaker, Miss McGrory's article, which is an outstanding example of the high caliber of American Journalism, follows:

**THE GRANDEUR OF DEATH: A YOUNG WIDOW BEGINS MOURNING TO TRAGIC CHAOS**

(From Mary McGrory)

Only one person has managed to pierce the black pall of horror and unreality that has gripped the Nation since last Friday. It is Jacqueline Kennedy, the President's widow.

Mrs. Kennedy has borne herself with the valor that is hers by right. Shock alone might have explained her dry-eyed composure. But Mrs. Kennedy has moved with more than the mechanical compliance that sometimes overtake people in appalling circumstances.

Everything she has done seems to be a conscious effort to give to her dead husband the kind of service and grandeur that the savagery in Dallas was calculated to rob it of.

In the grief in which she was trying to show the world that courtesy and courage did not die in Dallas last Friday, nor the tradition that her husband struck down in brutal irrelevance.

She agreed to his burial in Arlington National Cemetery rather than in Boston, so that he would belong to the Nation and would not in the end have the stamp of a local tragedy.

She has overwhelmed White House aids with her meticulous attention to the melancholy arrangements that have had to be made. She designed herself the memorial cards for his requiem mass. She suggested that she should receive the foreign dignitaries who would come from so far away to pay him last honor.

From the moment she arrived back in Washington last week and composed, wearing the blood-stained clothes of the infamous day in Dallas, she has imparted meaning to the contributions.

She has not wanted anything to be lost on the world.

She brought her two children to the Capitol yesterday, no hope of entry. They waited hour after hour in the cold evening. They complained only when interlopers crossed their order to the chaos around them. They waited with good humor and camaraderie.

She came again to the rotunda with her brother-in-law, the Attorney General, at 9 o'clock in the evening. She looked intently into every face she saw in that throng. She walked down Capitol Hill and stopped to talk to a group of nuns.

The crowd was, as a matter of fact, rewarding her with a heroism of its own.

The line stretched for many blocks and remained long after the rudest calculation predicted. They waited with good humor and camaraderie.

Seven blocks from the Capitol dome stood a young woman with a guitar. One of the seven children of a man in his neighborhood carried the guitar case.

Once, when they were always Republicand, the President's favorite song had been "Bill Bailey, Won't You Please Come Home?" They sang it through.

Then they did "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot."

A young boy with a 5-year-old twin boys, said she would wait all night to go in.

A bespectacled Negro said simply, "It's the least, least thing I could do for him."

A woman who had just had a foot operation, stood clutching a tree on the sidewalk. "I hope I can make it," she gasped, "I wouldn't do this for anyone but President Kennedy."

There were students from Syracuse, a couple from New York, a boy from Toronto, and everywhere the crowd was punctuated with the white habits of the underclass. They waited long after their bedtime, pognantly recalling a recent Kennedy quip that while they were always Republicand, the seven children of a man in his neighborhood carried the guitar case.

There were students from Syracuse, a couple from New York, a boy from Toronto, and everywhere the crowd was punctuated with the white habits of the underclass. They waited long after their bedtime, pognantly recalling a recent Kennedy quip that while they were always Republicand, the seven children of a man in his neighborhood carried the guitar case.

One boy watching the funeral procession before the White House bought a wreath for the final rest of his fallen Commander.

It is just what this young woman, hitherto celebrated for her beauty and elegance, has been doing in her own way in these black days.
EULOGY TO THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MATSUZAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an extra section.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUZAGA. Mr. Speaker, the President is dead—the victim of an assassin’s bullet. Hawaii? Was this a product of our vaunted society? Where had we failed? And why? Why? Indeed, the greatest tragedy in our Nation’s history has given us cause for deep reflection on the responsibilities we have to the dream of mankind; he inspired the whole world to raise its voice to greater heights.

After my speech of February 27, 1963, the sole source procurement of the antennas was suspended. Here is what the GAO report says:

"The award of the contract for this proposed procurement had not been made when you addressed the House on February 27, 1963. As the result of your statement, the Navy Department ordered that the award be suspended pending a complete review of the facts."

Later that sole source procurement was canceled.

GAO’s report to me showed that in the past a total of 224 of these antennas have been purchased at an average sole source price of $1,254. Can you conceive of a pil- lager buying a pill at $1,254?

In Jacqueline Kennedy, American womanhood, long epitomized by the pioneer’s wife, has blossomed into full bloom for the entire world to behold in admiration. Burdened by the grief of her late husband, she stood before the world and made her presence known.

In Jacqueline Kennedy, the white rose, she demonstrated how true womenhood—womanhood that was dedicated to world peace and good will—inspired the whole world to raise its voice to greater heights.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1963, I criticized in a speech to the membership of the House the proposed sole source purchase of a control antenna for a drone airplane. My criticisms were based on the fact that the Navy had or should have manufacturing drawings for the AT 948/U antenna and that competitive procurement might be cut in by at least 50 percent.

Today, my study of that case is concluded, and, as was the case of the AS 1018/URC antenna, I have been forced to dig under the red tape and find the real facts, not the extraneous matter.

More important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Navy now has a chance to save $50 but 69 percent of the tax money to be spent on this antenna as a result of competitive bidding forced by me. This compares with the up to $182,000 already wasted on the same equipment.

After I related to the Members the facts surrounding the AT 948/U antenna in my February 27 speech, I asked the Comptroller General to investigate the entire situation and find out if the proposed sole source procurement be stopped until all the facts were known.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General has completed his report and has forwarded his recommendation to me.

It was my contention on February 27, 1963, that the Navy had, or should have, manufacturing drawings. Mr. Campbell’s report did not establish that the Navy had any such data. However, in his report to me, he says the Navy paid for this material and should have been using it.

It might have had it except for the fact that everyone in charge relied on the other guy to get a job done. As a result, nothing was done. One middle-grade employee certified as true what another thought or hoped to be true. The result was that until GAO came into the picture and uncovered the real facts, nothing was done about drawings.

On May 22, 1963, the Navy called the AT 948/U antenna an “off-the-shelf item which is proprietary” to Chu Associates, the developer.

On March 19, 1962, the Navy said:

The AT 948/U antenna was designed and developed by Chu Associates at its own expense.

On October 8, 1962, the Navy said:

There does not, however, appear to be any requirement that the contractor prepare and furnish a complete set of so-called manufacturing drawings.

Even Chu Associates says it never supplied drawings of the antenna because it considered the equipment to be a proprietary item.

There you have it. The rubberstamp brigade. Both the Navy and Chu Associates said, time after time, that the antenna was a patented item, developed at Chu’s expense. But the GAO has dug under the red tape and found that Chu was paid for development of the antenna—by the Navy—and criticizes the Navy for its failure to obtain what it paid for.

As to point No. 2, the waste in past procurements, and the savings in a competitive procurement.

After my speech of February 27, 1963, the sole source procurement of 47 of the antennas was canceled. Here is the GAO report says:

"In view of these facts, it is possible that Dr. Lan Jen Chu or Chu Associates, Inc., developed the antenna’s—antenna family—cost and, therefore, the Government has obtained a royalty-free license to use the patented item."

Still quoting the Comptroller General, "In view of these facts, it is possible that Dr. Lan Jen Chu or Chu Associates, Inc., developed the antenna product—or antenna family—cost and, therefore, the Government has obtained a royalty-free license to use the patented item, including a right to manufacturing drawings, in the production of the equipments by any company selected by the Government."

Mr. Campbell said the GAO plans “to cover this aspect of the development of the antennas in a ‘broader review of electronics procurement currently in progress.’"

There, Mr. Speaker, is point No. 1 of my statement. Navy proclaims for all to bear that there is no right to what it calls Chu’s patented item developed at Chu’s expense. But the GAO has dug under the red tape and found that Chu was paid for development of the antenna—by the Navy—and criticizes the Navy for its failure to obtain what it paid for.

As to point No. 2, the waste in past procurements, and the savings in a competitive procurement.

After my speech of February 27, 1963, the sole source procurement of 47 of the antennas was canceled. Here is the GAO report says:

The award of the contract for this proposed procurement had not been made when you addressed the House on February 27, 1963. As the result of your statement, the Navy Department ordered that the award be suspended pending a complete review of the facts.

GAO’s report to me showed that in the past a total of 224 of these antennas have been purchased at an average sole source price of $1,254. Can you conceive of a piller buying a pill at $1,254?
Competitive bidding works, Mr. Speaker, and even the second low bidder in this procurement proves it. Especially so since it is also the sole source producer who jacked the price up when it operated without fear of competition from other industry.

Using Randesign's bid figure, it is obvious, previous procurements, over $192,000 was wasted. Even using Chu's figures, they show that Chu, the competitive bidder, could have saved the government $970 per unit, that was paid to the same Chu as sole source supplier.

Mr. Speaker, this is another damning indictment of our procurement people who every day in the week commit one atrocity after another on our tax dollars. In this case, as in the case I spoke of here yesterday, the General Accounting Office has ferreted out the real facts at my request, and the conclusion is inevitable.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is this more of the procurement practice in which Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris sees nothing that is a departure from the best. Thomas D. Morris defines BeLieu give little more to their jobs. The resulting inefficiency which proves BeLieu is an inefficient servant such as Mr. WILBON of Indiana: Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last March 19 I spoke to the membership—Congressional Record, page 4570—about the inefficiency and downright stupidity of the Navy Department in conducting procurements for a radar antenna, identified by the nomenclature AS-1018/URC (XMD). That same day I referred the matter to the Comptroller General requesting a complete investigation and report.

Mr. Speaker, I have now received that report and completely reviewed it. Before making the General Accounting Office's findings public, I want to again thank Mr. BeLieu and his staff for their excellent work. Certainly, they are providing a wonderful, needed service to the Congress and to the Nation.

If only the Navy had examined its own actions as did Mr. Campbell. His report to me shows that the Navy lied to prospective bidders for the manufacture of this antenna when it issued a bid document March 7, 1963. It also shows the Navy wasted at least $50,000 in one single past procurement of this antenna. Finally, the GAO report to me knocks down the contention of the former sole-source supplier that drawings cannot be furnished. As a matter of fact, they were paid for by the Navy, and the developer was paid to develop this and other antennas in the 1950's.

Mr. Speaker, this is a perfect example of what passes for the good procurement practice of which you are so proud. This is exactly the type of shenanigans Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris defines as not being a departure from good practice.

The bid document for purchase of the AS-1018 antenna was issued on March 7, 1963, to close April 9, 1963. In a special notice that was a part of the document the Navy stated it did not know if any patents were involved.

When I made my presentation to the House on March 19, 1963, I pointed out that such a vague certification is enough to frighten away many bidders. Not knowing what patent rights might be involved, how strong might be the claim to the rights, industry might well save the approximate $970 per unit by preparing a bid for a defense contract. My feeling was that Navy knew if there were patent rights involved all along, but simply put in that bogeyman to scare away competition.

In his report, the Comptroller General says that 10 days after my speech here on the floor, the Navy amended the bid document to state that only one patent might be involved and that the patent number and gave full information. The information proved that no industry need be frightened by any claim of proprietary rights.

Armed with full information, industry went to work. Seven bidders competed for the contract, and the price per unit dropped to $687, compared to $970 paid to Chu Associates, Inc., Littleton, Mass.—a 50 percent drop in price. Even Chu bid $635 per unit in competition when it got $970 each, sole source, for the antenna.

Thus, using Chu's figures, the low bidder's price to the last sole-source price, there is a saving on this one small contract of over 100 percent because only $109,000 will be spent, instead of the $218,000 last spent under a sole-source contract. Even the competitive producer the best break possible still reflects a saving of $33,000 on this one award, when Chu's competitive bid is compared to that of the low bidder.

Now, what about that phony Navy certification that was amended 10 days after my speech here on the floor? Here is what the GAO report says:

Our review indicates that the Navy's special source origin notice dated March 7, 1963, which stated the Navy did not know if any patents were involved in this procurement, was somewhat less than fully revealing. The Navy did know before March 7, 1963, that Chu Associates, Inc., was asserting a claim to patent rights on this item. Therefore, we can find no support for the Navy's special source notice and we believe the amended statement issued on May 29, 1963, could just as well have been issued originally on March 7, 1963.

There you have point No. 1. Mr. Speaker. The Navy lied, period. Someone in the Navy purposely fabricated a lie to scare away competition. Ten days after being caught red-handed, he tried to cover his tracks. Either alternative would have resulted in more waste but for the fact that I stuck a pin in them and cussed out both of them.

Point No. 2 concerns the Navy's past waste on this procurement. I charged on March 19, 1963, that the Navy awarded a competitive contract to Turbo-Machine Products, Landau, Pa., for $541 per unit, of this antenna. At almost the same identical time it processed a sole-source contract to Chu Associates for 970 each, thus saving $292 a unit, and $50,000 on the sole-source contract.

What does the GAO say of that? It says the contract under competitive bidding was awarded to Turbo-Machine for 107 of these antennas, at a unit price of $541 each. On June 29, 1962, a sole-source contract was awarded to Chu Associates for 151 units of the antenna, at a price of $970 each.

The report goes on to say:

Regardless of the dates of the procurement requests, both of the purchases were being processed during approximately the same period of time. Our review indicates they were being processed independently and that when each was concluded by a contract there was no coordination as to the prices paid for the unit. Thus, although the contract with Turbo-Mach for $541 per unit, we found no evidence that this fact was known or considered in arriving at the price of $970 per unit stipulated in the contract issued to Chu.

In summary, the Navy could have contracted for the item at a lower price if an appropriate delivery schedule could have been arranged.

That is point No. 2. Mr. Speaker. It proves that there was no coordination in Navy procurement; that inefficiency again penalized the American taxpayer. Naves left hand does not even know what its left hand is doing, much less its right.
I suppose this, too, is not considered by the Defense Department as being a departure from good practice.

Mr. Assistant Secretary at the final point.

I contended March 19, 1963, that the Navy should have manufacturing drawings. The Navy had said it did not have them, since the antenna is a patented item.

Navy contract NOber 55111, dated January 1961, required the contractor to submit manufacturing drawings. Almost 2 years later, the contractor submitted inadequate drawings. Four months later, the Navy got around to telling the contractor they were not sufficient; but then, in June of this year, the Navy said Chu Associates could delete proprietary items from the drawings.

I had GAO check out development of this and other antennas, and the GAO report to me says on this topic:

Review did show that research and development contracts were awarded by the Navy to Dr. Lan Jen Chu and to Chu Associates, Inc., during the 1960's that called for research and development, including the development of antennas. Further, our review disclosed that Chu Associates, Inc., had received purchase orders from Government contractors during the 1960's for antennas. In view of these facts, it is possible that Dr. Lan Jen Chu or Chu Associates, Inc., developed the antenna product (or antenna family) as a result of its business with the Government and its prime contractors, and, therefore, the Government should have obtained a royalty-free license to use the patent.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, point No. 3 proves the Navy should have had drawings and could have gotten responsible competition much earlier than was the case. But, here again, inefficiency and incompetency replaced hard work. Taking the line of least resistance and accepting what was stated, without checking into it, replaced intelligent inquiry which would have saved valuable tax dollars.

It will be interesting to see how Navy weasels out of this case, Mr. Speaker. This case is one in which Assistant Secretary Morris must have looked prior to being quoted in the Washington Post of June 30, 1963, that "we haven't found anything we consider a departure from good practice."

Is it any wonder a Member of Congress is disgusted and disturbed when such outright deceit and duplicity is labeled "good" by the No. 1 procurement officer in the Pentagon?

This is exactly the way in which so much of our Defense hardware is being bought. These middle-grade people take the line of least resistance; the other paper pushers sign anything that crosses their desks; and the men at the top rubberstamp their mistakes. That is the reason why our defense dollar is buying less and less worth. This is the reason the working man's tax bill is higher each year.

National defense has been a sacred cow for years, and these people have committed one atrocity after another, protected by this shelter.

In this particular case, the blame must be shouldered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu, under whose supervision the antenna case rests. He is the most inefficient command of the lot. It is by his tacit, unspoken consent that such tricky deals are carried on. Incompetence replaces hard work. Taking the line of least resistance and accepting what was stated, without checking into it, replaced intelligent inquiry which would have saved valuable tax dollars.

A BILL TO PROVIDE THE PROTECTION OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, during the tragical events of this past weekend, I was astounded to learn that it is not a Federal crime to assault or assassinate the President of the United States.

Presently the trial proceedings and the penalty for the assault or assassination of a President are solely determined by the laws of the State In which the crime occurs.

Ironically, it is a Federal crime to kill lesser Federal officials such as a U.S. Judge, U.S. Attorney, Federal Marshal, and FBI, Internal Revenue, and Secret Service agents, as well as certain employees of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

It is inconceivable to me that the protection of President and Vice President be offered to these lesser Federal officials has not been available to our President and Vice President. I have introduced a bill today to amend Title 18, United States Code, section 1114, so that the Presidency and Vice Presidency are specifically covered.

On the heels of this horrible tragedy which has befallen our Nation, I would welcome the support of my colleagues in this effort.

LEGISLATION TO AWARD OUR LATE AND GREAT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY WITH A CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer legislation which would award our late and great John Fitzgerald Kennedy with a Congressional Medal of Honor.

This would be a most appropriate action by this body which once had the services of this distinguished champion of freedom and fighter for world peace.

Few men have had the opportunity to serve our nation nobly for our Mission than the late President, in both bodies of Congress and then for an all too brief period as Chief Executive of the land.

As Commander in Chief of our armed service and one of this honor, Mr. Speaker, and no one will ever have such good cause, even though it must be awarded posthumously.

John Kennedy demonstrated throughout his life, during the Second World War and later until his tragic death last Friday in Dallas, that he had the qualities of courage that make genuine heroes. His life became, in fact, more than a profile in courage, but a case study in courage itself.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, a genuine honor in the House to extend to the new President, in the name of Congress, to award the honor.

It is a small but significant gesture which, in a House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, and, in doing so, demonstrate the honor, respect, and love we have in our hearts for this distinguished American hero.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, all America and much of the world mourns the late President Kennedy. All of us here in the House extend to the new President, in the name of Congress, our deepest condolences to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and the family.

As a young President, John F. Kennedy truly articulated the dreams of America and inspired women and men to new dimensions of service in the cause of peace. His hopeful and courageous approach to the future will long live in the hearts of the people.

Who can forget his call to a new generation of Americans—"ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Who can forget his injunction to "invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors" in exploring the stars, conquering the deserts, eradicating disease, tapping the ocean depths and encouraging arts and culture?

Who can forget his recognition of the great truth that our "revolutionary beliefs"—including the rights of man "come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

Now that he has passed—but with us still—let us remember his imperatives: First, "that our strength as well as our convictions have imposed upon this Nation the role of leader in freedom's cause."

Second, that "continued Federal legislative inaction—on civil rights—will continue, if not increase, racial strife—causing the leadership of both sides to
pass from the hands of reasonable and responsible men to the purveyors of hate and violence.”

Third. That in building the peace—“together we shall save our planet or together we shall perish in its flames” and that in our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has actually been achieved.

Finally, do not his words before the Massachusetts Legislature bear relevance to each of us here in the Congress:

Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the State—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: whether we were truly men of courage—were we truly men of judgment—were we truly men of integrity—were we truly men of dedication.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in this hour of stage, folly for our country, may we stand as one man back of our President and our Government. May Almighty God guide and sustain President Lyndon Johnson.

CHURCH SERVICES DEVOTED TO A MEMORIAL TO OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include messages from the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Europe and South America.

MESSAGES OF SYMPATHY FROM MEMBERS OF THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION IN EUROPE AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following cables have been received by me to transmit to the U.S. national group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and to the Congress. They are the expressions of sympathy of the Inter-Parliamentary Union from its Secretary General, Mr. de Blonay, and from the same group on behalf of the Council, and the president of the Union, Mr. De Ananei; from the Spanish group through its president, Mr. De Ananei; from the Brazilian group through its president, Mr. De Ananei; from the Italian group through its president, Mr. De Ananei; and from the French group through its president, Senator Mouet.

I ask unanimous consent to include the seven cables, with three translations, in the body of the Record.

I know that I interpret the sentiments of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in requesting you to transmit to the U.S. Group our feelings of profound emotion and deep sympathy in the tragic passing of President Kennedy, a great champion of democracy and peace.

BLONAY, Secretary General, November 23, 1963.

PARIS, November 23, 1963.

Ms. G. de Blonay, Inter-Parliamentary Group, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.: Suite certain interpreter sentiments union toute entiere en vous prions accepter et transmettre groupe American sentiments profounde emotion et sympathie emus a l'occasion tragique disparition President Kennedy grand serviteur de la democratie et de la paix.

BLONAY, Secretary General.

DEPUTADOS BRASILIANOS, November 23, 1963.

KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We extend our sympathy to the American people in the tragic event President Kennedy's death. Not only the United States but the whole world mourns one of its greatest leaders.

BLONAY, Secretary General.

VITORIA, November 24, 1963.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of Spanish group Interparliamentary Union, I express American group our most sincere condolences.

BLONAY, Secretary General.

BRASILIA, November 26, 1963.

KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply grieved tragic death President Kennedy I present name Brazilian group and my own expression our deepest sympathy.

RUI PALMEIRA.

The Inter-Parliamentary group of the principality of Monaco is deeply shocked at the tragic event that has put the United States and the world in mourning. We express our profoundest sympathy, Mr. De Ananei; and the deep emotion of the members of the National Council and the whole population of Monaco.

LOUIS AURELLIA, President.

MRS. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
U.S. Interparliamentary Group, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Touched for the tragic loss President Kennedy on behalf of Italian group please accept deepest condolences while joining to the nation's.

LOUIS AUDIGLIA,
President.

ROMA, November 25, 1963.

MRS. ST. GEORGE, Chairman, United States of America Group IPU, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Touched for the tragic loss President Kennedy on behalf of Italian group please accept deepest condolences while joining to the nation's.

VODACCI FANELI.

Deeply shocked by your national mourning. The French national group wishes to express its very sincere and deep compassion.

MOUTET.

PARIS, November 25, 1963.

MRS. PRESIDENTIAL ST. GEORGE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Profondement bouleverse par votre deuil. Le peuple francais vous exprime ses sentiments sincere et bien vive compassion.

MOUTET.

THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

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, on November 23, 1963, John F. Kennedy died in action. A young man in the height of his powers, he gave his life for his country. May God comfort his loved ones and give guidance to President Kennedy in his constitutional tasks.

As Mrs. Lindsay and I paid tribute to the late President at the East Room of the White House the day after his young life was cut short, and later in the great Rotunda of the Capitol, and finally at Arlington Cemetery, our thoughts were with Mrs. Kennedy, the children and the family, with our countrymen, and with the people of the 17th Congressional District in whose name and honor she stood in our Congress.

Out of the wreckage perhaps there will emerge a greater sense of the Nation's needs and fresh determination to get on with the job. The Congress has been divided and deadlocked on civil rights and other great issues of our time. Perhaps the late President's tragic death will bring into focus and perspective the futility of putting private prejudices ahead of public needs and human rights.

Always out of the deepest dark of the night there comes the first rays of the new sun and the new day. This week we commemorate Veterans Day and though we mourn our President and weep for his widow and children, we have much to be thankful for.

We are thankful that the world is in relative peace.

We are thankful that each American family will have Thanksgiving.

We are thankful that providence gave us John F. Kennedy even for a short while.

We are thankful that out of the ashes there can come a new sense of unity and commitment to values and purposes other than self.

We are thankful that in the new day the tensions and bitterness arising from unsolved problems of human rights may at last be solved by a people and a Congress awakened to the need for action.

We are thankful that this we can do in memory of the late President.

We are thankful that the unity and partnership of the Western World has been reaffirmed and rededicated by the act of respect and honor to the monarchs, presidents, and prime ministers of the Western World, and kings and queens of our troubled world.

Finally, we are thankful for and have a new awareness of the moral fiber, courage, and strength of the American family, because we have been shown by Jacqueline Kennedy that the American family has that character, courage, and strength.

For all of these things we are grateful. Mr. Speaker, and for these reasons this Thanksgiving will carry extra meaning for every American home.

PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE REPORT NO. 914 ON H.R. 7152

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and the following members of the Committee on the Judiciary are extended unanimous consent of December 2, 1963, to file additional views to accompany House Report No. 914 or H.R. 7152: Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MACCHIO, and Mr. BROMWELL.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. BROMWELL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Kennedy, like a clang of bells, tells us that we have been remiss.

Assassination, because of its effect on the operation of this Government and because of its infinite consequences, is a different crime from murder.

Nothing is more completely or appropriately part of the Federal performance than the security of the functions of Government by protection of the physical safety of its officers. I shall offer a bill to extend existing law to protect the lives of all Presidents so long as they live and the lives of all elected officials of the Federal Government, members of the Cabinet, and the Justices of the Supreme Court during their terms of office.

I shall also prepare a measure which will make punishable armed assault on any such officials during the same periods.

I commend consideration of these measures.

LINCOLN'S SPRINGFIELD MOURNS ANOTHER

Mr. FINDLEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President Kennedy has unusual meaning for Springfield, Ill. Ninety-eight years ago that prairie community knew the sorrow of bringing home for final rest the remains of another martyr President, Abraham Lincoln. Springfield, killed—like Mr. Kennedy—in the prime of his life and in the prime of his service to his country by an assassin's bullet.

Springfield had sent young Lincoln to Congress and had seen him rise to national fame in the Lincoln-Douglas series of debates over slavery. On February 11, 1861, the citizens of Springfield received Lincoln's affectionate farewell, as the President-elect entered the train that was to take him to the White House. Four years later he returned to Springfield in a coffin.

Jack Heintz, the present publisher of Springfield's Illinois State Journal, a paper that reported Lincoln's assassination, this February 11, 1861, in his Illinois State Journal.

We are thankful that each American family has that character, courage, and strength.

For all of these things we are grateful. Mr. Speaker, and for these reasons this Thanksgiving will carry extra meaning for every American home.

What kind of man is this? At 1 p.m. I look out my window at a street Christmas decoration which is now black. A man has died at the hands of a bandit. The streets are darkened by a drizzling rain which echoes my despair. What manner of man is this who would differ so violently with a father, a husband, a country's leader who would do what he felt in his heart was best for his fellow American, fellow man? May God have some mercy on his soul to the end of his violent, misshapen, and malicious days.

The Journal's companion newspaper, the Illinois State Register, the same day carried this front-page black-bordered editorial:

NATION IN STATE OF SHOCK AT PRESIDENT'S TRAGIC DEATH

Our beloved President is dead, victim of a bullet fired by a cowardly assassin. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, who lived for the celestial truths, who lived for the rest of the world, who died for the United States of America, who lived for the great achievements of his people, who lived for our nation, who lived for our people, who lived for the peace and the security of the functions of Government by protection of the physical safety of its officers. I shall offer a bill to extend existing law to protect the lives of all Presidents so long as they live and the lives of all elected officials of the Federal Government, members of the Cabinet, and the Justices of the Supreme Court during their terms of office.

I shall also prepare a measure which will make punishable armed assault on any such officials during the same periods.

I commend consideration of these measures.
A MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy has taken from us a great and enlightened leader, a noble soul and a gifted citizen of the Republic.

This tragic end to the young and spirited life of our President has brought to our community a period of deep sadness and mourning as the full magnitude of our Nation’s loss becomes more apparent with each passing hour.

It is a day of deep sorrow, while our hearts and prayers go out to Mrs. Kennedy and her little ones, and to the entire Kennedy family, our minds turn to the need for a lasting and suitable memorial to our late President. I can think of no greater memorial to his life and times than a development of the full truth behind his assassination.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY’S UNDELIVERED SPEECH

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time of tragedy there is much that all of us could say, yet in a sense there is nothing to say. In this hour of national and international grief let us dedicate ourselves to the principles and purpose of President John F. Kennedy; let us unite in common determination to cleanse our land of outrages and vituperation; in doing so, let us consider the words of our beloved President which he had prepared to deliver to the Dallas Assembly. In that speech, an eloquent statement of American policy, it is significant that President Kennedy intended with words of reason to caution against the doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness.

The text of the undelivered speech follows:

TEXI PREPARED FOR DALLAS
I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Citizens Council, to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is significant that symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city. Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.

The advancement of learning depends on community leadership in financial, political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership’s hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from M.I.T. to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking graduate research center.

LINK IN WORLD AFFAIRS
This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of any country—but the facts, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country’s security. In a world of complex problems, in a world of fullness of frustrations and irritations, America’s leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land—voices holding opinions wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness.

At a time when the national debt is steadied at the expense of the burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when the seeking of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed burdens are more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

The strength of a nation, or a plan...

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But who else than that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British Fleet that kept Germany from the English Channel. It was not General Marshall’s speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe; the frontiers of the free world were made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo or send East German troops to maintain offensive missiles on Cuba.

But while our goals were at least temporally obtained in those and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use. Let us consider the meaning of the principles we stand ready to defend.

REVIEWS AREAS OF STRENGTH

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive preschools to the most subtle places. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation’s progress in each major area of strength.

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the inevitability of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year—increased by more than 70 percent over our initial Polar commitment. In increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of strategic weapons available in our strategic alert forces.

Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken recently in the weapons to improve the speed and certainty of...
their response, their readiness at all times to receive orders and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone, for while we have accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the number of nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe—there are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons—and increased the strength of the Marines.

As last month's Operation Big Lift—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern air defense—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, in surprise landings in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, depend directly on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice.

Certainly in the view of these nations can be painful, risky, and costly, as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the great American adventure. For even as the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of the formal commitment of a member of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign-aid program, and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

MOST FOR NINE COUNTRIES

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc: nine countries whose security, directly or indirectly, with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of those countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own chiefs of staff think needed in the common defense.

Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist aggression. We have increased overseas deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help—by aid or by sales—would be felt directly, without in $100 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign-aid program is not growing in size; it is, on the contrary, smaller now than it was 20 years ago. But we have undertaken to correct them, and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase weaknesses by emasculating essential programs.

Dollar for dollar, in or out of Government, there is a fact in each program. In our national security our most abused foreign-aid program. We cannot afford to lose the watchman on the walls of world freedom. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 10 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communists bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

LOGS THROUGH BALLOTS

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as a way of life for everyone.

That is why our information agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of English-language programs by 30 percent—increased Spanish-language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin-American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the corners of the earth.

And this is why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined efforts of our allies under taken during the lifetimes—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any fear that strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system will not ensure our success.

Our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the corners of the earth.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice is forced upon them by the starvation and the hunger of people who live in a world in which we live. And only America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defense of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strength for victory as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most Western Europe in the rate of business expansion.

And the margin of corporate profits—by a wide margin over almost any of our overseas competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate incomes taxes by $4 billion in 1965. And as we have done for this Nation of the long-est and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass the $1 trillion mark. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporate profits after taxes—which have risen 45 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 billion.

The watchman on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of one another's confidence—may we may exercise our strength and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of people of earth, good and bad—must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago, "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. JOELSON. 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. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in a sunny street last Friday, a moment in time was made timeless in tragedy. And now we mourn our lost President.

The sense of revulsion that humanity has reached this other may be tempered by the sure knowledge that it is also produced the nobility that was John F. Kennedy.

He has left us a legacy of high purpose and idealism. Our willingness to accept this inheritance and our active commitment to it would be our finest memorial to him.

May God grant him sweet repose.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

NATIONAL HOME

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to make the Members of Congress aware of a very wonderful and unique institution located at Eaton Rapids, Michigan.

This institution is operated by a great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and
Department of Montana built a modern dairy farmstead to house the Holstein cows, which were originally started by South Dakota and provide modern and sanitary dairy equipment.

It seems that when one loves our home attempts to discuss or describe this great institution it is difficult to restrict the amount of time and space.

On June 30, 1962, our annual audit, certified by a CPA, showed the fixed assets of the home, including the buildings, homes, land, furniture, fixtures, and equipment, to have a total value of $1,805,084. I think you would be interested in knowing how the money is obtained for the care and education of the children at our national home.

Primarily, the source of income is threefold:

First, funds are obtained from the sale of Christmas seals to the members of the VFW and the ladies' auxiliary; and very importantly, the annual sale of the VFW buddy poppy provides vital help and income; naturally, a third category are the legacies and auxiliaries, as well as donations and bequests from individuals who love this home so very dearly.

I would say that the national home of the VFW is in the very forefront of children's homes regardless of location in providing a homelike, noninstitutional atmosphere. Family-sized living units each have a house mother and provide a typical American camp in suburb-an-like surroundings, with complete integration into school, civic, and religious life of the nearby community of Eaton Rapids. The house mother prepares the food for her family unit, and I can assure you that I have sampled this food and would say that it is of excellent quality and that each meal is prepared and eaten in the same manner as it would be in an average American home. The blessing is offered, and the trials and tribulations of juvenile life are discussed by the children with their house mother.

The VFW has never felt it would be wise to set up private schools on the homestead, and has provided that school facilities for the various life-styles in schools and in churches of the children's own choice in Eaton Rapids.

During its nearly 40 years of service, the VFW national home has provided care for a great number of children, many of whom lived there during their entire childhood. Hundreds have graduated from Eaton Rapids High School and a great number have gone on to schools of higher learning, including universities and trade schools. The higher learning is usually on scholarships provided by various individuals, VFW organizations, or by the home itself. More than 150 of our children served in World War II and Korea, and 3 of our fine young men paid the supreme sacrifice. Many received medals and citations and were wounded in service. They, like their fathers, have joined that great group of comrades who have served this Nation so very well.

The alumni of our home make up an impressive list of engineers, lawyers, doctors, businessmen, farmers, nurses, secretaries, and homemakers who provide care for their own children. They have
fitted themselves well into the social and industrial life of our Nation. Most of our graduates now have their own families, and those who lack a permanent home often return for visits, along with which gave them their chance in life. If the VFW had no other function, its existence would certainly be justified by the fact that it has helped to raise and care for our children.

May I conclude by saying what inspired these remarks before the Congress. The VFW national home is operated by a board of trustees, made up of 10 home districts representing the States of the United States. This board serves a period of 5 years on staggered terms, so that two trustees are subject to election each year. This year I was honored by election to the board of trustees, representing district 4, which is Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana.

The other new trustee to join the board was Dr. Guy C. Richardson, of Bristol, Va.

At its first meeting, the board elected Mr. Redwig Olson, of Denison, Iowa, as president, and Benjamin F. Winn, of Rohnert Park, Calif., as vice president. The board also reelected Charles A. Wagner, of Dearborn, Mich., as attorney, and Mrs. Hedwig Rhind, of Dearborn, Mich., as attorney, and secretary-treasurer. Both of these men have served the home for many years.

Other trustees are Thomas Bennett, of Bridgeport, Conn.; Mrs. Gertrude Rhind, of Wilmington, Del.; Mr. William R. Baker, of Winsboro, Tex.; Mr. Fred E. Barrett, of Chester, Mont.; Mr. Walter J. Gates, of Galveston, Tex.; and Mr. Wellington Rupp, of Seattle, Wash.

MONTANA FARM IN MICHIGAN AT THE VFW'S NATIONAL HOME

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana (Mr. Olsen) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recorders and include an article.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, in carrying on the discussion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home, it is with great pride that I point out the participation of my State of Montana in making this national home a reality.

Mr. Speaker; this national home provides for what every mother and father in every section of our beloved country prays for. A place in the world where children may grow up, pursuing their quest for peace and contentment in a climate of peace and universal goodwill.

To explain fully the work the Montana VFW and auxiliary have done in making the Montana Farmstead a reality and a paying entity at the home, I include in this article appearing in the March 3 issue of the Great Falls Tribune at this point in the Record:

MONTANA FARM IN MICHIGAN

(By Rita Lindstrom)

One of the most unusual of Montana farms is deep in the dairyland of another State.

It's the Montana Farmstead at the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home in south-central Michigan 23 miles from the State capital of Lansing.

The VFW National Home is a unique village of 150 children, so that it is available only to widows, sons, and daughters of VFW members. It is also one of the most childfully developed children's villages in the world.

Playing a large part in the financial and educational success of the Montana Farmstead, the pride of Montana VFW and auxiliary members who have more than 366,000 invested in this modern dairy farm.

A Montanan, Fred Barrett, of Chester, has an important role in the operation of the home. He was elected president of the home board last October and will serve until October 1963. It was founded in 1925, the VFW National Home was a single farm cottage and a group of farm buildings on 472 acres. From the first family, the widow and 6 children of Sgt. Edward Pollett, it has grown to a present capacity of 150 children. There are now 165 children and 40 housekeepers at the home.

The home today has 50 units, including 23 cottages on the main campus, a 250-bed hospital, nursery, guest lodge, chapel, clothing and grocery store on a 50-acre campus, and the Montana Farmstead, with 400 acres of fertile dairy and orchard land.

The home was developed entirely within the VFW organization. State department officers have provided many improvements, including family-sized cottages, a service center, picnic ground, private laundry, day nursery, pool, addition of the paper-softening system, firefighting equipment, and paved streets.

Not all State organizations have had unit projects in the Montana home. From all States are welcome if they meet eligibility requirements. There is no distinction as to creed.

When the Montana Veterans of Foreign Wars Department began its dairy farmstead project at the home in the fall of 1957, there were only an old barn and a farmhouse at the location.

Now there are a 10,000-bale hay barn with concrete yard, a $50 by 150-foot cattle barn or loafer parlor for the dairy cows, a modern milking parlor, new fencing, and new silos and concrete yards. The Montana Farmstead was originally only an old barn and an empty pasture, but children from all sections of the State are enrolled.

All finances for the home are direct donations from VFW and auxiliary members with the exception of the bountiful sale, which is VFW-sponsored—1 penny for every poppy sold goes to the home. The sale of VFW Poppy Seeds to VFW and auxiliary members accounts for the largest single income item, about $200,000 net annually. The current operating budget is over a half million dollars.

The home has pioneered in certain aspects of residential child care methods and is recognized as one of the foremost in the United States. Child care experts from all over the world visit the home, many of them at the suggestion of United Nations, to observe and learn its methods.

No children are adopted from the home. Families are encouraged to bring their children, at the home has been there for more than 3 years, some for their entire childhood.

Children can visit Eaton Rapids, 4 miles distant. Those old enough to attend church are required to affiliate themselves with the church of their family. Church services are conducted in the auditorium.

Many home graduates have gone on to college, helped by VFW and other scholarships. More than 160 have served in the Armed Forces. Graduates who now have their own families often return to show their children the home that gave them a good start in life.

The home is one of the ways in which the VFW keeps faith with its membership in “honoring the dead by helping the living.”

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Bay) may extend his remarks at this point in the Recorders and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the ramifications of the nuclear test ban treaty are of concern to all of us and we will continue to study them as time goes on. If you recall, the Kennedy administration had to deal with the Russians on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. What is, if any, is it carrying?

The SPEAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Dr. Lev Dobriansky, which appeared in the Ukrainian Quarterly November 26, 1962, be inserted:

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND THE COLD WAR

(BY LEV E. DOBRANSKY)

With the so-called first step toward guaranteeing the peace, it is high time for all Americans to learn an old Turkestan proverb: “When you travel with a Rustan, pay attention to what he says or at least what he leaves behind, for you may well be raising the biggest hoax of the cold war.” The home is the beginning of the end of the cold war itself. Many Americans already are talking in this uncritical vein. If such talk should assume serious proportions, testing could begin in earnest and the Kennedy administration has decided to travel with the Russians on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. What is, if any, is it carrying?

The home is the beginning of the end of the cold war itself. Many Americans already are talking in this uncritical vein. If such talk should assume serious proportions, testing could begin in earnest and the Kennedy administration has decided to travel with the Russians on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. What is, if any, is it carrying?
The Russians, but yet...evaluation of Russian cold war calculation. The treaty and its assumed observance will in no way lead to the cessation of the cold war. The superpowers will be required to regard as even the first step to any such eventualities. Indeed, to think in the most simplistic terms could end up without the necessary collapse of the imperial structure maintained by Moscow and its successors. Karl Marx wrote, "each party to the Cold War..."}

"...is certainly capable of more than nothing. Yet...we shall feel the brunt of all this. Whether we like it or not, the demands for cold war education on our part will be even more evident.

"...is the crucial..."

"...amidst a mass..."

"...in a way..."

"...is basically adventitious, as well as narrow rigidity, in coping with the political realm on a rich heritage of..."

"...or in the pursuit of these wars of liberation..."

"...in the beginning to realize that communism..."

"...in the historical works. This was the philosophical-ideological pitch made by Khrushchev; this has been the Russian image far..."

"...are the..."

"...are the..."

"...are the..."

"...The treaty and its assumed observance will in no way lead to the cessation of the cold war. The superpowers will be required to regard as even the first step..."
instrument of ideological deception manipulated by the Soviet Russian imperial-colonialism; that Marxism is a false credential in the Soviet Russian image, a facade behind which the real forces of imperialism and colonialism operate; that the real struggle is not between capitalism and communism but, in-between freedom and Soviet Russian totalitarianism; and that Moscow's cold war manipulation of a perverted ideology is not a neutral force, like the clerics, but that colonial exploitation in this substrate empire is rife.

Accumulated evidence clearly shows that when we strike out against ideological communism, scarcely a ripple is produced in Mos­cow. On the other hand, when we penetrate the ideological veneer and merely scratch the real enemy of Soviet Russian imperialism, the bear squeals. Much remains to be done in exposing the philospho­ideological fraud of the Soviet Russian image, and actively a study of Marxism can do it. Positi­vely, a study of Marxism and its historical interpretations and insights into the Soviet Russian imperial-colonial system, war activity, and the perennial goals of Russian statism helps immensely in the forma­tion of accurate historical perspectives on war activity, and the perennial goals of Russian statism. We have no problem in projecting the image of an expanding nation­ally-colonialistic, numerous so-called minorities and ethnic groups, similar to the United States. In fact, this fallacious concept is confused in the test of history. When, on the other hand, the U.S.S.R. is shown to be an imperio-colonial system in which many different nations are held in captivity, Moscow is completely stilled. The U.S.S.R. has not made any attempts to cast the image of multinational fraternality and brotherhood.

The Soviet Russian potential village is a "prison house of nations." Today, this concept is no less applicable to the Commis­sars of the Soviet Russian Union, the political component in the Soviet Russian imperialism. When, as in the case of Marxism and Communist ideol­ogy, we fail to analyze critically the terms in which the U.S.S.R. is shown, the U.S.S.R. but the Soviet Russian image is a "prison house of nations," a basic empire which forms the foundation of the expanded Soviet Russian imperialism. The exploitation in this substrate empire is rife. The more we concentrate on the true nature of the U.S.S.R., the more Moscow is com­pelled to defend its false image of multi­national coexistence, and the more we see the opportunities before us in the cold war. How all this came to be what it is, is the clue to an understanding of the last remaining major empire in the world. In this vital score is abundant. When Khrushchev in July 1959, exploded over the Captive Nations Week resolution, he did so because, for the first time, an official act of our Government pierced the false image of the U.S.S.R. In 1960 he appeared in the U.N. purposely to deride growing atten­tion in this country on the imperio-colonialism that prevails in the U.S.S.R. by stating that the U.N. does not call it "imperialism and colonialism." Down to this day, when pressure is exerted and the false image of the U.S.S.R. is challenged, Potemkin Village—placed under critical scrutiny, Moscow takes to the defensive in an attempt to perpetuate this perverted ideology. For ex­amples, for instance: (1) the series titled "The 15 Soviet Republics, Today and Tomor­row" (GoverLiv Books, London, 1963) is a case in point. Ordered by Moscow TV mass-printing in England soon after the Captive Nations Week resolution, the UNESCO study, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." (by I. P. Tushman and S. Rojin, UNESCO, 1965), was well received, but to what effect? It has been impossible to obtain—including, it is said, Ambassador Stevenson—is a study about the "truths designed to preserve at all costs the political component of the Soviet Russian image."

Here, too, the work remains to be done. Yet, when our own Secretary of State believes the Soviet Union is a his­toric ally of the United States, and China, and Ukraine are "traditional parts"—only to be completely contradicted by our U.N. ambas­sador shortly thereafter; when we spend $20,000 for an arms control and disarmament study (Walter Mills: "The Political Control of an International Police Force") to be told that "whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200-million-old Rus­sians and the many additional millions in the satellite states"; when, repeating an old adage, we solemnly tell the Soviets that it is an American interest to see the end of na­tionhood as it has been historically defined," the question cannot be emphatically helping in preserving the Soviet Russian image. Regrettably, even the President af­fects the cause of truth when in his Ameri­can University address in June 1963 he stated the quarter-truth that "no nation in the history of the world has suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War." We need hardly wonder nowly in Yugoslavia, Bukorussia and other non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R., who actually suffered the chief brunt of the Nazi German invasion, must react to this misleading statement of an American President.

OThER COLD WAR MUSTS FOR US

The economic, military and cultural com­ponents of the grand Soviet Russian Police Image are subject to the same critical analysis for practical disintegration. From every view­point, the colonial economy in the U.S.S.R. is essentially a underdeveloped economy with overdeveloped ambitions. One cannot but express amazement at times of some of the contradictions: a national economy and the Soviet imperial economy, as though the two in essence were compar­able. From an economy that in forty years has found it difficult to solve the ele­mentary problem of adequately feeding its population, we have little to fear in terms of civilized economic progress.

Militarily, the U.S.S.R. is, of course, an im­posing power. But, its quantitative equip­ment, furnished by its industrial technocracy and cold war economy, is no guarantee of its ultimate qualitative power. The military history of Russia's imperial forces in this century alone fails to attest to such ultimate power in the world.

The grand image induces timidity and fear in intended victims. We are the prime tar­get of this projected Soviet Russian image. It is an image that has been steadily de­fated, and tactfully destroyed. America's victory in the cold war, with peace but to­gether with the people, and freedom, necessitates that these things be done. We cannot repent too often Marx's own observation on the Russian Empire: "The only way to deal with a pow­er like Russian is the fearless way." The par­tial victory of the cold war is not an ex­pression of such fearlessness. The inten­sified cold war should induce it.

The LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUMSFELD) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and abide extraneous remarks.

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

There was no objection. Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I inclu­de in the Record the following editorial comments which indicate, as well as any word can, the depth of feeling, the profound shock, and the grief and sor­row which is felt by the people of Illinois.

A dedicated, valiant, and sacrificing leader has been taken from the Nation by an incomprehensible act of violence. With heavy hearts, we join with millions across the globe in mourning his loss, in extending our prayers for his family, and in pledging our support to our new President at this time of national crisis.

The editorial comments follow:

[From the Chicago Sunday American, Nov. 24, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT WE'VE LOST

American charge of President Kennedy from John F. Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson has been brought about by—methods dreadful­ly familiar in some countries, but strange and shocking in the United States. It is especially tragic that the victim of this assassination should have been the laughing President Kennedy.

While he lived, he was leader of the world—the free part of the world—and he led not only because he commanded the most resources of the United States but also be­cause he awakened faith in his purposes among people everywhere.

In his own country he led with imagina­tion and courage. In this time of great and powerful men, he was a modest, young man who had a great heart because he was a believer in change: he looked for good to come out of it, so he was not timid about letting old values go. He felt the country would benefit by the change. Although some of his suggestions were not acceptable to many conservative minds, the American people are not among them. Because, in general, he taught them to examine novel ideas for themselves instead of respond­ing by default as a minority to the teachings of tradition dictated.

The manner of his death is shocking as well as sorrowful. Had he lived, the people of this country would have felt the presence in this country of a mind that could not differ without hate, and did not hesitate to act to benefit the greater good. This is the spirit in which free people can govern themselves.

[From the Sun Times, Nov. 23, 1963]

The American people mourn John F. Ken­nedy. Their sympathy goes to his wife and his children. His death is as deeply shocking in the United States. America must be a land of open debate, not poisonous recrimina­tion.

The American people mourn John F. Ken­nedy. Their sympathy goes to his wife and his children. His death is as deeply shocking in the United States. America must be a land of open debate, not poisonous recrimina­tion.

President Kennedy lies dead, a martyr in the cause of democratic government. His countrymen weep in sorrow and in anger.

The immensity of the crime can hardly be grasped in these hours of confusion that surround the announcement of the chief of the most powerful Nation in the world.

The Nation is left temporarily without a leader. Vice President Johnson will lead.
the heavy burden of the Presidency and the peculiar pressures which threaten to diminish the country's honor.

And it should change the temper of our times. At the moment the motive that lurked in the twisted mind of the killer is not fully understood by the world.

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as burning of buildings, race riots, shipyard, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.S. presidential carriages.

All of these acts of violence are the work of persons who, fundamentally, do not believe in a democratic government operating under a rule of law.

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as burning of buildings, race riots, shipyard, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.S. presidential carriages.

All of these acts of violence are the work of persons who, fundamentally, do not believe in a democratic government operating under a rule of law.

The preachers and whisperers of hate and disunity, who undermine confidence in our Government and our public officials by irresponsible attacks on their sanity and loyalty, plant the motives in the heads of those who pull the triggers and toss the bombs.

Those who impugn the motives of our national leaders, who defy the courts and disrupt the work of the United Nations, who would not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the nation before the world.

Mr. President, is there any question in the minds of those who dare to stand by Mr. Kennedy's head in the crossfire of a rifle sight yesterday.

The awful loss that hate visited upon the Nation and the world should inspire all Americans to join together in this hour of shock and mourning in a reexamination of this national need.

The right of dissent, the exercise of free speech, the criticism of the President and other public officials high and low must not corrode into sullen rebellion that breeds violence. All Americans, those who agree with his policies and those who disagree, must stand together on this fundamental and demonstrate this unity by action as well as words. The purveyors of hate must acknowledge the danger they create.

When we speak of the purveyors of hate we obviously are not speaking of the President of our country or those who share his political opinions, those persons in his own party and in the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, this situation will undergo no change as long as there is a President of the United States.

The Nation owes a great debt to Mr. Kennedy and the American people to join together in this hour of shock and mourning.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the wide publicity that has been given to the attack levied on certain trade associations by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN], I felt that the information contained in an article which appeared in the Rockford Morning Register on November 29, 1963, should be of interest to the Members of this House. Not only should the information furnished by Mr. Shepard Blumenthal,为代表的, the President of the National Hide Association, be of interest, but I further believe that his remarks are entitled to receive the same attention as that accorded the charges that have been made.

Among the most important maxims of our Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence are those that relate to a presumption of innocence and of the necessity of proving guilt. In view of Mr. Blumenthal's prominent position in the industry that he represents, I think that it would be highly unfair to decide this issue before all of the facts are known.

I am personally greatly impressed by the statistics furnished by Mr. Blumenthal with respect to the hide industry. It seems to me that a very strong case indeed can be made for the proper and judicious employment of counterpart funds which might otherwise remain frozen in a sterile and unproductive account.

The article follows:

CLAIMS AMERICAN COUNTERPART FUNDS SAVE INDUSTRY

Best possible use of U.S. counterpart funds frozen in foreign countries is in promotion of American exports of hides and raw materials. Mr. Shepard Blumenthal, President of the National Hide Association, and Mr. Albert Finnegon, of the National Calf Tanners Association, have urged that the U.S. spending during congressional junkets overseas be curtailed.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Maryland, Congressman EDWARD A. GARGAN and Congressman SAMPSON N. FRIEDEL, join me in asking unanimous consent that the editorial on Mrs. Kennedy, appearing in the Baltimore Sun, under date of November 24, be made a part of the record. Her magnificent courage is, we feel, an eloquent tribute to her husband.

Mrs. KENNEDY

At a time when women far from the scene were feeling, and men were overcome with grief, Mrs. John F. Kennedy in Dallas mustered the inner strength to stand by her husband, to hold her head and stand in every fiber and gesture a President's wife. "Standing the horrible sheets of her shattering experience, she stood with Lyndon Johnson as he took the oath as her husband's successor and then faced reentry of Washington, so suddenly no longer her city, and a reunion with the children for whom the Nation's loss always would remain so inconceivably personal.

The world and world may take pride in Mrs. Kennedy, even as they extend to her their halting expressions of sympathy. No one knows the immense personal sacrifice may be, there can come those moments that demand the raw courage and self-discipline of pioneers. Gentle, retiring and always drawn, Mrs. Kennedy has demonstrated once again that reservoir of strength that from time immemorial has nurtured our faith, our stamina, our determination to face the future fearlessly.

With her husband dead so soon after the delivery of a child, with her other children bereaved, her home bestowed upon a new President and her future uncertain, not for a moment did she flinch. The stern demands made upon her. Her strength is the Nation's and humanity's
strength. We may share not only her ord-deal, but also her will to carry on as her husband would have expected from her and from all of us.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of ab-sence was granted to:

Mr. King of New York (at the request of Mr. Arne) for the balance of this week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. Jensen, for 1 week, due to death in family.

Mr. Nielson (at the request of Mr. Hallick), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness in family.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legisla-tive program and any special orders here-tofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Rogers, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Felter in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the re-quest of Mr. Mathias) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. Pinnix.

Mr. Goodling.

**SENATE BILLS REFERRED**

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

H.R. 9226. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Matthews:

H.R. 9226. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Fascell:

H.R. 9227. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Puqua:

H.R. 9228. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Gibbons:

H.R. 9229. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Pepper:

H.R. 9230. A bill to designate the author-ised Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the “John F. Kennedy Canal”; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. Roosevelt:

H.R. 9231. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Schweiker:

H.R. 9232. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Ayres:

H.R. 9233. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States, and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Cahill:

H.R. 9234. A bill to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Conte:

H.R. 9235. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Denton:

H.R. 9236. A bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Edmondson:

H.R. 9237. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that the penalties for homicide prescribed in such title shall apply to any person who kills the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the head of any executive department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Ellsworth:

H.R. 9238. A bill to provide that the re-fusal of nonprofit blood banks and of physi-cians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks, and other activities, shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Fulton of Tennessee:

H.R. 9239. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALES:

H.R. 9240. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make Federal crimes against the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: H.R. 9248. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by repealing the exemption for certain lumbering employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORSE: H.R. 9242. A bill to prohibit interference with the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY: H.R. 9245. A bill to repeal the cabinet tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER: H.R. 9244. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO: H.R. 9245. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: H.R. 9246. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to kill the President or Vice President of the United States, the head of any executive department, or any Member of Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: H.R. 9247. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that every applicant for correction of his military record shall be afforded an opportunity for a hearing, and to require the appearance of certain members of the Armed Forces before the boards for the correction of such records, and to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for judicial review of the decisions of such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON: H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORSE: H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON: H. Res. 573. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investigation and study of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS

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

By Mr. COHELAN: H.R. 9249. A bill for the relief of Donald Loo, also known as Loo Hong Mun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR: H.R. 9249. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Milazzo, Felicia Milazzo and Emanuela Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER: H.R. 9250. A bill for the relief of Que Ark Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY: H.R. 9251. A bill for the relief of Lee Gen Quon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

No Adjournment of Congress Until Public Laws 815 and 874 Are Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS M. PELLY OF WASHINGTON IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk among Members of Congress and others about possible adjournment of Congress now and coming back in January and finishing our job. Contrariwise, it seems to me advisable that Congress remain in session—if for nothing else than to unsnarl some of our important legislation.

I have in mind that closing down Congress is not going to cure such situations as the stalemate between the House and Senate over a vocational education bill which is holding up enactment of other major education legislation.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for Members of Congress to go home until Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have been extended. Impacted area assistance has been going on since 1950 and continuation of these programs is vital to our educational system. More than 4,000 local school districts are unable to complete their budgets and are in the dark about the number of teachers they can hire and the amount of salaries and other essential planning. By delaying the legislation Congress is putting our school administrators in an almost impossible situation.

As the House knows, impacted area legislation provides for Federal reimbursement of costs to schools in localities where Federal defense establishments have placed a burden on local communities and where such military establishments are no longer in existence. Industry, do not pay taxes for the support of these schools.

Obviously, while Congress has delayed passage of legislation to continue these laws, the school administrators have counted on our acting to continue these programs and it certainly does not seem right for us to close up shop and let the schools go on waiting. Extension of these two laws means better than $1 million to my State of Washington and to certain school districts these funds are absolutely vital.

He Thought He Had Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my son visited Gettysburg and paid a final tribute to a fallen leader.

It is ironic that 3 days prior to the day of this tragic event several nations joined in a tribute to a leader who suffered a similar fate.

Sunday, November 17, 1963, in the Student Union Building of Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., marked the beginning of 3 days' activities commemorating the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

It appears fitting that the addresses given on the occasion of this anniversary be recorded for our posterity.

They shall follow in the order of delivery:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY LT. GOV. RAYMOND F. SHAFFER

I deem it a great honor to have been chosen to open these ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the representatives of France, Great Britain, and Italy, Their presence is a singularly heart-warming tribute to the cherished memory of a beloved American.

I am privileged, too, to welcome so many of my own countrymen, the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, and you ladies and gentlemen who are here gathered.

It is the only place in the world, to my knowledge, where a monument has been erected to mark the delivery of an address. I am always amazed at the number of words spoken here a century ago, posses that they should become immortal? Almost as we ask the question, we are aware that they have drawn us here today. Certainly they cannot be separated from this site.

They cannot be separated from the event which gave rise to them. They cannot be separated from the man who uttered them.

A boy visiting Gettysburg sees—as did boys a century ago—the excitement and the glory of.

His father—like Lincoln—sees the tragedy.

The boy thinks how much stronger the Union is because the battle was fought. The father thinks how much greater the Nation might have been if the issues of the Civil War could have been resolved by councils rather than cannons.

President Lincoln came to Gettysburg to pay tribute to the fallen soldiers of the North. He spoke, not of the victory, but the sacrifice. He stressed, not the valor, but the devotion. He urged, not reprisal, but reunion.

Legend has it that he wrote his remarks on the back of an envelope while en route by train from Washington—as if, in an inspired burst, they flowed from the stub of his pencil. Whenever and however they were written, they were born out of the sorrow and anguish which had traced their toll in the furrows of his face.

They emerged from the long loneliness that was his—the long loneliness of command—the long loneliness of the test to which a dream, a hope, and an ideal had been put. Yet they had to be spoken, so that a broken nation might look to a brighter day.

He felt that his address was a failure.

Using the language of the plowman, he told a friend it didn't seour.

Yet the honest leader who had thought himself a failure. He had tried to preserve