

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 a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, 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 us through Thy holy word, for we penitently acknowledge that we are troubled in spirit, greatly disturbed and apprehensive, and often discouraged as we face the unknown future.

Grant that we may not forget that Thou wert our help in all the far-off yesterdays, drawing us to Thy self by Thy grace and love, giving Thy healing balm to hearts that were bruised and broken, bestowing Thy pardoning grace for our sins and shortcomings, renewing our strength and courage for our heavy duties and responsibilities.

As we go forth into the hours 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 those antagonisms and antipathies 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 safe lodging and 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. 228

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 Presiding Officer of the Senate appoint a 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,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1963.

HON JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The 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, considered 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. 2571, 87th Congress.
Minnesota: Crooked Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.
Colorado: Indian Wash, No. 1899, 87th Congress.
Minnesota: Joe River, No. 1234, 88th Congress.
Arkansas: Mud Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.
Tennessee: Thompson Creek, (supplemental), No. 895, 88th Congress.
Tennessee: Weatherford-Bear Creek, No. 1234, 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. \$184,869,965 has been cut from the \$2,160,472,456 of supplemental budgets in this session for the fiscal year 1963.

As to the main budget, for fiscal 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, Treasury-Post Office, Labor-HEW, and Defense, and they were cut by \$2,229,557,000. And, in the aggregate, they are below comparable appropriations for fiscal 1963 by \$339,000,000.

The conference agreement on the legislative bill is pending in the Senate, having been adopted by the House at a figure \$13,925,000 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 processed in the Senate committee.

The House has cut \$5,420,333,026 from the \$91,817,407,145 of budget requests considered in the 11 regular bills for fiscal 1964 and will substantially increase that 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—using a round amount because it does not stand still—of appropriations recurring automatically for fiscal 1964 under permanent law. That is not in the table to follow because it requires no annual action by the Congress. The principal expense is the interest on the national debt, tentatively estimated at \$10,020,000,000 in the January budget, but more recently figured to approximate \$10,500,000,000.

The substantiating details are in the following table:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Nov. 26, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriations bills]

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
1963 SUPPLEMENTALS									
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture.....	² \$508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	\$508,172,000	-----	Feb. 27	\$508,172,000	-----	-----
H.R. 5517	Supplemental.....	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	-\$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	-\$202,815,600	+\$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration.....	(500,000,000)	-----	(-----)	(-500,000,000)	-----	(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other.....	(1,141,507,106)	-----	(988,756,506)	(-152,750,600)	-----	(988,691,506)	(-152,815,600)	(-65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals.....	2,149,679,106	-----	1,496,928,506	-652,750,600	-----	1,946,863,506	-202,815,600	+449,935,000
1964 APPROPRIATIONS									
H.R. 5279	Interior.....	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	-68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	-75,383,800	-7,065,000
	Loan authorization.....	(13,000,000)	-----	(8,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----	(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----
	Contract authority.....	(17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	(-17,500,000)	(-17,500,000)	-----
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office.....	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	-149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	-149,816,000	-----
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW.....	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	-309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	-309,508,000	-7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture.....	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	-389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	-389,298,000	-----
	Loan authorizations.....	³ (855,000,000)	-----	³ (855,000,000)	-----	-----	³ (855,000,000)	-----	-----
H.R. 6868	Legislative.....	⁴ 148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	⁴ 140,038,919	-8,541,326	June 11	⁴ 140,038,919	-8,541,326	-----
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary.....	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	-308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	-308,622,000	-----
H.R. 7179	Defense.....	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	-1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	-1,932,228,000	-10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia.....	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(-5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(-5,295,000)	-----
	Federal payment.....	34,868,000	-----	32,868,000	-2,000,000	-----	32,868,000	-2,000,000	-----
	Loan authorizations.....	(8,000,000)	-----	(8,000,000)	-----	-----	(8,000,000)	-----	-----
H.R. 8747	Independent offices.....	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	-1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	-1,555,869,300	-100,000
H.R. 9139	Military construction.....	1,966,400,000	Nov. 14 (No. 901)	1,562,964,000	-403,436,000	Nov. 18	1,562,964,000	-403,436,000	-----
H.R. 9140	Public Works.....	4,561,747,000	Nov. 15 (No. 902)	4,276,116,400	-285,630,600	Nov. 19	4,276,116,400	-285,630,600	-----
	Total, 1964 appropriations.....	91,817,407,145	-----	86,414,446,119	-5,402,961,026	-----	86,397,074,119	-5,420,333,026	-17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations.....	93,967,086,251	-----	87,911,374,625	-6,055,711,626	-----	88,343,937,625	-5,623,148,626	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(876,000,000)	-----	(869,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----	(869,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	-----
	Total, contract authority.....	(17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----	-----	(-17,500,000)	-----

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 \$360,000,000 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 appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriations bills]

Bill No.	Title	Senate						Conference				Public Law	
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
							Budget estimates	House action					
1963 SUPPLEMENTALS													
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture.....	\$508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	\$508,172,000	Mar. 4	\$508,172,000				\$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6
H.R. 5517	Supplemental.....	1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	-\$163,616,615	+\$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	-\$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
	Public works acceleration.....	(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)		May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(-50,000,000)		
	All other.....	(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(-113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)	(-134,869,965)		
	Total, 1963 supplementals.....	2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	-163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,976,602,491	-184,869,965		
1964 APPROPRIATIONS													
H.R. 5279	Interior.....	998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	-18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	-45,552,500	88-79	July 26
	Loan authorization.....	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)			(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)		
	Contract authority.....	(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)				(-17,500,000)		
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office.....	6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	-77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	-101,376,000	88-39	June 13
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW.....	5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	-263,661,750	+45,846,250	(Sept. 25 No. 774)	5,471,087,500	-288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11
H.R. 6754	Agriculture.....	6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	-320,766,660	+68,531,340					
	Loan authorizations.....	¹ (855,000,000)		¹ (880,000,000)		¹ (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)					
H.R. 6868	Legislative.....	182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	-13,945,381	+28,234,150	Nov. 12 (No. 896)	¹ 168,293,069	-13,925,381		
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary.....												
H.R. 7179	Defense.....	49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	-1,674,530,000	+257,698,000	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	-1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia.....	(328,724,000)	Nov. 6 (No. 632)	(319,582,825)	Nov. 18	(319,587,785)	(-9,136,215)	(+35,300,985)					
	Federal payment.....	52,868,000		47,868,000		47,868,000	-5,000,000	+15,000,000					
	Loan authorizations.....	(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(+12,800,000)					
H.R. 8747	Independent offices.....	14,658,588,000	Nov. 13 (No. 641)	13,390,214,650	Nov. 20	13,300,214,650	-1,358,373,350	+197,495,950					
H.R. 9139	Military construction.....												
H.R. 9140	Public Works.....												
	Total, 1964 appropriations.....	83,181,006,450		79,572,437,959		79,449,037,959	-3,731,968,491	+742,314,140		59,857,313,069	-2,243,482,381		
	Total, all appropriations.....	85,341,478,906		81,566,706,800		81,445,893,800	-3,895,585,106	+792,306,475		61,832,915,560	-2,428,352,346		
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(888,800,000)		(906,800,000)		(906,800,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+37,800,000)		(6,000,000)	(-7,000,000)		
	Total, contract authority.....	(17,500,000)					(-17,500,000)				(-17,500,000)		

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 88-162), 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.

The 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 such 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 before obtained when Congress closed out 7 months of a fiscal year under such circumstances? Can the gentleman recall 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 certain 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 bill 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 Public Law 88-72 is hereby amended by striking the figure "\$172,562,000" 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-10, occupational health laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, \$1,650,000.

"Project 64-d-11, high temperature chemistry facility, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, \$1,435,000.

"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, \$5,900,000.

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

"Project 64-d-15, plant engineering and services building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, \$1,400,000.

"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, \$630,000."

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 \$17,945,000 to 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 is of the opinion that this bill represents an im-

portant 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 modern weapons laboratory facilities is necessary in order to attract and retain those competent scientists who can help to assure U.S. leadership in the nuclear weapons field.

At least one of the projects will also assist in maintaining our readiness 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 readiness to resume full scale weapons 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 plant 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 assure timely consideration of the funds involved by 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 may be included in the public works appropriation bill now under consideration by the other body.

Ordinarily, a continuing resolution would be effective in many matters. 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 Bureau of the Budget or the President. The responsibility rests also with the Congress of the United States.

It was unanimously agreed that in 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 safeguard 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 progress might take place 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 needed 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 is 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. In my own calculations, 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.

Mr. GROSS. 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 spelled out in detail what is needed by way of a vigorous underground testing program, what is needed to keep our nuclear laboratories vigorous and topnotch scientists at work on them, 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-

fined. Therefore we cannot authorize for the appropriations needed to purchase them. It is our responsibility both to see that they are defined and that the money be provided without undue delay.

Mr. ANDERSON. 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. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate bill, S. 2267, and H.R. 8971, to authorize supplemental appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1964. This legislation would authorize \$17,945,000 for the construction of 12 new facilities, necessary for the nuclear weapons development program.

It is important also to note at this point, that through the reprogramming of operating funds the Atomic Energy Commission intends to add an additional \$109,800,000 to its operating budget in fiscal 1964 for the weapons development program.

This request for supplemental appropriations comes as a direct aftermath of the Senate ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. The President of the United States, on September 10, 1963, in a letter to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate outlined a four-part program of safeguards which would be adopted and implemented by the executive branch if the treaty were adopted. This authorization is necessary to carry out that program of safeguards.

This program includes the following:

First. A carrying forward of a vigorous intensified underground nuclear testing program, designed to maintain our superiority in this type of test program;

Second. The maintenance of a posture of readiness to resume testing in these environments which are now prohibited by the treaty;

Third. The expansion of facilities which now exist for the purpose of detecting possible violations of the treaty; and

Fourth. The maintenance of strong weapons laboratories which will maintain the overall lead of the United States in nuclear weapons technology.

It is true that the primary responsibility for seeing that the safeguards are in fact implemented and carried out will be shared by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense. However, I think it is equally obvious unless the Congress of the United States provides the necessary authorization and appropriations that these agencies will not be able to provide the kind of safeguards that the President had in mind. When the Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, wrote the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body on August 23, 1963, he stated that:

With respect to safeguard (b)—the maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and a program in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will

attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied from the testimony I have heard as a member of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the construction projects which will be financed by virtue of the funds which are to be made available under this authorization and appropriation are needed to modernize, update, and expand the kind of laboratory facilities which will enable us to carry out the intent and purpose mentioned in safeguard (b). I am convinced that the "continued application of our human scientific resources" depends on the availability of adequate physical plant and facilities as contemplated in these projects. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of this legislation.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 8971) was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NATCHER, GAIAMO, CANNON, WILSON OF INDIANA, and WYMAN.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 238

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 27th day of November, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday,

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, the Chair announces 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 read 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 Report No. 914 to accompany 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 contentment, 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 casket 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 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. In an inaugural address which 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 posthumously 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 unselfish 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 May 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. 2966) 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 Blixseth, 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 meaningful—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. Blixseth 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 late President.

His words still ring so clearly "an investment in education is at the same time the most profitable investment that society can make and the greatest reward that it can confer—the future of any country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens is damaged, and irreparably 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 introducing legislation 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 a national competitive examination. 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 keystone 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 legislative proposals are being made to revise the banking laws in ways that would bring about important changes in the organization and structure of the banking 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 community generally. For this reason I thought it might be appropriate to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent speech of mine discussing the purposes of these questionnaires. 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 to the Iowa Bankers Association 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 FDIC examiners 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 on that.

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 was that I feel the bank examiners should interfere a little less in the loan and investment decisions by the banks, and give a little 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 deeply dedicated to their work. 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 lead to long life 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 it were realistic to think that all Government intrusions into the banking business could be removed, but because of banking's vital role in the whole economy, as provider of the Nation's money supply, this is not the case.

So let me say at the outset that the banking survey which our committee is making is an entirely friendly survey, though it is also one of serious import. We have been told that a few bankers have been apprehensive about our questionnaires. A few, not many, but a few have expressed a fear that the purpose of our survey is 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 hometown banks. We recognize 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 recognize that these banks—your banks, 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 providing proper, up-to-date banking laws. What we want, gentlemen—all of us—is to maintain the solvency and liquidity of the banking community, and maintain banking laws which will permit your banks to better serve the needs of your communities for the benefit of both your communities and your 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 even longer that many of the States have been chartering State banks.

With Government controlling entry into banking, it is always possible, of course, that competition might be stifled. Thus the historic mission of Government bank chartering has been to avoid two pitfalls: loose entry into banking which would lead to wholesale failures and troubles for the whole economy; and too little entry, leading to restricted services or a tendency toward a monopoly in banking.

A 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 have been several other 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 the House 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 seems sure to bring some significant changes in long-honored policies and practices."

The idea of bankers being in a state of "ferment" is perhaps a little too intoxicating. But there can be no doubt that change and pressures for change are very much at hand. During the past 3 years commercial banks have increased their time and savings deposits by 50 percent; by 100 percent in the past 7 years. Naturally, the bankers are seeking investment outlets for these funds, and seeking changes in laws which have restricted their investment opportunities.

But more fundamental pressures are at work. The banks are in the throes of adopting new technologies. And they are undergoing the rigors of adapting to the changing requirements of business and consumers for banking services, as well as to the competitive pressures of newer types of financial institutions. Tremendous pressures are at work for changing the structure, or organization, of the banking system. We have to face up to the question whether the trend of the future will be to the growth of independent unit banks or toward large-scale branch banking, chain banking, and holding-company banking.

Some very profound changes in the structure of banking have already occurred since the Second World War, even under present banking laws. A great many banks have merged; and many new branches and holding-company banks have come onto the scene.

I recently had a tabulation made of the mergers and new branches of national banks approved by the present Comptroller of the Currency, during his first 17 months in office. On the basis of the record we must conclude that national banks wishing to merge or consolidate have better than a 20-to-1 chance of winning the Comptroller's approval. During his first 17 months in office, he received 147 applications for permission to merge, approved 140 and turned down only 7.

Some impression has been created that although a great many national banks are disappearing through merger, the Comptroller of the Currency is, in effect, replacing these losses by chartering new national banks. I doubt if the impression is correct. The new national banks chartered by Comptroller Saxon and opened for business by March of this year had combined deposits of only \$33 million, whereas those banks that disappeared through mergers had combined deposits of \$2.2 billion. In other words, if we take deposits as a measure of competitive strength, those banks that disappeared through merger were 66 times as important as the new banks chartered.

Nor can I find much to praise in Comptroller Saxon's approval of new branches. Our tabulation showed that he has approved 893 applications for new branches, and over half of these are for banks having deposits of over \$100 million. These are the big banks. Only 2 percent of the banks in the country have deposits of \$100 million.

The state of "ferment," as the Wall Street Journal has called it, has led to a number of studies and reports urging all kinds of changes in both the Federal and State banking laws. There is the \$2 million study of the Commission on Money and Credit; there is the "Financial Institutions" report by the so-called Heller committee, headed by Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; and there is a report by the Saxon advisory committee, and several others. Many of the proposals being urged upon Congress for changes in the Federal banking laws would bring about quite profound changes in the banking structure. The Bank Holding Company Act is under stress; and since the Philadelphia Girard decision, the merger provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act are also under stress. All kinds of changes in law are being urged. The Comptroller of the Currency is even asking for legislation to permit him to override State law and authorize banks to branch statewide, in all States. It is quite possible that this proposal will be enacted—over my dead body.

But a great many of the legislative proposals that are being made are not so obviously wrong and perhaps not wrong at all. They are raising, however, some very serious questions in the minds of Members of Congress, particularly the members of the banking committees, since these are the ones who must take primary responsibility for

drafting and recommending banking legislation.

As you doubtless know, the members of a congressional committee are presumed to be experts on matters under that committee's jurisdiction, and, indeed, they should be experts and usually are; but in this case I must admit we are not experts, because we do not have the facts on which to make informed judgments about what changes of Federal law will be good or bad for the banking industry and for the country. I do not mean to downgrade the studies and reports I have referred to. They are thoughtful documents, written by well-meaning people; but they contain recommendations and conclusions based mostly on opinions, because the writers did not have the needed facts and 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 tinker with most serious matters. Much of this legislation will affect the opportunities 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 sufficient information to know what we are doing. Nor can we long refuse to act. A shoe that doesn't fit can ruin your foot. Banking laws which no longer fit modern-day 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 completing the questionnaires 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, legislative changes must come from the people themselves and not from officials who occupy seats of power in some bureaucracy.

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. I also want to thank those representatives of the banking industry who gave us so much help in developing our questionnaires. In particular, I want to thank Mr. M. Monroe Kimbrel, president of the American Bankers Association; Mr. Norris E. Hartwell, president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks; and Mr. S. E. Babington, president of the Independent 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 banking industry, we had the experts select scientific samples of the banks, representative of all parts of the country, all sizes of banks, and all banking structures. A total of approximately 3,000 banks are in the sample.

While making the survey on a sample basis reduces the amount of work on the banking industry, it also makes it more imperative that each bank in the sample cooperate in filling out the questionnaires promptly and carefully. If just a few banks give careless answers or neglect to answer, the whole sample will be invalidated and the work of all the other banks who cooperate will be wasted.

One questionnaire has been mailed to the banks, and most of the returns 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 management and management-succession problems. The second deals with banking services and, more particularly, correspondent banking arrangements and practices.

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

I think that the reasons for these questions will be obvious to you when you think about them. Conflicting views have been widely aired over the reasons for bank mergers, 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 competent management, or afford management with the diversity of skills that a bank needs. Another alleged weakness of small- and medium-sized independent banks is that they are unable to provide for a succession of good management as the older managers retire or pass away.

And still another popular notion is that small banks are unable to attract adequate capital to meet the loan requirements of their local communities. The section of the questionnaire dealing with the banks' public reports is related to this question of adequate capital.

We know that in many instances the public reports made by the banks are extremely skimpy. Prudent bankers would 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 pig-in-a-poke—and, for the same reason, they are investing in a less liquid asset. This means that when a bank finds it necessary to issue stock to the public, it usually must do so at less than fair value, and thus dilute the equity of the previous owner. I am not suggesting that you should be compelled 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 dealing 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 achieve the mobility of credit that modern industry and commerce require. Greater mobility is needed, we are told, in order that loanable funds may flow from one region of the country to another, with the changes in the season and changes in the pattern of credit demands. Under this arrangement, we hear, the local branches would channel their funds to Chicago, say, where the headquarters office could handle the credit needs of some national merchandising chain whose headquarters are also in Chicago.

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 analysts that are needed to determine whether or not a local loan application is sound. This is said with particular reference to those areas of the 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 banks do not and cannot offer their customers the quality and variety of services that the branch banks offer.

Well, when all of the virtues claimed for wide-scale branch banking are enumerated, some of us oldtimers recognize these as the selfsame virtues that we used to think correspondent banking supplied.

Let me point out that correspondent banking—if the claims made for it are 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 are generally believed to be associated with large-scale operation and concentrated control of an industry.

The old theory of 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 city correspondent banks, and the city banks put their surplus funds on deposit with the banks in the money market centers. Conversely, the funds then flow back to the regions and communities where they are most in demand at the moment.

The correspondent bank is supposed to come to the rescue of the local bank having a loan opportunity larger than it can meet from its own resources.

Conversely, the correspondent bank in Chicago—to continue my example—is supposed to share with local banks the large loan to the merchandise chain headquarters in Chicago.

Finally, it is claimed that large correspondent banks, who can and do have the specialized investment analysts, provide perfectly sound and adequate investment advice to the smaller banks.

This is a theory. And, of course, we all know that to some extent—to some unknown degree—actual practices accord with the theory. But we do not have a really factual picture of how correspondent banking is operating. Is it accomplishing the things I have suggested to the degree that it is a substitute for branch banking? Or is it superior to branch banking?

These are some of the questions that we hope to answer and we hope that the answer will be useful not only to the Congress and the legislatures of the States but to the banking community as well. It has always seemed to me that the most important improvements made in any industry are not those forced by law but those voluntarily adopted by an industry when it has information on which to base a judgment that some new way of doing things is better than the old way.

Let me add that the mechanics that we have set up to handle the questionnaires will fully safeguard the confidentiality of your answer. I have never been persuaded that information from individual banks or independent bankers should be withheld from the public when it seems clearly in the public interest to disclose information. But in our present surveys there is no reason to disclose information on any individual bank or person. Since the surveys have been designed on only a sample of banks, it would be inappropriate to disclose individual in-

formation. The fact is that neither I nor any other Member of Congress will ever see the individual questionnaires you return nor individual data from those questionnaires. The FDIC is collecting the questionnaires, editing them, and removing the identification. They then send them to the Federal Reserve Board where they are coded and tabulated.

What the results of these questionnaires will show I do not know. Nor do I have a strong premonition of what they will show. We are going to let the facts fall where they may and report them in just as objective a manner as possible.

This does not mean that I am trying to pretend personally that I have no preferences, no prejudices concerning the kind of banking system I think is best for the country. Of course, I do and some of you already know what my prejudices are. I think that the present trend toward big business, toward absentee ownership, and concentrated management of all business—including banking—is bad.

There is a need and a place for big business and big banks in our Nation. But I strongly believe that we are overdoing bigness, creating bigger and bigger corporations simply for the sake of bigness and not for the sake of efficiency. To have a viable economy, I think we should have just as many locally owned and locally managed businesses as possible, including banks. It will be a sad day indeed if all of the Main Streets of America become absentee owned and absentee managed.

As more and more decisions affecting our everyday lives on Main Street are made in board rooms of Wall Street or Chicago, we are in for more and more trouble—more big government and big labor—and less local self-reliance. How can we manage our local problems locally, if we 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.

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 things and comforts of life. And we have reason to doubt that any society has ever had more of its people engaged in unselfish and patriotic pursuits, or more dedicated 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 ASSOCIATIONS

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 law on the investment opportunities of national banks, Federal savings and loan associations, and other institutions subject to Federal law.

I had 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 Associations at Honolulu on October 23.

Since this matter may be of interest to executives of many of the savings and loan associations who were not present 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 first jet flight. Upon boarding the plane, they sought out the pilot and told him, "Please don't go faster than sound because we want to talk to each other."

As the ladies found out, neither speed nor distance makes things that different. And so it is with the issues facing the savings and loan industry in 1963. They are the same here as in Washington, but I must say that here we can consider them in much more pleasant surroundings—and perhaps we will even see them in a different perspective. In any case, it is a wonderful experience to be here and to be with you at your 20th annual convention.

When I first came to the Congress in 1928, the assets of the savings and loan business amounted to less than \$10 billion. Today I understand your assets have passed the \$100 billion mark. This is certainly a remarkable rate of development, and it necessarily reflects a remarkable achievement in building public confidence, which is your most priceless asset.

Today the savings and loan business is serving more than 35 million savers and homeowners, through some 6,300 savings and loan associations. Credit for the success in building public confidence in the savings and loan industry rightfully belongs to you and the other operators of savings and loan associations.

But 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 as fine a board as we have today.

No Government regulatory agency has ever worked harder to carry out its mandate from the Congress. Furthermore, Joe McMurray, during the past year and a half, has worked diligently to secure for the savings and loan business the legislation needed to better serve the savers and homeowners of the Nation. John Horne, who has only recently become a member of the Board, did a wonderful job as head of the Small Business Administration; and I know he will give to the savings and loan industry the same loyalty and tireless effort he gave to small business.

John de Laitre, the third member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, brings to his job a wealth of experience and knowledge

as the former president of a large middle western mutual savings bank. He too is an able and dedicated public servant.

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 safety and soundness. Let's keep it that way, while at the same time allowing private management of savings and loan associations the maximum freedom to exercise their energy and ingenuity.

There is no question in my mind but that you will continue to prosper and continue to grow. But the growth you have already attained carries with it new responsibilities. I do not urge you to adopt any new conservatism, 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 business.

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 or in the savings and loan industry generally.

As you know, the administration has recommended—and is recommending—that the Home Loan Bank Board be given "standby" controls over dividend rates paid by the Federal savings and loan associations. This is a proposal Congress has been reluctant 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.

You want to encourage savings, of course. But there is a question whether a dividend rate war actually encourages savings.

A few years ago the Ford Foundation made a survey to find out why people save. They sent questionnaires to a great many people, asking them to list 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 make a large purchase, such as a house and so on, for all the reasons familiar to you.

But apparently no one thought to say he saves because of the dividend rate or interest rate he can get on his money.

This suggests to me 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 a 5-percent rate at the present time is investing that money in sound enterprises.

Let me turn now to the legislation before the Congress. The banks and savings and 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 difference 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. "Tommy, why did you kick your brother in the stomach?" his mother asked. "Well, it was his fault," Tommy replied. "He turned around."

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.

Proposals to change the laws governing financial institutions 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 the Federal savings and loan associations. Without giving a final judgment on the merits of all the proposals in this bill, I would say that at least four proposals seem to have great merit, on the basis and standards I have just mentioned. First of all, we know, a basic problem of 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 whole 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 under consideration would permit the Federal savings and loans to make loans on household furniture, appliances, and other consumer durables which are directly associated with the home. Increased sources of financing for consumer durables of this type should prove advantageous both to the American family 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, anything that we can do to increase additional opportunities will benefit the Nation as well as the individuals involved.

Another provision of the bill would permit investment in mobile homes. I must confess my surprise at learning how tremendously the use of mobile homes 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 the savings and loan associations are deeply interested 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, Bill Kerwin, and your new counsel, Bill McKenna. These fellows are most able, most pleasant, and always obliging on inquiries from Members of Congress.

Let me come now to another most interesting legislative proposal which has been put forward by your membership. This is the proposal to create an international home loan bank, or some similar instrumentality, which would allow you to help bring about savings and loan associations in the underdeveloped countries, especially in Latin America. This would seem to me a most public-spirited idea. As one of the advanced capitalistic countries, we have had the good

fortune of learning that economic advancement comes 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 savings. I can think of no greater service that the United States could perform for these people than to make available the wealth of talent we have in this country, developed in the management of more than 6,000 savings and loan associations, to show the people of Latin America how to organize and encourage local savings.

Stimulating local savings will bring about a middle class in countries where there is 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, or even most desirable, it has been made clear in everybody's mind, I think, that the general thrust of this proposal is most desirable and necessary.

It is an inspiring idea—even an exciting idea—to consider extending the savings and loan movements to our neighbors in the underdeveloped countries who are groping for just this kind of means of improving themselves. 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 always makes us 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 extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently contained 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. J. Howard Means; 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 distinctions accorded 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 vast majority of these doctors are members of the American Medical Association, though they differ with its position on this issue. One of the physicians, Dr. Warren F. Draper, was a member of the AMA's house of delegates for 22 years. Another, Dr. William A. Sawyer, was chairman of the AMA's Committee on Medical Care for Industrial Workers.

The attack on the leaflet is equally surprising. The leaflet apparently is of such great interest that the American Medical Association itself has purchased 4,000 copies from the physicians committee.

The remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD October 31 stated quite rightly that only 40 physicians have their names attached to the leaflet. I believe that is quite fortunate. I suspect that if the many thousands of doctors who support hospital insurance for the aged through social security had had their names printed at the end of the leaflet, the AMA would have had to pay much more for its 4,000 copies.

I sincerely hope that the number of names printed at the end of a leaflet concerning legislation is not taken as an indication of how many persons support that legislation. On the issue of hospital insurance for the aged under social security, we have definite evidence of the support of tens of thousands of doctors throughout the Nation. This evidence comes from the press, including the medical press.

For example, an opinion poll conducted among some 30,448 physicians by *Modern Medicine* and published in the June 11, 1962, issue, brought answers from 27,773 doctors. Of these, 2,731 or about 10 percent, favored the King-Anderson bill. Since there are some 276,000 physicians in the United States, this sample would indicate that some 27,600 doctors support the King-Anderson bill. Of the 194,000 AMA members, we might assume from this poll that some 19,000 support the legislation which the AMA officially opposes.

There is still more evidence of large physician support of hospital insurance for the aged through social security. The National Medical Association, composed of some 5,300 physicians, has repeatedly and overwhelmingly supported this legislation.

The Boston Globe of June 8, 1962, published a story headlined "313 Boston Doctors Crack AMA Front on Medicare." The story reported that a petition was "signed by 313 Boston physicians, many of them holding major professorships at Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University Medical Schools, and with both national and international reputations in the world of medicine."

A few weeks previously, a paid advertisement appeared in the New York

Times of May 21, 1962, entitled "An Opinion Favoring Legislation for Health Care for the Aged (King-Anderson bill)." The paid advertisement was signed by 548 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 unfortunate both 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, it takes courage to make 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 an appeal to emotionalism, as so much of the material against hospital insurance for the aged under social security is. It does not predict the downfall of the Republic, the end of our free enterprise system, and the coming of fire and brimstone. 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 costs more than the older person can afford to pay." 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 physicians committee leaflet is attacked because it concludes that the Kerr-Mills program, although helpful in many ways, is inadequate to do the whole job of providing the 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 far more than the neediest of aged because only 30 percent were transferred from other programs. What is not said is that other people who met the requirements for old age assistance went directly on 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 all the State 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 applications approved for MAA were submitted in behalf of older persons previously receiving or eligible for medical aid under a public program other than Kerr-Mills.

The leaflet is also attacked because it states that Kerr-Mills help 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, an aged couple with no income and no assets except a life insurance policy with cash value of \$2,500 would be ineligible for MAA—I repeat ineligible. The couple would first have to cash in their policy and use the proceeds to pay medical expenses before they could be eligible for MAA. If this action is not using up one's assets before help is obtained, I do not know what is. If this 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 getting 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 find evidence that individuals 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 the persons with cataracts, diabetes, 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 attack calls on the States to defend themselves against this charge. But the use of unsafe facilities is well known to the States themselves. It is their own Hill-Burton surveys which provide the evidence for the leaflet's statement. In their surveys, the States have found that 40 percent of the beds in the skilled nursing homes have health or safety hazards. The reason for this is well known and succinctly stated in the leaflet—"limited State tax resources and high cost of good care."

Sixth. The physicians committee leaflet favors the social security approach to hospital insurance for the elderly, because it provides them the opportunity of paying their hospital insurance during their working years. They will then have hospital insurance benefits in old age as an earned right. The concept of earned right as used in the leaflet is attacked in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the money which is paid into social security is not the exact same money that is paid out in benefits.

I have difficulty in understanding this attack. To my knowledge, a private insurance company does not pay a person's benefits from his own contributions. A few receive much more than they pay in, many receive less. Social security is an insurance system and, I might point out, that the vast majority of those who pay the taxes to support the Kerr-Mills program will never receive a penny of benefits from it.

It is argued in the attack that social security taxes are considered by the Internal Revenue Service as gifts from one group of taxpayers to another. This is exactly what happens in a private insurance policy. Private insurance is no less secure for that reason.

It is said in the attack that earned right implies a contract between the recipients and the Government. This is exactly what social security does. That is why it is security. Congress will always be free to change the program, to improve it, or even restrict it. It will, of course, always act in a responsible way to those who have an earned right in the program.

Seventh. The physicians committee leaflet is further denigrated because it maintains that the patient's freedom of choice is preserved by the King-Anderson bill. Under this bill, the patient will choose his own doctor. With his physician, the patient will select the appropriate participating hospital, nursing home, or other service. That is clearly freedom of choice.

Finally, the leaflet is criticized because the doctor can only send his patient to a participating facility. The attack seems to imply that the choice among facilities will be limited, because few hospitals will participate in the program if enacted. This is hard to believe. Hospitals today participate in many Government programs. They also work with Blue Cross, and the King-Anderson bill would enable them to continue to do so. No hospital official has asserted that if the King-Anderson bill is passed, they will not participate. This attack does great injustice to the sense of responsibility of

our Nation's hospitals and nursing homes.

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 has been attacked on the floor of the House. Instead it should be congratulated for the apparent care and attention to fact with which the leaflet was prepared.

PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a group of physicians, under the name of Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, has sent Members of Congress a pamphlet in support of H.R. 3920 and S. 880. This pamphlet, which seeks to influence Members of Congress and the public on this legislation, contains many misleading and inaccurate statements as well as assumptions unsupported by evidence.

The very title of the pamphlet is deceptive: "Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security." Members of Congress are sufficiently well informed to realize that only a few physicians support this legislation. But the title of the pamphlet could well deceive many people not so well informed into believing that the medical profession favors the proposal. It seems reasonable to assume that these words were carefully chosen in an attempt to conceal the fact that out of more than 271,000 physicians in the country only 40 have expressed a willingness to be identified with this committee or to become signatories to a pamphlet of this kind.

The opening statement that "physicians have long been concerned because the elderly of our Nation live in fear of the catastrophic costs of hospitalization" is a blatant appeal to emotionalism and is totally out of context.

Physicians, more than anyone else except the aged themselves, know, or should know, that the prospect of being hospitalized is of less concern to the majority of older Americans than many other aspects of living during retirement years. This is not to say that they have no concern about the possible economic consequences of illness. Indeed they do, as evidenced by the fact that some 60 percent of the population over 65 now has health insurance protection. Nearly 10 million aged have health insurance, a half million have incomes of \$10,000 a year or more, more than 2 million receive medical care under the old-age assistance program, and more than 120,000 a month avail themselves of the benefits of the Kerr-Mills law. These facts alone reveal the absurdity of the portrait of the aged as a monolithic 17½ million-member group of citizens perpetually haunted by the fear of the cost of hospitalization—not hospitalization itself, but its cost.

The American Medical Association and State and county medical societies as well as myself and others in public life for several years have sought evidence of individuals in this country being denied medical care because they cannot pay for it. The AMA has twice asked Members of Congress for any information of cases of this kind so that the needed medical care can be provided and Members of Congress, including myself, have in turn asked our constituencies for such information. Hundreds of county societies have advertised in newspapers soliciting such information and pledging help to anyone who

needs it. Only a few cases have been brought to the attention of the profession or the Congress and in most instances these cases turned out not to be examples which King-Anderson type legislation would help.

A subsequent statement in this pamphlet builds upon the first overstatement; namely, that physicians know that because of this fear—of hospital costs—many older people who need hospital care do not get it at all or get it too late.

If these 40 physicians, most of whom are associated with hospitals, clinics, or health care plans, can say unequivocally that they know that many older people are not receiving needed hospital care solely because of financial fears, they must have concrete evidence of it, including circumstances and names. And if they have it, it is incredible that they do not provide these people with the hospitalization they need or call the cases to the attention of others who will.

Members of this committee, in a number of instances such as these, have made unqualified statements without benefit of supporting evidence, or have utilized the device of selective statistics to reinforce their arguments.

Health insurance and prepayment plans are indicated in the pamphlet as inadequate or too costly for the elderly. The physicians who attached their names to this pamphlet, however, offer no standard for measuring adequacy and, if they have one, do not apply it against policies the aged are buying. The fact that some 10 million of the aged have purchased health insurance would seem to demolish the argument that it is too costly.

The Kerr-Mills Act is dismissed as having clearly failed to meet the needs of any but a very few of the very neediest aged. Other erroneous or misleading statements made about Kerr-Mills include:

"1. Less than 7 out of every 1,000 aged people in the Nation (in the spring of 1963) were receiving any assistance under MAA.

"2. Kerr-Mills funds are used in large part to subsidize existing State relief programs.

"3. Benefits are generally meager, spotty, and often uncertain. In many instances, limited State tax resources and high cost of good care have resulted in the use of facilities that endanger health and safety.

"4. Administrative costs have run as high as 124 percent of the benefits in one State (Kentucky).

"5. The relief that is available is given only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced.

"6. Relatives with modest incomes may even be taken to court and forced to give aid."

Whoever wrote this pamphlet evidently avoided an examination of the Kerr-Mills record. This record, which is available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is not one of largely subsidizing State relief programs or helping only very few of the very neediest aged.

Only about 30 percent of MAA recipients have been transfers from other programs, mainly old-age assistance. Nevertheless, OAA medical care payments have steadily increased since the Kerr-Mills Act became effective and, in addition to MAA benefits as of May 1963, were running at the rate of nearly \$350 million a year. The statistic that only 7 out of 1,000 aged were receiving MAA assistance is deceiving. The fact is that by the spring of 1963, about 7 in 1,000 were being helped every month.

It would seem obvious that most of the very neediest aged were still receiving medical care through OAA now as in the past and that the bulk of MAA expenditures—nearly \$29 million in May 1963—are being paid for assistance to aged who are not on OAA rolls.

Furthermore, since a majority of the aged live in States which have implemented Kerr-Mills, a figure of 7 of 1,000 may well be a measure of the need for such an assistance program for the aged rather than an indication of failure as this pamphlet suggests.

States with Kerr-Mills programs may be interested in the charge that they are 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 this State's experience with Kerr-Mills administrative costs should be examined on the basis of current facts. Administrative costs in Kentucky now are reported to be running under 5 percent.

The statement is simply not true that Kerr-Mills assistance is available "only after resources are used up and incomes 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, as they 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 scare technique. Fewer than half 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, not that they are. Consequently, 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 are, of course, obvious flaws in such 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, these 17 million would comprise the majority of eligibles for many years to come. More important to this argument, however, is the implication that Congress would be foreclosed from amending the law, once enacted, to reduce benefits. This, of course, is nonsense. Moreover, the solvency of the social security system rests, not on actuarial insurance principles, but on the power of Congress to levy taxes and the further power of Congress to reduce benefits as an alternative to increasing taxes if the program runs into serious financial trouble.

The writer of the pamphlet has in other respects been careless with facts, stating that the proposed legislation would "permit voluntary organizations, such as Blue Cross, to perform certain administrative functions," would "utilize State agencies in planning, in determination of eligibility of providers of services and in consultation to the providers" and would guarantee free choice of physician and hospital.

Private organizations could not on their own initiative step in and perform admin-

istrative functions. They could enter the picture only if invited by providers of services and then only by agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on his terms. State agencies could become involved in all the functions mentioned only on the Secretary's request.

Free choice could not be 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 recipient 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 grant 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 the tragic death and burial of our beloved President to the people of America and to the world. Their presentation of this story proved to the world that they have matured. Almost without exception, every aspect 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 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. MULTER. 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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few days have saddened and shocked all of us; it is almost incomprehensible that President Kennedy is dead. The one among us here in Washington that has suffered a loss greater than ours, however, is the gracious lady 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 which 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 despite the anguish of personal involvement for the children it was a wise and wonderful thing to let them participate in this day of mournful history.

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, frustration, bigotry, and hate 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 that took the life of a great and good man, 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 pervasive climate of fear, violence, and suspicion has been created in this country since the end of World War II.

As a result of the frustrations 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 someone on the fringe could act.

I have seen evidence of growing bitterness and hate in mail I have received. I have seen it in vicious 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 week-end of November 22 should awaken the American people to the dangers of propaganda which is being broadcast by the hate network in hundreds of cities to create confusion, distrust, fear, and hatred of public officials and representative government.

Much of the money that feeds the hate network comes 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 reached and with the advance 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 the people and the Nation need to meet the challenge of these changing and dangerous times.

With consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following 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 his derangement, the assassin who felled the President of the United States may inadvertently have made as great a contribution to world peace as any man in the past 19 centuries: he has filled all mankind with revulsion to the end result of hatred.

He has stilled the lips of the most contemptible of redneck "nigger haters"; he has struck anguish to the heart of the most bigoted political partisan; he has united in hundredfold strength all men of good will, wherever they may tread the earth; he has martyred a brilliant and courageous man who had shown us moments of memorable greatness and stood at the threshold of historic greatness.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not die futilely. He brought America further forward than any man of his century in the reaffirmation of the principle that all men are created equal. His resolute posture in the grave confrontations of freedom's foes brought him administration and acclaim from even his severest critics. His grasp of the Nation's complex economic structure led him to present with forthright conviction the fiscal policies in which he believed.

In all these areas he blazed a trail to mark the way for the Nation's leaders who succeed him. Where he made mistakes, he made great mistakes—simply because he was in a job in which there are no small mistakes.

America has seen men of indomitable courage. It has seen men of dynamic vigor, men of high moral principle; others with the magic touch of warm human kindness, still others with razor-keen insight and profound wisdom.

But seldom has this Nation—or any nation—seen so many of these qualities combined within the frame and spirit of one

man. John Kennedy was born predestined to be a President.

America at this tragic hour of crisis may be likened to a military regiment, locked in mortal combat, that sees its commanding general cut down. Our mourning must be brief; we must close ranks and press on, that our cause—his cause—is not lost for the loss of one man.

Now we will pray, as all civilized humanity will pray to their several Gods, that solace and comfort be visited upon John Kennedy's family; that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, shall be given the strength and wisdom to assume the staggering responsibilities that are thrust upon him; and that we shall be unfaltering in our continuing struggle against "the common enemies of man—tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

Ask not, John Kennedy, what you can do for your country. No man can do more.

[From Sunbury Daily Item]

A courageous crusader for the causes in which he believed died a martyr's death when an assassin's bullet cut down John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States.

A glowing light that penetrated areas of darkness on the American scene and throughout a troubled world was suddenly extinguished, leaving only the hope that the problems so clearly reflected will be attacked with new determination. Ending racial bias and the prudent easing 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 the incongruities of American democracy that the man chosen by vote of the majority to head the Government and thereby assume responsibilities unequalled 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 bowed the Nation in grief. Millions in foreign lands who regarded him as a friend are stunned and apprehensively await the impact of his loss.

The greatest tribute that could be paid his memory would be to close ranks in these United States for the advancement of his ideals of equality, justice, and peace based on strength.

[From the Shenandoah (Pa.) Evening Standard]

THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD

Cut down from ambush in the prime of his life, at the height of a brilliant career by a cowardly, treacherous assassin in a meaningless, savage attack, the President gave the last full measure of devotion to the country he so dearly loved.

The loss of John F. Kennedy to the Nation is not only historic, but personal as well. Few Presidents commanded such personal affection of the people as did this warm, enthusiastic human being.

He combined intelligence and activity. He was a man of vitality as a person and as a President. He was a man of courage with a capacity for greatness.

The President's death yesterday leaves unfulfilled his hopes for the solution of many problems, both foreign and domestic. His vitality and energy pushed his programs in many directions, including reduction of taxes, civil rights, prosperity at home and peace throughout the world.

But no madman's bullet can stop the march of events initiated by our late President. And as the Vice President sorrowfully

assumes the mantle of the presidency, we are confident that Mr. Johnson will continue his work.

We join this region, the Nation and the world in expressing deepest human sympathy to his wife, who was by his side when he was struck down, to his little children, his parents and his brothers and sisters.

To his wife and family, we offer the words of Abraham Lincoln who wrote to a mother of five sons who died on the field of battle: "I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

But as we mourn a lost leader, we must go on. It is imperative and necessary that we close ranks behind our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. The burden of responsibility that he now assumes is great and with God's help and the united and dedicated support of the American people, he will 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 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. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following touching editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of November 26, 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 memorable words, for he spoke in trumpets, 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 Capital corresponding to his place in prayer in the Nation's heart.

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

The President and Mrs. Kennedy brought to the center of things the service performed by the arts for men and women. In thought and speech John F. Kennedy moved with familiar friendship among the poets and the prophets. It was the same in his and Mrs. Kennedy's home. The White House became a place of welcome for musicians and painters, dancers and writers.

The idea of a cultural center preceded the Kennedy administration. But President Kennedy gave the idea force and form, and 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

deeply involved. To salute her loss as well as ours, a Kennedy Memorial Cultural Center would speak intimately of part of her gift to us.

Other memorial proposals have been made, chiefly of renaming athletic stadia already in existence. The cultural center as a memorial to Mr. Kennedy is not only uniquely expressive of a purpose shared by the President and his wife. Since it is now in early process, since funds are still being raised, it also would give all Americans the chance to remember the President by bringing to completion an intent and wish of his.

The change of name and the dedication should be made at once. The building should be brought to reality as soon as possible.

John F. Kennedy will live in the hearts of men. Let him live also in the arts he loved.

A MEMORIAL FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I share in the national and worldwide grief at the death of President Kennedy, but I also feel a very personal sense of loss at his passing. Having served in the two Congresses during his Presidency, having campaigned with him, having seen his popularity, his vigor, and his selfless interest in the welfare of the people, I have felt a close identification with him. It has been a sad experience for me to have shared in the mournful ceremonies here in Washington.

In a larger sense, however, President Kennedy's tragic death is a loss to our whole country. With constant cheerfulness, unfailing courage and faith in America, he pressed for measures which would benefit the average citizen of this country and bring peace to the world.

We shall retain our pride in his achievements and our conviction that he has laid 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—nor in the life of that 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 made a noble beginning.

In the words of Whittier:

And now he rests; his greatness and his sweetness

No more shall seem at strife

And death has molded into calm completeness

The statue of his life.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission, whose functions would be the planning and construction of a suitable memorial in honor of the martyred President of the United States.

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 have no preconceived or 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 Record and include extraneous matter.

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

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 has suggested postponing the official tribute to President Kennedy until a later day. 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 during this grief-stricken weekend of heartbreak and sorrow.

Only the poets and the laureates will be able to fully describe the majesty with which she inspired the whole world throughout her tragic ordeal.

A proper tribute to the former First Lady must await a time in which men can compose more adequately their sorrow.

I should like, however, today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to America's press, radio, and television. Never in the entire scope of history have so many millions of people been able to witness personally one of the great tragedies of recorded civilization.

Television and radio, in particular, are deserving of outstanding commendation. Even though it has cost these two media many millions of dollars in lost revenue through the cancellation of advertising commitments, both radio and television gave the American people such a graphic description and portrayal of those incredible 75 hours, that we Americans today can take pride in possessing a new dimension in understanding history.

Those who have been quick to criticize and denounce this country's radio and television industry would do well to study the magnificent manner in which this

industry discharged its responsibilities over the most grim weekend in the annals of our Nation.

It would be impossible to try to single out any one individual, but it would be equally unfair not to emphasize that every single person who worked on the reporting of this week's tragic events brought a new concept of dignity and ability to the entire profession.

The anchormen on the networks, Mr. Speaker, maintained that degree of composure and decorum which, in effect, set the standard for our entire Nation in grieving the monumental loss of President Kennedy.

There is no question in my mind that television helped immensely to create an atmosphere of dignity throughout America in this period of enormous tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I think only today can we reflect upon what an appalling and explosive atmosphere existed throughout the country over these past few days. President Kennedy, it is now perfectly obvious, was a fantastically popular and beloved President.

The first flash of the assault upon his life and the subsequent tragic announcement of his death touched off a wave 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 the medium of television, 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 wanton and senseless assassination of its beloved President.

Here, Mr. Speaker, every single individual in this country who had anything to do with the reporting of this tragic week should hold his head high with pride that he or she discharged his or her duties in a manner of responsibility and dignity which has brought the entire communications industry a new image of profound respect.

History will show that America's television and radio wrote its greatest hours of glory last weekend.

Before we again attack television and radio as a "wasteland," let us ponder its impressive contribution to help democracy endure its most tragic experience during the past weekend.

The newspapers of this country can be equally proud. Even though the printed press has had more experience and perhaps has more time to avoid reportorial mishaps, I think that America's free press has given full meaning to that part of the Constitution which guarantees liberty and freedom of action to all journalists.

As we scan through the newspapers and magazines of our country, we find example after example of the kind of inspirational writing which makes us all proud to be Americans.

The still photographers of America's newspapers are deserving of particular

commendation. Who will again ever be able to equal the photograph of the late President's 3-year-old son, John-John, offering his own salute to his fallen father on the steps of St. Matthew's Cathedral?

Mr. Speaker, this is but one single example of a whole ocean of emotion dramatically captured by the press photographers and reporters.

Each of those men and women has given democracy 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 America, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, 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 shall go down as one of the great classics of American journalism. I have never met Miss McGrory, but I am sure that her colleagues of the press will readily join me in acknowledging her as one of the great writers of our time.

The depth of warm understanding which Miss McGrory demonstrated 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.

All 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 BRINGS MEANING TO TRAGIC CHAOS
(By 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 of a queen in a Greek tragedy.

Shock alone might have explained her dry-eyed composure. But Mrs. Kennedy has moved with more than the mechanical composure that sometimes overtakes people in appalling circumstances.

Everything she has done seems to be a conscious effort to give to his death the grandeur that the savagery in Dallas was calculated to rob it of.

It has been as though she were trying to show the world that courtesy and courage

did not die in Dallas last Friday, nor the tradition that was personified by 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 had come from so far away to pay him last honor.

From the moment she arrived back in Washington, erect and composed, wearing the blood-stained clothes of the infamous day in Dallas, she has imparted meaning and order to the chaos around her.

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

She brought her two children to the Capitol yesterday.

If she wanted them to see, however imperfectly, what their father meant, she also dramatized to the world and the evil people in it that a young father had been slain as well as a President.

It was, with the irony that has marked this entire episode, approximately the moment when her husband's suspected killer was being murdered in a Dallas police station.

She took 6-year-old Caroline by the hand and led her to the flag-covered bier, knelt and kissed it and returned to her place.

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 heroism with a heroism of its own. They waited hour after hour in the cold evening. They complained only when interlopers crossed the many intersections between them and the rotunda.

The line stretched for many blocks and remained long after the rudest calculation proved there was no hope of entry. They waited with good humor and camaraderie. Seven blocks from the Capitol dome stood a young man with a guitar. One of the seven children of a man in his neighborhood carried the guitar case.

Once, reminded that 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 mother coping with 5-year-old twin boys, said she would wait all night to go in.

A bespectacled Negro said simply, "It's the last, 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 black and white habits of sisters, out long after their bedtime, poignantly recalling a recent Kennedy quip that while bishops and Monsignors were always Republicans, sisters were inevitably Democratic.

Inside, four young sailors performed a last act that was perfectly in the Kennedy style. One by one, they halted before the exact center of the casket, squared their white caps and executed their best salutes for their fallen Commander in Chief.

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.

DEBT OF GRATITUDE TO THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Mr. MOORHEAD. 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. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States—nay, the people of the world—owe a great debt of gratitude to the communications media for their complete and sensitive handling of the events following the assassination of President Kennedy.

It required the greatest sensitivity to give such complete coverage of a family in grief.

It required the deepest understanding of our form of government to display not only for Americans but for all the people of the world, the wondrous majesty and stability with which the transfer of power takes place under our 175-year-old Constitution.

On both counts the communications media scored superbly well.

OUR NATION HAS LOST A GREAT LEADER

Mr. FRASER. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great leader. John F. Kennedy loved his country; and his countrymen loved him. He was a man of compassion and of determination. He brought to us his conviction that our Nation could fulfill its destiny as the leader of free men.

He was of a new generation, which has seen the tragedy of two world wars and the futility of efforts to prevent those wars. His understanding of history led him to search boldly for new paths to peace with honor. He knew that the people of this Nation want peace, and he worked with imagination and determination to secure it.

He understood the dynamics of our Nation's economy and he acted to keep it serving the welfare of the people. The jobless, the sick, the elderly—all those for whom our Nation has not yet fulfilled its promise—these are the people whom he sought to aid.

He spoke with conviction about the need to banish hate and bigotry and acted to translate the American ideal of equality into a living reality.

Above all else, he brought a new spirit to our Nation. He enlarged our horizons, and taught us that we can, when we will, find within this Nation a greater fulfillment of our own lives.

Let us then rededicate ourselves to the goals for which he worked—peace with honor, the elimination of hate and bigotry, and an abundant life for all. His sacrifice shall not have been in vain.

EULOGY TO THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the President is dead—the victim of an assassin's bullet. This was the unbelievable news from Dallas which shocked and stunned the Nation and the world 4 days ago. As we attempt to resume our daily responsibilities, the question which weighs most heavily upon our minds is, "Why? Why? Why? What manner of being was this who could be so filled with hatred so as to take the life of a man whose whole heart and mind were dedicated to world peace and good will toward all mankind? Was this a product of our vaunted society? Where had we failed? And why? Why? Indeed, the greatest tragedy in our Nation's modern history has given us cause for some real soul searching.

President Kennedy will go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents of all times. Just as Abraham Lincoln, almost a century ago, laid down his life to make men free, so did John Fitzgerald Kennedy give up his life to free his fellow men from the chains and shackles of prejudice.

We have lost a great President; indeed, the entire world has lost one of the greatest leaders it has ever known. He gave voice to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind; he gave action to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind. His unwavering courage and enlightened leadership will forever inspire men of good will everywhere to greater heights.

To Mrs. Kennedy and her children and to the entire Kennedy family, I wish to convey the deepest sympathy and condolences of the people of the State of Hawaii and mine.

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 known only to a bereaved wife, she drowned the woes of life her own in tears to others never shown. As the First Lady of our land, she walked in composed dignity as if guided by that same hand which inspired the rare courage and genius of her late husband.

PROPOSED SOLE-SOURCE PURCHASE OF A CONTROL ANTENNA FOR A DRONE AIRPLANE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

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 would cut the cost of this equipment by at least 50 percent.

Today, my study of that case is concluded, and, as was the case of the AS 1018/URC (XMI) which I reported here yesterday, my position has been borne out by the Comptroller General.

More important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Navy now has a chance to save not 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 \$192,000 already wasted on this 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 matter. I also demanded that the proposed sole source procurement be stopped until all the facts were known.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General has completed his review and has forwarded his findings to me.

It was my contention on February 27, 1963, that the Navy had, or should have, manufacturing drawings. Mr. Campbell's review 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 23, 1960, 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 cost and, therefore, the Government had no right to manufacturing data. That evaluation was approved, re-approved, and recertified time after time.

Now, what was the truth? In his report to me, the Comptroller General said, in part:

Our review (showed) that research and development contracts were awarded by the Navy to Dr. Lan Jen Chu and to Chu Associates, Inc., during the 1950's that called for

research in scientific areas, including antennas. Further, our review disclosed that Chu Associates, Inc., had received some purchase orders or subcontracts from Government prime contractors during the 1950's for antennas.

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" covered by its patent "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 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 process."

There, Mr. Speaker, is point No. 1 of my case. Navy proclaims for all to hear time and again that it has 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.

Now, 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 AT 948/U 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 procurement.

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 each.

Last February I predicted the price would fall by at least 50 percent when competitive bidding was introduced. As a direct result of my statement to the House and work done by GAO, a competitive procurement of these items was issued, and the bids were opened on November 12, 1963. There were three bidders. Bidder A, the low bidder, asked \$397.50 per unit—\$857 less than the average sole source price. Thus, the competitive price here was less than one-third the sole source price, or 31 percent. Expressed another way, the sole source price was over 300 percent that of the competitive price of the low bidder.

Bidder B, the second low bidder, asked \$713 per unit—\$541 less than the average sole source price. Bidder B, then, undercut the sole source price by 42 percent.

Mr. Speaker, bidder A, the low bidder, is Randesign, Inc., Copiague, Long Island, N.Y., and bidder B is Chu Associates, Littleton, Mass., which got an average price of \$1,254 for the same antenna sole source.

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 that in the two previous procurements, over \$192,000 was wasted.

Even using Chu's figures, they show that Chu, the competitive bidder, could have saved the Government \$121,240 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 of Defense for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris sees nothing that is a departure from good procurement practice? This is another of the cases that he had seen before he made that statement of June 30, 1963.

Answering my questions about this case, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics Kenneth E. BeLieu couched his replies always in a way to solidify and protect Navy's position that a sole source procurement was mandatory. It was the GAO which got to the bottom of things and exposed the Navy's sham.

This proves that servants such as BeLieu give little more than lipservice to their jobs. The resulting inefficiency raises the cost of defense and hikes every workingman's tax bill. This case involves waste of up to \$192,000 and is indicative of the way in which tax money is needlessly thrown to the winds.

Since these procurement people inevitably hide behind superiors such as BeLieu, and since the superiors inevitably defend them regardless of their blame or innocence, I am constrained to state that the top procurement officer behind these purchases was and is Kenneth E. BeLieu. This is another case which proves BeLieu is an inefficient luxury the taxpayers cannot afford. BeLieu must go.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in this case the Navy has wasted from \$121,000 to \$192,000 on sole-source buys, while the first competitive procurement there was a 69-percent saving.

INEFFICIENCY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

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(XMI). 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. Joseph Campbell 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 Navy and 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 practices constantly referred to by the Defense Department. This is exactly the type of shenanigans Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics Thomas D. Morris defends 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 \$5,000 it costs to prepare 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. It listed 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 \$487, compared to \$970 paid to the sole-source producer, 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, Mr. Speaker, comparing 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 giving the sole-source 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 notice originally published 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 original special notice and we believe the amended statement issued on March 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, through laziness, just said the Navy did not know if patent rights were involved without checking. It was easier that way. Or, someone in the Navy purposely fabricated a lie to scare away competition. Ten days after being caught redhanded, 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 pushed out needed information.

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, Lansdale, 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 wasting \$429 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 June 1, 1962, 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 121 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-Machine was issued at a price of \$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. Navy's 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.

Now, to point three—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 NObsr 85111, 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:

Our 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 1950's that called for research in scientific areas, including antennas. Further, our review disclosed that Chu Associates, Inc., had received purchase orders or subcontracts from Government prime contractors during the 1950'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 patented item, including a right to manufacturing drawings in production of the equipments by any company selected by the Government.

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 was one of the cases into 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 than 50 cents' 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. His is the most inefficient command of the lot. It is by his tacit, unspoken consent that such shady deals and manipulations are perpetrated. I shall have more to say about BeLieu in the future, and the evidence will all point to one conclusion—BeLieu must go.

Today's address is the first of 10 cases I will spell out to the House within the next 3 weeks. Tomorrow, I will deal with another procurement by the Navy.

Conclusion: \$50,000 wasted under one sole-source procurement. Up to \$108,000 saved by latest competitive bidding.

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 Record 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 tragic 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 Federal jurisdiction 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 Record 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 more notably for our Nation 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 services, no one is more worthy 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 responsibility of this House to enact this legislation which would authorize the new President, in the name of Congress, to award the honor.

It is a small but significant gesture which the House could enact, 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, 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. 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 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 young men and women 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 the arts and commerce.

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 "it is our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race; to advance step 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: were we 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 stark tragedy 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 extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, I feel confident, the majority of Members of Congress, together with millions of other Americans, and people all around the world, attended their churches to worship. In most instances, I believe, at least a portion of each service was devoted to a memorial to our late President, John F. Kennedy.

At the service in the church of which I am a member, the pastor's remarks were most appropriate, and his approach to this terrible tragedy was helpful to me. Therefore, I would like to share these remarks with my colleagues and with those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"On the Passing of John F. Kennedy," by the Reverend Finley M. Keech, minister of the First Baptist Church, Tully, N.Y., follows:

ON THE PASSING OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

In the 2 days just past we have been cast low by the passing of President John F. Kennedy. But in order to have profound appreciation it is not necessary that his opinions be altogether ours, nor his politics and policies. It is necessary only to know that his country is our country and that his citizenship is ours as well; and because of this we can mourn his passing from mortal life in our midst.

We all have heard many details of the circumstances by radio and television which we need not duplicate here. But in order to describe adequately the enormity of the crime that has been committed we must say some-

thing like: "One person, it would seem, has taken unto himself the prerogative which is God's alone—to grant life to a human being or to take it"—and herein is the essence of the tragedy.

Beyond merely describing what has come to pass, however, we crave an understanding of what is happening in our midst.

First, we can observe that there is among us a national personality. For I believe that groups as well as persons express a personality. We belong to clubs or small groups which, by virtue of the persons comprising them, possess a corporate personality. The same, it seems, is true of larger groups, the church congregations we belong to, and even political parties. And a national personality now shows itself in grief and sorrow for the passing from this life of our President.

But just as surely a national personality will also be observed in the days before us as the Nation continues to direct its people's purposes.

Second, in seeking to understand what now happens among us and within us, we must bring to the surface of consciousness what is at least subconscious, to say that we are now struck with how mortal we are. That is to say, upon seeing that another is indeed mortal we have it dramatically impressed upon us that we, too, are mortal and that we can die as well as he.

But there is another side to this matter, namely, that somehow, in our humanity and human society, we are a part of the whole of life that creates human hatreds and promotes, albeit unwittingly, even psychopathic animosities among some of the population. It would be fitting in this circumstance, therefore, that persons of the church use the occasion more assuredly to dedicate themselves to the Kingdom of God in our midst and resolve therein to use the Christian gospel as a counterforce to the passions of hatred.

And last, in the happenings around us we are finding the true purpose of intercession, that is, of intercessory prayer in which we render prayer in another's behalf. Be assured that we are not offering prayer for a dead and inert body. We pray, rather, in the behalf of a living soul received of our Heavenly Father. We pray for a family now broken, for a young widow and her almost infant children, and for a family that has suffered much tragedy and is now cast into the consummate tragedy of human experience. It should be our high hope that, in praying in the face of tragedy, we shall be able to learn also of life in its goodness and blessings.

Involving ourselves, as we have done, in intercession for others, we may hope also that therein shall be found the strength and direction for our lives whereby we shall be able to live in behalf of others and all.

It is a Christian thing to do, to pray for others. It is a Christian thing also to be able to weep with those who weep and to mourn with those who mourn. So I ask that we join with others of our fellow citizens in prayer, silently each in his own way, and corporately too.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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, President Mazzilli; from the Spanish group through its president, Mr. De Ananequi; from the Brazilian group through its president, Mr. Rui Palmeira; from the Parliament of Monaco through its president, Mr. Louis Aureglia; from the Italian group through its president, Mr. Vodacci Pisanelli, and from the French group through its president, Senator Moutet.

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.

PARIS, November 23, 1963.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE,
Inter-Parliamentary Group,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Suis certain interpreter sentiments union toute entiere en vous priant accepter et transmettre groupe Americain sentiments profonde emotion et sympathie emue a l'occasion tragique disparition President Kennedy grand serviteur de la democratie et de la paix.

BLONAY,
Secrétaire General.

DEPUTADOS BRASILIADP,
November 23, 1963.

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

Please accept my own name and behalf IPU Council expression deepest sympathy tragic event President Kennedy's death. Not only the United States but the whole world mourns one of its greatest leaders.

RANIERI MAZZILLI.

VITORIA, November 24, 1963.

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

On behalf of Spanish group Interparliamentary Union please express American group our most sincere condolence.

MANUEL DE ANANEGUI.

BRASILIA, November 26, 1963.

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

Deeply distressed tragical 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 through you our profound condolences and the deep emotion of the members of the National Council and the whole population of Monaco.

LOUIS AUREGLIA,
President.

MONACOVILLE, November 23, 1963.

MRS. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE,
U.S. Interparliamentary Group, House Of-
fice Building, Washington, D.C.:

Groupe Interparlementaire Principale de
Monaco consterne par tragique evenement qui
endeuille les etats unis et le monde vous ex-
prime condoeances profondement emues
des membres conseil natinal et de la popu-
lation Monegasque.

LOUIS AUREGLIA,
President.

ROMA, November 25, 1963.

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

Touched for the tragic lost President Ken-
nedy on behalf of Italian group please ac-
cept deepest condolences while jointing to
the nations's.

VODACCI PISANELLI.

Deeply shocked by your national mourn-
ing. The French national group wishes to
express its very sincere and deep compassion.
MOUTET.

PARIS, November 25, 1963.

LT. PRESIDENTE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Profondement bouleverse par votre deuil
national groupe Français vous exprime sa
tres sincere et bien vieve 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 No-
vember 22, 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
Johnson in his constitutional tasks. In
this most critical time, for our country
and for our troubled world, President
Johnson has my support.

As Mrs. Lindsay and I paid tribute
to the late President in the East Room
of the White House the day after his
young life was cut short, and later in
the great Rotunda of the Capital, and
finally at Arlington Cemetery, our
thoughts were with Mrs. Kennedy, the
children and the family, with our coun-
trymen, and with the people of the 17th
Congressional District in whose name
and for whom we stood in silent prayer.

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. Per-
haps 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 celebrate Thanksgiving 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 a Thanksgiving meal.

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 Con-
gress 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 faith by the mon-
archs, presidents, and prime ministers of
the West, whose country's have had
their share of tragedy, in bowing their
heads under an American flag in an
American cemetery.

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 fol-
lowing members of the Committee on the
Judiciary may have until Monday, De-
cember 2, 1963, to file additional views to
accompany House Report No. 914 or H.R.
7152: Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MAC-
GREGOR, 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-
ing 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 appro-
priately within the Federal purview than
the security of the functions of Govern-

ment by protection of the physical safety
of its officers. I shall offer a bill to ex-
tend existing law to protect the lives of
all Presidents so long as they live and the
lives of all other 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 ANEW

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 had
unusual meaning for Springfield, Ill.
Ninety-eight years ago that prairie com-
munity knew the sorrow of bringing
home for final rest the remains of an-
other martyred President, Abraham Lin-
coln, 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 na-
tional 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 Spring-
field in a coffin.

Jack Heintz, the present publisher of
Springfield's Illinois State Journal, a
paper that reported Lincoln's assassina-
tion a century ago, cried out last Satur-
day with these words:

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 madman. The skies
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
but 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 maniacal 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 had survived the ordeals
of war as a gallant hero, went to his death
as he led this Nation in a quest for peace.

The people of the United States, numb
with shock at the tragic manner in which
our President died, mourn as one. Our
hearts go out in sadness and deep sympathy
for the President's family in their bereave-
ment. The death of President Kennedy is

a loss to all humanity, a loss made even more tragic by the manner in which he died.

This dastardly crime shook to the core even the most calloused, and the entire Nation poured out its grief unashamedly at the news of the President's death, and mingled with the tears were emotion-filled outpourings of anger at the psychopathic killer who had pulled the trigger to fire the bullet that snuffed out the life of the President.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the fourth President of the United States to die at the hands of an assassin, had experienced in his 46 years the role of successful lawyer, author and recipient of a Pulitzer Prize, of Senator of the United States and of President of the United States. He had experienced personal suffering and hardship in the military service of his country; he provided leadership with the quality of greatness during this cold war period of international political strife with the Communists; and, he was a husband and father, a role dear to his heart. He was a man of integrity, a man of honesty, a man of deep conviction and sincerity.

In a moment of tragedy, his life ended. But the principles in which he believed, and for which he fought, will live on in the hearts of all who live on to fight the battle President Kennedy considered his greatest goal, the quest for peace.

In this hour of bereavement, we join with all Americans in their sorrow and in their prayers for our fallen leader, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

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 country a period of deep sadness and mourning as the full magnitude of our Nation's loss becomes more apparent with each passing hour.

In this period 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 national life of bigotry and vituperation; in doing so, let us consider the words of our beloved President which he had prepared to deliver to the Dallas Citizens Council and 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 "voices preaching 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:

TEXT 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 Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two 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—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.

The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and 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 a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full 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, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching 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.

At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

STEVENSON QUOTED

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained.

There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, but belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be no help.

STRENGTH OF AID PLAN

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British Fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability 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 swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba.

But while our goals were at least temporarily 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 on behalf 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 deterrents to the most subtle influences. 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 impossibility 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 our total Polaris purchase program—increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces.

Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of

their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack 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. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready army divisions—increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern army weapons and equipment—increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion and modernization program—increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft—increased 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 as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft—and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom 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, directly depend 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.

Our assistance for these nations can be painful, risky, and costly, as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number 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 confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own chiefs of staff think needed in the common interest.

Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the \$50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the \$4 bil-

lion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign-aid program is not growing in size; it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses, but we have undertaken to correct them, and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs.

Dollar for dollar, in or out of Government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much abused foreign-aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

LOSS 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 well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our information agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours 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 far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it 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 doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

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 affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an 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 strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion.

And the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our overseas competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some \$11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure 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 \$600 billion for, a record rise of over \$100 billion in 3 years. 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 corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of \$27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens, I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. That 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 sunlit 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 produced the twisted sniper may be tempered by the sure knowledge that it as 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, Mich.

This institution is operated by a great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and

is called the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Home.

Many of you know, I believe, of my activities in the VFW, for I feel sure you remember that I met some of you in your native States when I toured our Nation as Commander in Chief in 1957 and 1958. The VFW actually is the second largest veterans' organization in the world, and is the largest organization consisting exclusively of men who have served our Nation overseas and were thus awarded a campaign medal for such service. I might add further that the VFW requires an honorable discharge from wartime service in the armed services and campaign medal service for eligibility.

Our organization is chartered by Congress and is now made up of nearly 10,000 individual units called posts. The membership rolls number nearly 1,300,000.

Inasmuch as the United States has participated in many campaigns and expeditions, we find our membership made up of veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the many campaigns and expeditions recognized by the U.S. Government.

The VFW is also very proud of its ladies auxiliary of some 400,000, giving a combined membership of men and women of nearly 1 3/4 million Americans. The VFW this year is headed by an outstanding veteran from Brooklyn, N.Y., Joseph J. Lombardo, and our ladies auxiliary is under the direction of the National President, Lillian Campbell, of Neenah, Wis.

I have indicated that this is a unique organization, and our national home is an unique institution. I think that its very founding is unusual, and will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

In September 1924, first consideration was given at the national encampment of the VFW, held that year at Atlantic City, N.J., to the establishment of a national home for the orphan children of our members. The National Council of Administration, the ruling body of the VFW between encampments, had a session in Kansas City, Mo., in October of 1924 and appointed a committee with full power to act as it deemed fit to acquire farmland near Eaton Rapids, Mich., and thereby provide the establishment of a national home. The committee reported favorably to another council meeting in December 1924, and action was taken to convey to the VFW National Home the then Grand River Stock Farm at Eaton Rapids, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Corey J. Spencer, of Jackson, Mich.

The home was incorporated, following its acceptance of the farmland by the VFW, as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of the State of Michigan, and charter was filed with the secretary of state of the State of Michigan in January 1925. This act was approved by the national encampment in August 1925, at Tulsa, Okla. By this action, I feel that my comrades of the VFW gave real emphasis to the long-standing VFW motto—"To honor the dead by helping the living."

To continue just briefly with the history of our national home, the first oc-

cupancy was in March 1925, when the widow of one of our members, and her six children, became the first family to move into the home. At that time, they were housed in the original farmhouse which had served as the residence on the Grand River Stock Farm.

The original land conveyed to the VFW amounted to 472 acres. However, later purchases increased the size of these holdings to the 640 acres the home presently occupies.

The first cottage—and here I might qualify that term by saying that the cottages at our national home are rather elaborate, permanent dwellings constructed of either brick or stone and equivalent to private homes in the very best neighborhoods of American cities—was built in 1926 by the State of Michigan, and is referred to now as Michigan Cottage No. 1. This cottage is still in existence and is in use by the home.

The first cottage constructed by a department—or State—organization of the VFW was New York No. 1, completed in 1927. Since that time, many other departments have built cottages at our national home, and each unit represents a great deal of hard work by my comrades and sisters of the VFW residing in the department which provides the funds for the construction.

Only in one instance was a cottage constructed by one individual post. That was Parker D. Cramer Post 2145 in Clarion, Pa. The last cottage completed was by the Department of North Dakota in 1962, and we now have 32 of these beautiful homes housing children and giving ample room for a total of 230 boys and girls.

So many comrades and sisters of our organization have contributed to the growth of the home that it is impossible to list them all. Very important assistance to the national home came from the ladies auxiliary, for example, in building the original hospital and then, as a separate project, adding a wing to that hospital. The ladies auxiliary also built the community center, the nursery, the guest lodge and the chapel, and installed a complete street-lighting system.

The Military Order of the Cootie likewise has furnished important and needed additions to the home by constructing an athletic field and field-house, as well as the beautiful swimming pool, the fire barn and its modern and efficient firetruck, which is manned by the older boys living at the national home.

It is most difficult to single out those who have contributed time and money for our national home, but this great institution is mighty close to the hearts of all the men and women of the VFW. Individual posts, county councils, districts, and departments have built streets, provided transportation and heating systems, and provided general upkeep and improvement of the cottages. The Michigan ladies' auxiliary built the relief housemothers cottage, and the department of Pennsylvania expanded and improved the Woodside Center, named in honor of a distinguished past commander in chief, Robert G. Woodside. And just recently the de-

partment of Montana built a modern dairy farmstead to house the Holstein cow herd originally started by South Dakota and provide modern and sanitary dairy equipment.

It seems that when one who 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, land, livestock, et cetera, to be valued at \$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 source would be contributions from posts 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 home in suburban-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 homesite, and has provided that school and religious life be in the public 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 living near our national 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 opportunity furnished 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 Mrs. Hedwig 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 Mr. A. E. Littlefield, of Eaton Rapids, as 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 Winnsboro, La.; 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 RECORD and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. 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 good will.

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 the article appearing in the March 3 issue of the Great Falls Tribune at this point in the RECORD:

MONTANA FARM IN MICHIGAN
(By Rita Lindblom)

One of the most unusual of Montana farmsteads 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 children—unique in that it is available only to widows, sons, and daughters of VFW members. It also is one of the most beautifully developed children's villages in the world.

Playing a large part in the financial and educational operations of the home is the Montana Farmstead, the pride of Montana VFW and auxiliary members who have more than \$56,000 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.

When 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 250 children. There now are 195 children and 40 housemothers at the home.

The home today has 50 units, including 32 cottages, a modern hospital, day nursery, guest lodge, chapel, clothing and grocery store on a 50-acre campus, and the Montana Farmstead, with 590 acres of fertile dairy and orchard land.

The home was developed entirely within the VFW organization. State departments have provided many improvements, including family-sized cottages, a service center, picnic ground, private lake area, swimming pool, athletic field, water-softening system, firefighting equipment, and paved streets.

Not all State organizations have had unit projects at the home, but children 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 52 by 150-foot cattle barn or loafing parlor for the dairy cows, a modern milking parlor, new fencing, and new silos with an automatic silage mover connected to the feed bunk.

With the new farm setup, the milking herd was increased from about 40 head to more than 90, with more increases planned. During the past 5 years, the farm has developed to the point where a net profit of more than \$7,000 was realized last year to aid in the home's operation. Previously the farm was a nonpaying proposition, and in some years a liability.

All finances for the home are direct donations from VFW and auxiliary members with the exception of the public buddy poppy sale; which is VFW-sponsored—1 penny for every poppy sold goes to the home. The sale of VFW National Home Christmas Seals 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 finest in the United States. Child care experts from all over the world visit the home, many of them at the suggestion of the United Nations, to observe and learn its methods.

No children are adopted from the home. Families are kept intact. The average child at the home has been there for more than 3 years, some for their entire childhood.

Children attend public school in Eaton Rapids, 4 miles distant. Those old enough to attend church are required to affiliate

themselves with the church of their family choice and participate in youth groups of Eaton Rapids churches.

Many home graduates have gone on to college, helped by VFW and other scholarships. More than 150 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 its pledge of "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. Bray] 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 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.

One of the most worthwhile discussions I have seen on the subject is in the following article by Dr. Lev Dobriansky which appeared in the Ukrainian Quarterly:

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY AND THE COLD WAR

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

With the so-called first step toward guaranteeing the peace, it would do well for most Americans to learn an old Turkestanian proverb: "When you travel with a Russian, make sure you carry an ax." The Kennedy administration has decided to travel with the Russians on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. What ax, if any, is it carrying?

The partial nuclear test ban treaty may well give rise to the biggest hoax of the cold war. The hoax 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, the unswerving enemy will have scored a momentous victory in the cold war. The effects of this spreading illusion would be catastrophic for our cold war efforts and operations, inferior though they have been.

In the Senate hearings on the treaty many delicate questions and points will undoubtedly be raised. Indeed, the treaty itself is an awful gamble with our national security. Testing of all kinds is necessary for the advancement of our military technological knowledge and thus, in all its ramifications, of our national interests. Testing is by nature experimentation, and through the latter we learn more in ways of development and control. Even the dangers of fallout have by this normal process been reduced to a thin minimum. Are we to deprive ourselves of such critical knowledge because of emotional and irrational pleas for peace, much of it stimulated by Moscow's propaganda machine for the past 8 years? The greatest guarantee against the outbreak of a hot global war is our overall military and technological superiority. The treaty does not conduce to this guarantee.

Also, what of the indispensable development of the antimissile missile, which only by atmospheric testing can be efficiently undertaken? Would a ratified treaty lead to the demobilization of our nuclear capital as represented by our assembled scientists, engineers, facilities, and so forth? Who in his right mind would trust the Russians not to cheat on undetectable nuclear explosions in the atmosphere under 1 kiloton and the use of their results for adapted massive

missile development? Furthermore, since it is held with some validity that the heavy expenditures involved in nuclear testing have compelled the Russian totalitarians to seize upon this treaty, aren't we relieving them of this extra burden to patch up their imperial economy for even more intensive cold war operations—the Chicoms?

The burden of these and many more questions rests with the proponents of this treaty, not its opponents. Even from a strictly legal point of view the treaty is subject to serious question. Much can and will be made of article IV in the treaty which states that "each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty." What national sovereignty is exercised by an empire-state such as the Soviet Union, and a democratic but multinational entity like United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland? Two of the three "original parties," the depository governments, are mischaracterized and fallaciously defined right from the start. If parties to a contract are misrepresented in light of fact and logic, the entire contract is overshadowed by this basic invalidity. In a court of law such an ill-based contract could hardly survive the court's objective strictures. Why should it in this all-important case? Or are we to multiply error and fiction?

Highly important, too, for a studied consideration of the treaty are the points of an armaments race and a succeeding non-aggression pact. The treaty is supposed to herald the intention of curbing the armaments race. In developing more powerful and efficient weapons the United States has been in no race. Regardless of what Moscow does or does not do, our goal should unqualifiedly be an adequacy of the best weapons along the full spectrum of weaponry. As to a succeeding nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations, a ratification of the partial test ban treaty should in no way be interpreted as a predication for such a pact. Khrushchev's one great dream has been to obtain our acceptance of his empire. In point of logic, for a nonaggressor to agree with a historical aggressor on nonaggression is a rather one-sided and even absurd agreement. As an imperio colonialist power, Moscow, in fact, is in a state of constant aggression, and any such simple agreement on nonaggression would sanctify this state. It is all important to keep the test ban treaty and this proposed pact strictly apart.

Perhaps the most important of questions bears on the cold war implications of the test ban treaty? Is it, as the President has said, a shaft of light in the cold war? To believe this is only a psychological preparation for the hoax mentioned earlier. Such naive belief runs counter to the facts of typical Russian cold war play; it blindly ignores the utterances of the Soviet Russian totalitarians. More, it reduces our own effectiveness. The test ban treaty itself is in part the result of Russian cold war calculation.

From Moscow's point of view, the treaty can serve numerous ends. It is a slap at Red China; it will decelerate American progress in military technology and weaponry; it can accommodate Russian cheating; it will permit the retention of Russian superiority in high megatonnage weaponry; it will allow a diversion of resources in the economy that might enhance output for more effective cold war operations; and it is a lever for the exaction of a possible nonaggression pact and all that this would entail to the cold war detriment of the United States and the free world.

Neither can Moscow's sudden accession to the test ban treaty be divorced from its evaluation of the political factors surrounding Washington and London. Administrations in both centers will be up for election next year, and in both the United States and

Great Britain the pressure to show something as an offset to Cuba and the scandalous Profumo case, respectively, is intense.

The treaty and its assumed observance will in no way lead to the cessation of the cold war. The treaty cannot rationally be regarded as even the first step to any such eventuality. Indeed, to think in the most ultimate terms that the cold war could end without the necessary collapse of the imperial structure maintained by Moscow suggests both an unfamiliarity with East European history and a failure to understand the nature of the cold war itself. But, for that matter, both deficiencies have for too long punctuated U.S. foreign policy.

Moreover, despite its imperialist rift with Peiping, Moscow has been thoroughly consistent in its resolve to wage the cold war on the basis of its meaning of "peaceful coexistence." Taking just the most recent period, we should review a few examples of Moscow's meaning. In January 1957, Khrushchev minced no words when he declared: "For all of us * * * Stalin's name is inseparable from Marxism-Leninism. Therefore, each one of us, members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, strives to be as faithful to Marxism-Leninism * * * as Stalin was faithful to this cause." The cause of Stalin was the cause of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev reaffirmed traditional Russian cold war policy when he stated, "We will beat the United States with small wars of liberation. We will nibble them to exhaustion all over the globe, in South America, Africa, southeast Asia." New? Not at all. For centuries Russian imperio-colonialists have been "liberating" non-Russian peoples for one reason or another. Significantly, even during the Sino-Soviet talks in Moscow, July 1963, Russian organs emphasized that the Red Chinese have nothing over the Soviet Russians in the pursuit of these wars of liberation. And this immediately prior to the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

THE INTENSIFIED COLD WAR

Confronted now by the massive competition issuing from Peiping for leadership among the Communist parties throughout the world, Moscow will have to intensify its cold war efforts in order that its demonstrative deeds will exceed the stern competitor's. Unavoidably, 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 greater than ever before.

In meeting these demands we shall truly have to reexamine our views, habits, and notions regarding the Soviet Union. Karl Marx wrote, "The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing." In the contemporary context this, of course, is an extreme historical observation, since the eagle, the lion, and others are capable of more than nothing. Yet this Marxian insight into the nature of the beast, regardless of his ideologic pigmentation, carries immense weight and validity in the one sphere on clear-cut Soviet Russian superiority—the all-embracing sphere of political psychology, artful propaganda, systematic imagemaking. It is in this sphere, incorporating and interrelating into a manifest whole of projected imagery factors of ideologic, political, economic, military-space, and general cultural character, that imperial Moscow wages its Communist assault on American freedom.

In 1960, and on many occasions since, we Americans have been seriously concerned about the image of the United States in the world at large. We have been concerned about our prestige, about how other peoples and nations regard us as to our intentions, our goals, economic performance, scientific feats, military capability, and national will.

However, curiously enough, we have paid relatively little attention to the totalistic processes and attainments of Soviet Russian imagemaking. Category by category, ranging from the ideologic to the athletic, on the average we far surpass the Russians, but yet somehow, in the aggregate and in the minds of millions throughout the world, we are held to be in fierce competition by an adversary who claims the future will rest with him.

The whole of the Soviet Russian image far exceeds the sum of its parts. The remarkable ability of Moscow's totalitarians to project such a dynamic and imposing image is the consummate result of a number of institutional reasons. This unique capacity in global Potemkinism is founded in the totalizing political realm on a rich heritage of practical and speculative experience that includes, over the centuries, the cumulative achievements of empire building, the deep perceptions into the recesses of human behavior by the Dostoyevskys, the Tolstoyes, and the Pavlovs, the long traditions of revolutionary and conspiratorial activity, the secret society, and the Iron Curtain, and—in the basic institutional lineage of the khans, czars, and commissars—efficient practices in totalitarian control. A study and understanding of this type of assault—the assault of creative imagery to influence, deceive, and confuse in preparation for practical conquest—should guard us against emotional swings of underestimation as well as overestimation, against needless concessions as well as narrow rigidity, in coping with the centuries-shaped adversary. Above all, knowing that the Soviet Union is the crucial power center and all else, including Red China, is basically adventitious, they should motivate us in concentrating on a complete unmasking of both the assault and the assaulter.

SOVIET RUSSIAN IDEOLOGY IN THE COLD WAR

When Khrushchev visited the United States in 1959, every American had the opportunity to witness at first hand the display and manipulation of the philosophico-ideologic component in the image Moscow has sought to convey to the world. The march of communism, burying decadent capitalism, is supposedly in the historical works. This was the philosophico-ideologic pitch made by Khrushchev; this has been the fraudulent pitch made by the successors of the Russian czars since the establishment of Soviet Russia in 1917 and the forced inception of the Soviet Union in 1923. And, strangely enough, countless of our citizens continue to believe that the real struggle is between capitalism and communism. This specious belief is an ideologic-propagandist achievement by Moscow.

Those who have had systematic training in Marxism and its organic structure of thought, have over the years attempted to impress upon the inquiring mind the fact that Marxism is a mythical foundation of Leninism and all the ismatic variations that have followed. The arbitrary attachment of Marxism to the Soviet Russian ideologic scheme may lend philosophical dignity and status to the superficial operationalism of Lenin's works and those that followed, but in fact Marxism bears so much relationship to Russian totalitarian thought and, objectively, to the Soviet Union, as does French physiocracy to our society. On fundamental doctrinal points of economic determinism, the concept of society versus state, the forced institution of socialism in underdeveloped areas, the Leninist totalitarian vanguard, Marxian philosophical humanism, and the labor theory of value, Marxism in the Russian ideologic scheme stands as a crass perversion.

Fortunately, in our country more and more is being written about this ideologic perversion. More and more of our people are beginning to realize that communism is an

instrument of ideologic deception manipulated by the real enemy, Soviet Russia imperio-colonialism; that Marxism is a false credential in the Soviet Russian image, a facade behind which the real forces of imperialist conquest and colonial exploitation operate; that the real struggle is not between capitalism and communism but, instead, between freedom and Soviet Russian totalitarianism; and that Moscow's cold war manipulation of a perverted ideology is not a new practice. The czars, like the commissars, also hid behind ideologic masks—those of religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavism.

Accumulated evidence clearly shows that when we strike out against ideologic communism, scarcely a ripple is produced in Moscow. On the other hand, when we penetrate the ideologic veneer and merely scratch the real enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the bear squeals. Much remains to be done in exposing the philosophico-ideologic fraud of the Soviet Russian image, and negatively a study of Marxism can do it. Positively, a study of Marxism and its historical interpretations and insights into the Russian Empire, traditional Russian cold war activity, and the perennial goals of Russian statism helps immensely in the formation of accurate historical perspectives on this East European and Asiatic problem. However, it is also indispensable to penetrate the political component of the total Soviet Russian image for our understanding of the Communist assault on American freedom.

THE SOVIET RUSSIAN POTEMKIN VILLAGE

Marx called the Czarist Russian Empire a "prison house of nations." Today, this conception is no less applicable to the Commissars' Soviet Union, the political component in the Soviet Russian image. When, as in the case of Marxism and Communist ideology, we fail to analyze critically the terms in use and carelessly identify Russia and the Soviet Union, Moscow has no problem in projecting the image of an expanding nation-state with numerous so-called minorities and ethnic groups, similar to the United States. In fact, this fallacious concept is contained in the test ban treaty. When, on the other hand, the U.S.S.R. is shown to be an imperio-colonial system where many different nations are held in captivity, Moscow is compelled to shift its cold war gears and attempts to cast the image of multinational fraternity and brotherhood.

The facts are that the Soviet Union is a "prison house of nations," a basic empire which forms the foundation of the expanded Soviet Russian Empire, and that colonial 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.

Evidence on 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 deflect growing attention in this country on the imperio-colonialism that prevails in the U.S.S.R. by stimulating debate on so-called Western imperialism and colonialism. Down to this day, when pressure is exerted and the false image of the U.S.S.R.—the global-appealing Potemkin Village—is placed under critical scrutiny, Moscow takes to the defensive in an attempt to preserve its image. Witness these examples, for instance: (1) the series titled "The 15 Soviet Republics, Today and Tomorrow" (Soviet Booklets, London, 1959-60) that was ordered by Moscow for mass printing in

England soon after the Captive Nations Week episode in 1959; (2) the scandalous UNESCO study, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." (by I. P. Tsameyan and S. Ronin, UNESCO, 1962), which we helped to subsidize but which few Americans have been able to obtain—including, it is said, Ambassador Stevenson—is a neat, disreputable work of half-truths designed to preserve at all costs the political component of the Soviet Russian image.

Here, too, much study and work remain to be done. Yet, when our own Secretary of State believes the Soviet Union is a historical state, of which Georgia, Armenia, 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-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states"; when, repeating an old and stale argument, Rostow tells us that it is "an American interest to see the end of nationhood as it has been historically defined," one cannot but begin to wonder who is helping whom 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 battle ever suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War." We need hardly wonder how the Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other non-Russian nations 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 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 an underdeveloped economy with overdeveloped ambitions. One cannot but express amazement at times at some of the comparisons drawn between our national economy and the Soviet imperial economy, as though the two in essence were comparable. From an economy that for exactly 40 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 final showdown.

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 can be understood, deflated, and tactfully destroyed. America's victory in the cold war, with peace but toward justice and freedom, necessitates that these things be done. We cannot repeat too often Marx's own observation on the Russian Empire, now in the guise of the Soviet Union, "The only way to deal with a power like Russia is the fearless way." The partial nuclear test ban treaty 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 include extraneous matter.

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 words 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

America's change of Presidents from John F. Kennedy to Lyndon Johnson has been brought about by bullets—methods dreadfully familiar in some countries, but strange and deeply shocking in the United States. It is especially tragic that the victim of this assassination should have been the laughing and confident 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 vast resources of the United States but also because he awakened faith in his purposes among those with whom he came in contact.

In his own country he led with imagination and courage. In this time of great and rapid change, he was well suited to his task 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 indebted to him because, in general, he taught them to examine novel ideas for themselves instead of responding to them entirely as the teachings of tradition dictated.

The manner of his death is shocking as well as sorrowful because it shows the presence in this country of a mind that could not differ without hate, and did not hesitate to deal death to anyone who disagreed.

If this spirit of partisan hate is widespread in this country, let us have determined campaigns to trample it out. A free country cannot govern itself except by the exercise of friendly disagreement. America must be a land of open debate, not poisonous resentments living and growing in secret.

The American people mourn John F. Kennedy. Their sympathy goes to his wife and children, his mother and father. And so his death is as deeply felt by people who disagreed with his political philosophy as by those who agreed with it. That is the spirit in which free people can govern themselves.

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

AMERICA WEEPS

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 inevitably have followed the assassination of the chief of the most powerful Nation in the world.

The Nation is left temporarily without a leader. Vice President Johnson will assume

the heavy burden of the Presidency and the policies of the Nation will undergo no imminent change. But inevitably the assassination will change the course of history, not only in the Nation but in the world.

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, of course, known:

But the deed in Dallas was different only in degree of importance from such acts of violence as the bombing of houses of worship, racial murders and only last month, in the same city, the degrading assault on U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

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 distort the operations of the United Nations would not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the eyes that lined up Mr. Kennedy's head in the crosshairs 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 the national conscience.

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 their government's 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's regular political opposition, those persons in his own party and in the Republican Party who had disagreed with many of his views and policies and who also grieve for Mr. Kennedy. We are speaking of the extremists from both parties who go beyond the pale in their opposition and criticism.

The Nation owes a great debt to Mr. Kennedy who gave his life in the service of his country as surely as a soldier on the front-line. And to Mrs. Kennedy and the President's family the American people offer their hearts. The personal tragedy of an assassination seldom has been as heartbreakingly evident as in the scene that followed the shooting: Mrs. Kennedy holding the President's head in her lap and weeping "Oh, no."

No, it should never have happened in America. That it did must weigh heavily on America's conscience. And if it brings a reawakening and a real change in the temper of our times Mr. Kennedy will not have died in vain. This is a prayer in which all Americans can join.

COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

CIX—1437

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 Star on Wednesday, November 20, 1963, should be of interest to the Members of this House. Not only should the information furnished by Mr. Shepard Blumenthal, of Rockford, Ill., 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 being proven guilty. 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 evidence is in.

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 to promote an important domestic industry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave which I have obtained to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I wish to include with these remarks the statements of Mr. Blumenthal as contained in the article which I have referred to above.

The article follows:

CLAIMS AMERICAN COUNTERPART FUNDS SAVE INDUSTRIES

Best possible use of U.S. counterpart funds frozen in foreign countries is in promoting a greater flow of American-made goods into those countries, Shepard Blumenthal, Rockford, president of the National Hide Association, said Tuesday.

The association was one of the trade associations listed by Representative EDWARD FINNEGAN, Democrat, of Illinois, in an attack on what he termed "misuse and waste" of U.S. counterpart funds.

Morning Star Political Editor Joe Fisher, reporting from Washington Monday, disclosed that staff investigators of the House Government Operations Committee have been assigned to determine whether a congressional hearing on the use of counterpart funds is warranted.

Defending his own and other trade groups, Blumenthal credited this aid with saving one industry, the U.S. rendering industry. Europe now is a big market for U.S. tallow and other products of that industry, primarily because of the Government-supported promotional program, especially in Italy, he said. The National Renderers' Association was one of the groups cited by FINNEGAN.

As to the plight of the hide industry, Blumenthal said:

"There are such tremendous surpluses of hides in the United States, action must be taken in the foreign fields."

Hide prices are "off 40 percent" over the past year alone, he noted. Blumenthal pointed out one factor is that Americans are eating more and more beef and the slaughter is "going up and up."

In addition, since World War II, synthetic substitutes have taken 75 percent of the

market for sole leather and now new materials are threatening the market for uppers for shoes, he said.

A third major factor, Blumenthal said, is foreign imports. Some 87 million pairs of shoes were imported into the United States the past year, an increase of about 9,000 percent within a decade, he stated.

He said he personally favors the present U.S. policy under which there are "almost no restrictions" on such imports. However, Blumenthal declared, foreign countries should reciprocate by eliminating some of their "restrictive quotas and destructive tariffs" on U.S.-made leather products.

That's why the National Hide Association and other segments of the U.S. leather industry participated in the "Week of Leather," the world's largest show, in Paris during September, Blumenthal explained.

Blumenthal said he would welcome the investigation of counterpart fund spending FINNEGAN said is underway.

"Our hands are clean," Blumenthal said. Blumenthal said he has been questioned by investigators concerning what he understood to be waste in government. He added he felt FINNEGAN's attack was an example of "striking back" over recent criticism of wasteful spending during congressional junkets overseas.

MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY

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. GARMATZ and Congressman SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, join me in asking unanimous consent that the editorial on Mrs. Kennedy, appearing in the Baltimore Sun, under date of November 24, 1963, be printed in 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 fainting, and men were overcome with grief, Mrs. John F. Kennedy in Dallas mustered the inner strength to stand by her husband to the end; brave, composed and in every fiber and gesture a President's wife. Bearing the horrible stains 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 Nation and world may take pride in Mrs. Kennedy, even as they extend to her their halting expressions of sympathy. No matter how seemingly secure our existence may be, there can come those moments that demand the raw courage and self-discipline of pioneers. Gentle, retiring and finely drawn, Mrs. Kennedy has demonstrated once again that reservoir of strength that from time immemorial has nurtured our faith, our convictions, our determination to face the future fearlessly.

With her husband dead so soon after the death of a child, with her other children bereaved, her home bestowed upon a new President and her future uncertain, not for a moment did Mrs. Kennedy falter in fulfilling the stern demands made upon her. Her strength is the Nation's and humanity's

strength. We may share not only her ordeal, 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 absence was granted to:

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

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

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROUDEBUSH, 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. PELLY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PIRNIE.

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:

S. 298. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1309. An act to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); and

H.R. 8969. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase

the authorization for appropriation and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 130. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which commenced after January 1, 1961; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 6777. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday; with amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7751. A bill to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9124. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9004. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order that such building may be preserved as a memorial to General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing while being utilized in the best interests of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9223. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9224. A bill to designate the authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9225. A bill to designate the authorized 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 authorized 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 authorized Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the "John F. Kennedy Canal"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9228. A bill to designate the authorized 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 authorized 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 authorized 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 refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of physicians 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. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9240. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make Federal crimes certain offenses against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9241. 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.

Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9242. A bill to prohibit interference with the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9243. A bill to repeal the cabaret 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 28 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. 809. 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. 810. 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. 9248. A bill for the relief of Donald Loo, also known as Loo Hong Mun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

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, unlike private 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 \$10 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 the entire civilized world 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 posterity.

They follow in the order of delivery:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY LT. GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER

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, I welcome 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.

This is the only place in the world, to my knowledge, where a monument has been erected to mark the delivery of an address.

What remarkable power did these few words, spoken here a century ago, possess 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 setting.

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 war.

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 scour.

In his honest humility, he had thought himself a failure. He had tried to preserve