

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will toward men.*

O Thou God of love and of light, may the beautiful spirit of the gracious and hallowed Christmas, which is the high festal day in the annals of time, now possess and permeate the heart of all mankind with joy and peace.

May that great and glorious day, whose meaning our finite minds cannot fully comprehend, send forth its radiant splendor and healing flame into every land and life, every heart and home, for no explorer has ever discovered a place where hearts do not break or a clime where tears do not flow.

Grant that the Christmas spirit of generosity and good will, of sympathy and service, may last through all the coming days, encircling them with happiness and hope, and safeguarding them from greed and selfishness.

Hear us in the name of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace. 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 without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year"; and

H.J. Res. 648. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Yon Ok Kim, Chang In Wu, and Jung Yol Sohn.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth);

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins;

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 439. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Angelo Coppola;

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching;

S. 1445. An act for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Nina Carmela Pirritano;

S. 2073. An act for the relief of Roza Feuer;

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week; and

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF  
GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College.

Highest regards.

Respectfully,

HOMER THORNBERRY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-  
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on January 14, 1964, the following members on the part of the House:

Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, chairman.

Mrs. KELLY, of New York.

Mr. DULSKI, of New York.

Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois.

Mr. GAIAMO, of Connecticut.

Mr. JOHNSON, of California.

Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia.

Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.

Mr. TUPPER, of Maine.

Mr. ROBISON, of New York.

Mr. BATTIN, of Montana.

Mr. ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 249]

Abbutt	Gray	Nedzi
Abele	Green, Pa.	Nelsen
Abernethy	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Adair	Gubser	Osners
Alger	Hall	Ostertag
Ashley	Harris	Philbin
Ashmore	Harrison	Pilcher
Bass	Harsha	Powell
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Purcell
Belcher	Hays	Quillen
Blatnik	Hébert	Rains
Bolling	Herlong	Reuss
Bray	Hoeven	Rhodes, Pa.
Brock	Hoffman	Riehlman
Buckley	Hollifield	Roberts, Tex.
Burke	Hull	Rogers, Colo.
Burkhalter	Hutchinson	Rooney, Pa.
Cahill	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Cannon	Johnson, Calif.	Ryan, Mich.
Carey	Jones, Ala.	St. George
Cederberg	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Celler	Kee	Sheppard
Clancy	Kelly	Shipley
Colmer	Keogh	Short
Conte	Kilburn	Sikes
Cramer	King, N.Y.	Siler
Curtis	Kyl	Sisk
Dague	Landrum	Slack
Davis, Tenn.	Leggett	Staebler
Dawson	Lesinski	Stephens
Derounian	Lloyd	Sullivan
Devine	McCulloch	Talcott
Diggs	McIntire	Taylor
Donohue	McLoskey	Teague, Calif.
Dorn	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	Mailliard	Thompson, La.
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Martin, Nebr.	Thornberry
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Flynt	Milliken	Van Pelt
Foreman	Minshall	Watson
Forrester	Montoya	Wharton
Fulton, Tenn.	Morris	Whitener
Fuqua	Morse	Williams
Gibbons	Moss	Willis
Glenn	Multer	Wyder
Goodell	Murphy, N.Y.	Younger
Grant	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 288 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### ETHICS, ADVERTISING, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] 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. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an informative speech made by David J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission, entitled "Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities," before the Georgetown University and Catholic apostolate of mass media.

It is indeed a pleasure to participate in this conference on "Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities."

May I observe that in relation to advertising it may be more descriptive to refer to the responsibilities and obligations of the advertiser rather than his ethics and morals. These words—"ethics" and "morals"—are high-sounding terms and appear to belong more in a philosophical frame of reference rather than in a reference to advertising—whether it is deceptive or not. At the same time, we recognize that there is a moral concept involved in the observance of law generally, even though compliance with law may provide only a minimum standard of conduct. There is an element of "morality" inherent in the Federal Trade Commission Act in prohibiting "unfair" practices which includes deceptive advertising. However, rather than calling it "moral" or "ethical" to obey the law, may I refer instead to legal responsibilities and obligations.

The courts have recently reminded us that there is no constitutional right to disseminate deceptive advertising.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, there is a constitutional responsibility and obligation not to disseminate deceptive advertising.

There is severe criticism of certain current advertising practices. Complaints by consumers and business competitors are appreciably increasing. We appreciate the great contributions advertising has made to the economic and business life of the country, so we do not subscribe to the extreme criticism that advertising is an unproductive industry.

But it must be recognized that deception does exist in a wide variety of advertising, not only locally but also nationally and regionally, and there are involved certain responsibilities and obligations.

A prominent advertising manager at a meeting of advertising men asked:

"How many of us here can say that he's never been a party to deceptive advertising; that he has never, at the very least, allowed advertising of one kind or another to go by him that encouraged favorable but untrue inferences about his product?"

"And who among us has not been so mesmerized by the lyricism of a piece of copy, or the beauty of a layout, or the poetic

tintinabulations of a musical commercial, that he has ignored the consumer's rightful desire to be held told quickly and clearly—without a lot of meaningless guff—how the product will benefit him?"

It is no answer to say deceptive advertising represents only a small percentage of the \$12½ billion figure for all yearly advertising. It may be a small percentage, but it is a loud and dramatic percentage, a persistent and repetitive percentage. Moreover, it is a harmful percentage—it hurts everybody—the advertiser, business, consumer. It operates against the public interest and at times insults public intelligence. It cannot be ignored.

It is no answer to say there has been a vast improvement throughout the years in advertising standards. While this is acknowledged, it must be admitted that there is still room for further vast improvement. While the outright lie may not be evident slick, clever, sophisticated choice of words and pictures which convey an implication and impression contrary to fact is many times quite evident.

It is no answer to say there is no intent to deceive. Intention is not necessary. The test is not the intent of the advertiser, but the understanding of the consumer. The question is, "Does the advertising have the capacity to deceive?" Many times the motivation is quite clear—to place an impression in the minds of consumers in regard to a product or a service, an impression that is simply not true.

Let us look at a few examples:

A. The problem of hair loss and baldness. There is no known drug preparation, device or method of treatment which may be truthfully advertised as a cure or competent treatment for common baldness. The common baldness (male pattern baldness), which constitutes 95 percent of all baldness, is considered permanent and incurable. Despite a large number of actions by the Federal Trade Commission, advertising for worthless preparations, devices and treatments continue to defraud the gullible public. It is estimated that 25 percent—one out of four, of men 25 years old—have some stage of baldness and that approximately \$12 million are spent annually on these preparations.

B. Arthritis and rheumatism are common ailments of aged people. It is estimated there are about 12 million people in the United States afflicted in some manner with these illnesses. It is estimated that about \$32 million were spent during 1962 for arthritic and rheumatic pain-relieving drugs. These drugs include pills, salves, ointments, rub-ins, devices—claiming adequate and permanent cures. The Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation estimates that all forms of "frauds and fallacies" cost arthritis sufferers \$250 million annually. The Commission has issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist prohibiting these extravagant claims and, in any event, limiting claims to temporary relief of minor aches and pains. Yet advertisers, with claims for cures, still continue to give empty hope to the afflicted.

C. Cold and cough product advertising. It is estimated that about 500 million cases of common cold occur annually. This provides a wide and fertile area for the advertiser in making extravagant claims for the various products with respect to relief of symptoms. But the overall effect is an implied representation that colds can be cured. There is, at the present time, no drug or combination of drugs known to medical science which will prevent or cure the common cold. It is estimated that the consumer spent about \$375 million in 1962 for these cold products. Advertisers compete with each other in the extravagance of their claims. Where is the responsibility of the advertising industry?

D. Consider the full-page nationwide newspaper advertising of so-called land developers. Thousands of families have been attracted by clever advertising to buy, sight unseen, marginal land with the hope of establishing retirement or vacation homes. In most instances the land—arid, desert wasteland—is extravagantly advertised. A brief, on-the-scene inspection would have disclosed that, contrary to the advertising, there were no utilities, no streets, no schools, no churches, and, in a few cases, there was no water or vegetation. It is estimated that last year alone \$500 million was paid out or committed for payment on installment plans, for mail-order land. The Commission initiated over 15 investigations in this area—these actions are being coordinated with activities of the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice to prevent fraudulent use of the mails.

E. Fictitious prices. Probably the primary evil of deceptive advertising involves fictitious pricing. Fictitious pricing may be defined generally as a representation that a selling price of a product is a bona fide reduction from a former price, when, in fact, the product rarely, if ever, has been sold at the former price, in the trade area where the product was offered. The Commission issued guides against this practice which is common to many industries. The Commission has also in this area issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist—it has many times been sustained by the courts in these matters—yet advertisers continue to use this technique and are inventing new terms and phrases to cover the same practice.

Perhaps the answer to these problems lies with an industry program of self-regulation that is effective and realistic with an adequate and recognized authority. Attempts heretofore made in self-regulation have not generally been successful.

The Federal Trade Commission has responsibilities in this area of advertising. It has the widest advertising jurisdiction of any Federal agency. This jurisdiction extends to all media and with few exceptions to all commodities. The Federal Trade Commission is the only Federal agency equipped by statute, by personnel, by experience, and by procedures to perform this most vital responsibility. It is meeting its responsibilities by promulgating new procedures and techniques to speed up the administrative process.

In addition to its formal proceedings, the Commission has adopted and employed several informal procedures and techniques in meeting the challenges of deceptive advertising, including consent settlement procedure, trade practice conference rules, advertising guides, trade regulation rules, advisory opinions, assurances of discontinuance, and compliance advertising.

Once again—in a period of 2 years—we have overhauled and revised our rules of practice in order that we may more expeditiously be of genuine assistance to business and the public; in order that unfair acts and practices, including deceptive advertising, may be eliminated. We have employed the industrywide approach, when practicable, to avoid the singling out of one competitor when his competitors are engaged in the same practice.

It is not practical to think the Federal Trade Commission can, by itself, regulate and control all deceptive advertising. We are comparatively a small institution. Each of the 100 largest advertisers spends in excess of \$6,900,000 per year for advertising—an amount which is more than 6 times greater than the total allocation of funds to the Bureau of Deceptive Practices of the Commission. The Bureau's funds must be used not only for regulation of advertising but for

<sup>1</sup> Remarks are personal and not official.

<sup>2</sup> Murray Space Shoe Corp., et al., FTC docket 7476 (CCA 2, June 7, 1962); the Regina Corp., FTC Docket 8323 (CCA 3, Aug. 19, 1963).



prevention of deceptive labeling and numerous other forms of deceptive schemes and practices.

Advertising, with its twelve and one-half billion dollar budget, exerts a vital and tremendous force in the growth and prosperity of a free American economy. Because of this vast influence, the advertising industry—its whole chain of command—the advertiser—the agency—and the advertising media—has corresponding responsibilities and obligations.

It is appreciated that—stripped of its fanfare—the primary purpose of advertising is to sell advertising—is salesmanship—whether in picture, in print, or in voice. In the selling process advertising men have a right to make a profit. But they have no right, in selling, to deceive the consumer. I do not think it is an unjust criticism of advertising to allege that advertising men are more creative in promoting or selling a product or a service than they are in avoiding deception.

Business and the advertising fraternities must assume greater responsibilities of properly and honestly informing the consumer of the qualities and value of their products and services without the use of false and misleading statements and without disparaging observations of competitive products.

The advertising industry should be aware, and no doubt is, of two very important factors:

1. There are approximately 200 bills which affect advertising, directly or indirectly, which have been introduced in this 88th Congress.

2. In July 1962, the President appointed the Consumer Advisory Council to provide Federal agencies with advice on broad issues of economic policies and on governmental programs protecting consumer rights, the right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose, the right to be heard. Thus, the consumer heretofore not effectively organized—is now being recognized in an advisory capacity in governmental deliberations of these problems. It has recently rendered its first annual report to the President.

It behooves the advertising industry, therefore, to appreciably intensify and coordinate and strengthen its attempts at self-regulation or assume the serious risk of increased regulation by the Federal Government.

#### BANK ENCROACHMENT INTO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIELD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] 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. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services.

The bill would prohibit any national bank, banks operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System, or banks whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, from performing any clerical, administrative, bookkeeping, statistical, accounting, or other similar services for its depositors, borrowers, or other customers, except to the extent that such services are necessary and incidental to the proper discharge of the lawful functions of such banks.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, banks and other financial institutions are increasingly offering to their business customers, bookkeeping, accounting, and clerical services which would not ordinarily come within their province under the traditional concept of banking as it has developed in this country. These additional services are made possible by extensive investments in data processing and other automated recordkeeping equipment. No one can object to these financial institutions acquiring this equipment to better enable them to service their customers during the course of their normal banking functions. To broaden these services, however, to include the taking over of bookkeeping and accounting functions for businessmen should not be allowed to continue. Not only is it outside of the realm of normal banking procedure, it is also a serious encroachment into the sphere of those professionally trained and equipped to perform these services for their business community. There is no substitute in the accounting field for the competence and judgment of trained individuals. No data processing machine or its automation-oriented technician can supply that competence and judgment.

The accounting profession, like the medical and legal professions, is and should be confidential, individual and personal.

Congress should take a very close look at this problem and adopt legislation such as I have proposed to return the banks to their proper functions and get them out of the accounting business.

#### THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] 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. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will please allow me to express my gratification to the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, upon their refusal to accept the amendment to this bill by the Senate which provided that funds made available by the act "may be used to conduct research into the problem of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying on programs of population control."

While the House managers did have to agree that funds under the act would be available to conduct research into the problems of population growth, such funds cannot be used in any way toward assisting a recipient country in birth control. I believe that our providing funds to any country to implement such a population control program is totally beyond the proper concept or purpose of our foreign assistance program. This involves questions of morality and propriety which are personal to the people

involved and to their own government, if any government has anything to do with the subject.

I warmly commend the farsightedness on the part of the managers of the House on this matter and I am particularly gratified that the House supported its managers in respect to this subject and that the Senate also has retreated from the position it first took respecting the matter.

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH LANGUAGE PRESS IN AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 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. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Chicago will pay tribute this Sunday, the 22d of December, to the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Polish language press in the United States.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we in the Government, and outside the Government, overlook the one single factor which has made America the great nation that it is; the fact that we have brought to this country the best of traditions and cultural contributions from all other countries of the world.

Those who have come to this country from Poland can look with pride upon their own contributions, just as quite properly those who have come from Ireland, France, Italy, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Russia, and all the other countries can look with pride to their own ethnic contribution to America.

The impressive contribution made by Americans of Polish descent to their newly adopted country would not have been possible without the untiring efforts of the Polish language press.

In Chicago, to this day, we have three excellent Polish language newspapers, two published daily except Sunday and a third published bimonthly. The Chicago Polish Daily News, published by the Resurrection Fathers, is the oldest Polish language newspaper in America today. The Polish Daily Zgoda, published by the Polish National Alliance, is the other Polish language daily published in Chicago.

The Narod, published by the Polish Roman Catholic Union, is circulated twice a month.

There are also Polish language newspapers in New York, in Milwaukee, in Cleveland, in Detroit, and many other communities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these Polish language newspapers have provided the bridge toward becoming loyal Americans to millions of immigrants who have come to this country from Poland during the past 100 years. The Polish language press has been the catalyst for bringing together in America, all of those highly desirable attributes of struggle for free-

dom and respect for human dignity which have been so much a part of the Polish spirit for centuries.

We cannot pay too high a tribute to the great contribution made by these Polish language newspapers toward orienting the new immigrant with America's democratic processes.

Even though there are more than 15 million Americans of Polish descent scattered throughout the United States, it is a known fact that these Americans of Polish descent have produced no defectors to an alien cause; they have produced among the most gallant soldiers for our armies; the crime rate is impressively low in the Polish communities of America; and those activities which emphasize religious scruples and strong family ties are exceptionally high in Polish communities.

It is a known fact that employers throughout this country shower high praise on these people for their reliability and industriousness.

All of these attributes can be traced, to a great extent, to the guidance and influence of the Polish language press and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time today to call the attention of my colleagues to this impressive anniversary.

It is important to recall that the foreign language press in this country, whether Polish or otherwise, has operated under extremely difficult conditions. These foreign language newspapers have been high on ideals but always low on financial support. Yet, in the highest tradition of American journalism, they have managed to keep their publications going because of their deep belief in a cause for America.

I know that the editors and reporters who publish the foreign language press of America traditionally have been underpaid for their efforts. Most of these men could apply their talents to any number of other occupations much more rewarding financially. It has been my privilege to live closely with the dedicated men of the foreign language press and I know, Mr. Speaker, from my own observations, the extreme difficulties under which these foreign language newspapers have continued to operate. Yet, we today as a nation, are that much richer in culture and social standards because the foreign language press was able to provide that guidance and inspiration to millions of America's loyal immigrants which the English language press could not accomplish simply because they could not communicate with these people in their own native tongue.

In paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish language press in America, we are at once paying tribute to the imposing contributions made by Americans of Polish descent to this country. The two are inseparable. It would be my hope that those sophisticates in America who have never been able to quite appreciate the inspiring contributions made by immigrant groups in this country, would on this 100th anniversary recognize how shortsighted are their views; how unfair are their conclusions. It would be my hope that on this 100th anniversary of the Polish

language press in America, we Americans could adopt a new attitude toward the entire foreign language press of this country and recognize that it continues to play an integral role in our development. More so, Mr. Speaker, we should recognize that as America becomes not only the crossroad but the leader of the world, bilingualism becomes even more important to us as Americans. The foreign language press in this country can be the most effective instrument for developing bilingualism among our people, and it is for this reason that I sincerely hope we, as free Americans, will do everything possible to help assure continued operations for the foreign language press in our country. I hope that American industry, above all, will help these foreign language newspapers continue publication by using their advertising facilities and want ad columns when they need help for their factories.

May we all join in paying tribute on this 100th anniversary to the Polish language press of America. Those who publish it, have made as great a contribution to America's survival as any other warrior in our noble cause.

#### SECOND AMENDMENT OF OUR CONSTITUTION IS NOT A BLANKET LICENSE FOR INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 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. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of November 22, a great deal of discussion is being carried on throughout the Nation and here in Congress regarding legislation to restrict the sale of arms to unauthorized persons.

I am sure we can all understand the great concern of our citizens over this subject when the mad killer who murdered our late President Kennedy was able to purchase his rifle through the mail under an assumed name.

There is a very formidable movement among the citizens of our Nation for legislation to impose greater controls on this distribution of weapons. In my own district, the Nor'weston Congress, representing a large number of civil and social organizations on Chicago's North-west Side, is strongly in favor of stronger legislation to deal with this subject.

Those who oppose most suggestions for greater control of the sale of arms in this country usually argue that such restrictions would prove ineffective to the criminal who is intent upon getting a gun. I have previously cited strict laws in England dealing with guns and how this makes murder virtually unknown in the British Isles.

Also in this group of opponents are those who strongly argue that the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution clearly establishes a right for citizens to bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself today expressly to the subject of constitutional guarantees. Several of my constituents, who apparently are interested in this subject by virtue of their own gun collections or hunting activity, have stressed the constitutional guarantees.

My own research in this subject indicates that, all other considerations being equal, the argument that there are constitutional rights for an individual to bear arms does not seem to stand up in the light of known facts.

The second article of the Constitution provides:

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

I have long contended that this provision applies to the State militia and its collective right as a group to bear arms. I submit there is nothing in this second amendment that guarantees a constitutional right to bear arms to the individual.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the Declaration of Rights, it was complained that kings had disarmed the people. We all know that the early colonists were, by the very nature of their circumstances, bearers of arms.

But the right to bear arms was not regarded in English law as a fundamental right. The Statute of Northampton—2 Edward III, chapter 3; 1328—prohibited armed rides at night and by day in certain public places.

On the other hand, from very early times landed proprietors were required to have in readiness, according to their degree and estate, specified arms, equipment, and men-at-arms for military service when the Government called upon them. These landed proprietors, with their armed tenants and retainers, constituted the military forces—milites—the militia of the land; no other armed force was recognized as lawful.

Charles II and James II sought, however, to establish royal armies and to disarm the militia. After the Revolution of 1688, the Declaration of Rights declared that these efforts of the Stuart monarchs had been an "endeavour to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of this kingdom" and were contrary to law. In the subsequent statutory Bill of Rights based on that declaration, it was enacted "That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace unless it be with the consent of parliament is against the law."

It was the evident purpose of this guarantee of the right to bear arms to preserve the laws and liberties of England and not to enable a subject to violate them.

In the American Colonies every able-bodied man capable of military service was required to enroll himself for such service, provide himself with guns and be ready to use them in the common defense. Later, when royal oppression—particularly in the form of royal soldiers stationed in the Colonies in the time of peace, who were often quartered in citizens' homes against their will—threatened, the citizen-soldiery was relied upon



for the defense of basic rights and eventually to fight the Revolutionary War against England.

The Federal Constitution and the Bills of Rights of the new States, therefore, included guaranties of the right to bear arms, to insure that their freedoms would not be infringed upon by the Central Government. All of these guaranties of the right to bear arms, however absolute they may appear to be as words, must be construed in connection with the well-known objection to standing armies and the general belief in the need and sufficiency of a well-regulated militia for the defense of the people and the state. Thus construed it is a provision for preserving to the people the right and power of organized military defense of themselves and the state and of organized military resistance to unlawful acts of the government itself, as in the case of the American Revolution. The right to bear arms does not refer to the individual or the unorganized crowd, but organized military units of the state.

On August 17, 1789, the House of Representatives of the First Congress took up the proposed second amendment to the new Constitution, 1 of 12 amendments—10 passed Congress—which were to compose the Bill of Rights. As originally proposed, this amendment read as follows:

A well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, being the best security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; but no person religiously scrupulous shall be compelled to bear arms.

Mr. Gerry, at page 749 of volume 1 of the Annals of Congress, said:

This declaration of rights, I take it, is intended to secure the people against the maladministration of the Government; if we could suppose that, in all cases, the rights of the people would be attended to, the occasion for guards of this kind would be removed. What, sir, is the use of a militia? It is to prevent the establishment of a standing army, the bane of liberty. Whenever governments mean to invade the rights and liberties of the people, they always attempt to destroy the militia, in order to raise an army upon their ruins.

The rest of the debate in Congress on this amendment was to the same effect. The "religious scruples" section was taken out, but its original inclusion clearly showed that the right to bear arms was only a group right related to the militia service felt necessary to bolster a free State.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a whole series of judicial cases dealing with the subject which I shall be very happy to include in the record today along with my remarks.

I do not believe that anybody wants to interfere with the legitimate gun collector. I myself have enjoyed viewing some extremely interesting collections of weapons assembled by my closest friends. Nor would I ever want to do anything to interfere with the legitimate hunter who possesses effective rifles to pursue his sport. I am also cognizant of the fact that even at this late date, there are still many people in our country who rely on hunting for their livelihood, especially in the barren areas of our country.

No legislation that I would suggest would ever deny these legitimate users of weapons the right to continue using such weapons. But it is my understanding that every hunter in this country must first get a license to hunt and therefore I don't see how any legislation requiring a national registration of firearms, for instance, would in any way affect the hunter. He now is already registering his rifle.

Nor would laws more thoroughly controlling the sale of weapons interfere with the legitimate gun collector.

The legislation now pending in Congress is designed to protect our communities, not from the legitimate hunter or the bona fide gun collector or even the citizen who purchases a gun to protect himself and his property in our teeming urban communities, but from the killer who has no respect for law and order when he pursues his path of crime.

I am confident that none of the good people could have any bona fide objection to this law because I do not believe these people buy their guns through the mail. I am confident that these people buy their weapons from duly authorized and responsible gun dealers. I do not see how any law mentioned so far, including a proposal that hereafter any one purchasing a gun would have to first file his application with local police authorities, could be objected to. Nor could I see any objection to having local police screen mail-order applications for the purchase of weapons. There are those who argue that this provision would give the police department a record of where all the guns are and that if some diabolic scheme ever comes around for the overthrow of our Government, the first victims would be those who possess firearms in this country. I cannot help but feel that this argument just would not hold water. Those who point to countries that were taken over by dictators ignore the fact that many other factors contributed to the collapse of freedom.

It is my belief that the Congress should study all aspects of this problem. I believe the American Rifle Association should be given ample opportunity to present its views, but I think that those proposing this legislation should have an equal opportunity to state their views. I would be my hope that an appropriate committee would start holding hearings on this very important subject right after the first of the year so that we can indeed pass meaningful legislation without disturbing the legitimate rights of legitimate weapons owners in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, however, that this entire subject should wait any longer. It is one that affects our Nation very vitally and certainly is deserving of at least a very thorough discussion of the subject. I am confident that responsible men here in Congress can recognize the inconveniences that legislation now before the Congress would create for gun owners, and I am sure that this Congress can take all of these factors into consideration before reporting out a workable bill.

But I firmly believe that we have waited much too long in dealing with this problem. We were all stunned with the

tragic assassination of our President but, it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that other tragedies occur all over America every day and it is absolutely inconceivable to me how responsible organizations in this country and well-meaning citizens can continue to oppose all efforts to at least control the fantastic flow of weapons in this country.

We are a young nation as the histories of other nations of the world are measured. Because we are a young nation, I believe it is imperative that we start a logical program to bring this whole question of firearms into proper perspective. Mr. Speaker, following are the judicial cases which I have referred to earlier and which, in my judgment, certainly fortify my contention that there is no constitutional guarantee to an individual for the carrying of arms. I cannot help but feel that unless this relatively young nation deals with this problem forthrightly, by the end of this decade and certainly by the end of this century this whole business of weapons will become so monumental it may very well inundate us.

Before coming to Congress I was a police reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times. I saw the ravages of murder. I saw what this does to the bereaved family. I saw, only too frequently, how a completely irresponsible crazed killer with a gun in his hand turned to murder when there was no other way to escape.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that any law that we pass here in Congress will not be able to deal completely with this problem. But as our late and beloved President once stated in recalling an old proverb, "Even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step."

Mr. Speaker, let us begin.

The court decisions follow:

In *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174 (1939), the defendant was prosecuted for the interstate transportation and possession of a shotgun in violation of the National Firearms Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1237). The defendant asserted that the act was invalid under the second amendment. The trial court agreed with this claim, but the Supreme Court reversed the judgment, holding that—

In the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a "shotgun having a barrel of less than 18 inches in length" at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the second amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is any part of the ordinary military equipment or that its use could contribute to the common defense.

The Court declared that the "obvious purpose" of the second amendment was to render effective the provisions in the Constitution providing for the maintenance and calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions. The Court said:

It (the second amendment) must be interpreted and applied with that end in view.

The Militia which the States were expected to maintain and train is set in contrast with troops which they were forbidden to keep without the consent of Congress. The senti-

ment of the time strongly disfavored standing armies; the common view was that adequate defense of country and laws could be secured through the Militia-civilians primarily, soldiers on occasion.

The Court went on to review the history of the right to bear arms, including debates in the Constitutional Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of commentators, and found that they all plainly show that the State relied on the organized body of all able-bodied men, equipped with their own weapons and ammunition, for the preservation of liberty, order, and independence. Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations"—book V, chapter 1—stated:

Men of republican principles have been jealous of a standing army as dangerous to liberty.

Osgood, in "The American Colonies in the 17th Century," volume 1, chapter XIII, notes that in the New England Colonies, as in England, the militia system was based on the principle of the assize of arms, that is, the general obligation of all adult male inhabitants to possess arms and to cooperate in the work of defense.

Clauses intended to insure the possession of arms and ammunition by all who were subject to military service appear in all the important enactments of these Colonies which concern military affairs. He notes that New York and Virginia had similar laws.

*United States v. Tot*, 131 F. 2d 261 (1942; 3d C.C.A.) involved the prosecution, under the Federal Firearms Act, of the unlawful possession of a .32 caliber Colt automatic pistol by a person who had previously been convicted of a crime of violence. The Court upheld the act against a claim that it contravened the second amendment, saying:

Weapon bearing was never treated as anything like an absolute right by the common law. It was regulated by statute as to time and place as far back as the Statute of Northampton in 1328 and on many occasions since.

States having a similar constitutional provision have long upheld regulations of the carrying of firearms under their police powers. The Court held that the classification of the act—persons dangerous to society—was entirely reasonable—comparing it to the situation of a child or mentally unstable person—and did not infringe on the second amendment.

The Court reviewed the discussions of this amendment contemporaneous with its proposal and adoption and those of subsequent commentators and recognized that the second amendment, unlike the first amendment, "was not adopted with individual rights in mind, but as a protection for the States in the maintenance of their militia organizations against possible encroachments by the Federal power." The experiences in England under James II of an armed royal force quartered upon a defenseless citizenry was fresh in the minds of the Colonists. They wanted no repetition of that experience in their newly formed government. The *Tot* case was reversed on other grounds not involving the second

amendment in *Tot v. United States*, 319 U.S. 463 (1943).

In the *Miller* case the rule announced was that any weapon not bearing some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia was not protected by the second amendment and thus was subject to Federal regulation. In *Cases v. United States*, 131 F. 2d 916 (1942), the First Circuit Court of Appeals doubted that the Supreme Court meant this as a comprehensive and complete statement of the rule, because this would lead to anomalous results; virtually every lethal weapon has military application, and to follow the *Miller* case absolutely would limit the Federal Government to the regulation of flintlock muskets, matchlock harquebuses and other such curiosities having no military efficacy. The court in *Cases* preferred to proceed on an ad hoc basis, deciding each case on its own facts, thus picking out what is and what is not valid Federal regulation by the decided cases falling on each side of such division. This case involved a .38 caliber Colt type revolver which the defendant used to shoot up a nightclub. The Court decided this use of a firearm was not within the second amendment because the defendant was not a member of any military organization, his use of the weapon was not in preparation for a military career: he was "simply on a frolic of his own without any thought or intention of contribution to the efficiency of the well-regulated militia which the second amendment was designed to foster as necessary to the security of a free State."

*Presser v. Illinois*, 116 U.S. 252 (1886), makes it clear that the term "militia" in the second amendment means the National Guard or other State-created bodies of troops, and not private military units.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for their extraordinary efforts, cooperation and diligence during this session of the Congress. By their studies, considerations and dispositions of legislative matters before them, they have so ably assisted the Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibility of governing the Nation's Capital.

This has been perhaps the busiest session our committee has experienced, certainly in recent years. Within a month of the convening of this Congress, the House Committee on the District of Columbia commenced hearings and investigations, starting with joint sessions, initiated by our committee, with the District Committee of the other body, to look into the alarming crime situation in this Capital City. Hardly a week has gone by since that the committee or subcommittees have not been in session,

either in open hearings taking evidence, or in executive meetings thrashing out legislation deemed by the committee to be necessary for the District officials to carry out their delegated responsibilities.

The subcommittee chairmen, in particular, have contributed materially and magnificently by their advices and time, their study and devotion to the committees' tasks, and to the record of achievement summarized below.

The committees are deserving of well-earned respite from their labors, and I wish for them all a refreshing holiday season with their families. We shall be on hand again, with the convening of the next session in the new year, to continue in our determined efforts to meet the needs of the Nation's Capital.

Specifically, I wish to report on the activities of the committee in this session as follows:

First. During this first session of the 88th Congress, 201 bills and joint resolutions have been referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 183 of these being House bills and joint resolutions and 18 being Senate-passed bills.

Second. Over 166 scheduled meetings have been held by the committee or subcommittees thereof. Of these, 122 were open hearings, of which 90 were subcommittee hearings on various bills and 32 were hearings of the full committee and subcommittees on diverse subjects including joint crime and joint fiscal hearings with the District Committee of the other body, investigations of urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia, and so forth; 44 were executive meetings of the full committee and subcommittees perfecting drafts of legislation for report to the Congress.

Third. During this session, 40 bills have been reported by the District Committee to the House. All these bills have been considered and approved by the House and sent to the other body. A brief summary of the bills so reported to and approved by the House follows:

H.R. 1982—accidents, traffic reports—to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of \$100, or in personal injury to any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police. Presently, only collisions involving personal injury are required to be so reported.

H.R. 39—Armory Board—to increase its membership to five, by adding two additional civilians, to make three civilian members plus President of the D.C. Board of Commissioners and the commanding general of the District of Columbia militia.

H.R. 5342—Association of Universalist Women—a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia—authorizes consolidation thereof with the Alliance of Unitarian Women—a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts. The proposed consolidation of these two women's organizations is desirable at this time for the reason that they are affiliated with the Universalist Church and the Unitarian Church of America, respectively, and a merger of these two churches has already taken place.



H.R. 4277—borrowing authority—increasing the amount which the District might borrow from \$75 to \$150 million, which in conference between the Houses was further increased to \$175 million.

H.R. 4330—Business Corporation Act of 1954—amending the same to correct inaccuracies, improve the language of the act, and to make substantive changes to keep the act current and similar to the Model Business Corporation Act prepared by the American Bar Association, and with the statutes of the States.

H.R. 1935—Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department—authorizing the expansion of said corps, presently having a strength of 50 dogs. Provision for 25 additional man-dog teams has been included in the conference report just adopted by the House in the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

H.R. 8313—credit unions—repealing the D.C. Credit Union Act as amended, to permit 16 local credit unions, presently incorporated thereunder, to be chartered under the Federal Credit Union Act along with 159 credit unions in the District already chartered under the Federal Act.

H.R. 7525—Crime and criminal procedures—an omnibus crime bill consolidating various bills and proposals into amendments to the D.C. Criminal Code in order to provide the police with additional tools for law enforcement and to assist the prosecuting officials and the courts in ameliorating crime conditions in the Nation's Capital.

H.R. 7441—dangerous and unsafe buildings—amending the act of March 1, 1889, as amended, to provide for uniform assessment of costs incurred by the District in making repairs to unsafe buildings, and providing for removal of dead or diseased trees, among other nuisances.

H.R. 7440—District of Columbia Training School—providing for voluntary admissions to this institution for mentally retarded citizens of the District of Columbia, in addition to admissions presently authorized by commitment through court order.

H.R. 682—deeds of trust—to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

H.R. 6350—dental hygienists—to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners to waive any theoretical examination of an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners.

H.R. 4333—discharge of parolees from supervision—to authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

H.R. 2485—disease, communicable—to prevent the spread thereof by amending existing law so as to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily

to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians.

H.R. 5337—educational employees on leave—amending the act of June 12, 1940, to increase partial pay for public school teachers and other school employees while on leave of absence for educational purposes.

H.R. 7882—exemptions from attachment—amending the act of March 3, 1901, to stop the practice which has been developed of filing in the District of Columbia actions for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages of an employee who is a nonresident of the District.

H.R. 6177—Federal payment to the District—increasing the authorized Federal contribution to the District from \$32 to \$45 million. This authorization was subsequently increased to \$50 million in conference between the two Houses.

H.R. 5044—fire protection—amending the act of August 14, 1950, to require that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, all parties to mutual-aid fire-fighting agreements, indemnify each other from all claims arising from the operations of firefighters outside their own jurisdictions.

H.R. 4276—horizontal property regimes—condominium ownership—to provide for establishment of same in the District of Columbia by permitting fee simple ownership of a unit in a multi-unit structure which may be designed for residence, office, the operation of any industry or business, or any other type of use, with its accessory units.

H.R. 5871—judges retirement—amending the act of April 1, 1942, to permit retirement of local judges after 10 years' service and providing for disability retirements of judges or annuities for their widows or children.

H.R. 8355—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending the same by increasing capital stock requirements of life insurance companies organized in the District of Columbia from a minimum of \$100,000 to \$200,000, and other provisions respecting changes in the corporate charters and unissued stock.

H.R. 7497—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same with respect to the filing of annual statements by life insurance companies and publication thereof in local newspapers.

H.R. 1937—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6128—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same to permit life insurance companies to maintain current and complete records of all stockholders either at their principal places of business or with their stock transfer agents.

H.R. 3191—life insurance companies—amending the act of February 4, 1913, regulating the lending of money on securities in the District of Columbia, so as to exempt life insurance companies from the so-called loan shark provisions,

just as banks and building and loan associations are already so exempt.

H.R. 6413—milk and ice cream containers—amending the act of March 3, 1921, to permit the packaging of smaller quantities of milk, ice cream, and other dairy products than is permissible under present law.

S. 490 (H.R. 6348)—motor vehicles liens files—amending the act of July 2, 1940, by eliminating the requirement for maintenance of duplicate alphabetical files for recording and releasing liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3537—municipal court—amending the act of April 1, 1942, to increase the court's jurisdiction in cases involving \$3,000 to \$10,000; extending the subpoena power of the court to a 25-mile jurisdiction; changing the name of the court to District of Columbia court of general sessions; changing the name of the local appellate court to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

H.R. 7399—municipal theaters—to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of Loew's Capitol theater and Keith's theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters.

H.R. 1933—nurses—amending the act of February 9, 1907, so as to lower from 21 to 19 years the age requirement for registration as a nurse by the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3190—pour over trusts—amending the act of March 3, 1901, to authorize a testator, by the terms of his will, to pour over or add properties passing under his will to existing inter vivos trusts or testamentary trusts and thus give increased flexibility in the distribution of funds by a testator.

H.R. 4274—pupils, disciplining of—amending the act of June 20, 1906, so as to permit principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to use reasonable force in exercising their lawful authority to maintain order in the schools, and to forbid the Board of Education to abrogate this authority. At present, the District of Columbia statutes are silent on this point.

H.R. 4273—pupils, dismissal—amending the present District of Columbia compulsory school attendance law (D.C. Code, 31-207) so as to permit the suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils within the age limits of compulsory attendance.

H.R. 5081—Right-of-way over District of Columbia Training School grounds—authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell to the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. a right-of-way for the construction of towers for a high-voltage transmission line to cross a portion of the grounds of the District Training School at Laurel, Md.

S. 489 (H.R. 2696)—Small Claims Act—amending the act of March 5, 1938 to correct an inconsistency between two provisions of law relating to actions in the small claims and conciliation branch of the court now designated the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

H.R. 6353—Unemployment Compensation Act of August 28, 1935—amending

the same to require the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to advise the Department of Public Welfare whether an applicant for public assistance is eligible to receive unemployment compensation.

H.R. 5338—Uniform Commercial Code—providing for the adoption by District of Columbia of the Uniform Commercial Code already adopted in over 23 States.

S. 933 (H.R. 5097)—Practical Nurses' Licensing Act of September 6, 1960—to permit grandfather clause licensing without written examination for applicants living in the District and practicing in the Metropolitan area for at least 6 months during the base period.

S. 1533—D.C. Transit System franchise—amending the act of July 24, 1956, so as to eliminate duplicate auditing and authorize the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of the D.C. Transit System's net operating income, and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes.

S. 2054 (H.R. 8377)—unclaimed moneys in trust—providing procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved, after a period of 10 years, of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government, totaling at present some \$25,000.

#### PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLISON. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

#### POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political

status of Puerto Rico, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 17, after "Rico" insert ", unless prohibited by other law."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert: "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, strike out all after line 20 over to and including line 3 on page 4 and insert:

"(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions; and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under other law, without reimbursement."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 2 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 2 with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert:

"(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions; and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act, without reimbursement."

And in section 3, subsection (a) strike out "\$50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3. Page 4, line 11, strike out "at" and insert: "no later than".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 3 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "not earlier than the later of the two following dates:

"(i) one year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;

"(ii) one year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are ap-

pointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act,

and not later, in any event, than".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment to the title. Amend the title to read: "An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### MATHIAS F. CORREA

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Mathias F. Correa, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, is a great loss to the State of New York and to the Nation.

Mr. Correa's broad service in public life and in private practice was characterized by a high sense of purpose and a unique warmth of heart.

His accomplishments in the public interest were significant and will live on.

Freedom of the press in America today is stronger for his fight to uphold the confidentiality of reporters' news sources.

U.S. intelligence has come of age due to his foresight and recommendations—as a member of a three-man panel appointed by Secretary James Forrestal—which led to the establishment of CIA.

And the cause of justice in the courts is more secure as it was eloquently upheld by an attorney of rare skill and high principle.

I extend for my part and on behalf of the Members of this House our deepest condolences to Mrs. Correa and the family. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the obituary in the New York Herald Tribune be included in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

MATHIAS F. CORREA DIES, A U.S. ATTORNEY AT 30

PORT CHESTER, N.Y.—Mathias F. Correa, 53, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, died yesterday at United Hospital here after an internal hemorrhage.

Mr. Correa, a partner in the New York law firm of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel and Ohl, was only 30 when he was appointed to the chief prosecutor's post by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941. He was believed to be the youngest ever appointed, and the first district staff member ever promoted.

He held the position for only 2 years, amassing an impressive record of indictments and convictions, before resigning to accept a commission in the Coast Artillery.

After serving as chief prosecutor for the Allied Military Government in Naples, he



was transferred to the Marine Corps, promoted and assigned as a special assistant to Navy Secretary James H. Forrestal. This assignment led after the war to his appointment to a three-man commission that surveyed American intelligence operations and led to the establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In later years he also served as head of an eight-member commission appointed by Governor Harriman to review the parole system. The commission's report resulted in a number of legislative reforms.

Mr. Correa also managed an extensive and distinguished private practice. In 1958 he carried the defense of Marie Torre, then TV-radio columnist for this newspaper, to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Miss Torre had refused to disclose her source for certain statements in her column, which quoted an unidentified CBS executive on entertainer Judy Garland. Miss Garland sued CBS for libel, and Miss Torre was called upon to divulge her source in the Federal court trial.

#### LOSES APPEAL

She refused, and was cited for contempt by Judge Sylvester J. Ryan in a historic case dealing with a reporter's right to protect his or her sources. "The protection of confidentiality of reporters' sources is important," Mr. Correa argued. He maintained that preservation is essential to the maintenance of a free press."

Mr. Correa lost the appeal, and Miss Torre served 10 days for contempt of court, but legislation was later introduced in Albany and Washington to protect a reporter's right to protect news sources.

Most recently, Mr. Correa had been active on behalf of the board of higher education in a suit brought by two Queens College associate professors who charged they were denied promotion because they are Roman Catholics.

Last month, he opposed an appeal by the professors before the court of appeals.

Born in Brooklyn, where his father was in the real estate business, Mr. Correa attended Brooklyn Prep and Fordham College before taking his law degree at Columbia, where he was an editor of the Law Review.

After graduation, he became associated with John T. Cahill, an attorney about 5 years his senior, in the firm of Cahill, Gordon, Zachry & Reindel.

This was an association that was to last a lifetime. When Mr. Cahill was made special assistant to the New York County district attorney in 1936, he named Mr. Correa as his special assistant in the prosecution and conviction of three officers of the Bond & Mortgage Guarantee Co.

Three years later when Mr. Cahill was appointed special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General in charge of investigating the affairs of Martin T. Manton, senior judge of the U.S. court of appeals, he brought Mr. Correa back into Government service. The two men worked together to convict Judge Manton of bribery.

In March 1939, Mr. Cahill was named U.S. attorney, and his first act was to name Mr. Correa his chief assistant.

In this capacity, Mr. Correa successfully handled the Government's prosecution of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, World War I draft dodger when Bergdoll appealed a 7-year sentence on the ground that the Selective Service Act of 1917 was unconstitutional.

#### U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. Correa also took a personal hand in the prosecution of three cases involving attempts to undermine justice in Federal courts. He won convictions in all three.

Promoted to the \$10,000 a year U.S. attorney's post in February 1941, when Mr. Cahill retired to private practice, Mr. Correa continued his practice of personally

prosecuting the most important cases to come under his jurisdiction.

Of particular concern to Mr. Correa was labor racketeering, and he personally accounted for indictments and convictions of George E. Browne, onetime president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Operators of the United States and Canada, AFL, and William Bloff, a west coast racketeer. They were sentenced to 8 and 10 years respectively on charges of extorting \$1,200,000 from motion-picture corporations and union members.

On December 5, 1941, 2 days before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Correa was the major speaker at a dinner of the New York County Lawyers' Association—a dinner at which Judge Learned Hand, of the court of appeals, and Attorney General Francis Biddle also spoke.

Mr. Correa urged labor to "put defense first" and to realize that its own welfare depended on the success of the defense program. He also urged unions to rid themselves of racketeers.

#### EXPLOITER

"Most insidious," he said "is the form of that evil which crops out where unions seem to have lost their autonomy, their power to rid themselves of leadership which seeks to and does exploit the organization for personal ends which are alien to true union objectives."

When necessary Mr. Correa was also successful in the prosecution of captains of industry. He obtained a conviction of Joseph M. Schenck, former chairman of the Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. on income-tax evasion charges, and on a perjury charge resulting from his testimony in the Bloff case. Mr. Schenck's 3-year sentence on the tax-evasion charges were suspended after he recanted the perjury, but the film magnate did have to serve a year for perjury.

Another precedent-setting prosecution by Mr. Correa was that of the first espionage convictions of the war. Twenty-year sentences were meted out to the leaders of a gang of five men and a woman who obtained information on U.S. shipping for Germany. Because the espionage took place before the outbreak of World War II, the defendants escaped the wartime death penalty.

In 1943, Mr. Correa also prosecuted German Bund Leader Fritz Kuhn and 19 other Bund members in denaturalization proceedings, in what he termed an effort "to drive the Bund out of business." Kuhn and 10 others were eventually stripped of their citizenship.

But Mr. Correa's most notorious defendant was a man who never stood trial. He was Frank (the Enforcer) Nitti, a first cousin of Al Capone, and the man who inherited the Capone mantle. Nitti shot himself in the head in Chicago a few hours after he and eight henchmen were indicted in New York for their part in the motion picture extortion that sent Bloff and Browne to jail.

Also successfully under Mr. Correa's direction were the first black-market cases in this area and the first tests of the price-administration laws.

In 1943, after performing a special inspection of Justice Department facilities in Alaska for Attorney General Biddle, Mr. Correa resigned to accept a commission as a coast artillery lieutenant.

#### F.D.R. TRIBUTE

In accepting Mr. Correa's resignation, President Roosevelt expressed his "deep appreciation for the splendid service which you have rendered." He said Mr. Correa's "ability, industry, and integrity" made "an inspiring example for those who will follow you."

Mr. Correa did not remain in the coast artillery long. He was soon assigned as prosecutor in Naples and was promoted to captain after initial successes in breaking

up the wartime black markets in that area.

In mid-1944, an old acquaintance from his law practice days sent for Mr. Correa. He was Navy Secretary James Forrestal, and Mr. Correa switched uniforms. As a Marine lieutenant colonel, he became Mr. Forrestal's aid, and continued in that capacity after the latter became Secretary of Defense.

His wartime service won Mr. Correa the Letter of Commendation and Commendation Ribbon from Secretary Forrestal; the Bronze Star Medal from the Army, and from Italy, the Croce di Guerra.

Lieutenant Colonel Correa's service to the Government was not to end with the war, however. Even after his return to practice as a partner of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl at 80 Pine Street, Mr. Correa was selected by Mr. Forrestal as a member of a three-man board to overhaul American intelligence efforts.

His fellow committeemen were William Jackson and Allen W. Dulles, the first and second heads of the Central Intelligence Agency, which was set up as a result of their report.

"Our report was so top secret, I couldn't even keep a copy of it for my own records," he said later.

There was one final service Mr. Correa could do for Mr. Forrestal. After the Secretary's suicide May 22, 1949, Mr. Correa became an executor of his estate. Later, in 1951, he assisted in the long defense of Dillon, Read & Co., Mr. Forrestal's old banking firm, which had faced Government antitrust action.

Mr. Correa, who lived in Dogwood Lane, Rye, made only one attempt to enter the political field, running as a Democrat for Rye City Council after his return from wartime service. He said he had no illusions that he would win, and was not surprised when he lost.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Louise Kennedy Correa; three daughters, Mary Elizabeth, Louise Irene, and Ann Correa; his mother, Mrs. Irene F. Correa; and a brother, Rodolfo A. Correa, Jr.

A Requiem Mass will be celebrated Saturday at 10 a.m. at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. There will be a military funeral at Arlington National Cemetery Monday at 11 a.m.

FRED C. SHAPIRO.

#### DANGER OF COMMUNISM

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States was assassinated by a Communist. Yet many people do not seem to understand the danger that communism represents to our country, our lives, and civilization today.

#### THE SHEVCHENKO FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that history is filled with ironies. A little over a hundred years ago Taras Shevchenko, the great poet laureate of Ukraine, fought for the freedom of all subjugated nations under the heel of the czarist Russian conqueror and oppressor. Today, in our United States, supporters of this historic figure are fighting for the freedom of honoring this early freedom fighter with a statue in our Capital. Ironical, indeed; yet a sad commentary on controversies in our society.

#### EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

Much has been produced, not only in the recent period but for the past 3 years, about the freedom light of Shevchenko. His tremendous stature in eastern Europe is beyond rational question. Recently this was eloquently brought out again in an address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, at the Shevchenko groundbreaking ceremonies. I ask that the full text of Mr. DULSKI's address, titled "Taras Shevchenko—Europe's Freedom Fighter," be incorporated in my remarks:

#### TARAS SHEVCHENKO—EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

(By the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, U.S. Congress, address delivered at the Shevchenko Memorial banquet, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

We have gathered here in Washington today to celebrate a major new event in man's long struggle for national independence and for individual liberty.

We have come from cities and towns all over the United States to honor a poet. He was not an average man. During his lifetime, he rose from serfdom, and once his own freedom was won, he dared losing it in his fight for the freedom of all Ukrainians and of all peoples.

Taras Shevchenko has been the national hero of Ukraine for over 100 years.

Today, with the groundbreaking for a memorial statue to him in Washington, D.C., we proclaim him as a champion of liberty for all mankind.

I am proud that, as a Member of Congress, I had the opportunity to help in making U.S. soil available for the erection of the Taras Shevchenko Memorial.

All of you here tonight, and the many, many thousands elsewhere who join us in spirit, deserve the credit for this vision and generosity which has made this memorial a reality.

I feel humble as I stand before you on this great occasion tonight. Your fathers and mine came to this land, drawn by the bright flame of liberty about which Shevchenko wrote so eloquently and so movingly.

We gained our freedom from Russian czarist imperialism and from Russian Communist imperialism.

In our freedom, we are mindful of the legacy Taras Shevchenko has left to us and to all mankind. His legacy is an insistent demand that we, in our lifetime, risk whatever may be necessary to carry forward and complete the struggle he fought so courageously for, the national independence of Ukraine, and all nations.

Others here tonight, far more talented at reading poetry than I, would be better able to convey to you some of the most meaningful and beautiful passages from Shevchenko's poetry. But, if you will bear with me, I want to read just a few lines. These lines from "God's Fool" were addressed to those who defended freedom too weakly, and to

those who bowed down before the Russian imperialists and did their dirty work for them. I read:

"You were not fit to rise in the defense  
Of justice and our sacred liberty.

You have been taught to torture your own  
brothers,  
And not to love them. Ah, you miserable  
And cursed crew, when will you breathe  
your last?

When shall we get ourselves a Washington  
To promulgate his new and righteous law?  
But some day we shall surely find the  
man."

Ladies and gentlemen, there are those among the Russian Communist, imperialists, and colonialists, who would claim that the man who wrote these lines would be a Bolshevik if he were alive today. Never. Those who believe such claims deserve the whiplash of Shevchenko's lines—"You have been taught to torture your own brothers, and not to love them."

I leave it to you. Were Shevchenko alive today, he would be a hero in the fight against Communist imperialism for Ukrainian independence, as he was a hero in the fight for Ukrainian independence against czarist imperialism.

Taras Shevchenko is alive today. He is alive in his vibrant poetry. He is alive in the minds, and in the hearts and spirit of everyone who has read his poetry, and who has gained his inspiration.

This is the significance of the memorial statue to Shevchenko which will rise at 22d and P Streets in Washington. This memorial will be an inspiration to the peoples of Ukraine, of the other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. of East-Central Europe, and of Cuba, in their courageous fight for national independence and human liberty.

Shevchenko fought for the freedom of all peoples, regardless of creed, color, or national origin, and the memorial statue initiated today will rise as a beacon of liberty for the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as well.

To our fellow Americans, the memorial will have a double significance. It will be a constant reminder that the monolithic might of the U.S.S.R. is a myth, that the U.S.S.R. is composed of many non-Russian nations which once were independent and whose people today wish to regain their independence. It will remind fellow citizens here that Russian imperialism and colonialism remain as the major threat to the peace and security of our world.

The memorial will hold a second and even more important significance. It will represent to the entire world the American love of liberty, and the constant support of the American people for the just aspirations of the captive peoples for national independence. Our world, sadly, is divided today, part slave, part free. The free and independent nations, while in the majority, are under serious siege. Even we in the United States are threatened by the Russian Communist imperialists ambitiously grasping for universal power.

If freemen lose, and God forbid, it will not be to lack of economic power, nor lack of military power. It will be due to imprisonment in false concepts of the world forced upon us by massive and world-embracing Russian Communist propaganda.

If we should lose, we can also blame the lack of vigor and the lack of understanding in fighting for national independence and for human liberty.

We must not fail. We must know that knowledge is power even greater than the power of money and of machines.

The words of great poets, the words of Taras Shevchenko, have power to move men and shape human destinies, which is even greater than the physical might to imprison

them. It is this great power which has made Shevchenko the national hero of Ukraine, and a champion of liberty for all peoples. It is this great power that the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko will unleash throughout the captive world.

We, who meet here tonight, have our eyes focused on the future, just as we are mindful of the past.

May I at this time propose that we initiate action now to establish a Shevchenko memorial library as a section of the U.S. Library of Congress. This would be most helpful in infusing the heroic spirit of Shevchenko into others, and further inspiring them to join in the struggle for national independence and liberty. This should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

It has been my privilege to submit House Joint Resolution 174, providing for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp in 1964. It would be most appropriate and most telling to have this stamp issued on the day the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko is unveiled in this Capital of the free world. This would crown the whole action that began with approval of the use of American soil for this memorial.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the threshold of great events. In our power is the ability to carry forward the great struggle for the national independence of Ukraine, and of every other enslaved and subjugated nation of the world.

It is an undertaking in which we must not fail.

It is an undertaking in which we must overcome, and be victorious.

#### THE OPPOSITION

Despite the open record on the Shevchenko statue and its need in our Capital, there suddenly developed, as we all know, an opposition to its erection next May. Many aspects of this opposition have been elaborated upon by my colleagues and also myself. The latest phase is most interesting and should be placed for public view. It makes for additional absorbing reading for those who are concerned with our Nation's respect and esteem for the world's foremost exponents of personal liberty and national freedom. The following items relate this particular story vividly, and I include them in logical order as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 8, 1963]

#### STATUE TO UKRAINIAN MEETS RENEWED OPPOSITION

The National Capital Planning Commission was asked by one of its members yesterday to cancel its approval of a monument here to Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet.

Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., served formal notice on his fellow members that he will make such a motion at the Commission's next meeting December 5. He sought to make it yesterday but procedural rules blocked consideration.

The statue, authorized by Congress and financed by anti-Communist Ukrainian-American groups, is to be erected on a small triangular park at 23d and P Streets NW. A ground-breaking ceremony was held September 21.

Louchheim, who opposed approval of the statue earlier this year, said he based his renewed opposition on a belief that the Commission had acted upon "misinformation on several rather substantive points."

Recently, he said, "the Washington Post brought out information" that provides "an opportunity to reconsider."

Editorially, this newspaper's main point was that Shevchenko bore no relationship



to the United States that would justify a memorial here.

Louchheim made this point, calling Shevchenko "an inconspicuous figure" in American terms. He also said the poet was "both anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party."

There was no direct comments by Commission members dealing with Louchheim's views. However, one alternate member, Joseph Barnett, declared that he felt the Commission staff "did damn poor homework when the statue approval resolution was presented before us."

The Commission was told, Barnett said, that Congress in authorizing the statue had made the final decision, and that the Commission's role was finding a site and approving the statue's design.

However, he said, Congress authorized it "subject to the approval of the site and design"—not necessarily a mandate that it be built.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

#### UDALL URGES REVIEW OF SHEVCHENKO

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall has encouraged a full restudy of plans to erect a statue to Taras Shevchenko.

In a letter from Udall cited yesterday by Walter C. Louchheim, a member of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Cabinet member said he hoped the Commission would make such a restudy before it proceeds.

The Commission had been scheduled to reconsider its approval earlier this year of the location of the statue of the Ukrainian poet in a small park at 22d and P Streets NW.

But Louchheim, who served notice he would move for such action, said the background material for his presentation had not been completed. The action was postponed until January.

Congress authorized anti-Communist Ukrainian groups to erect the statue on National Park Service land in Washington subject to administrative approval of the site and statue. These were given by the Interior Department and the Planning Commission, among others.

Since that time, however, questions have been raised whether the freedom-cherishing poet is the proper subject for a statue in this Capital of a country that has no connection with him. The Soviets have favorably cited his writing as anticzarist.

In the letter, Louchheim said, Udall reiterated his view that a special commission be set up to screen the subjects of memorials proposed in Washington.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 6, 1963]

#### SHEVCHENKO STATUE SITE STUDY WILL CONTINUE

The National Capital Planning Commission is going to continue its study of a location and design for the Taras Shevchenko statue.

The Commission voted at its monthly meeting yesterday to have its Federal Projects and Planning Subcommittee make a further check into the matter. A year ago the organization approved a location at a little park at P and 23d Streets NW. for the statue, and then last May approved the design.

Congress directed that the Commission give its approval for the location and design before a Ukrainian organization erects the statue.

Commission Member Walter Louchheim tried last month to get the Commission to rescind its previous approval, but failed because he could not get a second for a motion.

Yesterday Mr. Louchheim read a letter from Interior Secretary Udall calling for more study of the proposal.

Shevchenko was a 19th century Ukrainian poet who is now revered by organizations of Americans descended from Ukrainians.

In other action yesterday, the Commission approved three District Highway Department projects, the Ninth Street expressway, widening New York Avenue NE., and interchanges for Missouri Avenue between 16th and Eighth Streets NW.

The Missouri Avenue project should be carefully studied, and two overhead bridges at 13th Street and Georgia Avenue might have to be built so that a four-lane freeway could have room for expansion later to six lanes, the Commission said.

The Commission also postponed action on a proposal to widen South Dakota Avenue NE., between Rhode Island Avenue and Bladensburg Road, to eliminate treacherous traffic conditions which have resulted in the deaths of several persons in the past 2 years.

DECEMBER 10, 1963.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,  
Secretary of the Interior,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was amazed to read in the Washington Post issue of December 6 the caption "Udall Urges Review of Shevchenko." In light of the Post's malicious, smear campaign against the Shevchenko statue, I cannot but feel that this has been slanted. To resolve my doubts, I would very much appreciate receiving your comments on this.

At the National Capital Planning Commission meeting last Thursday, Mr. Louchheim injected your letter as a seeming basis for the Commission's restudy of the Shevchenko site. I don't know whether you have been apprised of the smear campaign being waged by really only two men—Mr. Wiggins, the editor of the Post, who admitted early that he had never read a verse of Shevchenko's writings, and Mr. Louchheim who has associated himself with the baseless charges and bigotry of the Wiggins' editorials. But the impression conveyed last Thursday was that in view of these charges, malicious and unfounded as they are, you are encouraging a restudy of the site.

Despite the fact that Congress had examined the issues involved 3 years ago and that in this period every charge made by both Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Louchheim had been exploded, the latter has now maneuvered the Commission into an untoward position of "reviewing the legislative history" (as he put it Thursday) of this matter. So much as to suggest that the Commission will examine Congress own determination of this. Going far beyond the technical jurisdiction of the Commission, it is quite evident that Mr. Louchheim's aim is to bring about the rescission of the Commission's approval of the present site for the Shevchenko statue and the provision of a much inferior site, thus satisfying both the letter of Public Law 86-749 and his and Mr. Wiggins' desire to affront all who had sponsored this legislation and had participated in the huge groundbreaking ceremonies last September, including your own representatives. It appears that your letter encourages him to realize this aim. It also appears that you have been drawn into this ugly situation after Mr. Louchheim's motion to rescind failed even to obtain a second.

This case has now become somewhat farcical. The Washington Post consults with a puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative in the U.N. to elicit his opinion about a statue here; it highlights a thoroughly irrelevant New Jersey case about changing an avenue's name to Shevchenko; and the NCPC is maneuvered into a totally unrepresentative position of examining the worth of Congress decision in this on the basis of the Post's mendacious and bigoted editorials and also,

apparently, on the basis of your recent letter.

We, of course, do not intend to let these intolerant and ignorant actions go unchallenged. The Post has virtually closed its pages to our challenge. However, congressional supporters of the statue at the ground-broken site are carefully observing this fantastic development and recording it for public view. Since you have now become involved in this, I urge that you read all of the material printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues of November 13, 14, 20, 21, and December 4, and 6. I cannot believe that knowingly you would want to lend encouragement to the smear campaign launched by Mr. Wiggins and nurtured by Mr. Louchheim. Indeed, if there is any investigation or study to be made, in all justice it should be directed at the outrageous charges advanced by these two individuals. With clear civic and national responsibility, the Washington Star has accurately sensed all this. I enclose a copy of its recent editorial on the subject.

Our committees are proceeding, nevertheless, with set construction plans for the unveiling of the statue at the present site next May 30. We've acted openly, democratically, and faithfully in terms of the law and the approvals granted by you, the Fine Arts Commission, and the National Capital Planning Commission. I understand the site designs have been approved with minor changes by your Department. I request that since nothing has changed in the status of this important project, these designs be sent to our architect so that our plans may be fulfilled according to schedule.

I cannot believe that you would want to support any attempted rescission based on the untruthful and bigoted editorials of one man and the brazen maneuvers of another. They have taken upon themselves not only to flout Congress but also virtually to ridicule the statements of our late President, as quoted in my letter to Mr. Dutton, a copy of which I enclose. In fact, their reprehensible actions may also be construed as a slur against the wise judgment of President Johnson, who was responsible for the expedition of the legislation in August 1960.

If it is possible to receive a copy of your recent letter to the NCPC, I shall be deeply appreciative. In any case, I look forward to your reply concerning the other points raised herein.

With grateful thanks for your solid representation at our ground-breaking ceremonies last September and best wishes.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 15, 1963]

#### ASSOCIATION AGAIN

I wish to express my gratitude as one of the many thousands of Ukrainians who are deeply appreciative of your December 4 editorial, "Association Again."

Your editorial was like a ray of sunshine breaking through the dark storm clouds of vicious attacks and distortions being stirred up by another Washington newspaper in opposition to our efforts to erect a statue to Taras Shevchenko.

The Russian Communists naturally wish to give the world the impression that the Ukraine is happy with its Communist rule and that this Communist "paradise" is what Shevchenko had hoped and died for, when, in fact, Shevchenko cried out for a free Ukraine—free, like the land founded by Washington and not that the Ukraine should become the enslaved and captive nation that it now is. The Communists have taken the ideals of this great man and twisted them to suit their propaganda. How clever they are to take the side of Shevchenko and present themselves as freedom-loving

too. Too well they know that the Ukrainian blood is seething, that desire for Ukrainian national independence is burning, and that a blunder like opposing the revered hero, Shevchenko, could well erupt into another bloodbath like Hungary.

NADIA O'SHEA.

#### FREEDOM HAS ALL TO DO WITH AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, among the many arguments raised against the Shevchenko statue here is that Shevchenko had nothing to do with American history. The fact is that both in terms of the unfolding of world freedom—of which our history is an inseparable part—and on the scale of personal affinity and absorption Shevchenko is very much a part of American history. And when we begin to consider the freedom force and spirit his name and works represent in Eastern Europe today, he is very much a valuable part of our historical struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. These facts and his unprecedented personal orientation to Washington are a matter of history.

Indeed, with this view of the subject one can rightly maintain that for both the present and the future, not to speak of the past, a Shevchenko statue in our Capital would have a symbolic significance not easily shared by other statues. Without in any way reducing their importance for the reasons they were erected, I have in mind monuments such as Simón Bolívar, Edmund Burke, Dante, Discobolos, John Ericsson, Japanese pagoda, Jeanne D'Arc, Jules Jusserand, Marconi, Gen. Jose de San Martín, the Netherlands carillon, and others. When in one breath an individual advocates a statue for Shakespeare and in the next opposes the Shevchenko statue, he has good reason to examine his own charges.

Arguments to halt the statue of Shevchenko are an object of serious concern for every informed and right-thinking American. Furnishing examples of this, the concise statement on "The Desperation of Reckless Irresponsibility," issued by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, is very much to the point. I submit it at this point as part of my remarks:

#### THE DESPERATION OF RECKLESS IRRESPONSIBILITY

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

On the subject of the Shevchenko statue, anyone who since the end of September has followed the editorials written by Mr. Wiggins in the Washington Post cannot but feel an intellectual nausea and distaste produced by their mass of contradictions, fabricated information, and base motivation. These unbelievable editorials appearing in a modern press organ have to be read in their successive entirety to experience this nausea. Doubtless, the editor wasn't counting on anyone doing this. Side by side, and with appropriate replies, these editorials have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that our citizenry may have the opportunity of reading these gems of journalistic irresponsibility in toto.

However, because of an avalanche of protesting letters to the Post, Mr. Wiggins apparently decided to end his editorial campaign on November 12 and shifted gears of the smear campaign by producing semieditorialized "news items" on the pages of the

Post. These reports have undoubtedly added humor and amusement to this whole episode. They are prime exhibits of what might properly be called the desperation of reckless irresponsibility. More, they show the levels to which men of bigotry and ignorance inevitably must succumb.

The first of these "news reports" appeared on the first page of the November 29 Post under the howling and dramatic caption "Communists Love Shevchenko." The obvious aim of the "news item," which I attach here, is to associate Shevchenko with the Communists and thus influence the unwary or ignorant reader to disassociate himself from Shevchenko. Humorous? Yes, and for a number of reasons. One, the great "anti-Communist" newspaper, the Washington Post, decided now to play the anti-Communist angle, at that with a technique which it rallied against some 10 years ago. Two, of all things, Wiggins had to turn to a Soviet Russian puppet in the United Nations for his opinion about a Shevchenko statue here.

Three, the editor in his frenzy then discovered that Communists "love" Shevchenko, apparently ignorant of their "love," too, for Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, etc., when such "love" serves their purposes. Had Wiggins bothered to read House Document 445 and the testimonies given in 1960, he would have learned then that perverse Communist "love" embraced even Shevchenko. Fourth, failing to understand this whole project, the Post editor failed also to note in this first-page, semieditorial "news report" that the U.N. puppet omitted to praise Shevchenko for his cardinal teaching on the freedom and independence of nations and their liberation from foreign yoke, Russian or otherwise. This, in fact is the essence of the whole project. Shevchenko, his works, his towering symbol belong to the conservators of freedom, not to the destroyers. Sheer bigotry has blinded a few to this fundamental truth.

The other "news item" about a "New Jersey Town Kills Proposal for Shevchenko Street" is almost puerile. The December 5 "report" under this caption was the second on this matter, ostensibly to show that others think like Wiggins about Shevchenko. I attach also this "report" for the reader's interest. It, too, shows the desperation of reckless irresponsibility. What this incident has to do with the statue is anybody's guess. I myself would have objected to an imposition of Shevchenko's name on an already identified avenue. One can rest assured that this insignificant incident in a New Jersey town would never have appeared in the Post if the editor didn't find himself hard pressed for arguments that have ranged from salacious anti-Semitic and anti-Polish accusations to an avenue sign in a New Jersey town. In short, this instructive episode in journalistic bigotry has assumed the proportions of a comedy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 29, 1963]

#### COMMUNISTS LOVE SHEVCHENKO

Warm support for a Shevchenko statue in Washington has come from the quarter which the American sponsors of the statue intended as its political target.

This man-bites-dog turn, giving Communist and Soviet backing to what was conceived as an anti-Communist and anti-Soviet project, was accomplished by the chief of the Soviet Ukraine's mission to the United Nations.

This official, L. Y. Kizya, said that he favors a statue here of the 19th century Ukrainian poet. It is to be erected on the triangle of land at P Street, between 22d and 23d Streets NW.

But, said Kizya, he protests the efforts of the American sponsors of the statue to use

it "to fan up animosity toward the Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggravate the cold war."

Kizya fueled a growing controversy, Congress approved the statue, private funds are to pay for it and dedication is scheduled next spring.

But because of the poet's questionable significance and the statue sponsors' tactics in gaining congressional sanction, the National Capital Planning Commission is about to review its earlier approval of the project.

Kizya's comments were made in a statement sent to the Washington Post 4 weeks after this newspaper solicited his views.

He showed a reverence for Shevchenko equal to that displayed by the poet's American admirers. Terming him a "great son of the Ukraine, an uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression," Kizya said Shevchenko "deserves to have his statue decorating one of the squares of the U.S. Capital."

But where Ukrainian-American sponsors see Shevchenko as the focus of an anti-Russian and anti-Communist campaign for Ukrainian nationhood, Kizya portrayed him as a man with deep ties to the Russians and revolutionaries of his day and as a man now widely respected by all Soviet nationalities, not just by Soviet Ukrainians.

These contrasts are typical of the tug of war for Shevchenko's mantle between the Soviets and some Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Kizya said that the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth next year will be marked in the Soviet Union by "nationwide festivities," including erection of a monument in Moscow. The Washington statue of Shevchenko is due to be erected at the same time and for the same purpose.

"Nowadays in the age of radio, movies, and television (Shevchenko) can play an important role in the enrichment of the culture of the American people," said Kizya. He noted that Mark Twain is revered in the Soviet Union.

Kizya is the top official of the Soviet Ukraine in the United States, which considers the Ukraine as being 1 of 15 constituent republics of the Soviet Union, not a sovereign state. The Ukraine and another Soviet Republic, Byelorussia, have U.N. General Assembly seats through a proviso that Stalin demanded and received at Yalta in 1945.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 5, 1963]

#### NEW JERSEY TOWN KILLS PROPOSAL FOR SHEVCHENKO STREET

Washington no longer has company in its misery over Taras Shevchenko.

In New Jersey's Hamilton Township, civic uproar greeted a proposal several weeks ago to change the name of one of the small Trenton suburb's streets to Shevchenko Boulevard, in honor of the 19th-century Ukrainian poet. This week, the suggestion was killed.

In Washington, controversy has developed over a plan to erect a statue of the poet on a small park at 22d and P Streets NW.

The New Jersey proposal was offered by a township committeeman on behalf of some Ukrainian-Americans who see the poet's nationalistic verses as being anti-Soviet.

But reaction came immediately from residents along Deutz Avenue, the street to be rechristened. Angrily, they paraded in protest, scuffled with police and bombarded the township officials with petitions.

Wednesday night the committee backed off quickly from the explosive issue. "It is clearly evident the committee has made a mistake," declared Mayor George R. Holland, whereupon the five voted unanimously to drop the subject.



In Washington, no easy way out is in sight. The statue was authorized by Congress, has cleared all necessary reviewing agencies and is scheduled to be put in place next May.

The problem here is that the Kremlin also views the poet as a hero and has given his name to at least 1,620 public facilities in the Soviet Union. The Russians interpret his revolutionary writings as anticzarist.

#### THE SPIRIT OF SHEVCHENKO

Mr. Speaker, much also has been written and uttered about the indomitable spirit of Shevchenko. That spirit is one of freedom coupled with humanism. All of us know all too well the character assassination that can result from excerpting so-called "anti-" statements from contextual verse. This technique is both dishonest and disreputable. The Shevchenko spirit cannot be perhaps better expressed on this score than in the following letter to the chairman of the National Capitol Planning Commission, written by a close and long-term student of Shevchenko, and also the article written about the most outstanding exponent of Shevchenko's works in pre-World War II Poland, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, an illuminating article penned by an Israel journalist. I ask that both pieces be appended to my remarks:

#### THE SHEVCHENKO AFFAIR

DECEMBER 17, 1963.

Mrs. JAMES H. ROWE,  
Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C.

The vigorously pressed assault of the Washington Post on the Shevchenko statue in the Nation's Capital should be carefully scrutinized.

It is interesting to note that commencing with the editorial blast on October 18, 1963, all subsequent salvos (without benefit of corroborating exposés as the label "Affair" implies) draw their firepower exclusively from a calculated use of words and phrases of bias and prejudice.

As one who has read all the published works of Shevchenko in the original Ukrainian and being familiar with the rather extensive bibliography on the poet and his writings, I obtain a very sick evaluation chart when I apply my Rotary Club's four-way test to the charges of the Washington Post:

Is it the truth?

Is it fair to all concerned?

Will it build good will and better friendship?

Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

The term "affair" conjures up in the reader's mind the infamous Dreyfus case of France involving malign influences and false charges which lead to the court-martial and public degradation of Capt. Alfred Dreyfus for treason, to be followed by a violent national storm of charges and countercharges inflamed by prejudice, bigotry, and misguided patriotism before reason, fairness, and justice could prevail and the shame of France redeemed by vindication, reinstatement, and promotion of Captain Dreyfus to new honors in 1906.

When the Washington Post gives as its first reason for objecting to the approval of the project adopted by Congress that it was the "effort of a tiny group" only, the editors would have you believe that the project was neither endorsed nor supported by the vast majority of the more than a million Americans of Ukrainian origin in the United States.

The truth of the matter is that the project has the backing of thousands of persons who donated money to the statue fund. Lay and church organizations from every State in

the Union, representing Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, support the project. All the Ukrainian fraternal orders have worked for it. All Ukrainian-language newspapers and radio programs, excepting the Communist-controlled ones, have given the project their wholehearted support and encouragement. This phenomenon is not surprising, because Ukrainians in all walks of life know their Shevchenko, like the Irish know their St. Patrick, and revere him as a great poet who established the literary quality of their language; returned self-respect to the enslaved peasant serf; recalled the past glories of national freedom and independence and dedicated his gifted muse to a vigorous defense of the individual against governmental tyranny, religious bigotry, economic exploitation of the disenfranchised serfs, and prophesied the coming of an era of brotherhood of men under God. In the treasury of world's lyric poetry, Shevchenko has few peers. Why it is so difficult for a non-Ukrainian to appreciate Shevchenko as a great poet may be gained from the following quotation from the "Greek Way" by Edith Hamilton, when she wrote about Pindar: "He is securely seated among the immortals. And yet only a few people know him—and of all the poets there ever were, he is the most impossible to translate—one feels 'life abundantly' within him, inexhaustible spontaneity, an effortless mastery over treasures of rich and incomparably vivid expression, the fountain shooting upward, irresistible, unforced—and beyond description. But in spite of this sense he gives of ease and freedom and power, he is in equal degree a consummate craftsman, an artist in fullest command of the technique of his art, and that fact is the other half of the reason why he is untranslatable. His poetry is of all poetry the most like music."

An examination of the card index in the Congressional Library in Washington, the great libraries of New York City, Chicago and the libraries of any outstanding university in this country will reveal the existence of an extensive bibliography on Shevchenko. He is known; he is established; he is accepted as a great world poet who endures.

If the Ukrainians' love of Shevchenko is an "errant private passion," then they have multitudinous company among Americans (including Ukrainians) who show an "errant" passion for the author of the Gettysburg Address.

While it is true that it is the Ukrainians who know him best and that the average American knows little if anything about him, the same may be said about a number of outstanding world figures of the 19th century or even of this century, thanks to the impact of the former isolationist policies of our Nation.

America is an outgrowth and development of many ethnic streams. Each has added its particular share to our national development. Shevchenko is symbolic of the best cultural and national qualities of Ukraine. In him we have a unique situation of a great poet as a national hero. His universal appeal is evidenced by the large number of books, articles and translations by English, French, Italian, German, Slavic and oriental language writers. Reject him and you reject the great universal ideals he symbolizes to millions of people around the globe.

Alice L. Sickels, a sociologist who headed the International Institute in Minneapolis and later in Detroit, Mich., wrote a book entitled "Around the World in St. Paul" in which she said among other things:

"America is an idea. This idea is being worked out in the United States by carriers of historic civilizations who have gathered here from every corner of the world, largely from Europe. Democracy is the end toward which they aim; it is also a process by which we move forward. How long it will take to bring the real America into full expression

will depend on the men and women through whose faith and effort it must be achieved. Our America, an idea in action, is, in the last analysis, 'only you and me.' The following statement from the book's jacket too has relevancy to the "Shevchenko Affair."

"America is a laboratory. Its cosmopolitan cities, mosaics of peoples from many lands, offer an unprecedented opportunity for America to practice living in an interracial and international world order. When we have learned to live harmoniously and justly in our own country, we shall have learned also to live peaceably with the peoples of the world."

Another objection to the statue raised by the Washington Post is that the Communists also "love" Shevchenko. The Communists also love and make use of our constitutional Bill of Rights and our system of courts of justice which they have invoked on innumerable occasions. They also love our Mark Twain and our Van Cliburn. Is that any reason why we should do away with our Bill of Rights or our system of courts of justice, or renounce Mark Twain or Van Cliburn?

It can be truly said that because of his immense popular appeal for over a century, Shevchenko is the one mighty voice of Ukraine crying out for truth and justice that even the ruthless Communist system cannot suppress. Ironically, if not tragically, the Washington Post, an exponent of the freedom of the press in the Nation's Capital, is crusading militantly, persistently to still the voice of Shevchenko and downgrade and humiliate him before the eyes of the world.

In the nature of things, it would be unusual for a man of Shevchenko's public stature in the field of letters and national acclaim not to have enemies and detractors at home and abroad. The statesmen whose profiles grace the Halls of Congress, the national leaders like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and others whose statues and monuments constitute some of the finest attractions in the Nation's Capital were often the targets of similar attacks in their private as well as public life.

A notable example of such tragic attack on character is that of Thomas Paine, Revolutionary pamphleteer and patriot, attacking the character of George Washington in a letter addressed to the President: "And as to you, sir, treacherous in period of friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger) a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any."

Even in this respect Shevchenko has something in common with George Washington. Truly, it may be said that Washington had his Paine and Shevchenko has his Wiggins.

Obviously Washington's detractors failed because the charges were without foundation. No such methods detracted from Washington's greatness or prevented a grateful people from honoring his memory. Yet human nature had its fling before Congress could decide on a suitable memorial for Washington as evident from the extensive debates in Congress in the winter of 1800. For example, Congressman Sheppard rose to say: "I will do as much as any man to honor the memory of Washington. I have fought and bled with him several times. I have always supported and will continue to support him. But on the score of expenses, I think we are going too far. I will go so far as to have his remains placed decently within these walls. Further, I will not go; for I do not think we have a right to throw away the public money." He was answered by Representative John Randolph from Virginia: "Shall then a mistaken spirit of economy, and a still more mistaken jealousy arrest us? Honor him, it is true, we cannot. The world has charged itself with that task \* \* \*

but though we cannot honor him, we may dishonor ourselves; though we cannot increase the luster of his fame, we may show our own meanness, cowardice, spite and malice; and show an astonished world that we are deplorably unworthy of the high honor conferred by Nature in giving us a Washington."

The mistaken and ill informed voice of prejudice from the pages of the Washington Post ought not to be the means for either Congress or the responsible planning commission to demean the profile of Shevchenko, whose presence in the Nation's Capital would add luster to the spirit of America as personified by George Washington. They are kindred in spirit.

The proposed statue symbolizes Shevchenko's respect for as well as his yearning for the American ideal to take root in other lands, a yearning which was expressed in their day also by Marquis de Lafayette, Shelley, Hugo, Byron and others. Lord Byron in his "Ode to Venice" expresses this common bond between souls like Shevchenko and Washington in these words:

"Better be

Where the extinguished Spartans still are free,

In their proud chancel of Thermopylae,  
Than stagnate in our marsh, or over the deep

Fly, and one current to the ocean add,  
One spirit to the souls our fathers had,  
One freeman more, America, to thee."

Shall we accept Mr. Charek, son of Ukrainian parents, as president of our most advanced system of world communication, the Tel-Star Corp., and reject the spiritual father of his parents, Taras Shevchenko?

To charge that Congress was misguided and careless in this matter comes with ill grace from a newspaper whose editorial is so lacking in decent respect for truth and so biased in its views. Surely the normal procedures applicable to adoption of joint resolutions were followed in this matter. Appropriate committees considered the resolution. It was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Printed information and references covering the subject of the statue were made available. Opportunity for hearings and study were given. No substantive objections to the proposal were voiced in Congress. No costs were incurred by the Government for the realization of the project. The whole "Shevchenko affair" appears unworthy of the Washington Post.

Though this letter is already long, I cannot overlook the arrogant affront, the calculated inflammatory statement and brazen appeal to bigotry reflected in the charge that: "It is perhaps enough to say that both in the writings of the poet and in the efforts to exploit him there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background. A statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans."

Shevchenko was an inherently religious man. Old and New Testament influences affected his writings profoundly. His poetry is permeated with appeals to and respect for God. He is honored by Ukrainians of all religious faiths. The joint resolution of Congress authorizing the project was sponsored by Congressmen of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths. This is not to overlook the fact that religious "arguments" have been utilized on occasion by some of his detractors through distortion just as the Washington Post has done.

No doubt references have been made to anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic expressions in his poem Haydamaky. The theme of a fierce economic, political, and national struggle which inspired this historical poem did not minimize scenes of bloodshed, conflagration, and carnage of Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, women and children.

I have read Shevchenko's poems many times since boyhood. In the poem Haydamaky, Shevchenko expressed his personal abhorrence of the massacres and acts of fratricide by poetic interjections. In his prose preface to the poem, giving information on his source material, Shevchenko says:

"Thank God, that it's all past. When you recall that we are all children of the same mother, that we are all Slavs. Though it may be painful, it must be told: Let the sons and grandsons see that their parents were in error. Let them reestablish brotherly relationship again with their enemies."

Shevchenko was a great admirer of King David as a national hero of the Jews. Like himself, David started out as a shepherd boy adept with the harp and possessing a good singing voice. In translating David's Psalms, Shevchenko attuned his fervently lofty ideals to David's harp.

In conclusion, I am reminded of the last two stanzas of a poem dedicated by William Cullen Bryant to the memory of William Leggett, which expresses the enduring quality of Shevchenko for those who have ears and hearts to listen:

The words of fire that from his pen

Were flung upon the lucid page,  
Still move, still shake the hearts of men  
Amid a cold and coward age.

His love of truth, too warm, too strong

For hope or fear to chain or chill,  
His hate of tyranny and wrong,

Burn in the breasts he kindled still.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN PANCHUK.

[From the Jewish Digest]

THE FORGOTTEN EPIC OF COUNT SHEPTYTSKY  
(By Leo Heiman)

A letter written in Latin and postmarked Vatican City was delivered a few months ago to the desk of Col. David Kahana, chief chaplain of the Israeli Air Force. It was signed by a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, who is the head of a permanent commission that investigates beatification claims and makes final recommendations concerning eventual elevation to sainthood. The communication sought information about the late Count Andrew Sheptytsky, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

To millions of Ukrainians, the count is a true Christian saint, but Moscow is trying to prevent his beatification at all costs. Because the Ukrainians venerate the count as their greatest nationalist leader, Moscow is trying to prove that he was not a saint but a pro-Nazi collaborator, and war criminal. Books, films, and other propaganda have been employed by Moscow to vilify the late metropolitan as an agent of the Gestapo.

The only surviving witness who personally knew the late count and who can disprove the Soviet charges is Rabbi Kahana. I met the tough-looking rabbi-colonel, known as the fighting rabbi throughout the Israeli armed forces, in the concrete and steel building which houses the general headquarters of the Israeli Air Force.

When I brought up the name of Count Andrew Sheptytsky, Chaplain Kahana was visibly moved. For a moment the clock of history seemed to turn back from July 1962 in Israel to July 1952 in the Ukrainian city of Lvov (Lemberg), where Nazi officers amused themselves by using Jewish children for target practice. Placing his right hand on the Holy Book, Colonel Kahana said:

"I am willing to swear on the Bible that Count Sheptytsky was one of the greatest humanitarians in the history of mankind, certainly the best friend we Jews ever had. I say this not just because he saved my wife, my child, and myself, but because he was instrumental in rescuing hundreds of other Jews from certain death.

"When I met him, he was over 80, paralyzed and near death but not broken in spirit. He was well past the need to seek 'respectability insurance' or political gain. And he was aware that when the Nazis found Jews hiding in a church or monastery, they shot all the priests and monks, and either razed the buildings or converted them into barracks. If the metropolitan was willing to risk his priests and churches, he was moved by true Christianity, by love of our Jewish people, and by a sense of national responsibility. He realized that the enemies of the Ukrainian people would blame the actions of pogrom mobs and rag-tag militia on the entire Ukrainian nation. He therefore decreed that it was the sacred duty of every nationally conscious Ukrainian priest to save as many Jews as possible. Sheptytsky was a Zionist sympathizer and a firm believer in the messianic mission of the Jewish people. In 1942, when Jews were being butchered in the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Treblinka and slaughtered in the lime-filled pits on the outskirts of a thousand European towns and cities, Sheptytsky predicted the creation of an independent Jewish state in the Holy Land."

Pausing only to brush away tears of emotion from his steel-gray eyes, Chaplain Kahana recalled that before World War II Lvov was part of the Polish Republic. "I was the Jewish military chaplain attached to Lvov garrison troops," he said, "rabbi of the Syxtus Street Synagogue and Jewish theology teacher in the city's high schools.

"After the German invasion of Poland, the Nazis tried to wipe out the 200,000 Jews of Lvov and the surrounding hamlets with the aid of pogrom mobs, drunken peasants, and locally recruited militia. But when the Nazis saw that there was more looting than actual killing, and that criminal elements were fighting each other over the spoils rather than murdering Jews, the Nazis brought in the notorious Sinsatz-Kommando Lemberg and got down to business with Teutonic thoroughness. Slave-labor roundups, street massacres, and mass executions followed with agonizing frequency.

"Helpless against the tidal wave of murder and destruction, we sought to save our Torah scrolls, synagogue records, and various sacred books. The only safe place was in the crypts of Catholic monasteries and churches. Together with Rabbi Hamaydness, a famous leader of Polish Jewry, I went to see Dr. Kostelnik and asked for an introduction to Metropolitan Sheptytsky. We had already been herded into a ghetto, forced to wear yellow badges, and forbidden to enter the city proper on pain of death. Rabbi Hamaydness could not pose as a Christian, but I shaved off my beard, tore off my yellow badges, and stole out at night to see the metropolitan in his palace on Mount St. George.

"In the old-fashioned, high-ceilinged room that was the metropolitan's office, I saw him pushed in, in his wheelchair. Grasping my hand in his two hands and gazing at me kindly, he said gently: 'I see trouble brings you to me, my son. Please sit down and tell me about it.'

"When I described the sufferings of my people, he broke down and cried. 'I know all about it,' he told me quietly, 'and I have sent several letters to all priests, with orders to have them read to their congregations in all churches. I have warned my people that any person helping the Nazis to persecute or kill Jews will be doomed to eternal damnation.'

"But I am sorry to say there is little more I can do than protest. I have also sent notes to all German officials of the occupation administration and to Himmler himself, protesting against the use of Ukrainian troops in anti-Jewish actions. These young Ukrainians volunteered to fight Communists, but instead of deploying them at the front, the Nazis are forcing them to participate in



massacres of helpless Jews. The answer I received was an insulting warning to mind my own business and that but for my age I would have been shot for interceding on behalf of the Jews. My son, I can only pray for you and your people, and hope that prayer helps. Tell me how I can help, besides praying, and I'll do everything in my power \* \* \*

"I asked the metropolitan to save the Torah scrolls from the synagogues and the children whose parents have been killed by the Nazis, and who were due to die themselves in the next German roundup. The metropolitan called in his brother, Clement, who was in charge of all Ukrainian Catholic monasteries, and the Ihumenia Josepha, the head of all convents. Both declared themselves ready to help. But since the Nazis were raiding Christian orphanages and ordering all boys to parade naked to see whether any of them were circumcised, I was asked to select mostly Jewish girls for the first rescue operation.

"The first rescue operation took place on the night of August 14, 1942, when 200 Jewish children, including the sons of Rabbi Hamaydness and Levin and my own daughter, were smuggled out of the ghetto to monasteries and convents where they were concealed in crypts and given forged certificates of baptism and Ukrainian-sounding names. Then they were dispersed among convent schools and Catholic orphanages in and around Lvov. All of them survived the Nazi occupation and that was because the priests, nuns and monks risked torture and death as they played a deadly game of outwitting Nazi spies, collaborators and stool pigeons. The greatest satisfaction of my life was to gather these Jewish children after the war and to smuggle them out of Soviet Russia to Israel via an underground Zionist railroad and then to watch them grow up in a land of their own, serve in the armed forces, get married, raise families and forget their tragic past.

"After hiding my daughter safely, the Ihumenia Josepha asked me to bring my wife to the convent. The mother superior took my wife to the priest in charge of administration registers who provided her with forged documents identifying her as a native-born Ukrainian Catholic. He also furnished her with a false birth certificate, threw a nun's homespun brown robe around her shoulders and escorted her to the German Population Registry Office. There my wife received a Ukrainian identity card, stamped by the German Occupation Administration, food ration tickets, a domicile permit, and all other essential documents.

"Thanks to the mother superior and the priest, whose name I never learned, my wife was able to pose as a Ukrainian nun and to move freely about the city. She was my principal contact between the ghetto and the monasteries. When the ghetto was liquidated, she maintained a liaison between fugitive Jews and the Ukrainian church leadership. She slept in the Ihumenia Josepha's own cell at the convent, went to church to avoid suspicion and thus avoided exposure and capture for 2 years.

"When the Nazis liquidated the Lvov ghetto, I was among the Jewish men grabbed by the Nazis and thrown into the Janowski concentration camp. Each day thousands were killed by the Nazi guards while others were crippled and emaciated by hunger, beatings, and disease. During those terrible weeks in Janowski camp, I lost all faith in humanity and I might have lost my faith in God too, but for the shining example of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, his brother Clement, the Ihumenia Josepha and hundreds of nameless Ukrainian monks, priests, and nuns.

"Desperately looking for a chance to escape before the Nazis killed me in one of their cruel and senseless games, my opportunity came during a sudden rainstorm that flooded the drainage ditches and turned the camp into a morass. While the guards huddled in

their watchtowers, studded with searchlights and machineguns, and the police dogs took cover beneath the watchtower trestles, I crawled on my belly through mud and puddles to the northernmost corner in the fence. Earlier I had noticed that some ricocheting bullets fired by the guards into a group of Jewish prisoners had torn down a few strands of the barbed wire which the Germans had not yet repaired.

"It took me an eternity to get through the gap in the first row of wire and to disentangle myself from the twisted concertina wire of the second security fence. Rolling in the mud to hide from a searchlight's probing beam and burrowing through excrement and pools of coagulating blood to kill the scent of a human body whenever a dog barked, I managed to reach the dilapidated wooden buildings of a Lvov suburb. From there I ran uphill toward the metropolitan's palace on Mount St. George.

"When a sleepy monk finally opened a small barred window in response to my frantic knocking at the night gate, he took one look at me—ragged, dirty, emaciated, bleeding from wounds and scratches, and evil-smelling—crossed himself and shut the gate in my face. I knocked again but there was no answer. Just as I heard the jackbooted steps of a Nazi police patrol approaching, the gate suddenly opened and another monk dragged me inside. 'Brother Mykola almost fainted when he saw you,' the monk explained. 'He was sure you were a ghostly apparition.'

"I must have been a repulsive sight as I followed the monk to the metropolitan's private apartment. But the prelate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church embraced me and kissed me and then ordered his secretary to take me to a hot bath, burn my rags, and dress me in a monk's robes. The metropolitan was still waiting for me, despite the late hour, when I came out of the bath. He wept again, and asked me to tell him of my life in the Nazi camp. For 2 hours I talked, until at dawn the metropolitan asked me to join him in prayer. I helped him out of his wheelchair and supported him as he knelt before the crucifix. He prayed in his way and I in mine.

"I remained hidden in Count Sheptytsky's private library. Food was brought to me there. Only at night did I go out for a walk in the walled palace garden. In the spring of 1943, the metropolitan was taken down in his wheelchair to the garden every day at dusk. He sent away the monk who was his guide and I pushed the chair for an hour through the flower-rimmed garden paths as we talked about politics, philosophy, psychology, and theology. Needless to say, the metropolitan never tried to convert me. Once he gave me an old book to read. It was a Ukrainian priest's account of a visit to the Holy Land which ended with a description of Jewish suffering throughout the ages and a prediction that the Jews were doomed to weep forever because they had rejected Jesus.

"When the metropolitan inquired if I had finished the book and I replied in the affirmative, he suddenly seized my hand, kissed it and, in a voice choked with tears, apologized. Everybody kissed the metropolitan's hand, and he himself had to kiss only the Pope's hand, so I could not understand why he was apologizing so tearfully to a fugitive rabbi. The metropolitan said that at a time when the Nazis were butchering Jews, it was a tactical mistake on his part to let me read a book whose author denied the Jewish people all hope unless they accepted Christianity. He insisted that I accept his apology.

"When I tell you that Andrew Sheptytsky was a saint, I do not exaggerate. I am a professional officer, with 20 years of military service—5 in the Polish Army and 15 in the Israeli Armed Forces. I am an Orthodox rabbi and a doctor of philosophy and theology. I know human nature and I know that

the qualities which make a saint are so rare as to be almost nonexistent. But Count Sheptytsky possessed them all.

"Besides the count's brother Clement, the Ihumenia Josepha and the hundreds of Ukrainian clergy who risked their lives to save Jews, there was Father Marko, a village priest who rescued more than 40 Jewish children from Nazi firing squads. Later, I had an opportunity to help him escape to the United States, where he now lives.

"After World War II, following Count Sheptytsky's death and the suppression of an anti-Soviet uprising by Ukrainian guerrillas, the Soviet authorities imprisoned, exiled or executed most of the Ukrainian priests. I was then a colonel in the Polish Army and also associated with an underground Zionist organization which operated an escape route from Russia across Poland and Czechoslovakia to the American occupation zones in Germany and Austria.

"To avoid certain death, the Ukrainian priests who had helped me masquerade as a Ukrainian, now had to pose as pious Jews with beards and sidelocks. After crossing the River San into Poland, they made their way to Warsaw where they contacted me. Now I was able to repay their kindness. I lived next door to Wladyslaw Gomulka, now the Communist boss of Poland, and our apartment block was guarded by security police but no one suspected my links to an underground Zionist organization. When elderly, pious-looking Jews were seen entering my apartment, the security officers assumed that leaders of surviving Jewish congregations had come to ask me for assistance or to discuss religious problems.

"I gave the priests false Jewish identification cards and smuggled them out of Poland with transports of Israel-bound Jews. When the transports passed through Western Germany, the priests were guided to Ukrainian DP camps where they received new documents and visas for the United States and Canada. I compiled a list of over 240 such priests and monks who had rescued Jews from the Nazis. But this list is not complete. And now the Russians come up with documentary proof that the Ukrainian Catholic Church was a pro-Nazi organization and that the late Metropolitan Sheptytsky was a war criminal.

"The scientific triumphs of the Soviets are more than nullified by their basic attitude of deceit, contempt for human decencies and crimes of genocide committed in the name of communism. In this respect, at least, the Kremlin is ruled by the same kind of gangster regime which brought shame and ruin to Nazi Germany. That is why I felt it my duty to speak up and tell the truth about Count Andrew Sheptytsky, the only saint I recognize."

As Colonel Kahana accompanied me to the headquarters gate on my way out of his office, supersonic Israeli jet fighters streaked across the sky. Rabbi Kahana pointed upward and said: "You see this fighter formation? Four pilots in this squadron are among the Jewish children saved by Metropolitan Sheptytsky and his heroic assistants."

#### NAVAL REPAIR FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution calling for a continuation of the

Naval Repair Facility at San Diego, Calif. I feel that the contemplated closing of this very important facility will in fact be damaging to the defense posture of the Nation. The Naval Repair Facility serves as a service station to the Pacific Fleet and it is essential that it always be immediately available to the important naval commands stationed in the San Diego area.

I have called the importance of this facility to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and have requested that any final action be deferred until the newly formed Defense Department-Navy Board can make an objective survey of the situation. I am convinced that an impartial study will provide more than ample justification for the continuation of the facility.

The resolution reads:

Whereas since World War I the Naval Repair Facility at San Diego has served as a vital repair and overhaul base serving all elements of the Pacific Fleet in wartime and peacetime; and

Whereas the men and women of the repair facility have established an outstanding record of production efficiency; and

Whereas San Diego as the home port of many Pacific-based ships of the U.S. Navy as well as headquarters of numerous important naval commands, must be in a position to immediately service elements of the fleet on an emergency basis during peacetime activities or during the exigencies of war; Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the Naval Repair Facility at San Diego should be continued as a vital adjunct to the U.S. Fleet.

#### THE NEED TO SET A NATIONAL EXAMPLE OF ECONOMY BY STRESSING REHABILITATION AND THE ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IS BEING IGNORED IN THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in his inspirational address to the joint session of Congress, President Lyndon B. Johnson included a pledge which I hope heralds a new approach to the problems of a growing Federal budget. I refer to that part of his speech in which he said:

I pledge that the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy.

The sincerity of the President's remarks has drawn the plaudits of such conservative newspapers as the Wall Street Journal, and the head of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Edward Neilan.

Here in Congress, the President will find many allies for his economy drive. I would like to suggest that a good place to start the introduction of thrift and frugality in the Federal Government

would be the federally aided urban renewal program. The key to success in economizing in this area, however, is to place a new stress on rehabilitation and the central role of the private homeowner and businessman. This will preserve urban renewal without its excesses, and without losing the many benefits of which this program is capable.

In the Housing Act of 1949 Congress defined the national housing policy in section 2 and declared that:

Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need.

Emphasis on this clear policy statement by Congress has been particularly lacking in the District of Columbia. The situation as has been uncovered by the hard work of a House District of Columbia Subcommittee, and reports in the press reveal a number of factors inhibiting both local control and individual effort with inflated costs and poor results the invariable result. These factors have kept urban renewal from obtaining the most beneficial results in the most economical manner.

Several things have gone wrong in the District of Columbia's urban renewal program.

First, despite the disclaimers of Federal urban renewal officials that they have no desire to seek Federal control over local programs, the Federal Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia has imposed its vague and inadequate standards for housing codes upon District property owners. It has scorned the use of the housing codes and regulations of the District government. Not only does this Federal policy raise doubts as to the validity of local urban renewal agency findings of District areas in need of urban renewal, but an atmosphere of confusion is created. Businessmen and homeowners who wish to keep their property up to standard are discouraged from doing so. I spoke on this on December 12, 1963—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 24321-24323—and include, as part of my remarks, a legal opinion by the District's Corporation Counsel.

Second, projects in the District of Columbia have stressed luxury apartment projects and prime office space. Apartments renting for \$175 per month do not qualify as moderate or low income housing and do not meet the intent of the 1949 act to provide better housing for those who cannot find it, or afford it. Many families, a large proportion of them Negro, formerly living in urban renewal project areas, have not been substantially aided in their attempts to find decent housing they can afford. The pattern in the District of Columbia in this regard follows the national pattern, so much so that urban renewal has come to mean "Negro removal" in the minds of those it was intended to help.

Third, businessmen and homeowners point to the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project where the ill-advised removal of 141 small businessmen from that project area, without any structural survey and analysis of the condition of

their business buildings, proves that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission, both Federal agencies, have not heeded national housing policy regarding private enterprise. These businessmen and homeowners point out, in their frustration and exasperation, that the 1950 comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia—the basic and official plan for the District's long-range development—calls for the location of business in the very area now occupied by these 141 small businessmen. No Federal agency, or Federal or District official, should have such unlimited power to rewrite this local plan at will. Moreover, Congress must not support an urban renewal policy which, in practice, sounds the death knell of small business. I am pleased to say that the District's Republican Party leaders have protested the administration of the District's urban renewal program as injurious to the District as well as its citizens.

Clearly, urban renewal officials should not be permitted to exercise a policy which deliberately ignores and frustrates efforts by local businessmen, apartment owners, and private homeowners to rehabilitate their own property at no cost to the American taxpayer. This policy, however, has been adopted by acquiescence by both the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, and the District of Columbia Commissioners as well.

The difficulties of persuading urban renewal officials to make use of the rehabilitation concept is not limited to the District of Columbia, of course. In the 9 years since rehabilitation was stressed in the Housing Act of 1954, only a few thousand of the 100,000 or more dwelling units scheduled for rehabilitation have actually been improved. Yet, the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner, William L. Slayton, has said that:

The renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

In the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project rightful owners of property tried, in vain, to proceed with redevelopment and improvement of their private holdings without any governmental subsidy. Officials of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, however, had other plans for the area, and another redeveloper, selected in advance by them, stands to reap a \$3,500,000 taxpayer subsidy and untold benefits beside. This subsidy would have been wholly unnecessary had the original owners been encouraged and assisted, under the direction of the Housing Act of 1949, to redevelop their own property as they were prepared to do, and were capable of doing.

This policy of extravagant waste has been repeated in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. At hearings held by the District's Commissioners on July 1, 2, and 3, 1963, Fontaine C. Bradley appeared for the Eugene Meyer family and heirs, urging the removal of the 6-acre Henderson Castle site from the



Adams-Morgan plan. The owners of the Henderson Castle site further indicated that their own development of the property would proceed more rapidly than any development under urban renewal, would not cost the taxpayers a single dollar of urban renewal funds, and would yield a far greater return to the District of Columbia if privately developed. Yet the District's Commissioners, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency have failed to respond to this commonsense appeal.

In a public statement on December 4, 1963, the Property Owners Protective Improvement Association of the District of Columbia reported that subsequent to the National Capital Planning Commission declaring, on June 16, 1960, "that Adams-Morgan is not a slum," many private improvements have been made, or are in process, in areas "B" and "C" in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project without subsidies of any kind, Federal, or local. I include here the impressive list of these improvements set out in the association's statement:

1. First of them is the \$30 million Hilton Hotel in area "B."
2. The two Cafritz office buildings, costing \$24 million, in area "B."
3. An office building on the south side of Florida Avenue, costing \$3 million just outside of area "B."
4. Owners of 35 pieces of property in areas "B" and "C," namely the Fulton Brylawski interests, even now are rebuilding approximately 10 lots in area "B" on Belmont and Kalorama Roads. These efforts involve both restoration and new construction.
5. The A. M. Associates, of which Messrs. Gerald J. Miller, Donald J. Brown, and Melvin Lenkin are the trustees, have purchased on Wyoming Avenue, between 18th and 19th Streets, approximately 13 lots on which they are preparing to build luxury apartments in area "B." We understand the new owners of this land are asking for zoning to permit higher buildings. In like manner, most of areas "B" and "C" eventually will be zoned for higher buildings. We believe the present owners should receive the benefit of higher zoning values rather than friends of RLA.
6. Mr. Roscoe Jones owns properties in Adams-Morgan in area "B." He is restoring at least one house on Kalorama Road.
7. Mrs. Emma Parker is restoring a house on California Street, spending thousands of dollars in area "B."
8. Mrs. Alva Dawson owns a large former embassy on Vernon Street, area "B." She purchased the property to restore it into apartments. Mrs. Dawson is justifiably afraid to spend money on it while the RLA hangs over us. Interest payments and no rentals coming in are costing her a sizable amount.
9. Mrs. Dawson also has an apartment house at 1919 19th Street NW. She spent \$22,000 restoring it. This property is threatened by RLA to make a playground in area "B."
10. Mr. Zatinsky has just renovated an apartment house at 2110 19th Street NW., in area "B."
11. Mrs. Mildred Gott Bryan testified before the District Commissioners' hearing on July 1, 1963, that she is able and willing to modernize her Imperial apartment house on Columbia Road between Ontario Road and 18th Street, in area "C." The RLA will demolish that property for parking if urban renewal is approved for this area.

12. Stant Lithograph, Inc., on Champlain Street wants to erect a new and beautiful building in area "C."

13. Jarboe Printing Co. will enlarge its new building on Champlain Street in area "C." It is noteworthy that the Jarboe Printing Co. had its property in the Southwest seized under that urban renewal project and was forced to relocate. He did relocate in Adams-Morgan and, if urban renewal is initiated in this area, his property again will be seized and police powers used by RLA to force him to relocate for the second time because of urban renewal. RLA would demolish it.

14. The C. I. Smith Paint Co. will erect a new building on Champlain Street in area "C." RLA would demolish its present building.

15. Mr. Thomas J. Folliot, at 2407 18th Street NW., has done extensive modernizing of his building in area "C." RLA would demolish all of the east side of 19th Street from Columbia Road south to Florida Avenue, if urban renewal is approved for Adams-Morgan.

16. Mr. Tom Smith, on 18th Street, has modernized his building inside and out. He is in area B. Urban renewal would demolish it.

17. Colortone Press, at 2400 17th Street, has spent thousands of dollars on its building and will spend thousands more in area C. Urban renewal plan proposes demolition of this building.

18. Miss DeWitt Plummer has spent several thousands of dollars restoring her house at 2514 Ontario Road, NW. in area C. Urban renewal plan calls for property to be demolished for parking for the benefit of merchants on Columbia Road.

19. Mrs. Angela Fox has spent several thousand dollars modernizing her home at 2517 Ontario Road, NW. in area C. RLA proposes demolition of her property for parking for the benefit of Columbia Road merchants.

20. The M. & M. Pharmacy has spent \$45,000 or more remodeling its building at Ontario and Columbia Road in area C. RLA would demolish it for parking.

21. Recently, Avignone Freres has spent an enormous amount of money on an enlargement of its restaurant on Columbia Road in area C.

22. The Park Plaza Apartment House, 276 apartments being restored inside and out by Sidney Mensh. Area C.

23. Argonne West Apartment House recently restored by Sidney Mensh. Area C.

24. Woodyly Apartment House, Columbia Road, completely restored. Area A.

25. The new Rock Creek Park Hotel, 1925 Belmont Road. Mr. Louis Montague. Area A.

26. Several houses on Calvert Street, west of 18th Street.

27. Mr. J. B. Shapiro is trying to get permission to build a high-rise apartment house on Adams Mill Road, NW., a few feet from area C.

28. Three huge luxury apartment houses have been built just south of area C on 18th Street. They are the Dupont East, Imperial House and the Corcoran House.

In addition to these improvements in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, the Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society recently pointed out more than 80 of 287 homes in the Kalorama Triangle—area A of the Adams-Morgan project—have undergone substantial restoration since 1959.

Also, of the 43 apartment buildings in this famed and historic triangle, 16 have been modernized and restored recently.

The Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society has long been on record as op-

posed to urban renewal for the Kalorama Triangle. Yet this area—known as "the Gold Coast" of the Nation's Capital—was included in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project at the whim of the officials of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. When the House District subcommittee members asked Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, why this area was included, in view of the fact that it is one of the finest residential areas in the Nation, his answer was that Connecticut Avenue provided a better boundary than Columbia Road. This proves that whatever is included, or left out, of the District's urban renewal program is dependent entirely on the fancies of nonelected officials in charge of the District's urban renewal program. Hard facts about structural soundness have no place in their decisions.

Business is being stifled and discouraged as a result. MBG Associates recently announced their plan for a modern apartment building at 1851 Wyoming Avenue, in the heart of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, "not predicated on urban renewal." This business firm states that "private lending institutions are willing to go into the area, to finance both restoration and modern, new buildings without Federal Government assistance through urban renewal." The question which naturally arises is, why not encourage this type of private enterprise? Why do the Federal agencies concerned with urban renewal insist on doing the job themselves?

MBG Associates urged that the A and B areas of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project be eliminated from the plan. Yet the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency seeks to turn the entire Adams-Morgan area over to the federally aided program which it administers. It would be far better to encourage and assist owners of private property to rehabilitate their own property. There is nothing wrong with selective urban renewal. Rather than spend \$20 million of public funds unnecessarily in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, the Federal policy of thrift, frugality, prudence, and economy advocated by President Lyndon B. Johnson can be carried out best by encouraging and assisting private property owners in the Adams-Morgan project area to do their own improvement work without Federal subsidy, Federal controls, Federal redtape, and other Federal handicaps imposed on an unwilling and voteless citizenry by an overzealous Federal bureaucracy.

The property owners of the Adams-Morgan project area have already done a great deal to improve their property, and undoubtedly could do much more if the Federal Urban Renewal Administration and the District's urban renewal officials, including the District's Commissioners, devoted themselves to encouraging and assisting them in this enterprise.

Washington, D.C., as well as other cities, needs a workable urban renewal rehabilitation program. The URA Com-

missioner, William L. Slayton, says the urban renewal program cannot exist without a rehabilitation program. To be successful, a rehabilitation program must encourage and assist private rehabilitation of private property by private property owners.

Rehabilitation programs such as Adams-Morgan, which must of necessity be long term, should be planned to take advantage of changes in environment. It may be necessary to build into the Federal urban renewal regulations, and into the housing law as well, requirements for additional flexibility, but with appropriate safeguards.

Meanwhile, urban renewal officials at the Federal and local level, and the District's Commissioners as well, should take immediate steps to clean up their urban renewal program. They must bring it into line with the spirit and intent of the Housing Act of 1949, not just pay lip service to that act. Since the District Commissioners have ordered a resurvey of the condition of the buildings in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, and have admitted they may have made a mistake in the Columbia Plaza project, the responsible officials in the District and in the Federal Urban Renewal Administration have a duty to start anew.

The problems I raise here, using the District of Columbia as an illustration, are not confined to the Nation's Capital.

Next year, the Special Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives will be holding additional hearings on urban renewal. There is ample time for the District projects to be corrected and improved in the direction of rehabilitation and the use of private enterprise. This will enable the committee to tell whether the fine words of Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton in Georgia this past fall, stressing that rehabilitation was the key to urban renewal's future, are more than lip service paid to a recognized policy objective of the Congress.

If this administrative change of heart is not carried out, then I will move to improve this situation through legislative channels. It may well be necessary to redefine our national goals for urban renewal, to reemphasize the intent of Congress with respect to rehabilitation and the role of private enterprise, and to redefine the present wide areas of discretion left to nonelected officials. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that legislation for the District, such as S. 628 as presently written, should be held in abeyance until national policy is put back on the right track.

In a speech on December 12 in this House I discussed the importance of objective criteria and standards to a successful Federal urban renewal program. I said, among other things, that:

It is apparent that Mr. Slayton is determined to force on the District of Columbia the same inadequate and vague standards that plagued urban renewal in Cleveland's Erieview I urban renewal project. Under these standards almost any building, no matter what its structural condition may be, even the U.S. Capitol Building itself, it was pointed out in the hearings by a witness for

the General Accounting Office, can be declared substandard and almost any project can be justified. Efforts by the District's Commissioners to fulfill their responsibilities to the citizens will be useless unless Mr. Slayton allows for the local initiative he has so often talked about approvingly in the past.

The Department of General Administration of the District of Columbia has expressed great concern, on behalf of the District's Commissioners, over the present practice and apparent future plans of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to set up and enforce its own housing standards separate and distinct from those of the government of the District of Columbia. In a memorandum under date of February 1, 1962, it said that:

"Some additional questions which we have in the area of enforcement are: When is RLA through with the area? When does Licenses and Inspections start enforcing the minimum standards in the area? Who inspects (polices) periodically for violations of the requirements imposed by the urban renewal plan that are either above, variations of, or inconsistent with, the minimal standards? Why was the covenant technique applied to the urban renewal area? Was the 40-year time increment chosen because it is consistent with the financing of the project? Will our courts, in the years ahead, be clogged with the increased workload that would be generated by the civil actions instituted by RLA in enforcing these voluminous maverick requirements? We use the word 'voluminous' because in 40 or 50 years, if we impose dozens of requirements not contained in our codes and regulations upon each urban renewal project and ultimately have 40 or 50 projects in the city, we could have literally thousands of these special requirements imposed upon a picture-puzzle city."

"Cognizant of the temptation to say zoning is too weak an instrument to do a more satisfactory urban renewal job, therefore, we should resort to the more drastic techniques available through the urban renewal process. This matter has given us great concern for some time. We have carefully weighed the pros and cons and believe that the best interest of the Nation's Capital can be best served over the future years by tailoring our urban renewal plans and programs consistent with our minimal standards contained in the building, zoning, housing, sign and related codes and regulations."

"This, of course, would not preclude reasonable special rules for the initial development of an area, but in general the present trend toward setting up myriad special rules for longtime application leads to benefits difficult to prove, and most certainly leads to confusing and expensive enforcement situations."

The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, in the interest of sound government, as well as in the interest of prudence, thrift, and economy should support the District's building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations, rather than undercut them as it has been doing. The problems facing the District of Columbia are common to other cities and towns in our country. Only chaos can result from the present course of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration. Obviously, the properly constituted governing bodies of our cities and towns, conversant as they are with their own local conditions, are much better qualified to establish and enforce building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations for their local jurisdictions than is some Federal official, even if it is Mr. Slayton, sitting behind a desk in Washington.

I include as part of my remarks the opinion of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia on this point

which I mentioned briefly in passing earlier.

GOVERNMENT OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1963.

Re Whether section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is an integral part of the D.C. Redevelopment Act of 1945. (CCO: 755.1—sec. 110, Housing Act of 1949, as amended.)

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

GENTLEMEN: At a meeting of the Board of Commissioners on November 14, 1963, you requested that an opinion be rendered by this office concerning certain questions raised by Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director, District of Columbia Land Agency. Specifically, Mr. Doyle inquired as to whether section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, may be taken into account in determining the eligibility of an area in the District of Columbia for designation as an urban renewal project area.

In further elaboration of this question, Mr. Doyle by letter to me stated as follows:

"I raised this question with the District Commissioners at this morning's meeting because it appears to me that if section 20(1) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is interpreted by you and the District Commissioners to mean, as it seems to us to mean, that an area with the characteristics described in section 110 is eligible for designation as an urban renewal project, we would, in a survey of an area, include criteria which could not be included if section 110 is not an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. The important criteria included in section 110 but not mentioned in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 are stated under paragraph (c) of section 110."

"If section 110 is not an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, that act would appear to me to be so limited in its description of eligible areas that it would be infeasible to undertake in the District of Columbia conservation and rehabilitation projects of the kind contemplated by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

The question raised involves, first, the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 and, second, the extent to which section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949 affects that act.

By the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 790, sec. 5-701, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), Congress declared that "owing to technological and sociological changes, obsolete layout, and other factors, conditions existing in the District of Columbia with respect to substandard housing and blighted areas, including the use of buildings in alleys as dwellings for human habitation, are injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare, and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to protect and promote the welfare of the inhabitants of the seat of the Government by eliminating all such injurious conditions by employing all means necessary and appropriate for the purpose; \* \* \*"

Congress further declared that it was necessary to acquire property to effectuate its declared policy "by the discontinuance of the use for human habitation in the District of Columbia of substandard dwellings and of buildings in alleys and blighted areas, and thereby to eliminate the substandard housing conditions and the communities in the inhabited alleys and blighted areas in such District, \* \* \* and it is necessary to modernize the planning and development of such portions of such District."

In its declaration, Congress also spoke of the "accomplishment of the necessary social and economic benefits" and referred to the



portions of the District with which it was concerned as "obsolescent or obsolescing."

In order to achieve its purpose Congress, in section 5 of the act, granted to the Redevelopment Land Agency the "power to further the redevelopment of blighted territory in the District of Columbia and the prevention, reduction, or elimination of blighting factors of causes of blight and for that purpose to acquire and assemble real property."

In section 3(n) of the act, "redevelopment is defined as including 'the replanning, redesign, and original development of undeveloped areas, which by reason of street layout, lot layout or other causes, are backward and stagnant and therefore blighted.'"

The act contains no definition as such of "blight" or "blighting factors." The usual meaning of these words is "something that impairs or destroys", "to cause to deteriorate", and "marked by termination of healthy growth and development accompanied by deterioration and decline of property values." (Webster's Third International Dictionary) and Congress referred to blighted areas as "obsolescent or obsolescing" and as "backward and stagnant."

In the case of *Schneider v. District of Columbia, et al.* (117 F. Supp. 703), the Redevelopment Act was challenged as being unconstitutional on two grounds, (1) that it authorized the taking by eminent domain of the fee title to private property and the sale or lease of that title to other private persons for private use; and (2) that the statute authorized the taking of property in "blighted areas" without defining that term and thus failed to establish any standard sufficiently definite to sustain the delegation of power.

That court approached the constitutional challenge in three parts. First, it considered a slum; second, the land upon which the slum exists; and third, the "blighted areas." The court described a slum as being "made up of houses (or substitutes for houses), the appurtenances thereon and people. The houses and appurtenances are such that the people live in filth and breed disease and crime" (Schneider, supra, p. 704).

The court described blighted areas as: "sections of cities which are not at the present time used to their fullest economic possibility or are not arranged to fit current ideas of city development. An outstanding example is Trinity Church and its surrounding cemetery at the corner of Wall Street and Broadway in New York City. Apartment houses would be more economically efficient than are single dwellings. Phrases used to describe this situation are 'inadequate planning of the area,' 'excessive land coverage by the buildings thereon,' 'defective design and arrangement of the buildings thereon,' 'faulty street or lot layout,' 'economically or socially undesirable land uses.' The statutes dealing with these areas are usually called urban redevelopment laws. The areas are frequently called blighted. They are in no sense slums or similar to slums; they are out of date. They do not breed disease or crime; they fail to measure up to their maximum potential use in terms of economic, social, architectural, or civic desirability" (Schneider, supra, p. 714).

The court proceeded to consider the problem of the slum. It held that the Redevelopment Act is valid insofar as it authorizes the condemnation of improvements upon lands which are the creating or perpetuating causes of conditions injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare, as that term is used to describe breeding grounds for crime and disease.

In connection with the constitutionality of seizure of title to the land upon which slums exist, the court held that such title cannot be seized merely because a slum presently exists upon the land. The court's

view was that some further necessitous circumstance must exist to validate such a seizure. It must be either that the clearance of the slum is impracticable without taking the title to the land or that proposed restrictions which can be imposed only through the medium of a resale are fairly calculated to prevent recurrence of slum conditions.

Considering the third problem, that is, the blighted or deteriorated area upon which no slums presently exist, the court held that the act did not extend this far and that if it did it would be invalid for two reasons; viz (1) a public purpose would not be served and (2) "blight" was not sufficiently defined in the statute.

The court considered blight as covering two possible factual situations, one where the plan is to redevelop an area in which no slums exist and the other where the plan is to redevelop an area which the Government deems appropriate for redevelopment but only a part of which constitutes slums. As to the first such situation, the court described the area as one which failed to meet modern standards. "Let us suppose that it is backward, stagnant, not properly laid out, economically 18th century—anything except detrimental to health, safety, or morals" (Schneider, supra, p. 719).

As to this type area, the court held that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agent's, judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood should be.

As to the second phase of this problem, the court, reciting that the Government claimed power to seize all the property in any area which it might select as appropriate so long as the area included some slums, held that the act did not reach this far and stated that, if it did, it would be invalid.

The Schneider case, having been decided by a three-judge statutory court, was appealed directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, sub nom. *Berman v. Parker* (348 U.S. 26; 99 L. ed. 27). In reviewing the District court's decision, the Supreme Court held that the act was not limited to slums as narrowly defined by the District court and that the standards prescribed were adequate in connection with "the blighted areas that tend to produce slums." Thus, the Supreme Court held that the term "blight" is, together with the other references in the act, a sufficient standard to support the delegation of power to acquire areas that tend to produce slums. Stated otherwise, the act is not limited in its application to existing slums but also reaches to those areas in which slums do not presently exist, i.e., blighted areas which, because of the conditions existing therein, are inclined toward becoming slums.

It should be noted that the District court's concept of a "blighted area" was confined to areas which presently are not injurious to the public health, safety or morals. However, the Supreme Court referred to such areas as they relate to slums, that is, as forerunners of slums. Since the term "blight" is not defined in the act, those administering the act are left to ascertain and judge which factors are causing the deterioration or decay of the area and thereby making it prone to the eventual creation of slums. (See *Lichter v. United States*, 334 U.S. 742; 92 L. ed. 1694.)

The case history being thus established, it becomes appropriate to undertake a consideration of the effect of section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, on the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act. Prior to 1954, financial assistance was available under the Housing Act of 1949 only in connection with the acquisition of properties in slum or blighted areas and the

clearance and redevelopment of said properties. In 1954, Congress determined to broaden the Federal assistance by enlarging the Housing Act so as to include conservation or rehabilitation type projects. By section 311 of the Housing Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 590, 626), these projects were defined as follows:

"For the purposes of this subsection, 'rehabilitation' or 'conservation' may include the restoration and renewal of a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area by (1) carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; (2) acquisition of real property and demolition or removal of buildings and improvements thereon where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density, eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or to otherwise remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration or to provide land for needed public facilities; (3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of such improvements as are described in clause (3) of the preceding sentence; and (4) the disposition of any property acquired in such urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan."

By section 316 of the Housing Act of 1954 Congress amended the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 by adding the following to section 20 thereof:

"In addition to its authority under any other provision of this Act, the Agency is hereby authorized to plan and undertake urban renewal projects (as such projects are defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended), and in connection therewith the Agency, the District Commissioners, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the other appropriate agencies operating within the District of Columbia shall have all of the rights and powers which they have with respect to a project or projects financed in accordance with the preceding subsections of this section: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this subsection the word 'redevelopment' wherever found in this Act (except in section 3(n) shall mean 'urban renewal' and the references in section 6 to acquisition, disposition, or assembly of real property for a project shall mean the undertaking of an urban renewal project."

In previously considering the effect of this amendment, I have expressed the opinion that it did not broaden the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act by extending it to areas other than those described in said act. (CCO: 775.1-Bolling Air Force Base, dated May 17, 1961) In a supplemental opinion dated July 13, 1961, there are set forth the reasons upon which this view is based. In summary, those reasons are that a literal incorporation of the definition of urban renewal projects as found in the Housing Act of 1954 which lead to absurd results. In particular, a part of that definition reads as follows: "And provided further, That financial assistance shall not be extended under this title for any project involving slum clearance and redevelopment of an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character."

If such language were incorporated in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act it would obviously convey no meaning since the District does not give but rather seeks financial assistance. For this and other reasons more fully set forth in the Bolling opinions, I concluded that the legislative history must be considered in determining the effect of the reference to the definition of urban renewal projects in the Housing Act of 1954. This history makes it perfectly clear that Congress intended only to authorize the local agencies to engage in the new kind of

projects which, as stated above, were added and were the conservation and rehabilitation type projects. Accordingly, it is my view that the above-referenced amendment serves to incorporate the definition of urban renewal project in the Housing Act of 1954 as it relates to such new activities.

The "criteria" to which Mr. Doyle refers in section 110(c) is set forth in the definitions of conservation and rehabilitation type projects. It is my opinion that this portion of the definitions is an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. However, the inclusion of this part of the Housing Act of 1954 did not serve to broaden the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act since that act, as construed by the Supreme Court, already extended to the blighted areas which tend to cause slums. The so-called criteria contained in the definition of rehabilitation and conservation are related to removal of conditions which are causing the area to be blighted. A fortiori, these conditions are clearly relevant in determining whether any particular area is blighted so as to be within the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

#### CONCLUSIONS

1. Section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the Housing Act of 1954 is not "in toto" an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

2. Those portions of the definition of urban renewal project contained in the Housing Act of 1954 relating to rehabilitation and conservation type projects are an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

3. The conditions referred to in the definition of rehabilitation and conservation type projects in the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by the Housing Act of 1954 are relevant in determining whether any particular area is blighted so as to be within the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Respectfully,

CHESTER H. GRAY,  
Corporation Counsel,  
District of Columbia.

#### H.R. 7278, TO RELEASE SURPLUS CADMIUM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of December 18, 1963, reported that the price of cadmium has shot up to \$3 or more a pound compared to a price of only \$1.70 a pound earlier this year.

I am sorry to say that our Federal Government is guilty of causing this increase in price and in fact is the reason for widespread speculation in this important metal.

We have a substantial surplus of cadmium in Federal stockpiles over and above our anticipated maximum needs in an emergency. Yet, redtape, bureaucratic delay and governmental tampering with the law of supply and demand have caused artificial shortages of this metal.

Our Federal surplus of cadmium is equal to more than a year's total domestic need. The amount we have in surplus

over the maximum Government objective would balance supply and demand for a 5-year period at the present rate.

Interested Federal agencies seem favorable to releasing these excess stocks. Yet, nothing happens. The shortage of cadmium worsens and some firms have been forced to the wall because they cannot get cadmium at any price.

More than a year ago, I introduced legislation to release 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium. Delay in answers from the executive agencies involved caused the bill to die before it could be reported out by the House Armed Services Committee.

On the first day of this current session, I again introduced a bill for the release of 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium. Because of the urgings of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], this bill was acted upon promptly and became Public Law 88-8.

In an almost unbelievable method of disposition of this surplus metal involving something called an "upset price," the General Services Administration managed to drive up the price of cadmium and encourage speculation in this important metal.

In an attempt to offset the damage caused by GSA mishandling, I introduced another bill on June 26, H.R. 7278, calling for the release of an additional 5 million pounds of surplus cadmium. That was almost 6 months ago. Despite inquiries to the executive agencies by the House Armed Services Committee, no official reports on this bill have as yet reached the committee.

We hear through the grapevine that the reports are favorable. Yet, somehow, they never reach the committee so that hearings can be started and this latest bill can be acted upon swiftly.

Meanwhile, the price of cadmium continues to go up. Metal platers, paint and chemical firms and even bicycle manufacturers have been unable to obtain adequate quantities of cadmium for their products.

The Federal Government continues to play dog in the manger with its tremendous excess stores of this metal.

Justice too late is no justice at all.

Let us hope that the executive branch will see its way clear in the near future to taking a look at this problem and, for a moment, consider the damage it has done to business and industry.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 18, 1963]  
PRICE OF CADMIUM INCREASED AGAIN BY FIVE U.S. FIRMS: RISE OF 35 CENTS LIFTS QUOTE ON BIG LOTS TO \$3 A POUND; METAL ALSO UP IN CANADA—OTHER CONCERNS STUDY MOVE

NEW YORK.—The price of cadmium was raised another 35 cents a pound by five U.S. producers to \$3 a pound for lots of 2,000 pounds or more and to \$3.05 a pound for lots of less than 2,000 pounds.

The boost is the latest in a string of increases that has lifted the U.S. price for the metal from the \$1.70 a pound charged early this year.

Cadmium is recovered as a byproduct in the processing of zinc concentrates into metallic zinc. About 60 percent of the

cadmium recovered is used in electroplating, 20 percent for pigments and paints, and the rest for such purposes as low-melting-point alloys for solder, in nickel-cadmium batteries and in the chemical, plastics, and ceramics industries.

#### CANADIAN PRICE RAISED

In Canada, Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada, Ltd., increased its price to Canadian users by 45 cents a pound, Canadian funds, to \$3.25 a pound in lots of 5,000 pounds and over, and to \$3.45 a pound for smaller lots.

The rise in the U.S. price was initiated by American Smelting & Refining Co. The boost has been followed by American Metal Climax, Inc.; St. Joseph Lead Co., U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.

Other producers, who said they were studying the increase, include Anaconda Co. and New Jersey Zinc Co.

A split price of \$2.50 to \$2.65 a pound for cadmium had existed from mid-September to mid-November, when the quote became uniform at \$2.65. Previously the price had been \$2.35 a pound since May 1, when it had risen to \$2 a pound from \$1.85. Before that the price had been \$1.70 a pound, for lots of 2,000 pounds or more, from February 1962 until January 14, 1963, when it rose to the \$1.85 level.

#### SCARCITY IN BRITAIN NOTED

The rise in cadmium's price reflects a scarcity of the metal and continuing rising prices in the United Kingdom, where the metal is said to be quoted at levels ranging from \$3.50 to \$3.85 a pound. The U.S. Government, in a move to relieve the tight supply, sold 2 million pounds of cadmium to U.S. buyers in April through September. The metal came from Government surplus stocks; the sales were approved by Congress. Bids for this metal ran well above prices quoted by producers, industry sources said.

U.S. consumption of cadmium in 1962 was about 12 million pounds, and production about 10 million pounds.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA AND INTERNATIONAL YOUTH MUSIC COMPETITION AT INTERLOCHEN, MICH., IN AUGUST OF 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, with considerable pride, I rise to advise my colleagues about an ambitious and praiseworthy cultural program which has been launched from Interlochen, Mich., in the congressional district which I represent.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of the world-famous National Music Camp and Interlochen Arts Academy, and one of our country's best loved music educators, has embarked on a unique project which might well serve as an effective force for world peace and understanding. I am referring to the organization of an International Youth Symphony Orchestra, composed of young student musicians from all over the world, and an international youth music competition to be held at Interlochen, Mich., next summer.



The purpose of the International Youth Symphony Orchestra, as Dr. Joe Maddy has pointed out, is to promote world friendship through music, the universal language of friendship. This orchestra is already in the process of being assembled and our U.S. State Department has pledged its support through our embassies around the world. The orchestra will be composed of young musicians between the ages of 14 and 18 from countries all over the world. They will spend 8 weeks of intensive training in symphonic musical performance at Interlochen next summer, and will perform at both the New York World's Fair and the United Nations.

The Members will recall that in August, 1962, Dr. Maddy brought his National High School Symphony Orchestra and ballet corps from Interlochen to perform a concert on the White House lawn, at the invitation of the then First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. The late President Kennedy was so impressed with the performance of these young student musicians that he invited the entire group into the rose garden to meet with them and to congratulate them personally. He told them they had given a magnificent performance. In a talk with Dr. Maddy, the late President indicated his support and endorsement of Dr. Maddy's plans to broaden the scope of Interlochen to foster international good will and friendship through the universal language of music and the arts.

By now, most Americans are aware of the cultural explosion in our country which was stimulated in large measure because of the keen interest of the late President and Mrs. Kennedy in music and the arts.

No one is better qualified to expand the horizons of our cultural renaissance than Dr. Joe Maddy who is known as Michigan's "Music Man" and who, at 72, is undertaking one of the biggest and most worthy projects of his career with the organization of an International Youth Symphony Orchestra and International Music Competition. In many respects, a symphony orchestra is the same in New York, Moscow, Tokyo, or Singapore—performing the same music from identical scores printed in many countries, for audiences of all nationalities with comparable understanding and appreciation. Imagine an orchestra of 100 talented young musicians from 50 countries—after 8 weeks of living and working together—playing the world's musical masterpieces of Beethoven, Tchaikovsky, Debussy, Rossini, Gershwin, and Strauss.

The International Youth Symphony Orchestra will be worldwide in scope, and the International Youth Music Competition will be the first of its kind in history. It will bring prestige to Michigan, to the Midwest, and our Nation.

A project of such magnitude has never been done before on the high school age level. There are international music competitions in special categories sponsored in many countries, but none yet has staged such a competition for young musicians on all orchestral instruments. The distinguished young American pianist Van Cliburn, for example, rose to fame after winning an international

piano competition in Moscow. Similar competitions in string instruments also are held in Moscow. Israel holds an international harp competition. The International Music Competition at Interlochen will be the first in the United States—or anywhere in the world—to be open to players of all orchestral instruments from all over the globe.

It seems only natural, with the gathering of young musicians for the International Youth Symphony, that Interlochen should be host to the first international competition in the United States for players of all orchestral instruments.

The Philadelphia Orchestra, one of the world's finest orchestras is scheduled for a series of concerts at Interlochen next August, and members of this orchestra will serve as judges for the international competition.

It is impossible to measure the effect of such an experience on the young students who will come here from foreign lands. They will study and train at Interlochen, they will go on concert tour in New York and Washington, living, working, and playing with America's most talented young musicians. Such an experience can contribute significantly toward better international understanding by exposing the youth of foreign countries to our own country's most talented youngsters in a wholesome, cultural, American setting. Moreover, the entire International Youth Symphony and competition program is to be an integrated part of an annual Interlochen Arts Festival each summer which is being planned on a scope similar to that of the historic Salzburg and Edinburgh, Scotland, festivals.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this cultural center located in my congressional district. On behalf of Dr. Maddy and Interlochen, whose influence is already felt in the far corners of the world, I am pleased to extend to my colleagues in the Congress an invitation to visit Interlochen and to help support in any way possible Dr. Maddy's goal of promoting world friendship through an International Youth Symphony Orchestra and competition.

#### LIGHTING OF THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. STEED. 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. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement for the RECORD to show that as a result of authority contained in this year's legislative appropriation bill, the beautiful dome of the U.S. Capitol remained lighted under floodlights all night last night for the first time and will be so lighted henceforth.

#### THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, after more than 14 years in Congress, I am not easily disturbed at criticism of elected government officials. Censure is justified and constructive when members of the legislative or executive branch employ political expediency in substitution for public welfare. I must in conscience, however, take vehement exception to unwarranted scandalous attacks upon my fellow public servants whether or not they are party brethren or share my political philosophy.

It is for this reason that I rise today to express resentment and contempt for the devious and unjust character assassinations, implications, and innuendos that have become a popular pastime for those who seek to eliminate by intrigue and intimidation the presiding Speaker of the House as heir apparent to the office of President of the United States. I consider this insidious campaign an affront to every Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that President Lyndon B. Johnson will remain in his present state of health and vigor so long as he is in office. Whatever disagreements in policy may arise in the days ahead, he has the unqualified wishes and hopes of every loyal American for a successful, fruitful, and enjoyable term in the White House. By the same token, however, if it is God's will that his career should have an early termination, no one should doubt or question the capacity and ability of the individual upon whom the law of succession would place the mantle of Chief Executive.

The man upon whom the trust would fall is today Speaker of the House of Representatives. He is a public servant of long experience, proven wisdom, infinite understanding, and unassailable character. As Speaker he is exceptionally competent, efficient, and effective. Though we are of opposite political affiliations, I am honored to sit in the legislature over which he presides. I know no man more honest or trustworthy. I have profited by his advice and counsel and have been enriched by his friendship.

Because there is no blemish of any kind on his record of public service or his personal history, his opponents have sought to slander him on the spurious grounds that his age stunts necessary qualifications to our highest office. Let me remind my colleagues that our Speaker is younger than seven of the chairmen of the standing committees of the House, and it would be patronizing to attempt to substantiate their qualifications. He is 10 years younger than Ben Franklin was when he became a delegate to the convention which framed the Federal Constitution. He is 10 years younger than Winston Churchill was when that outstanding British statesman again became prime minister in 1955. He is a year younger than Charles de Gaulle of France and 14 years younger than Konrad Adenauer, who only re-

cently retired as chancellor of West Germany. He is, in fact, at the age when General Eisenhower retired from office in 1961, and you know and I know that there are millions of Americans who would cherish the opportunity to vote that former Chief Officer back into the White House.

Pope John 23d, who in his last years as head of the Roman Catholic Church contributed so effectively to the brotherhood of man, did not become supreme pontiff until he was 5 years beyond the age of our Speaker. To have ruled him out because of his age would have constituted an irredeemable disaster in world history.

Our late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, served nobly through his 79th year, and I challenge any Member of this legislative body to deny his intelligent leadership or capacity through the final years, or months, or weeks of his tenure. Nor would any responsible Member of Congress, or representative of the press, or knowledgeable individual question the ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Tomorrow our Speaker observes his 73d birthday. I ask my colleagues to join in an expression of confidence and congratulations to a dedicated and able statesman.

#### THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we have all noted since the sad day in Dallas that there have been a number of unfounded imputations laid against our distinguished and beloved Speaker. It is, however, reassuring to note that many people, here in the House he has served so well, and all over the Nation, have taken strict issue with those who impugn the ability and record and greatness of our learned Speaker. The record, dedication, ability, achievements, and greatness of our Speaker have been too numerous to state with any brevity. However, James G. Colbert has recently written a column which does show to us the legend of one of the grandest statesmen in the history of our Nation. I insert at this point in the RECORD this article by Mr. Colbert, which does considerably more justice to the past, present, and future of a man who has done so very much for all of us:

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WELL FITTED TO ASSUME PRESIDENTIAL POST  
(By James G. Colbert)

If Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK isn't the best qualified person to step into the Presidency in the event anything happened to Lyndon Johnson, it would be difficult to figure out who is.

That's why objective observers of the political scene can't quite understand what is behind the attacks leveled at McCORMACK by certain self-anointed pundits.

When a law was enacted back in 1947 providing that the Speaker of the National House of Representatives would be next in line for the Presidency, there was no outcry of protest.

An extraordinary situation was created at that time. Harry S. Truman had taken over the Presidential reins upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. There was no Vice President. Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., was Speaker of the National House as a result of the Republican wave which rolled across the Nation in 1946.

Had Truman died in either 1947 or 1948, he would have been succeeded by MARTIN, and the Presidency would have passed from a Democrat to a Republican.

That would have represented an upheaval rather than a smooth transition in the National Government. But the columnists now questioning whether McCORMACK should remain next in line for the Presidency raised no objection to MARTIN back in 1947 and 1948.

With all due respect and deference to JOE MARTIN, who was an able Speaker, it would be preposterous to claim that McCORMACK is any less qualified for the Presidency today than MARTIN was 16 years ago.

A legitimate argument could be raised against McCORMACK if he were to stand for election as President. That is that he has reached the age where the enormous Presidential burdens could prove too heavy for him to assume for a 4-year period.

McCORMACK, however, isn't running for office. He simply is holding himself in readiness in case any emergency should develop in the next 13 months.

With the possible exception of Lyndon Johnson, JOHN W. McCORMACK probably is better qualified to be President than any Vice President back through the sweep of the years who stood only a heartbeat from the Presidency.

It is fair to say that JOHN McCORMACK is better prepared for the Presidency at this moment than was Harry Truman when Franklin D. Roosevelt died in 1945.

JOHN McCORMACK fills the second most important and powerful post in the National Government. His power far surpassed that of Lyndon Johnson when John F. Kennedy was President.

The truth is that some Washington commentators have never given JOHN McCORMACK full credit for his outstanding work and his great accomplishments in Congress.

That is largely because McCORMACK is a modest, self-effacing man who does not shoulder anyone aside to get the spotlight.

He shuns Washington's social life and cocktail parties to which some of the commentators attach so much importance. He is too busy working to attend such affairs. That may be a grievous failing in the eyes of some Capital pontificators.

McCORMACK was seriously boomed for the Democratic nomination for Vice President back in 1948. He had widespread support and would have been a potent contender if there had been an open convention fight. Instead, he stepped aside when Harry Truman indicated he wanted Alben Barkley as his running mate.

In 1956 Massachusetts Democrats voted 3 to 2 for McCORMACK as their presidential preference over Adlai Stevenson who was subsequently nominated a second time as the Democratic candidate for President.

Many honors have come to McCORMACK in his public career. Except for his election to the speakership, it's doubtful that he values any of them more highly than the vote of confidence the people of Massachusetts gave him in the 1956 presidential primary.

One can't help but wonder what kind of man the columnists, who have been rapping McCORMACK, think should be standing next in line for the Presidency.

Shouldn't he be a man experienced in Government who could move into the breach

in a national emergency? If so, who better can meet that test than JOHN McCORMACK?

It's also becoming a little wearying to read in syndicated columns that JOHN McCORMACK is no Sam Rayburn. Of course he isn't. The two men were different in many ways. There was only one Sam Rayburn just as there is only one JOHN McCORMACK.

But it would be just as fair and accurate to observe that in some respects Sam Rayburn was no JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK really needs no defense from this writer or anyone else. His record speaks for itself. His name will live in history long after those who directed barbs at him are forgotten.

#### SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] 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. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, to my desk today came the current issue of the General Electric Forum, an issue devoted to probing in depth "The Developing Nations." Included is an "Editor's Note" outlining a school-to-school program that should command the pride and respect of all members of this body—indeed of all Americans.

Mr. Gene Bradley, editor of the Forum, is president of the PTA of Rosendale School, Nisayuna District in Schenectady. In researching this issue of the Forum, he became intimately involved with the problems of education in Latin America. Last year, he recalled, the Rosendale PTA had raised \$750.

"What," he asked a U.S. AID official, "could you have done with that \$750?"

The official replied: "I would have built a school." Not by sending in construction crews, he explained, but by providing a couple of supervisors and letting the villagers build it themselves—through self-help.

Intrigued by the idea, Mr. Bradley talked with leaders from the Peace Corps, CARE, the Alliance for Progress. And everywhere the answer was the same. For a relatively few dollars and through existing channels, it would be possible for education-hungry nationals of other countries to build their own schools and educate their children.

Students in Rosendale School have already raised \$250 of the \$750 needed to build a school in Colombia, South America. The money will go to CARE. CARE will provide a brickmaking machine and cement. Peace Corps volunteers will help organize a community action group in El Roble. And the people of El Roble will build the school.

In the Forum introduction, Mr. Bradley writes:

The revolution of rising expectations is real and immediate. There is no more possibility of turning it back than there is of taking back the shot that was fired at Concord. Whether we fan it into a flame of freedom or permit it to smolder into Communist dissatisfaction is our choice.

Students at Rosendale School are beginning to fan that flame. At this Christmas season, their action uniquely



represents the spirit of concern and compassion that is so much a part of our heritage. And their program brings renewed validity to the truth that in giving, the giver is more blessed. Already, the students at Rosendale—like the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers at work around the world—are finding that they are the principal beneficiaries of their program. They are more interested in their neighbors, more aware of their world, and more conscious that there is something they can do for their country and their world.

I am proud of them and hope that their efforts can be an inspiration for hundreds of other schools throughout America. For groups interested in expanding this school-to-school program, the Rosendale PTA has agreed to serve as a clearinghouse of information. To provide more detailed information on the program, I am including Mr. Bradley's "Editor's Note" in my remarks:

There is wide agreement that help to developing nations should begin to lay more stress on private initiative and self-help, rather than government-to-government assistance of the kind that tends to stifle local or private initiative.

It was in this frame of reference that I asked Stewart Van Dyke, AID Mission Director to Turkey, what he could do with \$750. This was the amount raised last year by the local Parent Teachers Association in our community.

#### SELF-HELP SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

His immediate response was, I'd build a school. I don't mean sending in construction crews. No; I mean buying the cement and the block-making machines and providing a couple of supervisors to oversee the construction. I mean self-help."

With these encouraging words, I went to the people in the Peace Corps, CARE, the Alliance for Progress: everywhere the answer was the same. For a relatively few dollars and some professional supervision, it would be possible for education-hungry nationals of other countries to build their own schools and educate their children.

I took the idea of an international "school-to-school program" back to the PTA and was given the mandate to explore the subject on my trip to South America in connection with this issue of Forum.

The objective was to see whether the Rosendale PTA in Schenectady, N.Y., could sponsor a much-needed school as a pilot program in an underdeveloped area for \$750.

Officials of the Peace Corps and CARE wrote ahead to their Colombian representatives outlining the project.

#### EL ROBLE SCHOOL A MUDHOUSE

Upon my arrival in South America, there was a letter from Duane Bensel and Larry Jasman, two Peace Corps volunteers, describing the need for a school in El Roble, about 85 miles northeast of Bogotá. The present school is a rented house made from mud which, the letter said, "may give way on the students any day now." Its location near a railroad track and main highway had resulted in the death of several students. The local Junta Accion Comunal (Citizens Committee for Community Action) had selected a new school site, but no funds were available for the basic construction materials. The school as it now stands can accommodate only about 20 percent of the children (boys only) and then just to the third- or fourth-grade level.

This was the type of spot we were looking for. With the Peace Corps volunteers, I visited the site.

The case was not overstated. And the enthusiasm of the local community action

group, who had already undertaken a substantial rebuilding program, was more than enough to convince me that the project should go forward and at the earliest possible date.

#### ACTIVE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

On our return to Bogotá, we discussed the practicalities of the program—such as providing teachers—with the Minister of Education for Colombia, Dr. Pedro Gomez Valderrama, and Gov. Fernando Laverde, both of whom gave their wholehearted support and cooperation. In addition, Mrs. Fulton Freeman, the U.S. Ambassador's wife, graciously agreed to provide liaison and counsel through the American Women's Club in Colombia.

Back in Schenectady, the idea was presented to the entire Parent Teachers Association. The vigorous response of not only the parents but also of the faculty members stimulated us to telegram our pledge of support to the responsible officials in South America—asking them to request the local citizens group to proceed with the ground-clearing phase of the project.

This is a pilot project. Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver told us that the mechanism exists—now—to expand the concept into a program that would oversee the construction of 3,000 such schools around the world. In addition, the hope was expressed that such an undertaking would stimulate teachers to seriously consider active participation in the Peace Corps program, an area which needs strengthening.

#### NOT AN ACT OF CHARITY

This undertaking is not an act of charity; it is an opportunity for self-help on an individual basis. Here are two groups of people in different continents, each with a common desire to educate its children. In El Roble the need is for adequate facilities and program guidance. In Rosendale the need is for the children to become better acquainted with the people of the world in which they will live as adults.

#### OPPORTUNITY FOR UNDERSTANDING

In entering this international self-help school-to-school program, its sponsors believe that their effort reflects the feeling of the American people that we have a moral obligation to those less fortunate than ourselves; a feeling of responsibility to take action in the national interest; and a desire to give our children an opportunity for understanding of which we as parents have, for the most part, been deprived.

In the last analysis, this is the translation of large efforts back to a local scale with the resulting benefits that people-to-people association can bring about.

Already, inquiries are being received from other schools on how similar programs might be initiated. For those sharing this interest, the General Electric Forum will be honored to serve as a clearinghouse for information.

#### AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON SHEVCHENKO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months we have carefully observed the discussion that has taken place on the forthcoming erection of the Shevchenko statue. Actually, there was nothing new in this discussion. All of the baseless and misinformed charges

made by a local newspaper had been properly countered 3 years ago when the legislation was prepared and considered.

However, what has been most disconcerting is the fact that the editor of a local newspaper refused to publish highly informative and striking replies to his self-contradicting editorials. The contention that little space was available for the publication of these letters holds no water when the amount of space taken up by the paper for a one-sided discussion is considered. This practice is scarcely in line with the established principles of a free press.

#### SHEVCHENKO IN OPEN DISCUSSION

One positive result of this whole episode has been a wider appreciation of the universal significance of Shevchenko. Other papers have with fairness and objectivity commented on him, and scores of citizens have come to know more about the poet by reading House Document No. 445.

Mr. Speaker, Shevchenko deserves a just and open discussion. In furthering such public discussion, I include the very able letter written by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University, as part of my remarks:

SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, INC.,  
New York, N.Y.

To the Editor,  
Washington Post  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the first Ukrainian Academy of Liberal Arts and Sciences (founded in Lviv-Lemberg in 1873), I kindly request this opportunity to comment on your editorials "The Shevchenko Affair" (of October 18), "The United States, Russia To Share Ukrainian Poet as Hero" (of October 25), and "Monument to Ignorance" (of November 1). The purpose of this and a succeeding letter is to correct the misinformation upon which these editorials were written and the distortions which they in turn conveyed to your readers.

Among the first of your many statements which justice requires be corrected is the following of October 18: "In the writing of the poet and the efforts to exploit him there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background. A statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans."

You returned to this line of argumentation in your editorial of November 1 in describing Shevchenko's writings as "an affront to the Jewish community of this country" in spite of the fact that you also mention that "he did oppose Jewish persecutions on one occasion." In that same editorial of November 1 you repeat that Shevchenko's "flaming nationalism [is] an affront to members of the Polish minority, which also is a very large one in this country."

Let me establish the proper background for this discussion. In every ethnic group of Americans there are two fringe elements: the one includes old reactionaries and imperialists; the other is comprised of Communists who hate the basic principles of our Declaration of Independence. They have the right to do so; by mental distortion and contortion, however, they also transfer this hate into the past histories of their old countries and consequently emerge hating those nations which endanger Moscow's imperialism as well as those persons and principles which destroyed or undermined their empires, privileges, and monopolies. Let me tell you with deep assurance, however, that the vast majority of the ethnic and religious groups you enumerated are made up of truly

liberal and democratic Americans who are dedicated to the ideals of our Declaration of Independence. And among those with even the slightest knowledge of their own ethnic history and of Shevchenko's works none would approve of your statement. Consequently, ideological disunity and re-creation exists among Americans simply because we are an open society and not because of the projected statue of Shevchenko.

Let me now present the facts about the relations and attitudes of Shevchenko to the various ethnic groups of Americans enumerated in your editorials.

Among Shevchenko's many friends were many great personalities of Russian literature and of Russian intellectual life; some, like the poet Zhukovsky, Count Fedor Tolstoy, and the brothers Zhemchuzhnikov, were his benefactors. He was not only acquainted with contemporary Russian literature but also met personally many leading writers, including Chernyshevsky and Turgenev. Shevchenko even wrote some poems and his diary in Russian. What all this evidence tends to prove is that he had absolutely no animosity or hate for either the Russian nation nor its language. Not once did he ever commit an infringement against the legitimate, human, and God-given rights of the Russian people. Up until 1938, when I published a volume on Shevchenko in translation, there were 70 Russian poets who had translated Shevchenko into Russian. Among them were such famous Russians as Briusov, Bunin, Kurochkin, Mey, Michailov, Drozhin, and Surikov. Today that number has exceeded 100. Consequently, no Russian with humanism and democracy in his mind and heart can regard the statue of Shevchenko as an "affront." Shevchenko never expressed an idea that violated the ethnographic unity and indivisibility of Russia. What he did do, however, was to claim the same rights for Ukraine and all other colonial victims from Finland, the Baltic States, to Rumania, from Poland to the Caucasus nations. What he did more than that was to oppose Russian imperialism and colonialism as it was based in his time on the serfdom of the peasantry and the tripartite official ideology: Russian Orthodoxy, Russian autocracy, and Russian chauvinism—all used for the one aim of Russifying all non-Russian nationalities including the Poles, Lithuanians, and the Jews. But the same opposition to Russian imperialism was led in London by the famous Russian, Herzen, who respected even Ukraine's right to independence (See A. Herzen, "Polnoe sobranie sochinenij i pisem," ed. by M. Lemke, VI, p. 303). In Shevchenko's funeral in St. Petersburg many distinguished Russian liberals participated and before his coffin eulogies were delivered by Kukochkin and Uzhakov.

No great Russian scholar regarded the name of Shevchenko as an "affront." In fact, the following members of the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg accepted election to active membership in our society (then in Lviv-Lemberg): Prof. Vladimir Bechterew, Prof. Fedor Korsch, Prof. Alexander Pypin, and Prof. Alexey Schachmatov.

Your contention that Shevchenko is "offensive" to Americans of German descent is also contrary to the facts. In 1913 I was an assistant to the great German Slavist at Munich University, Dr. Erich Bernker. In his graduate studies seminar he ordered me to render an interpretation of Shevchenko's poems. Shevchenko also had many cordial German friends in Russia such as Sternberg (to whom he dedicated a poem), the families Schmidt, Vitzthum, and Joachim in St. Petersburg, and many in Ukraine. Even in exile he was treated well by the distinguished scientist and academician, Von Baer, and by Captain Gern. Baron Klodt von Jurgensburg was his teacher and protector in the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg.

In addition, may I draw your attention to a complete bibliography of excellent translations of Shevchenko's works into German done by Obrist, Franzos, Kawerau, Bosch, Virginia Lengsdorf, Wutsky, Hans Koch, Specht, and other scholars. The excellent biography of the famous Scandinavian Slavist (Alfred Jensen, Taras Shevchenko, Ein Ukrainisches Dichterleben, Wien, 1916) was also translated into German.

And still another and final convincing proof that Shevchenko's name was never "offensive" to Germans is the following list of distinguished German scholars who were or are active members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society: Friedrich Kaindl, Max Vasmer, Theodor Gartner, Karl Mayer, David Hilbert, Felix Klein, Albrecht Penk, Max Plank, Friedrich Prege, Erwin Koschmieder, Heinrich Schmidt, and Hans Koch.

Your comments regarding the attitude of Americans of Polish descent toward Shevchenko are the climax of cheap demagoguery and complete ignorance. Shevchenko's whole life was merged into the lives of many Polish friends, writers, revolutionaries, and Polish ideological trends. Shevchenko was completely familiar with the works of the Polish national poet, Mickiewicz; he spoke Polish; even his first love in Warsaw was a Polish girl. Shevchenko was also a champion of the St. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in Kiev; of interest in this connection is that the real roots of the brotherhood's ideology, the "Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," was in Mickiewicz's "Books of Polish People." A Pole, Wielhorski, helped him gain liberty from his master in St. Petersburg; as an excellent student in the Russian Imperial Academy he shared an apartment with the Pole, Demski, a revolutionary; in Asiatic exile as he arrived in Orenburg (where there were more than 2,000 Polish political exiles), the Poles welcomed Shevchenko with a banquet headed by the Polish poet and lifelong friend, Bronislaw Zaleski. Shevchenko also addressed the Poles in a special poem of his wherein he stated that he regarded the fall of Poland as a catastrophe for Ukraine.

Among Shevchenko's many Polish friends who attended his funeral in St. Petersburg were Sierakowski, Zheligowski, Kruniewicz (all of whom later became leaders of the Polish revolution of 1863); and a Polish student, W. Choroszewski, took leave of Shevchenko. Again, a Pole spoke before his coffin in Kiev.

How allegedly "offensive" Shevchenko was and is to the Poles is clarified in this quotation from a book recently published in Warsaw by two scholars of Warsaw University ("Ukrainian Literature," by Mariam Jakobiec and Tatiana Holynska-Baranowa, p. 116):

"Shevchenko's poems enjoyed great popularity among Poles. The bibliography includes over 200 different translations. No other nation can be proud of such an imposing number of translations. Among the Polish translators are the names of Leonard Sowinski, A. Gorzalezynski, Pauline Swienicki, Stefan Zheromski, Leo Belmont, Gustav Danilowski, Wilhelm Feldman, Yaroslav Iwaszkiewicz, Wlodzimierz Slobodnik, and many others." In addition I call your attention to two other volumes of importance in this connection: "Shevchenko and World Literature" (Philadelphia, 1962) by a leading American scholar of Polish descent, Mieczyslaw Giergielewicz of the University of Pennsylvania; the other is a special study by academician W. Shchurat, "Shevchenko and the Poles" (Lviv-Lemberg: Zapiski of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1917, pp. 217-347).

I am a former professor of the Warsaw University and general secretary of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, a Polish state institution. With the full approval of the Polish Ministry of Education our institute published a 16-volume edition

of the works of Shevchenko with volume 14 completely dedicated to translations of Shevchenko's poems into Polish by leading past and present Polish poets. On the 70th anniversary of Shevchenko's death the Ukrainian Scientific Institute organized in the Aula of the Warsaw University a memorial conference attended by the Minister of Public Education, Professor Swientoslowski, the president and faculty members of the university including the rabbi of Warsaw, Professor Schorr, and the Polish political and intellectual elite of the capital.

The consequence of these old Polish-Shevchenko traditions was that in 1917 the Poles received not only full autonomy in the Ukrainian Democratic Republic but even had a Polish minister in the government. (Compare Henryk Jablonski, "The Polish National Autonomy, 1917-18," "Historical Publications of the Warsaw University, Warsaw, 1948.")

Any Pole knows how closely related are Polish and Ukrainian history, as well as Lithuanian and Beloruthenian, and in addition, the history of the Jews of Eastern Europe. By the Treaty of Hadiacz (1658) Hetman Wyhowsky attempted to reorganize the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a tripartite Union of Poland-Lithuania and Ruce-Ukraine. Even one Polish king, Wisnowiecki, was of Ukrainian descent; and the savior of Vienna, Sobieski, used the title "Rex Poloniarum, Magnus dux Lithuaniae et Ukrainae."

The following great Polish scholars were or are members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society: Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Alexander Brueckner, Oswald Balzer, Henryk Ulaszyn, Jan Los, Cezarya Baudouin de Courtenay-Jendrzewiczowa, Kazimierz Nitch, Kazimierz Moszynski, and Stanislaw Kot.

In your editorials you also describe the proposed statue as "offensive" to Americans of Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox backgrounds. What you fail to point out is that Shevchenko himself was an Orthodox. Many of us Americans of Ukrainian descent are Catholic (I, myself, am one) or Orthodox; a small number are Evangelical. I doubt that you are authorized to speak on behalf of the Catholics, Orthodox, and Evangelicals. Therefore, may I once again correct your misinformation with the true facts. How, for example, could the hierarchy and priests of the Christian churches find the statue "offensive" at the same time that many of them participated in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the monument? The Orthodox archbishop, His Grace Mstyslav, opened those ceremonies with a prayer; the Catholic priest of our Washington parish, the Reverend Theodore Danusiar, a native American, delivered a moving benediction based on quotations from Shevchenko's poems; in addition, many Christian clergy were present at the ceremony including representatives of the Evangelical Church.

The Catholic Metropolitan of the Ukrainians in Lviv, Count Andrej Sheptytsky, was an active member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; the Catholic Metropolitan of the Ukrainians in Canada, Maxime Hermaniuk, Winnipeg, is an active member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; the Catholic archbishop, Ivan Bucko, residing in Rome, is an honorary member of our learned society; finally, the heroic metropolitan of Lviv, Joseph Slipy, who, after 18 years in Siberian concentration camps was liberated by the previous holy father and arrived in Rome for the Vatican Council, is also an old member of our society. In addition, the absurdity of your statement that Shevchenko's name is an "affront" to Catholics is also demonstrated by the fact that his poetry was translated into Slovenian by a Catholic priest, the Reverend Joseph Abram, and that the Catholic Bookshop in Ljubljana published it in 1907 and 1908. To Father Abram we are indebted for the statement, "My first



book is the Gospel, my second is Shevchenko's 'Kobzar-Minstrel,' a more beautiful work than the 'Haydamaky' I do not know in the world." (Cf. Shevchenko's "Collected Works," Warsaw ed., 1948, p. 347.)

Now, in spite of all this, can you still say that the name of Shevchenko was ever "offensive" to the Catholics?

In addition, the orthodox metropolitan of Canada, Ilarion, Winnipeg, is also a distinguished member of our society.

Even in the Russian empire under the absolute rule of the czar, Shevchenko's name was not offensive to the orthodox church as is evidenced by the sermon delivered in Kaniv at his grave by the Reverend Macheyvch:

"How is this light, about which the Lord is speaking (Matthew 5: 16) and which has among human beings to shine? That is a clear light, unfalsified, not an illusion, but a true light. Here, brother Christians, before you is the light which did shine over the whole of Ukraine—before you is Taras Shevchenko.

"You hills of Kaniv, forest and valley of Ukraine. You see before you an enlightened man, a man who loved and was loved by Ukraine. From the northern capital of Russia to the most modest of towns—whose remains traveled? Who is thus accompanied to the grave with such a reverence? Who—a man with many war achievements, or a dignitary—famous in the field of politics, who acted by the power of the government and laws? No, brothers, it is Taras Shevchenko. Who does not know him?"

The priest then asked that all present pray for the soul of Shevchenko and regretted that he could not raise his voice so loud that all of Ukraine on both sides of the river Dnieper could join together in a prayer for his soul. Finally, he finished his eulogy:

"Thus, deceased in God brother—the wish of your heart is fulfilled: you wished to live in Kaniv and here you will rest. Come in pilgrimages to our town, Ukraine, with us here rests the remains of Taras Shevchenko. Here on one of the highest hills of the Dnieper River bank will rest his ashes, and, as to the Gogatha hill, which can be seen from all Jerusalem and Judea—so similar to the cross of our Lord there, will be here erected a cross, which will be seen from both sides of our famous Dnieper River." (This monument of a huge iron cross was removed by the government in 1931 and replaced by a monument of Taras Shevchenko.)

In regard to Shevchenko's relationship to the Jews, let me call your attention to the Jewish descent of that distinguished lady who objected to your editorials with a letter published on November 1, Prof. Lubov A. Margolena, the daughter of the late Arnold D. Margolin, judge of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic and Ukrainian Ambassador to Great Britain in the 1920's.

Active members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society were the following people of Jewish descent: Albert Einstein (elected March 17, 1929) and the Soviet academician, Abram Joffe.

Another distinguished member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society was the late Catholic metropolitan of Lviv-Lemberg, Count Andriy Sheptytsky (who is now in the process of beatification). It was he who saved Jewish rabbis, women, and children during the Nazi occupation. (Cf. the article in the "Jewish Digest" by Leo Helman, "The Forgotten Epic of Count Sheptytsky," reprinted in the Catholic monthly, "The Light" of Toronto, Canada, in November 1963.)

Before World War II the Jewish poet, Szymon Melzer, Wilno, ably demonstrated that the name of Shevchenko did not represent an "affront" to Jews when he cordially collaborated with me in the preparation of volume 15 of the "Collected Works of Shev-

chenko, Warsaw, 1938." He contributed the following article to this volume (pp. 437-444):

#### SHEVCHENKO IN THE JEWISH LANGUAGE

"The critical literature on Shevchenko in the Jewish language appeared long before the Jewish translations of the works of Shevchenko. It prepared the basis for the grasping and understanding of the poems of the Ukrainian genius although Shevchenko was known in Jewish literary circles and already appreciated in the nineties of the previous century. For instance, the well-known Jewish poet, A. Reizen ('Epizodn Fun-Majn Lebn, Wilno, 1921' I, p. 55) still as a 17-year-old boy was enthusiastically over the lyrical poems of Shevchenko and in spite of the fact that he still did not know Ukrainian perfectly. He confesses in his recollections that he long remained under a deep influence of the beauty of Shevchenko's poetry. The same applies to other Jewish poets born in Ukraine including David Hofstein and Osher Schwartzman. Before World War I both were very interested in Shevchenko's works. Translations of his poetry started only after World War I and since then the popularity of Shevchenko in Jewish literature increased every year. Therefore, the information about the project of the publication of all of Shevchenko's poetry, which appeared in the daily in Charkiv (Stern, 12 III, 1929) made the impression of something completely natural. In this edition the following people collaborated: L. Kvitzko, P. Markish, D. Hofstein, L. Reznik, and E. Fininberg. In 1937 there appeared in Kiev a volume of Shevchenko's poetry translated by D. Hofstein but we could not get it. Therefore, we must limit ourselves in this survey to translations which appear sporadically, especially because of the anniversaries or jubilees of the poet. S. Gorelik is the first insofar as I could establish, among the Jewish writers who became deeply acquainted with Shevchenko, and speaks about him with the greatest sympathy as, above all, a national and supraclass poet (a poet standing over classes of society). As such he also remained for the not numerous translators from eastern Galicia. The opinion that Shevchenko was prejudiced against the Jews did scatter N. Maizel, the present editor of Literarische Bleter, in Warsaw, translating from manuscript an article of Cherkasenko (a distinguished Ukrainian writer) which proved that humanism is the characteristic of Shevchenko's world outlook.

When Shevchenko proclaimed that truth and right must reign in the world it could not help but resound in the literature of an unhappy nation, of which the Jews are one and whose national consciousness developed almost simultaneously with that of the Ukrainian nation. The ethical national world outlook of Shevchenko appealed to the translators from East Galicia: B. Horowitz, A. Klein, Sh. Melzer. Horowitz, born in Malden near Stanislaviv and a Jewish poet of the younger generation, translated Ukrainian folk songs and published translations of several of Shevchenko's poems in 1924-25 which can be regarded as equal to the originals. In the same years A. Klein and at that time still a student of the Ukrainian Gymnasium of Kolomea, published for the Jewish youth of this school a handwritten paper Der Eigener Klang which was permeated with the cult of Shevchenko. The author of this article, who also finished the mentioned gymnasium, prepared a whole series of Shevchenko's poetry for printing as early as 1923 (e.g., Hamalla, Ferebendia, Ivan Pidkova, Do Osnovianenka, Topocia, and many others). But all that, as the previous mentioned translations, remain yet in manuscript form while waiting for better times.

The Jewish literature in the Soviet Ukraine underscores in Shevchenko, above all, the anticzarist and antireligious tendencies and regards him as an expression of the torments and the rebellion of his peasant class, putting into the background his ethical and national world outlook. Of all the translators in Soviet Ukraine perhaps the most noted is one of the chief representatives of Jewish poetry—the already mentioned D. Hofstein. It was he who translated the poems, "The Caucasus," "The Dream," "Saul," and many others. Seldom do we find in his translations mistakes of syntax of the Jewish language, casually he uses the white verse where Shevchenko uses assonances. Another excellent translator is M. Chashche Wacky; Reznik and Fininberg, however, are disappointing in spite of the fact that their names are popular in the Jewish literature on the other river bank of Zbruch.

The work on the translation of Shevchenko's works continues and the near future can bring us a full Jewish edition of Shevchenko's poetry."

SIMON MELZER.

Let me now explain frankly to whom Shevchenko was and is an affront. He is an affront to all open and secret champions of dictatorships, to all dreamers of neoinperialism, to some unenlightened descendants of the old nobility of imperial Russia (Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, Germans) whose ancestors kept the peasant masses of Shevchenko's lifetime bound in cruel serfdom and in the most brutal manner exploited them while degrading their human dignity. He is an affront to some descendants of the administrators of this despicable institution of serfdom—an institution abolished in England in the 14th century but not in imperial Russia until after Shevchenko's death in 1861. Shevchenko's revolutionary poems, the martyrdom of his life, contributed not only to the later emancipation of the serfs in Ukraine but to those in the entire Empire, the Russian serfs included. Shevchenko also defended the freedom of the non-Russian peoples in the Russian Empire and for that reason he is an affront to all present Russian imperialists.

In this struggle for social justice and national freedom, Shevchenko fought as a champion of George Washington's just and new law of the ideas of the American Declaration of Independence, which he regarded as an ideal to his mother country. To all champions of Russian imperialism and colonialism, to enemies of this new and just law, Shevchenko is and will always remain an affront.

Thus are Washington's ideas, propagated 100 years ago in the czarist Russian Empire of Eastern Europe by the national bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko. Thus are these same ideas now regarded as an affront by contemporary American Democrats in the United States of 1963—the centennial of the Gettysburg Address.

But in Soviet Ukraine, before Stalinist fascism in the 1930's, the Shevchenkologist, Richyckij, could publish the following (cf. Taras Shevchenko, 1814-61, A Symposium, Slavistic Printing and Reprintings, vol. 31, edited by C. H. Van Schoonefeld; Stanford University, Mouton & Co., 1962, Gravenhage, pp. 268-269): "Richyckij held that Shevchenko sought a modern form for his ideas of nationality and the national state of the future when he wrote: 'When shall we get our Washington with a new and just law? One day we shall.' Here the author (Shevchenko) has in mind nothing less than his people's struggle for their liberation from a foreign yoke and the creation of a Ukrainian state, namely a republic. Here in the image of Washington with a new and just law, in the image of the national and military leader of the American bourgeoisie in its war of liberation against England, and in the image

of the first President of the North American Republic, Shevchenko expressed his program for a revolutionary war for the independence of the Ukraine as a republic."

Spiritually, Shevchenko was the first American among Ukrainians.

All other questions mentioned in your editorials will be discussed in my second letter.

Sincerely,

R. SMAL-STOCKI.

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, to obtain still further insights into this episode, I append a few letters that I have received concerning the local newspaper's position and also letters which the newspaper in question refused to publish:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

November 7, 1963.

THE WASHINGTON POST,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: About 2 weeks ago I had occasion to write you as president of Branch 19 of the Ukrainian National Association, commenting on the article in your newspaper "The Shevchenko Affair."

Your most recent article on this subject, "Monument to Ignorance" in the issue of November 1, 1963, prompts me to make a few remarks again, this time in an individual capacity.

Aside from the fact that the very title of your last article is insulting to the 1½ million of Americans of Ukrainian descent and to those American leaders in an out of Congress who have been espousing the cause of freedom for Ukraine and less ignorance and prejudice about matters Ukrainian, it is also replete with misstatements of fact and wrong conclusions. As regards the alleged affront to the Jewish and Polish community in this country, you are on very weak ground, since even you admit that Shevchenko did oppose Jewish persecution; and, of course, your newspaper reported the participation of many Members of the U.S. Congress of Polish descent in the Shevchenko ceremonies. Do you really believe that had Shevchenko been "anti-Semitic" as you allege, the eminent U.S. Senator from New York, Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS would have been one of the earliest sponsors of the Shevchenko monument in Washington? Senator JAVITS is far too good an adroit political leader to fall for any possible entanglement with anti-Semitism, and you can be sure that he thoroughly ascertained all facts, circumstances and the historical background of the matter, before committing himself to the sponsorship of the monument. And what about the Congressmen of Polish descent: Dulski, Machrowicz, Lesinski, and others? You surely know that there are many Polish institutions of learning and research in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and elsewhere which would have alerted these honorable gentlemen to anything anti-Polish in the works and life of Shevchenko, had there been any trace of it. Your farfetched conjecture about a statue to Shevchenko in Tel-Aviv or Warsaw is not so farfetched as regards Warsaw. For, indeed, Warsaw had erected a monument much better than a statue to Taras Shevchenko: in the 1930's, the Polish Government subsidized "The Ukrainian Institute" in Warsaw, a scholarly academic institution headed by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, now the chairman of the Slavic Institute of Marquette University in Milwaukee, and this institute, with money provided by the Polish Government, published the first complete and fully unabridged edition of the works of Shevchenko, plus an exhaustive biography of the poet, which first brought to light the fact that Shevchenko had a good knowledge of the Polish language, had read the masterpieces of Polish literature in the original, and was an admirer of his contemporary, the poet-prophet of Poland, Adam Mickiewicz.

Your entire line of making Shevchenko appear to be the idol of the Soviet Communist Party also seems to rest on false assumptions. The fact that there are monuments to Shevchenko in Ukraine and in a very few other places in the Soviet Union and that his works are being published does not prove that he and his works have become a fetish of the CPSU. All it proves is the truth of the old American political saw "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." It proves the truth of what Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the CPSU that Stalin would have sent all Ukrainians to Siberia, except that there were too many of them. Indeed, with 45-odd million Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, 90 percent of whom revere Shevchenko, what else is there to do for the Kremlin leaders, but to placate to the Ukrainians by likewise admiring Shevchenko, but at the same time subtly twisting, distorting and "officially interpreting" his works in the light of Marxist dogma, and thus making him appear as the most revolutionary and most democratic poet of the 19th century. Surely Shevchenko was revolutionary and democratic, but never Marxist. And were not our Founding Fathers the same way, too?

You also deny universality to this great poet. At the same time you make an oblique reference to "American nationalism." I do not know what you mean by the latter, whether Ku Klux Klanism, "John Birchism," or simply insularism within the so-called English-speaking world. From your previous references to Shakespeare, I suspect that it is the latter. Incidentally, the Ukrainians are not as insular as you, and more Shakespeare is shown on the stages of Kiev than New York. Now, to speak to you through the instrumentality of one of the great literary figures of the English-speaking world, I will attempt to set you straight on Shevchenko through none other than Charles Dickens.

The London weekly *All the Year Round*, with Charles Dickens as its chief editor (All the Year Round, a weekly journal conducted by Charles Dickens, vol. XVIII, London 1877 (issue of May 5, 1877, No. 440, pp. 220-224)), publishing a biographical sketch of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko, made numerous interesting references to the poet, both concerning his literary worth, as well as the then already prevalent cult of him, particularly among the Slavic peoples. I am not saying that the article was written by Charles Dickens himself, although it might have been. In any event, he fully approved and concurred with the article by publishing it. This article of 1877 already admonishes the English-speaking world about the need to make the acquaintance of Shevchenko: "Whatever you may think of him as poet, he has made such a name for himself that you ought to know something about him." And Mr. Dickens' author is not ashamed to call this Ukrainian poet "genius." The author also informs his readers that "the last complete edition of his works was published last year (i.e., in 1876) in Prague," and that the poet is hailed and read "all Slavdom over."

It is significant that the author of the article mentioned above was able to recognize the poet's universality by making his words fit conditions in England in his time: "Some of Taras' saddest poems would apply, almost word for word, to our own land; but there is just this difference, that feudalism in England is weak. Americans wonder how strong it still is; yet we know that feudalism among us is weak indeed compared with what it was in Russia a few years ago. . . . Emancipation . . . must come (Shevchenko) thought, as part of an ideal republic—a poet's dream of the restitution of all things; such a reign of justice and brotherly love as seems very glorious when we read about it in Isaiah, but very dreadful when fifth-monarchy men or socialists try to carry it

out in practice. Under such a republic all the Slav states would form a grand federation; the Ukraine should be once more independent . . ." and the author continues with reference to Ukrainians: "There are 14 million of them, a good slice of that strange conglomeration of peoples who make up the Russian Empire; and now that nationalities are so much talked of, they will scarcely be content to give up their language and customs—to be, in fact, Russianized."

Thus we see that the author working for Charles Dickens in 1877 correctly appraised the position of Shevchenko as champion of liberty, not only individual, but also social and national, of his own Ukrainian and of the other enslaved peoples of the Russian Empire, but 86 years and several wars and revolutions later, an author working for the Washington Post fails to see the universal human significance of this poet's work, and dismisses those who know and understand him, as being "gullible."

This writer is personally opposed to public monuments of marble or bronze as providing more parking space for the already pestilential pigeons; he would rather see a "Shevchenko Library" or "Shevchenko Institute" in Washington, dedicated to the dissemination of his works and ideas among the English-speaking people so that there would be no need to wage battles against prejudices like those displayed by you. But since the Ukrainian community in the United States can, for the time being, only afford a statue of the poet, I will battle for his integrity, good name and reputation of genius against all comers, and on all occasions.

Lest you come to the erroneous conclusion that this writer is a flaming Ukrainian nationalist, let me explain that although a Ukrainian, I worked in the foreign service of Poland (1936-39), being a member of the legal profession in Poland prior to that, and a member of the New York bar at present. I have never experienced any feeling of prejudice against any neighbors of Ukraine, and this includes the Jews, with whom I grew up in a small town in Galicia, and whose language (Yiddish) I have mastered in my teens.

Very truly yours,

ROMAN OLESNICKI.

FEDIR F. ISKALO,

Buffalo, N.Y., November 20, 1963.

THE WASHINGTON POST,  
1515 L Street NW.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: After reading your articles on the Taras Shevchenko monument, printed in "The Washington Post" I have this to say.

I am very disappointed with your attack and misrepresentation of the Taras Shevchenko monument.

Your apparent distortion of the facts makes me wonder why you are opposing the erection of a monument honoring a great poet and humanitarian.

In one of your articles you mentioned that Shakespeare does not have a proper memorial.

If I may ask you, why not? Who tries to oppose erecting one?

What would happen if someone like you tried to stop William Shakespeare from being recognized as a great poet and dramatist?

Maybe Taras Shevchenko is another Shakespeare? What authority do you have to decide, who can come in and who should stay out?

You stated that Shevchenko's statue would be "a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans," if so, what do you consider yourself?

As I see it, you are destroying the basic Constitutional right, "Equality and justice for all."



It is my sincere belief that you owe an apology to 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Thank you,

FEDIR F. ISKALO.

NOVEMBER 21, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: I am deeply disturbed with the inflammatory "Washington Post" editorials because they do not reflect the principles of American democracy. For years, the United States has been honoring all those who fought for freedom and human dignity irrespective of their birth, creed, or nationality. We should not change these principles now. I support your resolution for the issuance of a Shevchenko commemorative stamp.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL WOLOSCHUK,  
Jamaica Plain, Mass.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Certainly, the provocative editorials in the Washington Post against the Shevchenko monument, and previously against the Captive Nations Week Resolution, will not win friends in this country, nor among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. We need a Shevchenko stamp, therefore, I support your House Joint Resolution 174.

Very truly yours,

MR. MYCHAJLO FRANKIUS RYJ,  
Jamaica Plain, Mass.

FALLS CHURCH, VA., November 13, 1963.

MR. J. R. WIGGINS,  
Editor, the Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: In your renewed editorial attack on the proposed Shevchenko memorial of November 12, you advance the following points:

One, Shevchenko is a hero of the Soviet Union and his monuments are the object of annual Communist adulation.

Two, the approval of the memorial was a result of "the most artful and arrogant of lobbies ever operated by a minority group."

Three, the National Capital Planning Commission and other agencies involved should review their decision of approval because Shevchenko did not have anything to do with Americans.

Four, the money raised by the Ukrainians be better spent for a memorial to some "Ukrainian-American whose genius reflects the success of their countrymen in embracing the cause of this country."

The points are irrelevant and your analysis parochially shortsighted.

First, Shevchenko is a spiritual giant of Ukraine, but not a Communist. The Soviets are using his name, but not his ideas. While using his name, they vigorously suppress his ideas.

Second, Washington is not only the Capital of the United States, but also the spiritual focus of the ideology of freedom in the world. The efforts to erect a memorial to the freedom fighter Shevchenko in Washington, assume both of the attributes, not only the Capital.

Third, the approval of putting up a memorial to Shevchenko in Washington is a bargain to the United States. For a small piece of real estate this country is getting friendship and loyalty of 40 million Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, the long-run benefits of which might prove to be worth millions of American lives and billions of dollars. The United States has never made such a bargain before.

Fourth, Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky, the principal of the "lobby" arguing for the Shevchenko memorial, is acting in the best interest of the United States. He is still young. Before his life is out, he might

emerge as the Ukrainian-American who deserved an American memorial.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL BORETSKY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
December 7, 1963.

TO THE EDITOR,  
Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to thank you for your fantastic attack against the erection of the Taras Shevchenko Monument in Washington, D.C. By your outraged campaign against the poet and against the entire Ukrainian people you have aroused my compatriots, Americans of Ukrainian descent and many other Americans to action. (One result of the above, I hope, Shevchenko, will soon cease to be a "cipher" in many minds, including yours.) You have awakened Ukrainians in this great country and in the Diaspora from their lethargy and reminded them that nobody is going to deliver freedom and independence to Ukraine on a platter; that an enemy of liberty and of national dignity of a people might be hidden even in a place where one would least expect—in a respected and supposedly democratic newspaper.

In your vicious attack you have shown that there is a real master of demagoguery on your editorial staff. (It is an interesting coincidence that, a few weeks before the beginning of your anti-Shevchenko Monument and anti-Ukrainian campaign, the Russian Communists in Moscow and in Washington attacked the erection of the monument, too.) You have called T. Shevchenko a Ukrainian nationalist and a Communist idol. Well, who is he? This "cipher" as you call him, more than 100 years ago, cried out: "When are we going to receive our Washington with a just and righteous law? One day we will." Doesn't the above phrase tell you that the great Ukrainian poet advocated the American type of democracy in Ukraine. And if you read his other poems like "Caucasus" or "Jan Huss," you poor soul, you will find out that Shevchenko fought tyranny everywhere.

You called the great humanitarian an anti-Semite. By now, probably you know already that T. Shevchenko signed a protest against the Russian pogroms published in St. Petersburg "Illustration" in 1858.

In one of your anti-Ukrainian editorials, you argued that the T. Shevchenko Monument will antagonize some American minorities such as the German, Polish, Russian, etc. You ought to know that the U.S. Congressmen of Polish descent are the staunchest supporters of the Taras Shevchenko Monument and of the Ukrainian drive for freedom and independence. I do not know why the German minority should be against the monument. And I will let you be the judge of some Russian dislike of the Shevchenko Monument. Not the Taras Shevchenko Monument but your malicious articles of ignorance smearing the entire people might antagonize various ethnic groups.

Shevchenko all his life fought for truth and for the "just law of Washington" for all people and, therefore, a monument honoring him will be erected because "Truth shall win" as the great Czech liberator, T. G. Masaryk said—despite your incomprehensible hostility.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL SPONTAK, BBA.

BOSTON COLLEGE,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
Chestnut Hill, Mass., December 9, 1963.

J. R. WIGGINS,  
Editor, Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: The unprecedented effort of the Ukrainian-Americans to honor their

former homeland's champion of liberty—Shevchenko—with a monument in Washington has a deep significance. First, it rededicates these people to the ideals of freedom and liberty—the ideals of American democracy. Second, it demonstrates that freedom of expression is possible for all Americans, even those belonging to the less influential minority groups, and, third, it underscores the solidarity of not only the diverse ethnic entities but of America itself with the aspirations of all subjugated nations to attain their national rights.

The pertinent legislation that had been passed, especially when received favorably by the public opinion, seems an appropriate tribute to those millions of Ukrainian immigrants and their descendants who helped with their sweat in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and their blood on the battlefields to make this country the bastion of freedom and democracy.

Your editorial in an October issue of the Washington Post together with several subsequent articles seems to unfold a hostile campaign against the honoring of a poet whose writings epitomize to Americans of Ukrainian descent the ideals of the American dream. I suggest you stop this infamous campaign exciting public opinion against the decisions of a representative Congress. I hope you will personally acquaint yourself with the role of Shevchenko's ideals in the life of Ukrainian communities throughout the United States for almost a century. If you do, I am confident the Shevchenko project will gain a firm supporter.

Sincerely,

DR. V. N. BANDERA.

ASTORIA COMMITTEE FOR  
CAPTIVE NATIONS,

Long Island City, N.Y., December 15, 1963.

DEAR SIR: Our Ukrainian committee is surprised by your editorial of October 18, 1963, under the heading "The Shevchenko Affair." It is well known that the Shevchenko affair started in 1959-60. Your editorial and opposition began only this year. Several weeks before the October 18 editorial appeared, your paper was praising the plan to erect a statue of Shevchenko in Washington. This was enough opportunity in the past 3 years for you to express your opposition to the plan—but you did not do this.

It is well known to us that the U.S.S.R. is planning to erect a statue of Shevchenko in Moscow. Our question to you is, "If Moscow builds a memorial to Shevchenko, does that mean that we cannot erect a statue of him in Washington? Can things be done in Moscow only?"

This reminds us of the long years of diplomatic maneuvering concerning the banning of atomic weapons which was concluded only when everyone went to Moscow. We are not surprised that the Russians living in the United States are opposing this project.

Let us adhere to the principles expressed by the words of President Johnson:

"... The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. So, let us turn away ... from those ... who pour venom into our national bloodstream."

Yours truly,

NICHOLAS RYWAK,  
First Secretary.

MRS. IRYNA KOSTYNIUK,  
Rochester, N.Y., December 9, 1963.

EDITOR,  
The Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It was with great concern and deep disappointment that I read the remarks of your newspaper about Shevchenko. I can-

not understand how you could allow that kind of unfair evaluation of this great man who dedicated his life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and finally died, to be displayed on the pages of your paper.

Freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighters for man's liberty, regardless of national origin. Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

I ask the Washington Post to stop rendering bad service to the cause of freedom.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. IRYNA KOSTYNIUK.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., October 20, 1963.

The Editor,  
Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Your recent pseudo-messianic editorial ("The Shevchenko Affair," October 18, 1963) calling for the immediate cessation of the construction of Taras Shevchenko's statue since it would be a "monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans" is a good example of bad writing. The only real conclusion one can reach after stumbling through this statement of strained polemic character is that you object to the construction of the statue, with a valid reason for this objection, if any, hidden fortuitously or intentionally in a mass of dishonest reasoning. Your concern for national unity would be laudable if you only did not stretch that concern to obfuscate the point that you are attempting to make, whatever that may be. A catastrophe such as you describe in terms of disunity and recrimination resulting from the construction of Shevchenko's statue could only occur in the passionate imagination of an editor who has space to fill and nothing to fill it with. The alarmist conclusion—which is quite simply an appeal to the readers' emotion to provide his own reason for the editor's conviction, and in so doing agree with the editor—is laughable since it is rooted in that imagination.

However, you are partly right when you state that the statue was "conceived as a blunt weapon in the cold war." This weapon is not so blunt as you might think. And the "implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood" does not seem so implausible when you consider that the Thirteen Colonies also held an implausible goal of nationhood. If you are so anxious to find a "monument of disunity" you have only to look at the Berlin wall. No great mind is required to see its significance; you should not miss its point. Richard Nixon in "Khrushchev's Hidden Weakness" (Saturday Evening Post, October 12, 1963), states that "only the mobilization of an aroused and informed American public opinion will prevent the sellout of the right of 97 million enslaved peoples in Eastern Europe to be free." When you say that "as a poet Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans" you put the proverbial foot in your mouth. Quite simply you don't know what you are talking about, for freedom has universal significance not only for Americans, but for all nations.

MARK IWASZ,

Secretary for English Correspondence.

NOVEMBER 8, 1963.

Editor,  
The Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, which appeared in your publication on Friday, November 1, 1963, under the title of "Monument to Ignorance," which lambasted the authorities for approving the erection of a monument to Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet, was not only shocking but out of character for an American newspaper, and certainly out of character for an American editor.

To you, Taras Shevchenko may be as meaningless as the great men of your ancestors are meaningless to me, but that does not necessarily negate their greatness. The monument to Taras Shevchenko is not being erected in Washington to glorify the history of America because he was not an American patriot or poet, but rather, because he represents a dynamic figure in the movement for human freedom and dignity of the Ukrainian nation.

In your article you state: "It is inconceivable that a statue be dedicated to him in Tel-Aviv or in Warsaw." I ask you, Why is that inconceivable? Do you not think it is probable that if there were a sufficient number of Ukrainians residing in Tel-Aviv or in Warsaw who desired that such a monument be erected that that could not be accomplished?

In your article you also state, knowing too well that your statement is erroneous, that Taras Shevchenko "is the idol of the Communist Party members who have caused the Soviet Union to flower with libraries, collective farms, etc." For you to make this statement constitutes the grossest abuse of editorial integrity for the reason that you must be aware that the Communist Party will pervert history to suit its own aims and purposes. On the contrary, Taras Shevchenko was not only an avowed enemy of slavery, despotism, and monarchial tyranny, but he was also an avowed enemy of the ideology which is known today as communism.

I certainly hope that your paper does not embark upon many more editorials as irresponsible and ill conceived as your editorial on Taras Shevchenko, regardless of the reason you may rationalize to be justifiable for your actions.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. DEMER,  
President.

NEW YORK, N.Y., December 14, 1963.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,  
Editor, the Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: As a group of women of Ukrainian descent formed in a branch of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc., a cultural and educational organization, we are greatly disturbed by your attacks against the Shevchenko statue project in Washington, D.C.

Taras Shevchenko was born a serf, but through his immortal poems in the Ukrainian language, which were translated into scores of other tongues, he became one of the great champions of human liberty. For his rousing words he was sentenced to 10 years in exile and came back a broken man. He died at the age of 47, but his heritage has been passed on to future generations who continue the struggle to free Ukraine and other enslaved nations. He remains a symbol of the universal striving for justice, humanity, and understanding among all people. We trust you will desist in your campaign against the Shevchenko statue and will heed the voices of all those who are writing you with clarifications and explanations and are setting forth valid reasons for this project.

Yours very truly,

BRANCH 72, UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.  
Mary Dushnyck, president; Mary Lesawyer, vice president; Anna Kosciw, secretary; Anne Bezkorowajny, treasurer; Millie Smejka, Dorothy Chupa, Olga M. Lileplo, Tanya K. Kravitz, Stella Klawnick, Adele Wasylciow, Sophia P. Kotyk, Anne Harrison, Mae Demey, Mary Fisanick, Helen Prociuk, M.S., Tessie Husiak, Olga S. Lileplo, Ann Redosh, Katherine Lucyshyn, Mary Tollock.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
December 14, 1963.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,  
Editor, the Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: This is to voice my objections to your editorial attacks against the erection of the Shevchenko statue in Washington, D.C.

You state we have "an implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood." In 1776 many thought the goal of the American revolutionists was also implausible.

You write that Ukrainians favoring the statue are a tiny group. Ukrainians total almost 2 million in the United States, most of whom favor the statue project. A small group has a right to be represented and to seek freedom. There are scores of countries with populations of less than 2 million. Then you say, "Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans—he is the pet of a small minority." Shakespeare was at one time the pet of a small English minority, but eventually his appeal became universal. Shevchenko's life and works were dedicated not only to freedom for his own Ukraine but for the liberty of all the oppressed people.

Your statement that a statue of Shevchenko "would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans" is a gross exaggeration. Almost every project brings forth differences of opinion. Today many people do not approve of changing the name of Cape Canaveral to Cape Kennedy.

You suggest "the Ukrainian group . . . leaving the quarrels of their ancestral homeland where they originated." This is cynical. Would you have us forget the captive nations such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, Bulgaria, etc., or would you just forget the non-Russian nations enslaved in the Soviet Union?

As for the statement of Mr. W. Louchheim of the National Capital Planning Commission that Shevchenko was "both anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party," perhaps he would also call Shakespeare anti-Semitic because of the shlock characterization in "The Merchant of Venice." Would Mr. Louchheim want us to forget the Bard of Avon for this reason?

You remark that Shevchenko's name is an affront to Jews and Poles. However, the statue project was supported by a Jewish Senator and several Congressmen of Polish descent.

Your editorials could be refuted on several other points but these examples show the misinformation and misstatements which you are printing to stir up dissension and antagonism toward a great literary and historical figure, Taras Shevchenko, and toward the Ukrainian people who are ever striving for the freedom not only of Ukraine but of the other enslaved nations.

Yours very truly,

MARY DUSHNYCK  
(Mrs. Walter).

Finally, a letter written to the Washington Star for its excellent editorial "Association Again" is indicative of the wide response given to the just and fair observations made by that large organ. I request that this letter, which was published in part, be included in my remarks:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The candor and clarity with which this paper's recent editorial "Association Again" expressed its sentiments regarding the erection of the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital was one of intellectual honesty. Most welcomed after the recent vilifications by a few fanatical bigots who oppose the project by engaging in a continual malicious smear campaign, and who



finally, in abject misery, felt the need to solicit approval for the statue by a Kremlin-supported puppet of Soviet Ukraine in the United Nations.

But throughout their venom of hate operation, these illiberalists have lost the prime purpose of the erection of the Shevchenko statue—a memorial to a universal poet and national hero, a humanitarian who so loved justice that his most earnest desire was freedom for all oppressed peoples. In his yearning for freedom for his own nation, he has the finite distinction of mentioning in one of his great works our own George Washington, expressing the hope of such a man to free his Ukrainian people.

At a time when nullification and bigotry have taken perhaps their greatest toll, it would do well for those who so vehemently oppose this commemoration to freedom to return to reason and reality, to logic and clear thinking.

Contemplate the many memorials in our melting pot of nations. What lack of perspective it would be to question the affinity of the many statues we have of individuals who have no direct relation to America, but what pride we can take in our Nation and its leaders, who saw fit to approve the building of these monuments in respect to the historical heritage of its people.

The statue of Taras Shevchenko will be a commemoration to one who dedicated his life to the preservation of the dignity of man—a potent force in world freedom. This is very much contrary to the concepts of a puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative.

VERA A. DOWHAN.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICA'S RESOURCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] 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. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of speeches on development of America's resources, particularly through land and water reclamation projects. Because of the current drive for economy in government, there are some Members who may be willing to see our program of investment in reclaiming potentially useful land cut back. Mr. Speaker, the wise saver knows that prudent frugality demands a sound plan for the future; he knows that at the very moment he cuts unnecessary expenses, he must take care to maintain development of wealth-producing assets.

Perhaps the most important asset any nation has is its water. One of the greatest historical bases of America's strength and prosperity has been our seemingly endless water supply. We now are able to see that without wise management, we will very soon be faced with a severe shortage. It is through reclamation that we make certain that future generations will have enough to go around.

SALT RIVER, ARIZ.

In March of 1963 the Salt River Federal reclamation project observed the 60th anniversary of its approval for construction. It is one of five pioneer reclamation undertakings, authorized upon passage of the 1902 Reclamation Act,

and has surpassed even the fondest dreams of its early supporters. Only a few of the early stalwarts live today who saw the 25-car caravan bearing Theodore Roosevelt wind its way up Arizona's dusty Apache Trail in March of 1911 to dedicate the completion of the world's largest masonry dam. The Honorable CARL HAYDEN, Arizona's distinguished senior Senator, is among these. Sharing his experience with those who saw the Salt River Valley grow and prosper in the years that followed, the Senator remarked:

Observance of the golden anniversary of the dedication of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam and the coming into being of the Salt River project is a source of pride and satisfaction to me as one who was there at the time.

In 1910 there were about 35,000 inhabitants in Maricopa County. Today over 650,000 people live and work there. This growth is attributable almost solely to what is now the Salt River project and to the faith and hard work of those who have maintained it throughout the past half a century.

Today, besides the vast agricultural economy and the preference of thousands of persons annually for the resorts of the area, which are so well known throughout the world, there are several hundred manufacturing establishments—all of which are welcome contributors to the good of Maricopa County and Arizona—and all of which are dependent to a greater or lesser degree on the water and electricity available because Theodore Roosevelt Dam and the Salt River project exist. Water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic use, and electricity for farms, homes, and plants are responsible for the \$100-million-a-month retail sales in Maricopa County—for the nearly 150,000 family homes in the county—and for the more than one-quarter of a billion dollars of State and Federal taxes derived each year from Maricopa County.

These figures are firm evidence that the Federal funds expended for the costs of dam and downstream irrigation works and electrical generating capacity, all of which have been or are being repaid, are a sound capital investment. Not only is the Federal Government getting its construction money back, but the economic results are enriching the Treasury by many times the original costs through taxes on activities which could not have been without the Theodore Roosevelt Dam.

Senator GOLDWATER, too, is among those who realized early the wisdom of water resource development through reclamation. Said the Senator:

The United States is indebted to the pioneers of the Salt River Valley whose foresight and resistance resulted in the construction of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam. This structure, together with those which have come after it, have provided the water which has turned our valley green and has attracted to it people from all over the world who have added their contributions as farmers, merchants, bankers, the professions and labor.

It is proper that \* \* \* the name of Theodore Roosevelt be remembered as the President who was the "Father of Reclamation" in this country, and it is proper that the observance take place at the dam carrying his name.

Time rushes on inexorably. In the interval, Maricopa County has increased its population to more than three-quarter million, and Phoenix, the largest city in the county and in Salt River Valley, swelled to more than a half million peo-

ple. Monthly retail sales in the county neared the \$125 million mark.

The gross value of crops produced on the 117,000 acres of land irrigated through facilities of the Salt River project came to \$69.2 million in 1962. This represents an increase of more than \$1 million over the previous year, despite continuing losses of large areas of fertile cropland to the growing pressures of urbanization. The total value of crops produced on the project since 1908 now stands at \$1,835 million; this is 183 times the project's original cost of about \$10 million.

The reclamation program in the Salt River Valley of Arizona has performed an invaluable service to the State and the Nation. It has helped to transform a barren wasteland of cactus and mesquite into one of the richest and fastest growing sections of the United States. Only a few decades ago, the city of Phoenix was a dusty little place covering less than 6,400 acres. With the introduction of water from facilities of the Salt River project on the fertile lands of the valley, an oasis of productive endeavor and bustling enterprise was created which soon served as a magnet to those in search of economic opportunities.

Today, the incorporated area of the city of Phoenix encompasses more than 220 square miles of land. Urbanization has taken over more than 62,000 acres of Salt River project lands, transferring the use of project-furnished water from irrigation to domestic, municipal and industrial uses. Great industrial plants have located on valley lands once growing lettuce, or citrus, or some other valuable crop: Motorola, with three big plants in the valley, General Electric, Reynolds Aluminum, Goodyear, U.S. Steel, Sperry-Rand.

Was it wise of Uncle Sam to spend those original \$10 million on behalf of reclamation back in 1906? I daresay the Nation was much the richer even if the irrigators had not repaid a single cent. The \$10 million was repaid "in toto" some years ago. The Salt River Valley Water Users' Association is now repaying to the Treasury the additional \$6½ million invested in the Bartlett Dam completed in 1939 and the \$11 million spent in the 1950's to rehabilitate and modernize the project irrigation works.

The story does not stop there. In the physical plant, property, and equipment of the Salt River project, the American public owns a \$20 million asset which produces dividends in other ways as well. In addition to serving a farm population of 29,000 people, and a nonfarm population of more than one-half million persons, project facilities control floods, generate hydroelectric power, and enhance fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

In 1962, the six project reservoirs attracted nearly a million visitor-days of use. Recreationists could avail themselves of 184 miles of shoreline and 81,000 acres of land and water area given over to recreational pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, even the vision of men like Teddy Roosevelt probably did not foresee what 60 years would bring the

Salt River Valley. Just so, today we probably fail to fully comprehend what additional benefits the years will bring through reclamation projects being built in our day. Of one thing we can be certain: the demands upon our water supply, for food and for fun, for commerce and for energy, are going to continue to multiply. We must act now, wisely, judiciously, but positively, to preserve for the future the great land and water resources that still lie undeveloped all over America.

#### MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] 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. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I invite the special attention of all Members of the House to the very fine memorandum of December 13, 1963, which President Lyndon B. Johnson sent to the heads of all departments and agencies of the executive branch. President Johnson in this memorandum appealed to every employee in every agency, at every location in the Government, to "give your best to the job and to your country."

As chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I take this opportunity to assure President Johnson of the full support of our subcommittee. We concur fully in his inspirational message which follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, December 13, 1963.

#### MEMORANDUM TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

I ask that you convey this personal message to all of your employees:

In these first days, men and women of all ranks within the Government have asked me, "What can I do to help?" Many more of you, deeply committed to the Federal service, are undoubtedly asking yourselves the same question. It is impossible for me to make a direct and personal response to all of you, much as I would like to do so. Yet there is an answer which I would like to express to every employee in every agency at every location in the Federal Government. It is simply this: Give your best to your job and your country.

As your Chief Executive, I will do my utmost to maintain the high quality and character of the career service in the Government and to advance its usefulness through improvement. I will look to those who direct the day-to-day activities of this great work force and to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission for continuing reports and recommendations to assist me in this purpose.

We have a great resource of abilities and talents among the people serving our Federal Government. We have career systems to assure continuity of people and programs. We are organized for the job and the work is before us. President Kennedy did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, and he would not have us shrink from carrying forward the great work he began so

well. I say to you as I said to the Congress: "Let us continue."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvenes in the second session I plan to present a report in detail to the Members indicating the accomplishments of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee during 1963 and also to reveal the plans for our subcommittee during the second session of this Congress. For several years this subcommittee has, in cooperation with the departments and agencies, worked to improve the control and utilization of civilian employment in the Federal Government, knowing that this would, in turn, improve the services of Government for its people, reduce the cost of Government, strengthen our defense effort, and better the career program of the civilian employees in the Federal Government.

President Johnson's message of December 13, 1963, reflects the objectives of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee; and, therefore, may I again indicate to the Members and to the White House the complete backing of our subcommittee in the President's noble efforts.

#### BLUEPRINT FOR MURDER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the October 1963 issue of the Americas, monthly magazine of the Pan American Union of the Organization of American States, published on pages 10 and 11 a "cubistic" poem by Homero Aridjis suggestive of individual and wholesale assassination of political leaders.

In all of my experience and observations, I have never seen in any newspaper or periodical disseminated in the United States such an outrageous and monstrous incitement to downright assassination of those charged with the responsibilities of government. In this country, we do not teach and have never taught so foul a doctrine. The use of the word "tyrant," in the alleged poem means that anyone in authority who incurs the displeasure or opposition of others, not in authority, may be denominated as a "tyrant" by the latter and be removed by bloody assassination. This is the naked teaching and practice of international communism; and wherever that odious system is permitted to fester, the murder of authorities of state may be expected. Certainly, the foul murder of President Kennedy by one who was an avowed Communist is ample proof of what I say.

Furthermore, since funds appropriated for the Department of State are allocated, in large measure, for the operation and maintenance of the Organization of American States and the Pan American Union, it is a frightful commentary on our easygoing foreign policy and practices that within our midst a supposedly friendly inter-American establishment

should so grossly abuse our courtesy and all the proprieties involved.

It may be significant that the publication and dissemination of this monstrous item took place several weeks before the assassination of President Kennedy and about the time when the murderer Oswald made a trip to Mexico, the home country of the author and perhaps, Oswald did confer with communistic elements there.

Under the setup involved, the Government of the United States itself must share the responsibility for this emanation from the pen of one who openly espouses the process of murder to accomplish political ends. Our Government jointly shares with Latin American governments the responsibility for the Organization of American States and for the principles and practices thus involved. The Congress should never appropriate another dollar for this organization unless and until it makes a public apology and retraction for such inflammatory and revolutionary political propaganda which is well calculated to provoke in all countries of this hemisphere the practice of murder for political ends. It is shocking, indeed, that our Latin American neighbors and ourselves already plagued by the sanguinary processes of communism, should be subjected to the downright incitement of murder clothed with the dignity of the Organization of American States, which was created and dedicated for the purpose of promoting—not assassination and murder—but the evolution of the principles of constitutional liberty for the betterment of the peoples involved.

It is, indeed, impossible to describe adequately the monstrous evil that has thus been inflicted on the countries of the Western Hemisphere, in all of which the indicated magazine is widely circulated.

I am introducing a bill in the Congress to denounce as a crime the publication and/or dissemination through the mails, or any interstate processes, of any communication or publication which urges murder for political or other purposes as well as for the commission of any other criminal offense. The murder of President Kennedy and the publication and distribution of the mentioned poem are well calculated to lend color to the criticisms so often of late that our people and their Government have been "soft on communism."

I am not including the text of the indicated poem because of its horrible and provocative nature; but I have sought to indicate its fearful import. I am also writing to the Secretary of State enclosing a copy of these remarks and asking for an explanation in the premises.

#### THE HONORABLE HOMER THORNBERRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] 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. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY leaves us with mixed emotions. For in accepting an appointment from the late President John F. Kennedy as Federal judge for the western district of Texas, we who have known and admired our distinguished colleague from Texas felt pride in his assumption of this new honor and responsibility, but we also feel a sense of loss. Our distinguished colleague has left the House and that is a loss.

His record as the Representative from the 10th Congressional District of Texas, the seat formerly occupied by President Lyndon B. Johnson, is a matter of history. And posterity will note the fact, just as many of us present today know from personal experience, that in the votes he cast on the floor of this House since his initial election in 1948, as in the votes he cast as a member of the Rules Committee since 1955, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman THORNBERRY, has faithfully represented the people and has been a force for good.

Judge THORNBERRY has been my friend for a number of years, and he has been not an acquaintance but a true friend.

An example of the warmth of his friendship was manifested to me in November of 1961. During that month I came to Washington, D.C., in my official capacity as Congressman for the first time. As a freshman and a stranger, awed by the size of this city and my responsibilities to my constituents and the people of this Nation, the Capital seemed a cold, lonely place, the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, changed all that. He searched me out that day in 1961, he greeted me and made me welcome. All of us who have known the discomfort of being transplanted from one part of the country to another, know that such a gesture is not a small thing.

I have been fortunate to be a friend of HOMER THORNBERRY. This Congress has been fortunate to have had him as a Member. And though his abilities and his goodness will now flow from the Federal bench, the people, as always, will remain his ultimate beneficiaries.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CRASH OF JET AIRLINER AT ELKTON, MD.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] 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. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the investigation into the crash of the Boeing 707 four-engine jet airliner that occurred at Elkton, Md., on December 9, 1963, in which 81 persons were killed is now in progress. That investigation will probably go on for several months, and the probable cause of the crash will not be determined until its completion. But the strange circumstances surrounding the tragedy and the bizarre events that have followed have raised questions and doubts in the minds of many people, and these circumstances and events should be discussed fully.

First. It is known that the Boeing 707 was flying in a holding pattern at the time of the crash, awaiting clearance to approach the Philadelphia International Airport, and that there was a great amount of turbulence in the atmosphere. It is not known at this time whether the immediate cause of the crash was a lightning strike, whether static discharge ignited the fuel, whether the plane broke apart because of the turbulence, whether the turbulence ruptured a fuel tank and caused enough friction to ignite the fuel and caused an explosion, or some other reason.

Yet one question does naturally follow from the facts that are known. That is, why did not the FAA approach controller instruct the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern outside or away from a turbulent area?

In this connection, it has been brought to my attention that it is common practice for FAA towers to give takeoff clearance to pilots even though the takeoff route may bring the airplane into the teeth of great turbulence. I have been informed of such an incident occurring at an airport in one of our major cities within the last 45 days. In that incident, an airlines pilot while awaiting takeoff clearance at the end of the runway, observed on his cockpit radar severe thunderstorm cells adjacent to the airport, and directly in line with the departure route specified by the control tower. The pilot requested a different routing, but was advised by the tower to follow their instructions or return to the ramp. Rather than fly directly into what he considered a hazardous condition, the pilot did return to the ramp.

This incident illustrates one case where the pilot refused to succumb to the instructions and pressures of the FAA tower when in his judgment it was unsafe to take off. I am advised that tower instructions in similar situations sometimes include a warning that failure to take off as instructed may cause a delay for as much as a week. How many pilots have succumbed to such pressures and taken off under hazardous conditions and along routes which carried aircraft and their passengers into turbulent weather? How many airplanes have crashed and how many passengers have died as a direct result of flying into such danger?

I repeat my first question: Why did not the FAA approach controller instruct the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern outside of or away from a turbulent area?

Second. It will be recalled that officials of both the FAA and the CAB rushed immediately to the scene of the crash, and that the earliest stories contained quotes from officials of both the Agency and the Board. It will further be recalled that the newspapers carried the story that there was a tape which had recorded the conversation between the Philadelphia Airport tower and the Boeing 707, containing the following message from the pilot of that plane:

Clipper 214 is going down in flames.

Now it has been revealed that this message came not from the ill-fated Boeing 707, but from another plane

nearby which witnessed the jet airliner going down.

What may not be generally known is that officials of the CAB and others participating in the investigation had been studying this tape and had not yet decided which pilot made the statement in question, when officials of the FAA caused the tape to be removed from the place where it was being studied. The FAA officials then played the tape for the benefit of the news media. The result was the erroneous and misleading conclusion that the message on the tape had been given by the pilot of the Boeing 707. After the tape was returned by the FAA for further study, the CAB was able to determine that the voice on the tape came from another airliner in the vicinity of the Boeing 707.

The result of the FAA's rash decision to release the tape prematurely was not only to perpetrate a hoax on the public. This interference into the due course of the investigation also had the serious effect of delaying and sidetracking that investigation.

And the public may justly ask, Who is in charge of investigating airplane crashes, and is the FAA conducting itself properly in connection with such investigations?

In regards to the question of who is responsible for instructing the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern in a turbulent area, it is reasonable to assume that the turbulence played some part in the tragedy. But even if the turbulence had nothing to do with the crash, the question is still pertinent. For almost everyone agrees that turbulence in the atmosphere presents a hazardous condition for aircraft. But the Federal Aviation Agency does not seem to agree with the statement and has exhibited a dangerous indifference to the hazards of turbulence. To the FAA, air traffic lanes are the same as superhighways, and planes are routed along these lanes with regard only to whether or not they are free from other air traffic. But turbulence or other atmospheric conditions may present as dangerous a condition to airplanes as a huge rut in a road or the washout of a bridge presents to automobiles.

I feel confident that the CAB will conduct a thorough investigation, and that in its final report the questions I have raised, and which are in the minds of many people, will be answered.

And in regards to the question of who is in charge of investigating airplane crashes, it may be recalled that in previous speeches delivered on the floor of this House, I have pointed out that in the last three reports published by the CAB the finding of probable cause has in each instance implicated the FAA as contributing to the crash in question. In addition, there is strong evidence that the FAA was at least partially responsible for the midair collision over New York City in December of 1960. These are serious charges, but they are completely supported by the CAB aircraft accident report of the Eastern Air Lines crash in New York City on November 30, 1962, by the CAB report of the Slick Airways crash in San Francisco on February 3, 1963, by the CAB report of the

Zantop Air Transport crash in Puyallup, Wash., on February 16, 1963, and by the recently announced agreement between the Federal Government, United Air Lines, and Trans World Airlines, whereby the Attorney General overruled the decision of the FAA Administrator and agreed that the Federal Government shall pay 24 percent of the damages ultimately fixed in lawsuits growing out of the midair collision over New York City on December 16, 1960.

These facts serve to illustrate one important point: that the FAA is a party to the investigation of every crash involving civil or commercial aircraft in the United States. The FAA is a party in the same sense that the pilot of the plane that crashes is a party, and in the same sense that the owner and the manufacturer may be a party. For either or all of these individuals or companies may be responsible for a crash. Under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA is not only responsible for certifying the airworthiness of all aircraft, but is also responsible for maintaining the safety of air traffic.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 also leaves no doubt as to who has charge of investigations of air crashes. Section 701(a) (2) of the act states that the CAB shall "investigate such accidents and report the facts, conditions, and circumstances relating to each accident and the probable cause thereof," and section 701 (g) of the act states that the CAB shall provide for the appropriate participation of the FAA Administrator in any investigation conducted by the Board "provided, that the Administrator or his representatives shall not participate in the determination of probable cause by the Board under this title."

The latter provision obviously was put into the law by Congress to prevent the FAA from assuming the power of investigating itself. It would be anomalous if a party to a collision could investigate himself, and certainly this is a wise provision of the law and one that ought to be closely guarded by the CAB and by Congress.

So we look forward to the final report of the CAB on this terrible crash at Elkton, Md., in the hope that the CAB will be able to complete its investigation unobstructed by the grandstand tactics of the FAA, and in the further hope that the knowledge gained from this investigation will help us avoid similar crashes.

#### "THE EDUCATION CONGRESS"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] 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. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson rightly called this "the education Congress" as he signed into public law the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act on December 16 and the Vocational Education Act on December 18.

This and several other bills which have had their origin in the Committee on Education and Labor, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, have caused Americans to rededicate themselves to the realization that if America is to remain free, its citizenry must be educated. To this end, the gentleman from New York, Congressman POWELL, introduced the most comprehensive measure in education that has yet been brought to the floor of Congress. During this 1st session of the 88th Congress, five of the measures have been approved by the House, and each has added an important dimension to the picture of American education.

#### H.R. 6143: HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES ACT

Title I, undergraduate academic facilities provides for matching grants to institutions of higher learning—\$690 million for 3-year program—\$230 million per year for 3 years. Twenty-two percent of that amount has been earmarked for public community colleges and technical institutes—equivalent to \$50,600,000 per year for 3 years.

Title II, grants for construction of graduate academic facilities—\$145 million for a 3-year program, broken down into \$25 million for the first year; and \$60 million for each of the 2 succeeding years.

Title III, loans for construction of academic facilities, graduate and undergraduate: \$360 million for a 3-year program, or \$120 million annually. The total money authorized under this legislation is \$1,195 million for the 3-year program. With the signature of the President affixed to this legislation, it is now Public Law 88-204.

#### H.R. 4955: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION; EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT; AND FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS PROGRAM

The vocational education aspect of this bill, signed by the President on December 18, calls for a 5-year program, and authorizes expenditures of \$1,031 million on new programs in this area, in addition to the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden vocational education legislation already in existence. Amendments to the National Defense Education Act legislation, including a 1-year extension, calls for \$319,600,000.

Impacted areas legislation has a 2-year extension, through fiscal year 1965, and money authorized in the amount of \$527,600,000. These three programs total \$1,879,200,000.

First year funds for vocational education amount to \$60 million; second year \$108,500,000, and the third year \$177,500,000. Beginning with fiscal year 1967 and for each succeeding year thereafter \$225 million. This amount of money will be available annually as a permanent authorization of this program. Part of the money is earmarked for the development of work-study and residential schools in a 4-year program. After fiscal year 1968, this would phase out. For this purpose \$30 million is available in fiscal year 1965; \$50 million in fiscal year 1966; \$35 million in fiscal year 1967; and \$35 million in fiscal year 1968—a total of \$150 million for the 4-year program.

Also included in the vocational education segment of the bill would be an additional amount for title VIII of the National Defense Education Act—technical education—which also becomes a permanent authorization: \$15 million for fiscal year 1965, and thereafter \$60 million annually.

The practical nurse training program also becomes a permanent aspect of this vocational education program, beginning in fiscal year 1966, with \$5 million being annually authorized for this program. For fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965, \$5 million is included in the bill, making \$15 million available under the totals of this bill for practical nurse training.

In summary, then, the basic program of vocational education, covering fiscal years 1964 through 1968, provides \$806 million; residential schools and work-study programs, \$150 million; technical education under the National Defense Education Act, \$60 million; and practical nurse training, \$15 million—making for a grand total for these fiscal years in this bill of \$1,031 million.

#### H.R. 8720: Amendments to Manpower Development and Training Act

Fiscal year 1964.....	\$161,000,000
Fiscal year 1965.....	407,000,000
Fiscal year 1966.....	281,000,000
Total.....	856,000,000

This legislation includes extension of occupational training; special youth program to permit 25 percent of all trainees to be selected from age group 17 to 22; authorizes a pilot program permitting the Federal Government to assist workers and families to move to new areas providing bona fide jobs are available; and augments present subsistence payments with up to \$10 weekly "incentive payments"; and trainees able to work part time with no deduction in allowances.

This bill is now awaiting signature of the President.

#### H.R. 4879: LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION BILL

This bill is almost identical to the Senate-passed S. 2265. H.R. 4879 is now pending floor action, a rule having been granted last week. It provides two main things:

First. It will increase the present act which is now a rural library services legislation providing \$7,500,000 annually in matching grants to \$25 million annually for a 3-year period. It will be expanded to include all communities of all sizes. Total money available for the 3-year program is \$75 million.

Second. Construction grants of \$20 million annually for a 3-year period, totaling \$60 million under this portion of the bill.

A total of \$135 million is authorized under this legislation for 3-year program of library services and construction.

#### H.R. 6060: EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

This bill has become Public Law 88-38, and defines the inherent right of all individuals without regard to sex to work in areas for which they are qualified and to be paid for their labors at an equal rate.



Thus as one views H.R. 3000, the National Education Improvement Act recommended by the late President Kennedy, one finds that parts of every title have been accepted by the 88th Congress:

First. Title I, expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education has been adopted through amendments to title II of National Defense Education Act.

Second. Title II, expansion and improvement of higher education has not only been accepted as recommended in aid to public community college academic facilities, but also a broader measure of aid to colleges, both undergraduate and graduate, through the adoption of H.R. 6143.

Third. Title III, improvement of educational quality was met in part through adoption of H.R. 4955.

Fourth. Title IV, strengthening elementary and secondary education was realized through amendments passed to the National Defense Education Act, titles III and V.

Fifth. Title V addressed to expansion and improvement of vocational education saw an even greater development than was originally envisioned by passage of H.R. 4955.

Sixth. Title VI, expansion of continuing education is reflected through the adoption of an amendment to Manpower Development and Training Act, and the ruling permitting debate on the Library Services Act.

These major measures coupled with other bills passed by other committees in the House makes this truly the "education Congress."

I commend my colleague from New York upon his outstanding leadership.

#### PRESENTATION OF AWARD FOR HUMANITARIANISM TO HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] 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. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the proceedings I wish to include in the RECORD an address eloquently presented by our colleague, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, when accepting the First Annual Award for Humanitarianism given by the National Hemophilia Foundation at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington on Friday, December 6, 1963.

All of those in attendance were profoundly impressed with the sincere and humble acceptance of this award which is one of so many JOHN has received for his accomplishments in behalf of the people of our Nation. The list of JOHN's accomplishments is endless and they are accomplishments of which not only he, but the entire Nation, should be proud. It is to the credit of the National Hemophilia Foundation that he has again been

publicly recognized for his humane efforts.

I would like to share with my colleagues the story of an incident which occurred early in JOHN FOGARTY's congressional career and which did much to trigger his interest in medical research. The incident occurred in 1949, shortly after he became chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, when he met a young man walking with the aid of two canes. JOHN stopped him and inquired as to what was wrong and why was he walking with canes? The young man explained that he was a victim of multiple sclerosis. JOHN, with his impatient and warm-hearted Irish drive, went into action. At that time very little was known about the disease and JOHN found that the Government was conducting no research on it whatsoever. Within a relatively short period of time he was successful in pushing through Congress a \$500,000 appropriation to commence research on multiple sclerosis. It is through his efforts that what is now known about this crippling disease resulted directly from JOHN's chance meeting with the young man with the canes.

I cite this incident to illustrate the intensity of his interest and the measure of our colleague. The address he gave on December 6 is another measure of this man and a fine example of his willingness and ever intense desire to be of service to his fellowman:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY, NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION, SHERATON PARK, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 6, 1963

I am deeply grateful to the members of the National Hemophilia Foundation for the honor which you have bestowed upon me here today. To be designated a humanitarian, to be recognized for my efforts on behalf of the health and well-being of the American people by an organization whose whole purpose for existence is humanitarian—many of whose members literally contribute their lifeblood each week to preserve the lives of others—is truly gratifying.

The National Hemophilia Foundation is only 15 years old, yet the underlying principle upon which it is based is centuries old. This principle is behind the moral teaching that we should help one another. And this principle is behind the democratic faith in the value of individual human life—a faith which crystallized in the cry of liberty, equality and fraternity which caught the conscience of the peoples of the world.

The humanitarian impulse was behind the dramatic conquest of the infectious diseases which we have seen in our country in this century. Fifty years ago epidemics of diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox and typhoid ravaged this Nation. And it is still the humanitarian impulse which today is behind efforts to conquer and vanquish the chronic and metabolic diseases—diabetes, congenital heart ailments, cystic fibrosis, and, of course hemophilia.

In attempting to prevent these disorders, the humanitarian effort to promote the welfare of humanity through the elimination of pain and suffering is at present helpless, because the secrets of these diseases are locked in the germ plasm. Children do not catch diseases like hemophilia; they are born with them, or with the tendency to develop them. Medical treatment can save and prolong the lives of those afflicted into the years of reproduction—and then the disorder is passed on to their children.

This paradox of increasing the magnitude of the disease as progress is made against it

is particularly true of hemophilia. For hemophilia is not only a hereditary disease, it is a sex-linked trait. As the life of a hemophiliac is prolonged by new methods of treatment, sons and daughters are born who will inevitably carry to future generations the tendency toward hemophilia or the actual disorder itself.

Several years ago I had the privilege of addressing the board of trustees of the National Hemophilia Foundation at an annual meeting such as this. At that time, in noting the historical significance of this disease I was struck by the fact that in the days of Queen Victoria, hemophilia was a rare disease, a "disease of kings." Today, this is no longer the case.

Due in a large measure to the efforts and interests of this organization and its 24 local chapters, great strides have been made in hemophilia. Since 1940 the average life span of hemophiliacs has been increased from 14½ years to 29 years of age, allowing plenty of time for hemophilia to be passed on to progeny. I am told that in the United States alone, there are about 100,000 known hemophiliacs with probably an equal or even greater number of females who, although not afflicted with the disorder, carry the trait in their genes. Year by year the incidence of hemophilia multiplies.

The only answer is in continued research, for only by ferreting out the secret of the genes and learning to control the paths of inheritance will we ever eliminate the problem.

Day by day research is continuing. Hemophilia is now being fought on many sides and at many levels—by Congress, by Government-supported research, by this organization in numerous ways, and by the contributions from the general public. The increase in the life expectancy of the hemophiliac attests to the progress made, and the growth of the National Hemophilia Foundation shows the growing awareness of the problems presented by this disease.

One of the most noteworthy advances in the care of hemophiliacs seen in this country in recent years is the development and clinical use of a highly concentrated form of antihemophilic factor, the vital factor missing in the blood of persons suffering from the most prevalent type of hemophilia. With the use of this plasma concentrate, I am told, a hemophilia patient can undergo surgery and have almost the same chance for survival as persons without this disorder. Formerly, at least 25 percent of hemophilia patients who underwent surgery died from loss of blood.

Unfortunately, this lifesaving therapy is far beyond the reach of most hemophilic families. The plasma concentrate sufficient for 1 operation can cost from \$2,500 to \$5,000 and occasionally \$10,000, and 600 donors must give their blood in order to obtain enough of the concentrate for 1 treatment.

Investigators at the National Institutes of Health are now concentrating on the development of better methods of purifying and separating out this concentrate in an attempt to reduce the cost of treatment and the number of donors necessary.

Much more research is needed to simplify the fractioning process and studies are now going on investigating the therapeutic use of this fraction concentrate in surgical cases to determine how long this factor survives in the body, where it is localized, and its period of effectiveness.

At the same time, better ways of concentrating and assaying the factor are under study, and a new method has been developed to detect relatively small amounts of antihemophilic factor within the body. This new method provides a basis for developing better therapeutic regimens with the antihemophilic agents now available, and will permit easier evaluation of new agents.

Another area of research which I believe needs strengthening is the epidemiological study of hemophilia. There is much work to be done before all hemophiliacs in this country are located and diagnosed. By way of contrast, Sweden has a complete record of each of its hemophiliacs, including family histories. Of course, in a country with a population of 7 million—less than the population of our New England States—the identification of any segment of its population is a much simpler matter than it is in the United States.

I have heard of recent reports of circulating anticoagulants in the blood of hemophiliacs. The inactivation of the antihemophilic factor by circulating anticoagulants is enzymatic in nature and may be a kind of antigen-antibody response. Hemophiliacs with a circulating anticoagulant represent, of course, a difficult treatment problem, as they will not respond to any substance injected or transfused that might aid the clotting mechanism. As fast as such a substance is transfused, it is deactivated by the circulating anticoagulant.

Scientists from Buenos Aires, Argentina, working with investigators of the National Cancer Institute, have recently developed a new experimental method of isolating this plasma factor in a purer form. A research foundation in New England is also devoting much of its time to this problem.

I have seen another recent report indicating that a researcher in Boston has found that flavinoids, found commonly in "cold cures," may be effective in reducing the severity of bleeding episodes of hemophiliacs by as much as 50 percent. Others are studying the basic mechanisms of blood clotting in an effort to discover the role played by various enzymes in the clotting process. Several of the enzymes studied have been shown to possess certain clot-accelerating activities.

The National Hemophilia Foundation has a significant role in research support, but you and your members do far more than that. You have helped to lift the veil of secrecy and ignorance which obscures many hemophiliacs by disseminating information to the general public and community health organizations on the problems and treatment of hemophilia. Through your efforts, medical records and family histories of hemophiliacs are being made and studied. Through your work, blood donors have been organized to keep a sufficient supply of the precious life-saving plasma on hand. I wish to commend you for this work.

I am delighted to see the National Hemophilia Foundation grow in size and strength, for you have the power to help the individual hemophiliac and his family adjust to the disease and the forced sedentary life which accompanies it in a way no Government agency can do. What reassurances it must be to the family with the problems of a hemophiliac child suddenly thrust upon them, just to know that there is a National Hemophilia Foundation, to realize that thousands of private citizens have banded together to help each other face their problems.

Certainly we can say that our combined efforts have done much to lessen the suffering of the hemophiliac. Still it remains very clear that much more must be done, for the problem will continue to plague our people until a method for curing and preventing the occurrence of hemophilia is found. This requires more basic research.

Some years ago biologists began to turn from the study of disease on the gross level to the study of disease on the microscopic level. With the invention of the electron microscope, biology plunged deeper into the mysteries of life. Today scientists are working at the molecular level, where the secret of hemophilia lies locked in the genes.

Gradually, progress is being made; slowly, the genetic code is being broken—the code

that will reveal the mysteries surrounding hemophilia and similar "inborn errors of metabolism." It is here that we place our hope and our concentrated efforts.

I need not explain to those of you here today why we must continue our research, nor why we must discover the secret of these tragic disorders. Many of you have children or close relatives afflicted with hemophilia; some of you may yourselves be hemophiliacs; you know the agony, the pain, the tragedy of these diseases. You understand the need for continuing the humanitarian efforts of our forefathers, for you know, better than I could ever tell you, why the fight for freedom from disease must be won.

We have seen in our generation great advances in forging powerful new weapons in the war against disease. We must continue our efforts, we must measure ourselves against the challenge—it must not be said of us that "The century has brought forth a great era, but the great moment finds a generation of little men."

#### U.S. FOOLISHNESS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. HARDY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a former head of our foreign aid program once told me that in his opinion half of the money being spent on aid was wasted. He acknowledged that unfortunately he did not know which half, nor had he been able to correct this during his administration of the Agency. The accomplishments of his successors in this regard do not appear to be much better.

The firm position which the House took last Monday on foreign aid funding should suggest to AID and the Department of State that the elimination of waste must receive priority attention. A diligent effort in that direction could produce sufficient economies to permit our foreign aid program to be carried on without impairment and even, perhaps, with greater effectiveness. A good starting place would seem to be with the funds the Agency has budgeted for countries which have made it plain by words or actions that our aid is not wanted or appreciated. A distinguished member of my former Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, who also serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee, our able colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [JOHN S. MONAGAN], made this point in a statement on the floor last Wednesday and his remarks resulted in a sharp editorial in the *Waterbury American* of December 16.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

#### U.S. FOOLISHNESS IN CAMBODIA

The right hand so often doesn't know what the left hand is doing, in these days of big government.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state, has delivered himself of a diatribe against the Government of the United States, announcing that he would be "happy to break diplomatic relations with the United States." Indeed he expressed the hope that there would be "an early break in relations between the United States and us."

Yet at almost the same instant this vitriol was being poured out, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, announced that he has reliable information

that there is "a belief in the high level of the State Department that further funds should be expended on the Cambodian Port Highway."

This is the highway which was the subject of a hearing and report by the Hardy subcommittee more than 2 years ago—a project which the committee found to have been so badly mangled as to injure our prestige. Some \$34 million was expended on the highway, yet even 2 years ago it was found that one-third of it was in need of repair.

Mr. MONAGAN minces no words: "This highway was foolish in its conception; it was criminal in its construction. In view of the present situation in Cambodia, it is my belief that it would be the height of folly to spend more American funds on this construction project \* \* \* I will do all in my power to prevent such expenditure."

Hear. Hear.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOCAL 66 OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

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, the year 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of a remarkable labor union, local 66 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

As this golden anniversary year draws to a close, I am honored to salute local 66 and its manager, Murray Gross.

I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the following passages from "The Fight's Just Begun," a history of local 66 over the last half century published by the local.

Formally, local 66 has a mouth-filling title: Bonnaz, Embroideries, Tucking, Pleating and Allied Crafts Union, Local 66, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL-CIO. But in the shops, over the bonnaz machine, or the embroidery frame, the workers call local 66, "the union."

Over the years, local 66 through the dedicated efforts of its members and officers has built a structure of benefits, duties, and rights that touches upon each individual within the union. From the highly skilled bonnaz operator or tucker to the unskilled floorworker, the oldtimer and the newcomer, all the members of local 66 enjoy the same basic benefits and rights.

Where do these rights begin? They begin with each union member; perhaps it might be said that they begin with the latest member to join local 66, a young girl, say, who has just found work as a floorworker in an embroidery shop. Typically, she is a recent migrant from Puerto Rico or the South. Chances are, she's married and helping to support a growing family. Whatever her personal circumstances, she's new to the union and is entering a new way of life.

Here is a beginning that has repeated itself many times over the last 50 years within local 66. The new member may not realize it yet but she now belongs to a union family of 9,000 members. Most of these are women—about 80 percent of the local's membership.

The local 66 family, however, reaches beyond the confines of the canyons of New York City's teeming garment center. As each individual within the local is related by the bonds of union brotherhood to each other, local 66 is tied to over 500 locals of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union



(ILGWU) and local 66 members are part of the great family of some 450,000 other workers in the ladies garment industry organized in the mighty ILGWU throughout the country and in Canada and in Puerto Rico.

Solidarity, says the dictionary, is an "entire union of interests and responsibilities in a group." Joseph Conrad wrote of the "invincible conviction of solidarity that knits together innumerable hearts." And, in the words of the song, "When the union's inspiration through the workers' blood shall run," there is solidarity and "no greater power anywhere beneath the sun."

Union solidarity, however, is not solely confined to a local union or its parent international union. By its affiliation to the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the ILGWU brings the members of local 66 within a brotherhood of some 12½ million workers that covers the United States and Canada as well as every craft and industrial occupation. Through its ties with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the AFL-CIO in turn links up America's union families with some 56 million workers throughout the free world.

Local 66, it has been said, is a "little United Nations" because so many workers of different creeds, color, and race are under its banner. With its multiplicity of crafts as well as ethnic groups, it might be more apt to call local 66 a miniature ICFTU. Bonnaz embroiderers, tuckers, pleaters, crochet beaders, nailhead and rhinestone setters, covered button and tubular piping workers, to name only a few, work in local 66 organized shops.

A vast majority of local 66 members are skilled workers, practicing their arts on possibly the widest variety of crafts and on the largest assortment of machines to be found within the jurisdiction of any single garment industry local union.

Local 66 unites these Jacks and Jills of all the trades into a common organization striving for common goals. Participation is the key to the union democracy that flourishes within the local.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to bring to the attention of my colleagues a message from ILGWU President David Dukinsky to local 66 to mark its 50th anniversary:

As local 66 celebrates half a century of its existence and progress, there comes to mind the fact that in the early days, it was often argued that "professional pride" among the bonnaz embroidery workers, considered an "elite" element in the needle trades, would be an insuperable barrier to unionization. (In other trades, at the same time, a variation of this theme was that "girls can't be organized," or some other rationalization.)

Fortunately, the determined pioneers of unionism among the embroidery workers, such as Nathan Riesel, Ossip Wolinsky, Zachary L. Freedman, and others did not share this pessimistic outlook. If one attempt did not take hold, they tried again—and again—until the present local gained a permanent foothold in 1913.

Major improvements obtained in the first collective agreement in 1915, such as cutting back the workweek from 53 to 50 hours and setting minimum scales for operators, may not seem earth-shaking today. But they laid the basis for the steady achievements through the years that raised workers' standards to the levels enjoyed now.

Though the work opportunities for local 66 members, whose ranks now also include crafts such as tucking, pleating, stitching, tubular piping, Swiss handloom, covered bottoms, nailheads and rhinestones, vary to such a great degree, with the whims and vicissitudes of fashion, the unchanging devotion of the local to the ideals of progressive trade unionism is a source of continued strength, both to its members and to the ILGWU as a whole, in meeting the challenges ahead.

I know that under the constructive leadership of Manager Murray Gross, the local's future course will remain constant to ILGWU concepts of decent, democratic trade unionism.

DAVID DUBINSKY,  
President, ILGWU.

#### THE REVEREND DR. JOHN COLEMAN BENNETT

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, yesterday the Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett, a distinguished theologian, was elected president of Union Theological Seminary in New York. Dr. Bennett, author, scholar, and educator, served as dean of the faculty and professor in the years before he became acting president last June. Under his leadership and wise guidance Union Theological surely will continue as one of the world's foremost educational institutions.

I include at this point in the RECORD two articles about Dr. Bennett published in today's New York Times which I know will be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 20, 1963]  
SEMINARY ELECTS A NEW PRESIDENT: BENNETT  
FOLLOWS VAN DUSEN AT UNION THEOLOGICAL  
(By George Dugan)

The Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett was elected president of Union Theological Seminary yesterday.

He succeeds the Reverend Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, president emeritus since last June, as head of the world's largest interdenominational training school for ministers.

Since Dr. Van Dusen's retirement Dr. Bennett had served as acting president in addition to filling the Reinhold Niebuhr professorship of social ethics. From 1955 until assuming the active presidency the 61-year-old theologian had been dean of the faculty.

Most of his teaching career has been devoted to this seminary, which was established in 1836 to train for the ministry students of every denomination.

As its name indicates, the school is dedicated to the goal of Christian unity. Its faculty includes many leaders in the so-called ecumenical movement for a worldwide united church.

#### SPREAD OF STUDENT BODY

Union's current enrollment numbers nearly 600 students representing more than 60 Protestant denominations. There are about 80 students in residence from 28 countries.

And, for the first time, three Roman Catholics are doing graduate work at the seminary.

Most of the students come from six major denominational groupings: Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, and Lutheran.

The seminary is at Broadway and 120th Street, adjacent to Columbia University and the complex of educational institutions in the Morningside Heights area.

Its English Gothic architecture blends with the nearby towering spire of the Riverside Church.

Last year Union completed a \$4 million residence hall for married students and faculty members. It is called Van Dusen Hall, in honor of Dr. Bennett's predecessor.

Like Dr. Bennett, "Pit" Van Dusen is one of Protestantism's leading ecumenists and was one of the architects of the World Council of Churches.

He was elected president of Union in 1945, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin.

#### QUALIFICATIONS SET FORTH

Dr. Bennett was named to the seminary post by its board of directors, headed by John N. Irwin 2d.

In announcing the election, Mr. Irwin noted that the new president had been associated with Union in his student days and had continued through 23 years as a faculty member.

"In these days of critical tensions," Mr. Irwin said, "we are fortunate to have in him a man of keen social sensitivity and insight as well as an awareness of the ethical demands of the Christian Gospel."

"Under his leadership we anticipate continued advance in the seminary's program for serving the church by providing well-trained men and women for its various ministries."

"Union's more than 6,000 alumni around the world will be happy at this distinguished appointment and Christian leaders, in this country and abroad, will feel closer to the seminary because of their acquaintance with John Bennett through his scholarly books, his timely articles, his lectures in the classroom and on television and radio, and his participation in the highest councils of the church."

"He will also be welcomed in his new position by all of those who are concerned to bring about interfaith understanding and cooperation."

#### WORLD CHURCHMAN: JOHN COLEMAN BENNETT

Like his predecessors for more than 125 years the man who was elected president of the Union Theological Seminary yesterday is dedicated to Protestant unity and freedom of inquiry in religious studies. Thus, no sudden change in policy is indicated under the leadership of the Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett. In fact, Dr. Bennett has been acting president since last June, when the Reverend Henry Pitney Van Dusen retired. Before that, Dr. Bennett was dean of the faculty for 6 years.

Both men have an abiding interest in the ecumenical, or Christian unity, movement. They have long been active in the affairs of the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches.

#### OPENING INDIVIDUAL WAY

Their dedication to the training of a clergy in "solid learning, true piety, and enlightened experience" is well known in church circles—as is their rejection of a "Union position" on theological issues. Each student must seek and arrive at his own answers.

Dr. Bennett is regarded as a brilliant theologian, somewhere left of center. Precise of speech and quickly sharp in debate, he has made a lifelong study of communism.

More than once he has warned his fellow Christians that God is not automatically on the side of the West.

Three years ago he wrote these words to buttress his thesis: "The very atheism of communism is a judgment upon the churches, which for so long were unconcerned about the victims of the industrial revolution and early capitalism and which have usually been ornaments of the status quo, no matter how unjust it has been."

"The temptation to turn the cold war into a holy crusade is ever with us, and insofar as we yield to it, we make impossible the tolerance and humaneness which must yet come into international relations if there is to be a future for mankind."

Dr. Bennett was born in Kingston, Ontario, Canada, on July 22, 1902, the son of a Presbyterian minister.

After his family moved to New Jersey he attended Phillips Exeter Academy and Williams College and then went on to graduate work at Oxford University in England.

#### PREFERENCE TO TEACH

He took his bachelor of divinity degree at Union in 1927 (magna cum laude) and 2 years later earned a master's degree in sacred theology (summa cum laude).

An ordained minister of the United Church of Christ, Dr. Bennett immediately eschewed the pulpit in favor of education.

He began his teaching career on the Union Seminary faculty the same year he received his degree.

Three years later he was named assistant professor and then associate professor of Christian theology at Auburn (N.Y.) Theological Seminary. Auburn was later to move to New York as part of Union.

After 8 years at Auburn Dr. Bennett went to the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif., where he was a professor of Christian theology and philosophy of religion.

He returned to Union in 1943 as a professor of Christian theology and ethics. In 1957 he was appointed to the William E. Dodge, Jr., chair of applied Christianity and in 1960 to the professorship of social ethics named in honor of his colleague, the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr.

Dr. Bennett was named dean of the faculty in 1955, a post he held until last summer when he became acting president.

The new president of Union (he will be installed next spring) is the author of eight books, including "Christianity and Communism Today," "Christian Ethics and Social Policy" and "Christians and the State."

Dr. Bennett was married to Anne McGrew, at Auburn, in 1931. They have a daughter, Elizabeth, and two sons, John and William. The Bennetts will continue to live in Knox Hall on the seminary quadrangle.

#### VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to liberalize certain provisions of the law relating to veterans' pensions.

This bill is the result of a vast amount of study undertaken during this, my first year in Congress, stimulated by many conferences and conversations with veterans of World War I. All of its provisions are not limited exclusively, however, to these veterans, but as a practical matter would be of the most advantage to them.

This bill would provide that any veteran who reaches the age of 65 would be considered permanently and totally disabled. It would liberalize the income limitations in the first two brackets of the non-service-connected, totally and permanently disabled, single veteran, and of widows without children. It would increase from \$70 to \$90 the monthly regular aid and attendance benefit to those veterans unable to take care of themselves. It would exclude the income earned by employment of a

World War I veterans' wife in computing the income available to the veteran.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses itself to the most troublesome areas of disagreement in our veteran benefit legislation, and to those areas where there is the greatest demonstrated need. It is a practicable bill and one which I think has a good chance of passage.

Mr. Speaker, through my entire legislative career, both in State government and here, I have always tried to treat all citizens fairly. The charge is made that our pension laws have discriminated against veterans of World War I. This charge is just as vigorously disputed and true comparisons are difficult to make. The universal pension bill which many of the World War I veterans want is entwined in a controversy which does not auger well for success. Many who have signed the discharge petition will not support the bill on the floor and a Presidential veto is a possibility if not a probability.

I am not prepared to say that equity does not demand the passage of the veterans of World War I sponsored bill. But I prefer to get something accomplished for those most in need while there is still time for them to enjoy it rather than giving tacit support to the unattainable and accomplishing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold hearings on this bill early next year. Although the chairman has been subjected to a great deal of criticism, I should like to say that in my opinion, he has proved himself over the years to be a real friend of the veteran. He has been honest and at times, blunt, but always compassionate, understanding, and practicable.

A controversy over one piece of legislation should not prevent us from agreeing on other things that should be done. I hope this bill will make some small contribution toward better and more equitable treatment to those older and more impoverished veterans of World War I for whom we all recognize the need and the justice.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting way to end this session than by wishing you a most happy and blessed birthday tomorrow.

I join in the expressions of congratulations which have been given to you here today and add my own thoughts of esteem and appreciation.

As you celebrate this birthday anniversary, Mr. Speaker, you truly may have a sense of fulfillment for a job well done during the past year.

Our times are trying ones. The work of a Congressman, as we well know, increases with each passing year. Yet none of us carries the awesome burdens

and responsibilities which are yours, Mr. Speaker. Faced with what often must appear to be insurmountable problems, you have fulfilled your office with knowledge and ability.

You have shown skill in the parliamentary rules of this body. You have demonstrated a keen sense of political wisdom. You have given leadership—not just to the fellow members of your party—but to the Congress as a whole, and, therefore, to the Nation.

For your accomplishments, for your diligence in the work of your office, for your guidance of our Nation's affairs, we humbly salute you today.

To your already staggering burdens, an assassin's bullet has added new responsibilities. For now you stand next in line to the succession of our Nation's most lofty position, the Presidency of the United States.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself fully with the remarks of our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. I am completely confident that you could capably and effectively discharge the duties of any of the highest offices of our land.

#### THE 73D BIRTHDAY OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, THE HONORABLE JOHN W. MCCORMACK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has sort of jumped the gun. I have discouraged a lot of Democrats from making advance announcement of the Speaker's birthday. But seriously I am happy that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has noted the imminence of this important occasion. However, I would like to take this time to state that the best birthday present we can give the Speaker is for every Member to be here until we finish the program of the House, and for those who are not here to return. One of the most important measures before the Congress this year is now in conference on the foreign aid appropriation bill. We want to dispose of this matter and dispose of it finally in this session. So I urge all Members to remain here and all Members who are absent to return here. There is no business anywhere more important than the disposition of this bill.

#### THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.



Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have been here in this session of the Congress for almost a year. Many members have expressed their feeling of frustration at the fact that week after week after week we were here with very little legislation of any particular consequence to be considered.

Obviously every Congress wants to complete the work that needs to be completed. I am not saying it is the fault of anyone on the other side of the aisle—but certainly it is not the fault of anyone on our side that the foreign aid appropriation bill has not yet been enacted into law. The fact is that the foreign aid program has been carried on for the past 6 months under a continuing resolution which now extends to January 31 of next year. If the conferees can agree with some expedition on that measure and it can be finally acted upon, that is fine with me. I am going to stay here, I will say to the Majority Leader, but I do not know how many others will. Today 288 Members answered to the quorum call. But I am ready to stay here.

On the other hand, having gone along under a continuing resolution for almost 6 months I cannot see any particular reason why we could not let it go a couple of weeks more, although again I say I am ready to stay here and do whatever needs to be done.

By the same token, I can understand the anxiety of Members who, in good faith have made transportation reservations to go home, and who, in all probability, will not be able to reschedule their arrangements over the weekend because of the circumstances.

I voted on the so-called wheat amendment. I understand, of course, that is considered a matter of great consequence by many people, but I am not particularly interested in staying here to help finance the Russians and the Communists because such an arrangement does not appeal to me.

I thank the Speaker for his indulgence.

#### U.S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WATSON. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the U.S. court of appeals that the Communist Party did not have to register as an instrument of the international Communist conspiracy defies all understanding. The court has apparently chosen to disregard American security interests and the manifest intent of Congress to expose the membership of such subversive organizations.

An ironic aspect of this decision in favor of the Communist Party is that it comes on the heels of the President's assassination by a Communist. This decision is a bitter pill for all patriotic Americans, and we wonder what it will

take to shock the courts into a realization that atheistic communism is a deadly menace to this Nation.

#### "DEPOSITION ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I returned from Brazil a week ago and brought with me a translation of an article written by Mr. F. Do Nascimento Brito and published in the newspaper, *Jornal Do Brasil*, Rio De Janeiro, Sunday, July 7, 1963. It is entitled "Deposition About the Soviet Union," and as I read it on the plane returning to the United States I was reminded of my own trip to the Soviet Union several years ago and the impressions which I gathered and acquired with my own eyes.

This article is the result of Mr. Do Nascimento Brito's experience. It is based on what was seen through Brazilian eyes. His picture of Soviet life has an angle which millions of persons would like to be able to examine: Through the eyes of the man on the street.

In the 8 months preceding his visit, the author devoted himself to a systematic understanding of the books which analyze the Soviet Union, studies of the Communist economy and social organization, examinations of the reality in the light of political doctrines, reports by personalities and writers who know the Communist regime intimately. These studies prepared the journalist to view almost half a century of the Communist regime with critical eyes.

This deposition mirrors the observations of a democratic Brazilian journalist, and I believe them to be of paramount importance, particularly at a time when this Congress is giving more and more attention to our Latin American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the article to be reprinted in its entirety at this point in the Record.

#### DEPOSITION ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION

(By M. F. Nascimento Brito)

From high above the Aeroflot jet offers the arriving visitor to Moscow an extensive view of enormous, empty avenues; of century-old houses and enormous modern residential blocks.

Moscow is not a hospitable city, and the first moments on land are sufficient to reveal and confirm this impression; the army comes aboard and the passports are collected.

The first and most constant presence in the Soviet Union is the uniform. When it is not the militia, it is the armed forces; this is a dramatic picture of a nation which prepares for war but so far speaks of peace.

It was 8 p.m. and still clear on this sun-washed summer evening in Moscow. On the road to the city, after the first encounter with the militia we noticed the fever of construction. Entire neighborhoods were being created to house the Soviet citizen, who dwells badly and lives badly, as we will demonstrate later.

Coexistent with this delirium of construction, on the margin of the route from the airport to the Hotel Ukraine, a huge slum sprawls before the eyes, arousing the curiosity of the visitor. It is the first thing we see.

The new constructions impress one with their quantity, but their quality is not convincing. They are far below the taste and the minimum requirements of a westerner, and this is true not only in Moscow. Leningrad, one of the most beautiful and fascinating cities of Europe, shows the poverty, and it is the same also, I have been told, in the remainder of this agglomeration of Republics united politically under Communist tutelage, but without doubt separated by national characteristics which Marxism-Leninism have not succeeded in destroying.

It is necessary that we explain that these Republics which today form the Soviet Union were too crushed before to permit them later to surge anew with national characteristics, but rather with a culture integrated with communism.

As strong as the presence of the police is the propaganda which makes only one concession: Priority to peace while the nation works for war. The peace propaganda is the happy note which distracts the eyes of Russians and visitors alike from the sadness which impregnates the construction material in the residential blocks; the clothing which covers the people, but which makes the women appear ugly and awkward, without the least feminine vanity, and which sets a pattern of masculine inelegance.

The quality—if one can call what exists there quality—is patternized, and consumption also follows rigid patterns. The public is not given any choice; the visitor confirms and conforms to the daily way of life.

In the stores, in the restaurants, at the spectacles, the state sets the pattern and the people accept it.

And it is only just that we point out the high level of the theatrical spectacles. Symphonic concerts are of impressive quality, but present only Russian composers. The spectacle of the closing of ballet in the Bolshoi Theater is something marvelous and rarely seen. The regional dances, the typical ballets which are exhibited, impress with their beauty, their perfection and their technique.

But there does not exist any option, even in the color of the costumes used, because who decides this is a bureaucrat who lives well, dwells well, and is the owner of an automobile, a privilege which escapes patternization to which everyone is subjected. It is worth noting here the presence of ticket scalpers at the doors of the theaters.

Beginning with his first contacts on the streets of Moscow, the visitor feels the extreme poverty and tension under which the people live, humbly and silently affable.

The inexpressive faces reflect the tension which is not lost in either the work or the patterns of consumption to which all are held prisoner. The high quality of the artistic spectacles does not compensate for the lack of freedom to speak, to meet and to act.

They seek in synthesis that which we classify as downward leveling. They are not a badly educated people, but an uneducated people, uneducated in their manners and their personal behavior.

#### THE STATE AND THE DESTINY

Nobody chooses his destiny. The aptitudes of each one are used by the state, where and how the political directors desire; in the diplomatic life, in a military career, in scientific research, in spacial conquest, in the labor of industry, which is heavy, for peace and for war, which they prepare under the pretension of "defense against imminent attack by the capitalistic countries."

I was the witness to the drama of a father whose son had just completed a course in

foreign languages. He wanted his son to enter a diplomatic career, and the son shared this desire. But I was told by the father, with a certain air of desolation: "It appears that the Government will send him into the army. It does not matter. He can become a military attaché in some embassy."

A student studies, but he does not know what he will become. It is not his father and his brothers who decide his future with him. The final word is that of the state. If he does not care to submit himself to the designated officials, he probably will become a marginal in the Soviet society. If he resists, he becomes a political case and in the Soviet Union a political case is a police case.

Mothers also are required to work to provide the necessities to sustain their home.

During the day they leave their children in the nurseries, first instrument in the preparation of what the state calls "a harmonious man in the Communist society."

Later, when the child becomes an adolescent, it goes to a city of the pioneers, or to primary school. And later enters the middle education, where work becomes obligatory, and thus attains the university level, if he has aptitudes and understandings.

Everyone is obliged to work in the universities. The examination I made in the University of Moscow over the young people who do not want to either work or study, brought the response that they were sent to other parts of the country, where they were obliged to work. Work is obligatory in the Soviet Union, equally for the man as for the woman.

The visitor is surrounded everywhere by groups of closed faces, faces closed and sad. No human communication is transmitted. The silence, trademark of the Russian people, is the legitimate defense of the Soviet citizens who make no effort to break the language barrier with a smile, or those interjections which in any Western country establish a friendly interchange between any two persons.

Any contact with foreigners can signify a summons to the police, for interminable questioning. The climate of suspicion is permanent, and causes each Soviet citizen to conceal a feeling of fear.

Even foreigners learn, in a short time, to look around before they speak. To speak is suspicious in the Soviet Union. Speak carefully, because a strange sensation of government control weighs on everyone.

The presence of the uniformed police reminds the people that the secret police could be at their side in the person of any companion at work, or in any attempt to establish a free conversation.

The records of the secret Russian police provide material to write volumes. The victims of the secret Russian police, according to what I was told there, principally during the regime of Stalin, were estimated in round numbers at 10 million Russians and foreigners. Who does not remember the Moscow purges?

It is this tension which consumes the Russian soul, and perhaps from this is derived the habit of Russian citizens to walk; to walk silently throughout the night in the streets of Old Moscow. It is a terribly beautiful spectacle they present as they pass, women and men, when they are not the militia, shrouded in their heavy capes, walking through the dark alleys of the older part of Moscow. They probably are consuming energies and liberating tensions which are not consumed and liberated in their work, and which are aggravated by the lack of liberty to do as they please.

We saw this frightful picture after we discarded the guide charged with supervising our official program. People who have lived long in Russia took us to see that other Moscow, which does not figure in the routine

of political propaganda. Seeing it is indispensable so that one does not capitulate before the systematic preaching with which they attempt to convince one that there is no lack of liberty and human felicity, and besides, what they have constructed in half a century is justified. It is not. And the proof is the anguish which one sees in the spirit of the Russians. Anguish that is the prime material of political propaganda. From this the Russian citizens make sacrifices to give priority to the national force, which signifies the production of arms instead of better homes; airplanes instead of domestic articles; rockets in place of liberty.

Communist propaganda channels the fear which dwells in the innermost soul of the Soviet citizen into the fear of war, which twice has swept over this sad and suffering people. They dream of peace, but they are paying an excessive price for it.

#### SLEEPWALKING MOSCOW

The people who walk through the Muscovite nights are an authentic page from Dostoevski. It is possible that the Russians walk because they cannot sleep and find the peace of those who work. The nervous tension that accumulates, through the much that they give and the little they receive—only the little to live—impels them to walk, forced to wander aimlessly by the consciousness that they do not enjoy the liberties; by the omnipresent agents of the KGB, the commissioners, the building agents, the ever-possible watching eye even within their own homes—in finale, all the police apparatus and the invisible net of terror which circles even the dignitaries of the regime, because this is the terrible price which must be paid by those who implant terror.

What a violent contrast exists between the barely finished apartments, with their narrow areas, lugubrious and empty of all family happiness, and the luxurious residence which the visitor can view only from afar. In these latter the leaders of communism enjoy the advantages of the dominating class. Along the banks of the Moscow River impenetrable doorways bar access to the Avenue of the Birds. Here the great ones of the regime live. And what a violent contrast we encountered on this avenue, in a small and ancient church located only 600 meters away.

We arrived in the middle of worship by the cult of the Orthodox Russian Church, with its marvelous icons. The beauty of the hymns, the humility of the priest and the poverty of the faithful, old, young people, and children alike.

The people live badly and reside in badly arranged spaces, while the fever of second-class construction continues. Any citizen, head of a family, is subject to accept the arrival of one or more families whom he does not even know to share his little space with those whom the Government selects.

Between this avenue and the slums we have already mentioned—enormous, sprawling, where the women, like the women of Rio de Janeiro carry cans to draw water from the collective outlets—reminded us that there are many scenes like this in underdeveloped lands which would appear impossible in a socialist country. But they exist.

The visitor who wants to see slums in Moscow need only walk around the city a little, without a guide. On the road leading to the city from the airport there are slums. And in many other sections. But one of the largest is found adjoining Sakolkini Park—one sees it and returns without ever learning what name the Communist regime reserves for such a manifestation of underdevelopment.

The regime designed the broad avenues in Moscow with two white lanes; isolated in the center is a strip reserved for the circulation of the Chaikas and Zios, which are used by the owners of the regime.

The only exceptions are ambulances and fire apparatus. Those luxurious automobiles are the owners of the lanes, and the Communist bureaucrats are the only owners of automobiles.

But they are not to be seen, because the curtains are always drawn over the windows. It is not easy for the people of the Soviet Union to see the bureaucrats and dignitaries of the regime.

The ministries are closed, as are all public offices. One can enter them only with a paper which authorizes such entrance. The militia notes the time of entering the gate, as well as the name of the dignitary who is sought and notes the time and collects the pass. This is authentic.

As you can see, the institution of the Chapa Branca (white license plates for official cars) also affects in Russia the same inevitable reactions on the psychology of the bureaucrats, the superior social group in rights and privileges. They alter the dignity of people through servile adulation of chiefs with whom they cannot disagree.

We went to Piridielkino, when, in a new escape from our guide, we decided to pay homage to Pasternak, who is buried there. Another hard and realistic contrast with respect to residence and of the very system of the regime was brought to our attention: The beautiful "datchas," country homes which we read about in Tolstol, show that the Russian rulers patternize the life of the people but reserve for themselves those privileges which mark the degeneracy of the revolution in which so much blood was shed.

Communism has not altered, after almost half a century of political intolerance and suppression of liberty, human nature: The Soviet citizens continue being Russians and are human beings. The bureaucrats pervert themselves in a soft life which fools the political police, between the hardships of ideological exercises practiced in public and private exorcisms and degrading self-criticism.

The collective farm experiment, according to what I was informed, is passing through a serious crisis. Production becomes impossible when the fieldworker becomes a public functionary. The lack of liberty destroys initiative. Only part of the youth, and a reduced minority of fanatics work for the sake of work in that which the propaganda calls "Stakanovism." The people, in the immense majority which includes young men, remain silent or are forced to remain silent. And the leaders accept that silence which is imposed rigorously by the police as consent.

And the day when these people wake up? Hungary woke up, and Poland, also. East Berlin is another example, but for a very short time. The arms produced in the name of a defense invoked against a theoretical attack serve to tyrannize the people.

What threatens the Communist government is not the arms of the West, but the most elementary rights to which the Russians, and all those under domination, aspire, and which are denied them by a bureaucracy armed to the teeth.

The architectural style, which contrasts with the ancient lines, is always monumental. We have the impression that Soviet architecture attempts to impress the man in the street, making him feel small before the state. This would be a form of intimidating him, to frustrate the most profound anxieties for freedom of thought and action.

The monumental line of Soviet architecture, above all that of the Stalinist era which had its own architectural style, can also be seen in the ruins of the architecture of Hitler's national socialism, of the false classicalism of the era of Mussolini, in the dictatorial falsifications of Trujillo—and to a greater or lesser degree, in all those countries



which have been saddened by dictators of the left or of the right.

If the visitor is a journalist, he attempts to learn something about the Soviet press, where it is easy to establish that freedom has absolutely no opportunity other than to bootlick the powerful and injure those who fall into disgrace.

In the Soviet Union you oppose only the dead. A powerful man who is still living is untouchable—and who does not agree with him in his thought is acting like a national enemy. The picture of these powerful ones, who never are seen by the people except at solemn ceremonies, and then only at a great distance, travel in automobiles with drawn curtains. They surround themselves in their palaces with an impenetrable security service.

Speaking of the Soviet press, it is enough to cite the Moscow newspapers.

Two of them are national organizations, and centralize information. The official truth which illuminates the opinions of Moscow feeds the entire country with material for the press.

And it is well to take into account that in the Soviet Union—in the 15 republics which compose it, comprising 220 millions of inhabitants—two state organizations edit Pravda and Izvestia. You can change the name, even on an afternoon paper in Moscow, or in the most distant regions, but the material of all is manipulated, directed, controlled, and distributed through these two organizations.

Pavel Sartiakov, director of Pravda, is a personal friend of Khrushchev, an influential member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party—much more, very much more than Alexei Adjubel, the "globetrotter" director of Izvestia, and son-in-law of Khrushchev. These are the men who control the information and the interpretive distortions in the Soviet Union. I have the impression that Sartiakov is very much stronger than Adjubel.

The Russian people read the news items, the editorials and the articles which these gentlemen permit, or else in a variety of publications in various languages, offered in the different newsstands—but all, without exception in the service of Soviet communism.

From other countries, such publications as *L'Humanité* of France, the Italian *L'Unità*, the English *Daily Worker*, are permitted to circulate.

The Russian man in the street, the man of the people, after all is the one who pays for the existence of this repugnant political system. Dying from overwork, the Russian dares not touch any foreign publication because he knows that he can be denounced, perhaps even inside his own home, for exposing himself to "capitalistic contamination." And for this only, he can be called to a questioning by the police, which many times is only the first step on the road which ends in Lubianka, the famous prison located under one of Moscow's principal squares.

Thousands of vehicles pass this square daily, circling the statue of the sinister Dzerzhinski, the creator of the Soviet police apparatus. They say of Lubianka Prison that its doors open easily for suspects to enter, but rarely open for any of them to depart.

There is only the Soviet radio, which maintains high standards in its musical programs. The Western radio suffers the effects of jamming ordered by the Government.

We went to the Soviet Union after a long and well-organized preparation for the journey, which we intended to put into practice, contrary to those unprepared tourists who fall under the control of Intourist the minute they leave a European capital to walk on Soviet territory. On the contrary, those who are received with those magnificent Chalkas automobiles, with receptionists in the Western style and an irritating manner of at-

tempting to make converts, these see that Moscow which Moscow wants to show them—and they never will discover what the regime is trying to hide.

And Moscow shows proudly a swimming pool for 10,000 persons, broad and modern thoroughfares, a university whose architecture is typical of the Stalin era, the Dynamo Stadium, the city of the movies—seen only from outside, the Palace of the Congress, the theater constructed in the Kremlin in only 1 year and a perfection of skill and comfort, for grand assemblies, the Red Square, of bewitching beauty; the Cathedral of St. Basil and that wall of barbarous beauty—foundation of a Russia which communism has taken over, the Kremlin wall.

The tomb of Lenin is located in Red Square—he who declared that "the revolution is above the truth," justifying the lie as a means to attain an end.

The official visitor, only because of this, passes in front of 2,000 persons who stand silently in a long line every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, to see the body of Lenin, a scene which reminded us of the dead Christ on Good Friday. It is not a religious devotion, it is an exercise of impressive mysticism.

I saw a little boy of 10 years walking in front of me, take off his Georgian beret, and with glassy-eyed mysticism, pay reverence to what was embalmed, something more than a political leader of a triumphant revolution. Today Lenin is the mystic leader of a philosophical thought that cannot be sustained by any reason, but which survives through religious impulse. Lenin is the god of a Russia also without freedom, like that which he destroyed.

The Russian Government denies the people the existence of the spiritual values that are the salvation of humanity, the faith in God, and an eternal destiny of the human soul, and substitutes the spiritual necessity of a divine faith with a political mysticism that cannot last eternally because it is founded on perishable and material values.

The visitor will be accompanied by a guide who is incapable of any conversation beyond what he has been given to say; to see the subway of Moscow, with some of its stations located 250 meters below the surface; with an impressive luxury, with marble walls, and enormous statues to call the attention of Brazilians to something they have suspected for some time, and of which I am now convinced, convinced by my visit to the Soviet Union: Part of the Soviet Union campaign in Brazil is the work of attempting to separate us from the United States, pointing out and accentuating the failings in the relations with Brazil—and they exist—and everything that possibly can be used for this purpose.

Official guests never fail to see one of the Moscow watch factories, where watches are made that can be found in the Western European capitals, and be told that 8,000 persons work in them.

"Do you only manufacture watches?" we asked with an ingenious air.

"No; we also manufacture other precision instruments," was the reply.

"What other instruments?"

"Those that the Government asks us to make."

Half a word is enough for complete understanding.

The visitor only sees two floors, and in his passage from one floor to another, he climbs the stairs because the elevators are for freight only. He finds the entrance completely blocked, with militiamen watching each access to every floor, and workers who come and go showing their identity cards, and all in an uncommon hurry. And the workers do not indulge in that normal movement of heads, which is human and a universal habit when visitors arrive or show feminine curiosity by lifting their eyes to

the visitor. But it is certain that at those workbenches located beyond the production line there are watchers, with production schedules controlling the workers.

After traveling the length of the production line, from the raw material to the final touching-up process, the accompanying manager said, with Communist enthusiasm and Marxist tranquillity, that the Russian system of manufacturing watches is better than that of Switzerland.

We were perplexed, but since we still wanted to learn about Russia, we continued.

We returned to our hotel for our meals, because Moscow is a city where restaurants exist only to serve quick lunches, like a cafeteria, to the working folk. In order for a tourist to frequent such a restaurant, he must possess a card which is furnished by Intourist.

When we asked the reason for the card we were told:

"It is a kind of travelers' check." And nothing more.

Anyone who wants to learn about Russia must strain his brain, he must prepare; it is not enough to ask because the Russians are not always disposed to answer. Generally the guide repeats only that which he was ordered to say. It is useless to attempt to converse with the driver of your car. Besides the language barrier, you never succeed in knowing any of them. During 7 days in the Soviet Union seven different tovarichies drove the automobile which carried us around.

The visitor who expects to receive benefits from his invitation should not fail to visit the Kremlin, the assembly of chapels which compose the interior of the medieval citadel which is the heart of Moscow.

And we continued to discover marvelous icons, some of them deprived of the precious stones which had been encrusted on them, a lack which was not clearly explained to us. It is possible that these precious stones will be restored, because at the moment Russia is in an enthusiastic fever of restoration of monuments and artistic and historic things.

We visited several of the Kremlin chapels. There is, however, one door prohibited to visitors. This is to the seat of the Government of the U.S.S.R. The guide pointed out, with national pride, that Khrushchev worked behind a certain window. We were at least 70 meters away from that window, but the presence of militiamen was most intense.

What beautiful churches and chapels we saw in the Soviet Union, all with Byzantine towers making a strange and fascinating effect. And one of the most beautiful views we have ever seen is the spectacle of those towers against the gray background of a Muscovite night.

We went to one of those Moscow churches to watch the religious ceremony, where the people worship freely. Not even Communist propaganda and brutality can suffocate the religious spirit. The religious cult overcomes part of the sadness of a people who are submitted to a pitiless process of oppression. It is the sorrowfully beautiful hymns of this cult that is revealed the humility of a people who seek on the road of their faith the redemption of a brutalized destiny.

We visited the Leningrad cemetery, where 600,000 inhabitants of this city are interred, and who were killed in the 900 days of the battles with Hitler's army.

But it also was necessary that we visit diplomatic friends in Moscow, because it is not possible to go there and not meet old friends, in a visit which joins Brazilians in a cult of homesickness.

We sought a telephone book to learn the number of the Brazilian Embassy, and to our surprise discovered there are no telephone books in Moscow. It is necessary to ask the telephone operator for information, and for this we had recourse to an interpreter who, with speed and efficiency, put us in contact with the Embassy.

In Moscow a group of the elite of our Foreign Ministry, led by the extraordinary figure of the diplomat that is Vasco Leitão da Cunha, with his entire life dedicated to the international affairs of Brazil, working and studying day and night.

When we were still in Brazil and preparing for our visit to Russia, we heard unacceptable comments about Vasco Leitão da Cunha.

I was told that he is not suited to the Embassy in the U.S.S.R. because he is not understanding. And why not? Because he is intelligent, experienced, and prepared? Because he does not live in puerile preconceptions?

Our diplomats live in Moscow without enjoying the liberties which are granted here to the Soviet diplomats. You must know that the Soviet Ambassador in Brazil can, whenever and wherever he wants, meet with Luis Carlos Prestes to give him instructions, bawl him out for talking too much, and receive information—and even berate him for erroneous information sent to Moscow by Brazilian Communists.

We consider necessary, and even indispensable, diplomatic relations between Brazil and the Soviet Union. Our Ambassador in Moscow is important, even from the viewpoint of national security, because we must not fail to know, for example, how the interpretations sent from here by the representatives of the Kremlin circulate there.

We continue to accept the hypothesis of commercial relations with the U.S.S.R. although today we have sufficient valid facts so that we do not believe in them as we believed before, accrediting for various reasons that are not pertinent at the moment. But we understand that reciprocity of treatment is indispensable, and the reciprocity that we ask fits very well in the Communist regime, which has refused to concede it because of a strange love for a privilege which is not founded in Marxism.

And it fits well into the Brazilian democracy, because democracy does not presuppose the disuse of these elements necessary to guarantee its intangibility.

And how do the Brazilian diplomats live in Moscow?

It is necessary to know that with the exception of the Ambassador, all the personnel of our diplomatic representation reside in the so-called ghettos, gigantic residential structure of the category reserved for the residence of diplomats, with militiamen at the doors noting punctually every departure and every arrival.

The social intercourse between the personnel of the diplomatic corps does not figure in the social columns, but in the police registers. For this reason when they wish to converse they take a ride in an automobile. No one has confidence, no one trusts anyone. Wherever there is a wall, there could be, who knows a hidden microphone. There are incredible stories about microphones and this permanent vigilance of foreigners and diplomats.

I received from one diplomat who resides in the Hotel National the complaint that he cannot open the windows of his room on days when there is a parade or other ceremony in Red Square. The police will not permit it.

Vigilance over diplomats was accentuated in a peculiar way after the Penkowski case. The press, in suspicious editorials, called upon the Russian people to keep away from foreigners. In order for a Brazilian member of the diplomatic corps to travel more than 40 kilometers, counting from kilometer 0 in Red Square, he is obliged to communicate his desire 48 hours in advance. And he is obliged to tell where he will go, where he will stop for luncheon or dinner, where he will sleep.

During the entire trip he is watched by militiamen with their motorcycles, automobiles, and telephone patrol posts. And

this does not include the role played by the secret police which, as is obvious, is invisible.

Can it be that here in Brazil we are conceding this reciprocity, as was established in the protocol of the reestablishment of relations? There is very little that we can do.

It is necessary that we know that the United Kingdom Embassy in Moscow has an entire wing of its building devoted only to researchers and analysts of Soviet life. Political, economic, and social facts are analyzed to establish an understanding of Soviet reality.

The U.S. Government, we know, offered Brazil an opportunity to send Brazilian diplomats chosen to serve in Moscow to a high course of Russian studies at Harvard University. The response was that while the offer was interesting, politically perhaps this was not the proper time. They train U.S. diplomats for Russian service in 9 months—and the Russian is not easy to know and understand. He is fascinating and complex material.

In all the ministries of foreign affairs in the big countries of the West we find men specially equipped in the study of Russia and East Europe. It is not easy to be the representative of a foreign country in Russia, and modern diplomacy has as one of its fundamentals the role of channeling exact understanding of the foreign country.

We must know the Soviet Union better. We think we know it, but the truth is that we know nothing, or very little of what is happening there. Generally our information is deformed.

There still must be established a Brazilian insight, built by our people prepared for the job, about the Soviet Union. We are convinced that even the criticisms of us have the wrong address.

When they talk about Fidel Castro, the Russians always use the term "liberator." They invoke the legend of Simon Bolivar, and present him as the man who is constructing Cuba's greatness. We listen and understand that this is just one more of the usual Communist heresies.

And they say this without realizing the enormity of what they are saying, but with the intention of attacking the North American social organization, about which they immediately begin to speak but which is completely unknown to them.

They do not know, because they are not permitted to know, that it is one of the most advanced and socialized societies in the world. They cannot free themselves of prejudice to perceive that the American society offers the human creature the highest rights. It is in the United States where everyone has an equal opportunity, and not in the U.S.S.R., where almost everyone is barred from any opportunity—almost all, except the career men and the bureaucrats who constitute the new class.

We were advised to take the least possible amount of clothing on our weekend visit to Leningrad.

In Moscow, all railroad destinations are distributed in nine huge stations. One of the best trains in which I have ever traveled carried us in 8½ hours to Leningrad. There was no luxury, but there is comfort on the best Soviet trains.

The conductorettes (there are no conductors) make the journey pleasant with eager solicitude, and offered us tea to compensate for the absence of a dining car.

Punctuality is held to the second with Soviet trains, and from Moscow to Leningrad, over the famous Route of the Czar, the train reached a high velocity.

We knew, through Brazilian friends who had been in Moscow previously, and by tricking the guide we visited another Moscow station where trains brought in the rural population. The spectacle was diametrically opposed, especially at night, which was the time we visited it.

The rural Russian still lives in the czarist past in his manner of dressing and his standard of living. He appears to be a page from an old romance. We saw entire families of poor countryfolk sleeping on the floor of the station huddled together to escape the night chill of a Moscow summer, piling at their sides the sacks containing the vegetables they would take to the Moscow market in the morning.

This is one of the pungent pictures of the low living standard, of misery migrating for work. Seeing this reminded me of Brazil, and there occurred to me, for some reason or other, the picture of the migrating northeasterners on the trains crossing the Brazilian backlands, and I also do not know why, but I recalled that the Soviet regime soon will celebrate half a century of existence.

What is happening in the Soviet backlands, where an agrarian reform whose high price we all know is being carried out? Looking at this station, which is the arrival and departure point for Russians of the interior, brought me the picture of a problem that I must say has not been solved.

It appears that communism seeks urgently for a revision in the farmlands, and there are those who now speak about formulas that are not entirely in accord with the principles of the revolution.

We were received at the Leningrad station by a representative of the Journalism Union of that city, going directly to the hotel, a building in ancient style. It is of the time of the czars. And in Leningrad, the pleasing capital of Russia of the czars, the visitor can see and hear one of the best symphonic orchestras of the world. He can see also, if he likes, a theatrical spectacle produced with the best technique.

The Leningrad Ballet, also world famous, has several Brazilians attending its courses.

The fascinating beauty of Leningrad, cut by the Niev River and its tributaries, was 366 bridges, leaves the visitor in a world of dreams.

The hotel, like all the other, is proletarianized, that is to say that the minimum essential services do not exist with the desired rapidity and service.

We visited the Winter Palace, today transformed into one of the largest museums in the world. An infinity of galleries hold precious exhibits, and we were surprised to encounter one of the good collections of Picasso, an excellent collection of impressionist art.

And we were surprised to learn what there is in the way of Soviet art. We could see that it obeys the rigid patterns that subordinate esthetic concepts to the political, like all the other artistic and intellectual manifestations in Russia. Communist Russian art has two themes: the suffering of the people and the popular activity in the struggle which is called liberation, or what they think it is. Abstract art is prohibited. The Marxist theories attribute to it the power of dividing the Communist society. The manifestations of the intelligence deny the power to create freely.

Through special permission, we were permitted to visit the Treasury, a marvelous collection of jewels which belonged to the imperial Romanoff family.

We also were taken to the Fortress of Peter and Paul, with its countless cells reminding one of the phase of terror which is one of the chapters of Russian history. We were told tales of episodes of horror registered during the epoch of the czar, in a sequence which well reflects the telluric evolution of a sad people who, over a long period of time and for different pretexts, saw their fundamental rights violated.

If we had lived in the epoch of the czars, we would have been just as much opposed to the oppression which smothered the Russian people then as we are today to the society



which pretends to be Communist and devoted to equality, but which overthrew in the name of the people a regime of violence only to supplant it with a despotic system. What was accomplished was merely the ascension of a new class which, to maintain itself, also uses terror and violence.

While the great majority of the people live in stolid submission, the bureaucrats enjoy a sweet life. Only a Fellini is missing in the Soviet Union, but Fellini was possible only in Italy, a democracy.

The motion picture is an art, and because of this fact, is subjected in the U.S.S.R. to the control of the Communist Party. And without liberty there can be no art.

The new class lives far removed from the people, far from its problems. Any Western citizen, who retains a minimum of liberty to criticize a country where he is the guest of the government, cannot fail to feel a profound repugnance for the contrast between the life which separates the people from the directors, and for the oppression which maintains the equilibrium of social injustice.

At night—those beautiful white nights of which Dostoevski speaks—principally on Saturday nights, there is dancing in the ballrooms of the hotels. Dancing to the sound of old rhumbas, which are just becoming known in the Soviet Union in a wave of splendor. It reminded me of Garcia Lorca, who said in a marvelous verse: "Oh, Cuba, rhythm of dried seeds."

The rhumbas fill the salons of the hotel with the sound of dried seeds on Saturday night. But the rhumba is not there to honor Lorca, because the influential figure is Fidel Castro.

#### SCHOOL OF DICTATORS

We conversed with the director of the Tass Agency in Leningrad.

He said little about the U.S.S.R. and wanted to hear about Brazil. Then he began to talk.

From that point on, I do not know why, whenever we passed the house where Raspoutine was assassinated and his body thrown into a tributary of the Niev River, I remembered always this strange director of Tass, the official news agency.

In Petergoff—the old residence of the czars—on a sunny Sunday morning I witnessed the solemn ceremony of opening the fountains which had just been restored. This is a spectacle out of the best school of dictators. We saw similar things in Santo Domingo, during the era of Trujillo. Through books and the movies, we know that it was the same in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.

The armed forces, youth and unions, these are the basic elements for a perfect scene, with flags and militia on all sides. And the people gathered en masse. It reminded me of Charles Chaplin, in the beginning of "Modern Times"—the masses, the sheep.

The speech of the mayor, which the interpreter translated, and who said, with the greatest tranquillity, that the Communist regime had made that recreation center possible. He also said that the parks were open, but he did not add that the residences, with the exception of one, continued closed, with police dogs guarding the doors.

The police dogs made me think of that strange Russian habit, which is repeated in different places and under different circumstances: This was the third time I had seen police dogs guarding places where the public was not admitted.

Petergoff had been laid waste by the Nazi army, but now has been completely reconstructed.

We were "liberated" one night for 4 hours. The generosity was not intentional. That way, we were told, we would have time to write an article for which *Izvestia* has asked, and which we were constantly being pres-

sured to complete, by the Journalists Union representative who accompanied us.

He used all kinds of arguments, at every opportunity, to induce me to write the article. He even became puerile once. To convince me he said that "Khrushchev will read it," and that this represented "an immense honor" for me.

No one can imagine the enormous interest that an article written by the director of a Brazilian newspaper about Brazilian affairs can hold for the Russian reader. We can speak freely about theatrical pieces, about political matters, in fact about anything Brazilian. We know, perhaps, about Brazilian literature which the Russian people like so much. Later, on a visit to a publisher of foreign books in Moscow, we discovered that the only Brazilian books available to the people are those of the admirable Jorge Amado, and a few others written by those of our authors with Communist leanings.

In the end, all other arguments failing to convince me I should write the article, the Journalists Union representative decided to use what appear to him decisive: "You will receive 50 rubles for the article."

I promised that I would consider his proposal. And without giving any more thought to the matter, I went to my bedroom where I could enjoy the sleep that would restore my forces. That same night I took the train to return to Moscow to complete the remaining portion of my program.

The following day in Moscow, I faced the same questions: "Where is the article?"

So I decided to end this ill-mannered joke. I said that I never would write it, and above all, I never would write it for any sum in kopeks, much less for 50 rubles which was half the minimum wage in the Soviet Union.

They still insisted: Continue thinking and who knows if inspiration would not strike me—it could be about anything Brazilian.

But now they added another note: It could be about Brazilian political personalities, such as, for example, Luis Carlos Prestes, Leonel Brizola, Francisco Juliao, and others. Passing all limits, it was an open provocation.

I asked them if it could be about Carlos Lacerda. The response was total silence.

The automobile continued to roll.

A little later, on a visit to the director of Pravda, I was questioned about the eventual political leadership of Carlos Lacerda.

#### MEDITATION ON THE RETURN

That Monday afternoon in Moscow they handed me the return tickets, already certified by the airline. I put them in my pocket with the sensation that they were well-needed—the very precious return to the Western World.

And this is the sensation that is being refused by the Soviet Government to more than 800 Brazilians, in their majority native-born or naturalized, who left Brazil tricked by Russian propaganda and who are regretting it there, many of them since the very day of their arrival. Many of them pleaded dramatically, in letters or knocking on the door of the Brazilian Embassy, that our Brazilian diplomatic representatives in Moscow obtain from Brazil a pardon for the terrible error they committed.

And the diplomats pound on the doors of the Russian Foreign Ministry, where functionaries, instead of treating the liberation of these Brazilians who do not want to continue living in Russia, say that the presence of "John Doe" in Moscow is illegal because the right of free travel within the country is prohibited. Or they say, as has occurred, that "Mrs. Jane Doe," native-born Brazilian, can return to Brazil but must leave her husband and children in Russia.

Up to now only 40 or 50 of the most fortunate have succeeded in returning.

They live under the greatest of difficulties, because the Russian Government knows they

want to return and refuses them employment. They live on odd jobs and the hope that the Brazilian people will be capable of forcing the Government to discuss the matter with the Kremlin, to overcome the political sophisms which prison them in Soviet territory.

There is no Marxist principle of philosophy capable of justifying the brutality of this treatment. For those Brazilians it is inconceivable that any foreigner in our country could be prevented from returning to his own country, as is well known.

This is one of the points most difficult to understand, if not impossible. The principles of international law, it is alleged, are not applied to the right to travel.

We are discussing, in simple terms, Brazilians who want to return to Brazil. Brazil, through its embassy in Moscow, has already taken all the measures of bureaucratic procedure. Why cannot these men, women, and children return to their own country, and why does not the Brazilian Government act in a political manner, if that is necessary?

Why, after all, should the Brazilian Government conceal the situation from public opinion? Why not demand from the Soviet Government an action which is only a sign of respect for the elemental right of Brazilian citizens?

And nothing, none of this, can be taken to affect the Russian-Brazilian diplomatic relations.

Only for argument's sake, let us suppose that this situation existed in one of the Western countries, let us say, the United States—or any other. In all certainty we would see an hysterical chorus resounding throughout our country. What a clamor our Communists would raise, stirring up the incautious masses, if instead of the U.S.S.R. it was any democratic country which prevented the return of 800 Brazilians to Brazil.

Would the CGT have announced a general strike, the National Students Union smash streetcars, if we still had them, if our people received the information that a station wagon of the Brazilian Embassy, imported from Germany and which went to the U.S.S.R. by way of Finland, had been intercepted by the militia between Leningrad and Moscow because it was late in passing one of the highway control points due to a mechanical breakdown?

Would there not be a mob hurling stones at embassies to heal the wounded national sovereignty if instead of choosing Russia the 800 Brazilians had selected the United States, England, France or Italy?

Now is the time to remember that the principal objectives of Communist propaganda, which plays the game of Soviet interests and not Brazilian, is to separate us as much as possible from the Western countries, traditional friends and allies, through cases of friction which can easily be inflamed.

#### TIME TO SPEAK CLEARLY

This is the time to declare that the Brazilian economic life still has not fallen into collapse, because we have credit which is justified more by friendship than by financial motives, because we have long since passed the limits. Friendly countries and allies still believe in Brazil, and offer us ways through which we can recuperate time and delinquencies, and to pay later.

Our word still holds value because they believe in us. And they have confidence because they know that, by natural propensity and historical formation, we are a people identified with the freedoms and democracy. They give us the right to live and to decide what is best for us.

It is time, also, to explain that the Soviet Embassy in Paris has a press attaché for France and Latin America. It is not difficult to suppose that the Russian Ambassador in France is closer to Brazilian interests than the Brazilian Ambassador in France. But

that is another story, one which must await a better opportunity.

We arrived at the end of our stay in the Soviet Union.

It was early on a beautiful Russian morning when we went to the airport. We saw several slums marking the socialist passage along the road. The heart aches on leaving a country inhabited by such a marvelous people.

The delightful beauties which the Russian past has left in the hands of the Soviets made us think about the strange destiny of this people, who suffered under czarist oppression and, thinking they were on the road to liberty, surrendered themselves to an even greater oppression. We were filled with emotion.

While passing time at the airport we listened to a Russian citizen who spoke reasonably good English. Looking at the planes he said: "I know what you are thinking. It is a terrible oppression." I looked at him and invited him to come to my country, if he could obtain permission to leave Soviet Russia. I told him that here one could be against the government, in favor of the government, express freely what one thought, be a Democrat, be a rightist and, if one wanted, even continue to be a Communist.

On the plane I began to perceive the unfolding of all that I had seen and heard. The isolation in which those people live assailed me. I had an overall understanding of the enormous significance of the Berlin Wall, and those 1,800 kilometers of barbed wire which separate the Soviet zone of Germany from the rest of the world. These thoughts began to assemble themselves in broad lines of reasoning while we still flew over Soviet territory.

I felt sufficiently ripened to judge the suffering of the extraordinary Russian people, after having seen them close up, having seen their greatness and felt the political misery of the Communist regime to which they are submitted.

Imagine what a castigation it would be for Brazil if one day, through emotion and the lack of information, there came about such a fatal situation as that which has fallen on the Russians.

I struck a balance: When I left Brazil I was filled with a sincere desire to identify the hopes which a flood of literature feeds in younger people, and in those in whom age has not destroyed their aspirations for a better world. I came disarmed, without preconceptions. In the 8 months preceding my visit I read extensively and prepared myself sufficiently so that I could arrive in the Soviet Union knowing that I was not going to encounter any paradise.

All the declarations, newspaper reports, documents, articles, literature and interviews which had the U.S.S.R. as their subject had prepared me to investigate profoundly in the search for answers which I could see with my own eyes. I wanted to confirm things for myself, with my own eyes.

I returned with clarified thoughts, freely clarified. The people are admirable, but the regime is condemned.

Communism, as the expression of a society which does not know freedom, is only a label; a package which still misleads but cannot continue to do so for long.

It has made the people literate, given them scientific victories, turned the Soviet Union into a first-class military power, lifted its science into space, but on the other side of the medal there is so much effort, so much sacrifice in vain.

The fruits of labor are not within the reach of the people. Peace is a camouflage for the superforce for war. The fear of the people makes the Soviet leaders invoke the peril of a foreign aggression for those who work, not to improve the life, but only to

arm. The Government is against most ardent desires for liberty.

#### HAPPINESS RESTORED

A little while after we had passed Riga the hostess of the Soviet plane, beautiful Moyaravskaya, announced that we had just crossed the frontier. We were flying over Scandinavia. I thought about Smetanya, a beautiful child of Piridiekin, who in the innocence of her 4 or 5 years, perhaps is destined to never become anything more than that to which she is confined by the lack of liberty.

I became aware of cheerful movement behind me. I turned and saw a group of tourists who, without thinking, had become expansive and unreserved with each other. It appeared to me that every one had returned to himself.

I realized that the emotional contrast gave me an accumulation of responsibilities to the public opinion of my country. The destiny of Brazil was presented to me as a challenge to interpretation.

The moment had arrived to speak clearly about things, without omissions and without fear of telling the truth.

We are a people who have arrived at economic development, social and political progress, several decades late.

On one side we have a traditional structure submitted to a process of growth and increased value. The molds are ready for the work we must perform. The world in which we live is divided on the ideological level, and on the material level. Democracy and communism confront each other in every manner. In Brazil we discuss day and night; we divide because of others who have nothing to do with our history.

The demographic explosion of Brazil has surpassed the rhythm of development in the country. Almost 3 million persons are born annually, and there are not enough schools to guarantee all of them the minimum, which is society's obligation: access to the A, B, C's. And the greater part of every group which succeeds in learning to read and write cannot continue its studies. We have not succeeded in routing the young to a democratic political consciousness in our system of education.

The aggravation of the national crisis, multiplying the difficulties, offers opportunities for the marginals of politics. The level of debate is lowered, and is dominated by those least capable and on an emotional level. Those who are speaking are those who have nothing constructive to offer, and nothing to say about the real problems of the country. What kind of an example is this to place before the eyes of Brazilian youth?

Twenty years later, there are arriving in Brazil ideas which were old in Europe a hundred years ago. Nobody is deluded in Europe by the promises which fill the mouths of the Communists. Here even the opportunists, the unscrupulous in their ambitions, the adventurers, gather on the left to fool millions.

There are books which speak of a Soviet Union which exists only in the propaganda magazines. The proof of this is within the reach of everyone.

The life of the Soviet citizens is worse than ours, and is aggravated by the absence of rights and freedoms. I am certain that the Communist regime could not continue in Brazil, even if its implantation were possible by a coup of force. It is contrary to the very soul of the Brazilian people.

It is not with this that I am preoccupied, principally. It is the breakdown of authority, the national dispersal, slow and inexorable, which is being brought about in a calculated manner.

We are watching a political retreat. Nobody studies. Nobody worries about anything. Nobody is nobody.

There are few who are disposed to confront honestly, rationally, without passion, the task of clarifying public opinion.

The people are weary of political discussions which are sterile, seeking only personal advantages. They are fed up with hearing explanations by those interested in confusing the facts. The danger that surrounds Brazil is the imprisoning which we are watching, and which does not leave a place for the judgment of those who know how to evaluate the liberties and not accept any material price in exchange for a much more valuable patrimony.

It is necessary to not have fear to tell the truth about Soviet Russia. It is difficult, but we need to be democratic, and repudiate the dilemma in which an attempt is being made to place Brazilian society. The option that is forced on us does not correspond to any Brazilian necessity, but on the contrary, serves only the interests of those who are not legitimately national.

I have in my mind the conviction that Brazil can only be lost through the omissions of her best men. Heads of families, factory workers, public men, women, youth, the clergy, military men and the middle class—all maintain confidence in democracy.

Debates are not the evil of Brazil, because they only represent a sign that those responsible for the national life are not equal to the Brazilian reality. But having debates strengthens liberty.

Brazil, we are certain, never will be an experimental camp for a socially unhappy experience such as I have just finished observing and where an admirable people live under a sinister social order. It is necessary to explain to the Brazilian people, because only by explanation and clarification, can the Brazilian people make the desired decision.

The plane prepared to descend in a city where we all would feel like human beings. We flew in the midst of heavy clouds and fog, but we knew that it was a Western city, with the characteristics of life totally different from those we had seen in the Soviet Union, and which made the Russian citizens nothing more than human ghosts.

And suddenly there came to my mind a phrase which I had read in the autobiography of the poet Jevtuchenko:

"I know that these men have an alibi that must have been invented by one of their brothers: silence is gold. And I reply to them: This gold cannot be pure; this silence is not authentic."

#### IN THE UNITED STATES WE ARE STILL FREEMEN

Mr. RUMSFELD. 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. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as the year nears its close, we might pause to reflect on the fact that we are still freemen. We should stop to consider as we hurry to purchase the last gift, as we read our newspaper, as we discuss politics, as we gather with family and friends, and as we worship, that we are exercising the right to choose. To secure this right, Americans have sacrificed their lives since 1776, from Lexington and Concord to the jungles of Vietnam.

During this long session, we have been privileged to participate in the deliberations of our national legislature; to



speak and vote as freely elected Representatives on matters affecting our country. From this vantage point, I am made acutely aware of the genius of those who conceived our system of free government; a structure which has endured world and civil conflict, depression, and, most recently, grief and outrage at the deed of one who in his perverted arrogance would take the life of our President.

But I am made aware, as well, of the agonizing responsibility and burden which the preservation of these freedoms puts on each of us. As the Congress strives to find responsible and workable solutions to vast and complex domestic and international problems, I am convinced that there are no simple answers. I doubt that my generation will witness the coming of a new year when it can say, "The task of protecting freedom is done." For as the ashes of nazism still smoldered, there emerged communism; and like as not, there will appear other forces to threaten our sacred institutions.

The Declaration of Independence proclaims that the equality of men and the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are self-evident. It does not declare that they are self-enduring. As we enjoy the bounty of this holiday season, I urge that we all give special thanks for our freedom. May all of us resolve that in the coming year we will willingly undertake to pay the heavy price that this great privilege demands; that we shall not lag or despair if the way is hard; and that by our own actions, we will seek to further the causes of peace, good will among men and human dignity, which are the central themes of this season.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, December 19, I was necessarily absent. As a result I was not recorded on rollcall No. 248. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

#### NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTIONS FOR NEW ENGLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New England, as you well know, has contributed much to our Nation. It is not my intention to detail these many notable contributions; it is not necessary. The pages of our Nation's history have been written and tell the tale. Nor will I dwell at this time on the continuing contributions to our Nation being made by New England, for surely, all well-informed citizens are aware of them. But, Mr. Speaker, as we now approach adjournment, it seems appropriate to remind this House that New England is not being as fairly treated as it should be by the Nation for which it has done much.

Residual oil quotas impose on our heating costs an unfair burden approximating \$30 million yearly which our economy can ill afford. A decree of decapitation by the CAB that will take 83 percent of its air-passenger-miles from Northeast Airlines threatens to kill off our only airline and reduce us to colonial status in the air age. Our Government's unkept promises to provide our wool industry the same protection already given to cotton jeopardize the jobs of thousands of New England workers.

I have discussed these matters before, Mr. Speaker. It should be emphasized that we are not asking for handouts or subsidies. We ask only for equal treatment and fairplay.

And now comes word of a dire threat to New England's agriculture. Due to rate differentials, feed grains are being shipped to our competitors in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia at lower rail rates than to New England. This situation, unless corrected, will sound the death knell of our poultry industry. The threat to our dairy industry is equally grave.

Mr. Speaker, how long must New England suffer thus at the hands of its own Government. This is not a partisan matter. Both of our great political parties have proud histories for righting wrongs and treating all States and regions and sections and citizens of our great Nation with fair and equal regard. This is not a plea for subsidy or special treatment. The plea is for equality and fairness and that promises be kept.

It seems to me as we approach the new year, that among the resolutions that should be made, high on the list should be a resolve to assure to New England equal and fair treatment. Not only should the new year find New England free of crippling residual oil embargoes, it should also find the promises of the administration to the wool industry fulfilled, and the restoration to Northeast Airlines of its southern routes. And surely, New England's agriculture should be permitted to compete fairly with other parts of the country by enjoying equalized rates for grain shipments to our farms.

#### REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FUND PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. LAIRD. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader discuss the possibility of getting out of here this afternoon.

I think the action, or perhaps I should say inaction, of the White House has raised some questions as to whether we will be able to get out of here this week or not. I refer particularly to the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which was made to

the Bureau of the Budget to fund Public Law 874 in the amount of \$216 million and \$31 million to fund the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Both of these requests were placed before the Bureau of the Budget by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and were approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The White House decided that it would not submit requests for any assistance to schools in federally impacted areas or any money for the student loan program. The Senate, however, is presently acting on the supplemental appropriation bill, House Joint Resolution 875. The Senate is taking action to add the funds for schools in federally impacted areas to this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, we here in the House of Representatives should insist that the executive branch submit requests for funding this program or we should not consider it. If, when this bill comes over from the Senate, there still is no request from the White House for this funding, this bill will be objected to and the whole bill will be in serious jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, with all the publicity and ceremonies that went on when the authorizing bill was signed, with the support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, it must be to show some sort of false economy that the White House refuses to submit a request for funding these programs which were signed into law just a few days ago. It is either that, or the White House has reason to question the need for the amount of funds the Department requested.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of printed public record that the Department's request for these funds had been studied and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that they were on the President's desk before he signed the authorization bill so that, if he saw fit to do so, he could sign the request for funds immediately after he signed the authorization bill. I cannot understand the attitude of the White House in rejecting the request of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There must be an error in the estimate or else the White House is trying to make a show of economy and make us look like big spenders. If it is the first, we should hold hearings and find out what is really needed before we act on this bill. If it is the second, I am not about to be an accomplice.

#### THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL 1964

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I might say that those of us on this side of the aisle are as anxious to complete the work of this session as anyone in this body.

I might also say that it is not unusual for the majority to feel that the appropriations for a given year should be concluded before the Congress adjourns and goes home, even if it means that some of us—and in this case it means all of us—are inconvenienced.

Mr. Speaker, my family has gone home, like the families of many of the rest of the Members. But, our obligations are here, regardless of whether some in this body and elsewhere may have been dilatory.

Let me say further, Mr. Speaker, in direct response to a statement made by my good friend, the distinguished minority leader. Mr. Speaker, there is not one penny in this bill which would finance any of the groups he mentioned. I ask the Members of the House to find it and point it out. The bill is available to any of the Members who want to see it.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, if the Members will read carefully the language as offered by the gentleman the other day in his motion to recommit, it constitutes as I understand it a limitation on the Export-Import Bank and this bill does not appropriate for the Export-Import Bank.

In addition under the continuing resolution there is no limitation whatsoever in the Export-Import Bank or any other Government agency.

This is a matter of considerable disagreement. The other body by bipartisan votes on two occasions has rejected this proposal, so it is a proper matter for the conference to work out and bring in a constructive solution.

I want to set the record straight.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with hearings scheduled for civil rights legislation at the beginning of the next session, I trust that we will also consider pending legislation for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. As free men we are morally obligated not only to improve the conditions of freedom in our own midst but also to extend the hope of such conditions to the millions in Europe, Asia, and Cuba, who are deprived of both civil rights and national freedom and independence.

#### THE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Several pointed questions have been raised about the measures calling for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. They will be repeated time and time again until satisfactory answers are obtained. Why have not hearings been scheduled for the 40 resolutions submitted to create this special committee?

Why has not the majority of sentiment in the Rules Committee been satisfied to see this legislation through? What could be Secretary Rusk's opposition to the formation of this committee today? That the Russian Dictator Khrushchev wouldn't like it? What has happened to the so-called captive nations' studies undertaken by a subcommittee of one of our standing committees? As was predicted, its show in 1962 was only a maneuver to discourage formation of a special committee. How much longer will we continue to ignore the popular demand for a special committee, as was so widely expressed during the fifth Captive Nations Week observance last July.

#### THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. Speaker, in July 1964 the American people will be observing the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. The months-long preparations for this anniversary will highlight the need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As we prepare to pursue civil rights for our domestic scene, it is obligatory for us to also pursue the ways and means of free existence for all the captive nations.

Much has been written and said about the 1963 Captive Nations Week. Its story seems to be endless. However, supplementing the heavy evidence already given, I request that the following items be published as part of my remarks: First, additional news reports of the week; second, the Los Angeles program of the week; third, the Boston Globe editorial, "Lest We Forget", fourth, the Boston program release; and, fifth, a letter to the Standard-Times editor:

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1963 IN UNITED STATES PRESS

North Carolina Catholic: article entitled, "Red Web Around the World".

"Nikita Khrushchev is succeeding in establishing an iron chain of political, economic, and industrial-interlock from the Russian oil fields to East Berlin that is making a single complex of these nations. What is even more poignant is that we need to ask ourselves if Americans have not done and are not doing much to strengthen this Soviet power. . . .

"We Americans can ask ourselves: What is our Nation actually doing to help these captive peoples? When will we throw off the indifference that has marked our course since the end of World War II, when we acquiesced in Soviet rule over these countries."

Columbia (S.C.) State Record: Editorial entitled "Free Choice": "Captive Nations Week is upon us again—aimed once more at reminding peoples behind communism's curtain that the free world has not forgotten them."

The Shreveport (La.) Times: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"The great Hungarian revolution of 1956, however, was a great embarrassment to the Eisenhower administration which had openly called for revolt in the Communist captive nations."

"The Kennedy administration has moved to avoid any such 'embarrassment' by flatly making it a policy matter to discourage any freedom rebellion against Communist rule. In fact, even the U.S. broadcasts beamed into Iron Curtain countries have been sharply reduced."

"It is no wonder then that President Kennedy was willing to dismiss the captive nations with a perfunctory message devoid of even his usual flashes of spirited oratory. Washington has simply written off the Com-

munist captive nations. Such is the spirit, sad to say, of the United States in the sixties."

Santa Monica (Calif.) Outlook: Editorial entitled "They Haven't Got the Word":

"It seems our Washington policymakers have been so anxious to get a nuclear test ban treaty, and otherwise 'exploit' (as they think) the ideological quarrel between Moscow and Red China, that they have not wanted to annoy Nikita Khrushchev by any reminder of Russia's broken promises to hold free elections in the occupied countries. When President Kennedy recently issued the annual proclamation of 'Captive Nations Week,' he left out any reference to Soviet Russia. He deliberately refrained from using the greatest propaganda we have against Soviet Russia."

"Are we going to deprive ourselves of this great propaganda and moral weapon as the price of a worthless agreement to ban nuclear testing?"

McAllen (Tex.) Valley Monitor: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "It might be well to remind Brother Kennedy in Washington that while he is thinking of freedom for the Africans, he might give a thought to freedom for the Hungarians, the Latvians, and perhaps even the Cubans."

Woonsocket (S. Dak.) Artesian Commonwealth: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week and Recognition of Red Hungary": "No one, however high in our official life, can possibly, sincerely believe in recognizing Red Hungary and at the same time believe in government by consent of the governed."

Nowata (Okla.) Star: Editorial entitled "Another Hollow Gesture":

"These oppressed peoples still live in a state of subservience and inner misery that is unmatched almost anywhere. There have been surges by these captive peoples to regain their freedom from the satanic Communists of Russia. In East Germany, in Poland, and in Hungary the desire for freedom and the rights of the individual surged up and burst into the open, momentarily."

"In each instance where were those who were free?"

Wildwood (N.J.) Leader: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "Millions have fled from the captive nations, and the attempts to escape continue in spite of obstructions of concrete walls and barbed wire fences patrolled by guards who shoot to kill. They risk death gladly in their search for liberty."

The Hartford Courant: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations": "Captive Nations Week . . . is the time when relatives and friends living in the United States turn their thoughts to the plight of the residents of countries like Poland, Lithuania, Hungary and the rest. Millions of human beings have come under the control of the satellite governments. Congress has proclaimed the third week of each July as a time to remind the peoples of the captive nations that their plight is not forgotten. The United States will not go to war to free them. But it is interested in seeing them win their freedom, and will help them as best it can."

Morning Democrat, Davenport, Iowa: Editorial entitled "Hopeful Leaks from Moscow":

"And this is Captive Nations Week, reminding us that Mother Russia still holds ruthless control over Armenia, the Ukraine and other so-called Soviet Socialist Republics."

"Khrushchev himself, in a new letter to Britain's egregious Bertrand Russell, has once more bluntly and specifically refused to pay any part of the United Nations' peace-keeping assessments, on the specious grounds that this would serve 'the colonialists' purposes."

"The only colonies enchained since the Second World War—Hungary, Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, East Germany—go unmentioned, but not forgotten."



Columbus (Ind.) Republican: Editorial entitled "To Be Free":

"We know who holds the captive nations. So do the peoples of these nations and so does Khrushchev. The main thing is that we understand that none of us is free until all are free. Many Americans would just as soon not face this responsibility, but it is our heritage.

"And it is our heritage, whether we want it or not, that none of us will ever be free of responsibility to one another."

San Bernardino (Calif.) Telegram: Editorial entitled "Set the Captives Free":

"Each year Americans are reminded by the observance of one special week that the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe are yoked to the Communists' juggernaut of tyranny. Yet, why not keep their plight lucidly in our minds 365 days a year?

"Let not the American people become so drugged by questionable policies of accommodating the Soviet Union—ostensibly because of the threat of thermonuclear war—that we lose sight of the enslaved millions behind the Iron Curtain.

"Always we must remember—in this age of many voices—that Communists are not Russians, not Asians. They are world revolutionists. They are passionately determined to destroy not only the American way of life but also to remove all individual freedom and human dignity from the face of the earth. To think otherwise is to invite quick suicide."

Captive Nations Week was also highlighted in the Blade (Toledo, Ohio); Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News; Philadelphia (Pa.) Catholic Standard and Times; Davenport (Iowa) Times; San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal; Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer; Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald; Eau Claire (Wis.) Leader; Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News; Reno (Nev.) Gazette; Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger and Chronicle; Sandusky (Ohio) Register; Atlantic City (N.J.) Press; Brownsville (Tex.) Herald; Lynchburg (Va.) Advance; Duluth (Minn.) Herald; Manistee (Mich.) News-Advocate; Yakima (Wash.) Republic; Paris (Tex.) News; Indio (Calif.) News; Sea Isle City (N.J.) Cape May Times; Claremont (N.H.) Eagle; Goone (Iowa) News-Republican; Billings (Mont.) Gazette; Phoenixville (Pa.) Republican; Jefferson City (Mo.) Capital News; Norman (Okla.) Transcript.

The Providence Journal: Editorial entitled "The Kremlin Loosens the Bonds of Its Captive Nations":

"The hope symbolized by the bouquets showered by Hungarians on Mr. Nixon emphasizes the validity of this Nation's annual expression, by means of a Captive Nations Week, of its concern for the plight of the satellites and its peaceful dedication to their eventual independence.

"It is important that Americans keep this torch high in their own hearts and in the eyes of people longing to be free."

Chester (Pa.) Times: Editorial entitled "Captives":

"The slavery of Hungary today—while the reins of oppression have been loosened a little—remains in principle as basic as it was then.

"Maybe this makes Hungarians wonder a little. What do they have to do to concern other freemen with their plight?

"Will the free world remember slavery exists only when it's dramatized by men dying in the street?"

Santa Monica (Calif.) Outlook: Editorial entitled "The Captive Still Languish":

"Mr. Kennedy's proclamation, reluctantly given and couched in vague generalities, conveys the impression that the U.S. Government is seeking to play down this observance for fear of offending Nikita S. Khrushchev and his puppet slavemasters.

"Every step the Kennedy administration takes toward peaceful coexistence and recognition of the status quo is a step away from delivery of the millions enslaved by communism. The United States can risk the offended sensitivities of Khrushchev and Kadar, but it can never in conscience forsake the peoples of captive countries."

Chicago Tribune: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Soft-Pedaled": "Now, Khrushchev would like to quiet the captives while he is trying to keep his ideological war with China within the formal confines of a fraternal party struggle. He has his hands full with China, but they could become fuller if the captives were to seize upon the split as a time for winning concessions."

Springfield (Ohio) News: Editorial entitled "Dead-Wrong Word": "People as brave as these can live for a long time on hope that is genuine even if deferred. They will lose heart only if they are betrayed once too often by false promises."

Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations' Role in Sino-Russian Strife": "We can think of a few measures that would better serve to wipe out old United States-U.S.S.R. differences than the freeing of the captive nations.

"Khrushchev may well be thinking today of the implications of the West's Captive Nations Week as he looks eastward at the growing power and increasing bellicosity of the Red Chinese leaders.

The thoughts will take time to mature, if indeed they ever do, but if they take shape at all, the world may be headed toward a new and better alignment of powers."

Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram: Editorial entitled "Meaningless Proclamation": "Repercussions from Kennedy's captive nations statement reverberated through American ethnic organizations. These groups also received details of the administration's backdown in the United Nations this year over recognition of the credentials of representatives of the Kadar regime in Hungary. For the first time, this Nation failed to vote against such recognition, thus tacitly expressing approval of Russia's suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956."

Fall River (Mass.) Herald News: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations": "In an age of nuclear war it may be no nation will wish to precipitate a planetary catastrophe in order to rescue the victims of aggression. But this should not and need not mean that those victims can be forgotten. They are human beings whose sympathies and beliefs are our own. They have a right at least to the clear-cut expression of our support that can be given this week."

Augusta (Ga.) Herald: Editorial entitled "Bitter Irony of Captive Nations Week": "There have been men in this country who did not let expediency temper their devotion to principles. Men with names such as Washington, Jefferson, and Lee. Had the middle decades of this century seen more men of that kind in the United States there might be no occasion today for a Captive Nations Week."

Redondo Beach (Calif.) Breeze: Editorial entitled "Poor Week for a Tour": "Keeping hope alive within the breasts of millions of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain is the primary—and just about the only—basis of Captive Nations Week. \* \* \*

"One wonders how these captive people will interpret the visit of a party of smiling Americans to their midst, while Americans at home are dedicating a week as a memorial to their enslavement?"

Marion (Ind.) Chronicle: Editorial entitled "Are We Still for Freedom?": "The American people still stanchly stand for the freedom of all peoples and the administration's efforts to play down Captive Nations Week does not do justice to the intent for which the week was founded."

Santa Ana (Calif.) Register: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "We haven't heard much out of Washington this year about Captive Nations Week.

"Apparently the administration is unwilling to remind the Communists of the unpleasant fact that millions of people the world over are being held captive by governments that were imposed on them by outside forces."

Mishawaka (Ind.) Times: "The U.S.S.R. calculators will be watching to see whether U.S. public opinion is becoming apathetic about the captive nations \* \* \* about the right of all people to self-determination ultimately. People in the captive nations will be watching, too, through their grapevine sources.

"Few things would strengthen Mr. Khrushchev's hand so much as for people in the Red-enslaved nations to give up hope of ever having a voice as to their form of government."

Stone Harbor (N.J.) 7-Mile Beach Reporter: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed in order to impress upon the minds of all Americans that the countless numbers of oppressed people in the captive countries need our thoughts, our sympathy and our help."

Concord (N.H.) Monitor: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "At a time when Communists are attempting to expand their colonial domain throughout the world, we should not only encourage the hapless captives of their empire, but by means of a special committee, publicize their plight as a grim warning to prospective victims. Such a committee would help to expose communism for what it is neocolonialism—a modern-day version of czarist imperialism. It could also help in giving new direction to our foreign policy."

The Miami Herald: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations": "Americans whose family trees originated in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have no monopoly on concern for the captive nations. Neither have fugitives from communism in mainland China, Tibet, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, and many other countries. Until all those nations are liberated, no American can rest easy."

Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram: Editorial entitled "Not a Message of Hope":

"The Proclamation issued by President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1960 specifically called for the freedom of these peoples and condemned Communist imperialism.

"President Kennedy undoubtedly felt such a call would be embarrassing at a time when American and British representatives are in Moscow for talks about a possible nuclear test ban agreement. But the generality and evasiveness of the proclamation surely cannot inspire much hope among the people of the captive nations."

Malvern (Iowa) Leader: Editorial entitled "Communist Imperialism Now the World's Biggest Threat to Freedom of Nations and Peoples":

"Today there is a substantial sentiment in the United States to forget the captive nations of Russia, and to let the Russians hold to any new territories they can acquire. Few deny that without Russia's occupation of Cuba Castro's chaotic government would last only a brief time, yet the U.S. State Department seems more concerned about preventing resistance to Castro than in getting the Russians out of Cuba.

"There are two freedoms—the false, where a man is free to do what he likes; the true, where a man is free to do what he ought."

Columbus (Ohio) Catholic Times: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "And what can you do as an individual? You can make a contribution to Radio Free Europe which broadcasts information and inspiration daily to the Iron Curtain coun-

tries. You can be interested in aiding refugees through your own Catholic Welfare Bureau. You can follow the proceedings of the U.N. as they affect the captive nations. You can be vigilant of the legislation in Congress which can help or hinder these peoples."

Captive Nations Week was also featured in the Muncie (Ind.) Star; Hartford (Conn.) Times; Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal; Alexandria (La.) Town Talk; Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig; Tampa (Fla.) Tribune; Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel; Mobile (Ill.) Dispatch; Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftan; Anderson (Ind.) Herald; Elkhart (Ind.) Truth; Kannapolis (N.C.) Independent; Meriden (Conn.) Journal; Sarasota (Fla.) News; Sheridan (Wyo.) Press; Malone (N.Y.) Telegram; Macon (Ga.) Telegraph; Anniston (Ala.) Star; Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index; Salem (N.J.) Standard and Jerseyman.

#### COMMEMORATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA FOR FREEDOM OF ENSLAVED NATIONS

(Dr. Emil Onaca, president; Carol Blaze, secretary; Wolodymyr Szyak, treasurer)

Sunday, July 21, 1963, 3 p.m. sharp;  
Ukrainian Culture Center, 4315 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

#### Delegations:

Armenia: Art Bacholian, Hagop Manjikian, and Michael Minasian.

Estonia: Walfried Gutman, and Bernard Nurmsen.

Hungary: Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy, Dr. William Rethy, and Tibor Dollinszky.

Latvia: Miss Silvija Pilmanis, Arnis Tubelis, and Viktors Vaitis.

Lithuania: Jonas Motiejunas, and Stasys Paltus.

Poland: Carol M. Blaze, George Radwan, and Edward Skirmuntt.

Rumania: Dr. Emil Onaca, Mrs. Ileana Petrescu, and Ironim Petrescu.

Ukraine: Orest L. Dolyniuk, Leo Roman, and Wolodymyr Szyak.

"I have sworn upon the Altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

"We will never surrender positions which are essential to the defense of freedom nor will we abandon people who are now behind the Iron Curtain through any formal approval of the status quo."

—JOHN F. KENNEDY.

#### PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies: Carol Blaze.

Presentation of colors.

Invocation..... Rev. Sumbat Lapajian, pastor, Armenian Apostolic Holy Cross Church.

National anthem— Henry Czarnecki.  
"Star Spangled Banner."

Opening remarks .... Dr. Emil Onaca.  
Address ..... Geo. Kramer, Ph. D., columnist, L. A. Catholic Tidings.

Adoption of resolution. Dr. E. Onaca.

#### Intermission

##### I. Ukrainian

Ukrainian Freedom Ukrainian Choir, Vocal songs, by Iodymir Bozyk, director.

##### II. Rumanian

Vocal solo..... Mrs. S. Shishmanyany; accompanist, Mrs. Silvia Ramba.

Cavaleria Rusticana, folk songs.

##### III. Polish

Vocal solo..... Henry Czarnecki.

#### IV. Lithuanian

Mrs. Zina Kalavaitis, soprano; accompanist, Bronius Budriunas, composer.

My Country..... by A. Kacanauskas.  
Oh, Faster, Faster... by St. Simkus.  
The Call..... by Br. Budriunas.

#### V. Hungarian

Violin solo..... Master Andrew Balogh (age 8 years); accompanist, Sandor Dienes (age 16 years).

Scene de Ballet by DeBeriot.

Helyre Kati by Hubay.

Obertass by H. Weintawski (Polish).

#### VI. Armenian

Vocal solo..... Mrs. Ankin Keshishian-Mouradian, soprano.

"God Bless America."

#### THE VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

Armenia: An ancient country and victim of Communist imperialism, succumbed to Communist-Turkish collusion in 1921, after an epic struggle for independence in which 3 million lives were sacrificed. A simultaneous attack by Communist and Turkish armies crushed Armenian resistance and divided her territory between the two invaders. Five-sixths of Armenians went to Turkey and one-sixth became a Soviet Republic. The Armenian people soon became the first and only people to throw off the Communist yoke, but the precious independence—unassisted by arms or aid—lasted only 2 months. The dead cities of west Armenia—called Turkey on the world's maps—and the living cities of Communist-enslaved eastern Armenia, stand together as an accusing symbol of injustice, inhumanity, and lack of conscience among the world powers. Armenia remains Armenia forever, whether it is called Turkey or Socialist Soviet Republic on a map, and will again be free—assisted or unassisted. Armenians will never be satisfied with anything less than complete freedom and complete independence.

Estonia: With a prewar population of 1,200,000, is one of the Baltic States. Her people are akin to the Finns and Hungarians, her culture unique.

Her history has been constant struggle against invasion and foreign domination by Denmark, Germany, Sweden and from the 18th century on the Russian Empire. At the start of the Russian revolution in 1917 she won her independence for which she fought the Soviet armies for 15 months. In 1918 a Declaration of Independence was proclaimed, heralding 22 years of peaceful development in the free Republic of Estonia. All this came to an end in 1940, when this nation lost its independence to the Soviets as a result of a pact between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Ever since that time the systematic murders extermination of this small nation had been carried out until by now the Estonian population has, "by Russian admission" decreased by 25 percent.

Hungary: A country which has been the outpost of the freedom of the Christian world for a thousand years was ruthlessly oppressed by the barbarian terror of Soviet occupation. Yet, after 11 years of Communist indoctrination, her youth arose on October 23, 1956, and showed the indifferent Western democracies what the people of a tortured nation are willing to pay for their freedom. This nation of only 10 million was willing to tackle the mighty Red army of the Soviet Union, but with the sympathy of the West being the only aid received, their war of freedom was cruelly suppressed.

Let us hope that 40,000 Hungarian patriots—students, workers, and children—have not sacrificed their lives in vain.

Latvia: Toward the end of World War I, Latvia—one of the three Baltic states—became an independent republic after the collapse of the czarist Russian empire. It is a little country of about 2 million people and in territory not much larger than the State of Maine. For centuries it had been ground between the two giant millstones: Germany and Russia. Having gained its independence in 1918, Latvia became a prosperous and enterprising free nation of farmers and aspiring intellectuals, but for 22 years only. In 1940 it was occupied by the Soviet armies, a year later by Germany but since 1945 it has again been subjugated by the Soviet Union. The Iron Curtain came down and from behind it thousands of her best men: professors, statesmen, lawyers, farmers, etc. were deported to Siberia. Almost none returned.

Lithuania: Founded as kingdom 710 years ago, was in the 15th century a leading power in Eastern Europe, but by the beginning of the 19th century it had been absorbed by the Russian Empire and had lost its independence. In 1918, the Lithuanians regained their independence and for two full decades thereafter enjoyed their freedom. They lost it again early in the last war. After its occupation and forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1940, a shockingly large segment of its population (10 to 15 percent)—and most of its intellectuals—have been deported to Siberia or simply shot to death. At no time before during the turbulent history of this country, have its people been subjected to such systematic annihilation, and the Soviet Government not only plunders the lands it occupies—it also wants to destroy the heart and mind of the people it subjugates.

Poland: Is a country of 30 million people and was founded 1,000 years ago. Between the 18th and 20th centuries the country was partitioned four times but gained full independence in 1918. It became a Republic under the leadership of Joseph Pilsudski and the world-famous Ignacy Paderewski became the Prime Minister. Between the two World Wars, their country has established a strong economy and innovated many social services. In 1939 a time of great suffering has begun for the Polish people. Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany have by agreement, divided her territory among themselves. Under their joint occupation a countless number of Poles perished in concentration camps in Germany and slave labor camps in Siberia. After the end of the war the Soviet occupation troops remained in the country and were instrumental in bringing about the existence of a communistic government. The Polish people lost their independence in 1939. They have still not regained it but they are continuing their fight in exile under the leadership of a legal Polish President and government-in-exile residing in London, England.

Rumania: A land whose history dates back to Roman times, in 1944 suffered the 11th Russian invasion, since 1711, this time by the hordes of Stalin's Red army. Worse than all previous invasions this one enslaved and transformed Rumania into a large prison, called People's Republic of Rumania. Since 1944, the 20 million Rumanians live under the cruel Soviet military occupation, some in permanent terror, some in dark and humid prison cells and some in concentration and extermination camps in Rumania and Siberia. Although, Rumania is the world's fourth producer of oil, rich in agriculture, minerals, forests and cattle, the Soviet Union takes everything by force and the Rumanians live in misery and poverty.

Ukraine: Is a country of 45 million people and was founded with the capital city of Kiev 1,000 years ago. This territory about the size of France, contains the richest farmland and



concentration of mining resources in the Soviet Union. In the 17th century they were forcibly absorbed by the Russian Empire but proclaimed their independence in 1917 and created their own parliament. For 3 years the army of the Ukrainian Republic fought the Red army—without any support from the West. After their defeat the first Russian satellite state was born. Military defeat didn't break the resistance of the Ukrainian people thus in 1932 Moscow confiscated their whole harvest. The result: 7 million Ukrainians died by starvation. When World War II came the Ukrainians fought the armies of both Hitler and Stalin. In spite of the cruel suppression they endured for so long, the Ukrainians are strong in spirit and united in their desire for liberty.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, July 19, 1963]

#### LEST WE FORGET

Though the memories of men are notoriously short, it is well to remind ourselves that this is Captive Nations Week, and why. For millions in many parts of the world, tending the lamps of freedom through long years of exile or cherishing its flame in secret places of the heart under repressive regimes, this annual week of commemoration in the United States means much.

It means that their voices are not like a drowner's cry "lost on the desolate wind" of indifference; and that other men and women have not forgotten them. It is a reminder that no genuinely free elections have ever stamped with popular approval the regimes now dominating Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba, or the Baltic States whose cultural leaders were subjected to genocide by the Russians. Freedom does not coexist with the sepulchre.

#### THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE AND THE NEW ENGLAND CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE PRESENTS NEW ENGLAND'S CAPTIVE NATIONS FREEDOM RALLY

(Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Boston, Mass., July 20, 1963)

Mr. DERWINSKI's speech will be preceded by a cultural program presenting Latvian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Hungarian talent. Expansion of communism's colonialism has to be challenged by assuring our allies, the captive peoples, that our prayers and sympathies are with them. Mr. DERWINSKI, dynamic speaker and statesman, will speak on the challenging subject of the freedom for the captive people and how to stop communism's aggression.

For the past 4 years, pursuant to Public Law 86-90, the President of the United States has proclaimed the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. All Americans are asked to work and pray for the restoration of the enslaved people to their historic freedom and national independence. The Soviet Union and its satellite puppets constitute a vast colonial empire. Khrushchev knows what danger to his Communist empire constitute 17 million Americans who may contact their kin enslaved by the Soviets, urging them to continue to battle and thwart Communist designs upon their freedom.

In the captive nations lie our best hope to destroy Communist dreams for global conquest. The captive peoples of the Soviet Union continue to pose many difficulties for the Kremlin tyrants. Captive peoples demonstrate an amazing stamina to resist not only communism, but continue to perpetuate their diverse racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds.

Ukrainians and Byelorussians had a history of national independence of six centuries prior to 1795. Latvians, Lithuanians, and

Estonians for centuries have enjoyed self-rule and independence. The same is true about Armenia, Georgia, and other nationalities listed as captive nations. When the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, lists any of the captive nations as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," he seals the fate of the first victims of Soviet imperialism and seeks to wiggle himself out of a historic responsibility and the opportunity to launch an offensive for the expansion of freedom in keeping with the principles of self-determination of nations.

Captive peoples are not reconciled with their status. Their dreams and aspirations for freedom and national independence pose a major problem to their oppressors. Though hundreds of thousands of captive peoples have been executed and millions have been scattered throughout remote parts of the Soviet-Asian landmass, the faith of Christians, Moslems, and Hebrews persists to be indestructible and lives for the day of liberation and freedom.

Legitimate groups of most of the captive peoples of the Soviet Union are functioning throughout the free world. They should be provided truly effective assistance for the cause of freedom to develop and continue effective liaison and communication with their oppressed brethren behind the Iron Curtain. In many instances de jure governments-in-exile continue to operate. With a realistic foreign policy we can take the offensive and roll back communism.

We have a responsibility to the oppressed peoples to aid them in regaining their God-given rights of legitimate free national government. The doom of millions of captive peoples can be thwarted by an outpouring of indignation of the American people. Write your President, your Senators, your Congressman, your Governor; speak to your minister, priest, rabbi, demanding action to establish a progressive program to aid captive nations and to start the long-overdue crusade for the final and complete destruction of anti-God communism. A select permanent Captive Nations Committee with the U.S. Congress should be established to advocate freedom and national independence for all captive peoples.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, June 5, 1963]

#### WANTS COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

To the Editor of the Standard Times:

Last January 9, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Public Law 86-90 of 1959 enumerates 22 captive nations under communism, such as: Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Georgia, and others. The proposed committee will handle all the matters concerning the captive nations and recommend peaceful means by which the United States can assist these nations to regain freedom.

More than 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for the passage of H.R. 14, including Massachusetts Congressmen JOHN W. MCCORMACK, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., JAMES A. BURKE, SILVIO O. CONTE, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, and F. BRADFORD MORSE.

Presently H.R. 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee. As with any other piece of legislation, the passage of the Flood resolution needs the widest public support.

Each of us can help the captive nations by writing letters to:

1. His Congressman, urging him to vote for the passage of H.R. 14 and,

2. Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging him to spur action on the proposed legislation.

The Flood resolution injects a powerful tool into our fight with communism. The proposed committee will bring to full light the true nature of the new Soviet colonialism.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman, HASTINGS KEITH, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and to HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington. Urge them to vote for the passage of H.R. 14.

O. SZCZUDLUK,

Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

Mr. Speaker, to indicate further the feelings and thoughts expressed not only in this country but also in other parts of the world, I append the following resolution on captive nations passed unanimously at the recent Conference of the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League:

RESOLUTION AT THE CONFERENCE OF APACL  
(Submitted by Turkey and Supported by Hong Kong, Australia, Malaysia, and Macao)

Witnessing the process of the decolonization of the world, the collapse of old empires, and the victory of the national freedom idea in all continents;

Realizing that the Russian colonial imperialism threatens the freedom and independence of the peoples of the entire world above all the peoples of Africa and Asia recently liberated from colonialism;

I. This Ninth Conference of APACL reaffirms the resolution of the Eighth Conference that advocates the disintegration of the Soviet Russian colonial imperialism into national, independent democratic states of all subjugated peoples;

Supports the revolutionary liberation fight of the peoples in Europe, Asia, and Cuba, subjugated by Soviet Russian colonialism and communism, for the restoration of their national independence and for the destruction of the Communist system;

Requests the United Nations to put the problem of Soviet Russian colonialism in Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Czechia, Cossackia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Turkestan (Uzbekistan, Tadzikistan, Kirgizistan, Turkmenistan, Karachstan), North Caucasias, and other countries subjugated by communism and Soviet Russian imperialism, on the agenda of its General Assembly, to condemn said colonialism, to exclude all Communist governments from the U.N. and in their stead to admit the authorized representatives of the peoples subjugated by Soviet Russian imperialism and communism;

Exhorts the free world to give wholehearted, active support, including military support, to the national liberation revolutions of the peoples subjugated behind the Iron Curtain, as a possible alternative to an atomic war;

Corroborates the solidarity of the APACL with the U.S. Congress resolution on Captive Nations Week, in which said Congress advocates the liberation and freedom of Hungary, Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Rumania, White Ruthenia, Estonia, Bulgaria, Latvia, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, mainland of China, northern part of the Republic of Korea, Idel-Ural, Albania, North Vietnam, Cossackia, and others;

II. The ninth conference of APACL warns against the demobilization of the free world by means of the campaign of the so-called positive neutralism, in particular in the countries of Africa and Latin America, which is being pursued in the interests of Moscow by Yugoslavia, whose Communist regime has

subjugated the Croats and other peoples who yearn for their national independence.

III. The Ninth Conference of APACL warns against the growth of Communist influences in Latin America.

It declares its solidarity with the fight for freedom of the Cuban people against a Communist despotic regime supported by Moscow, and appeals to the anti-Communist countries of the American continents to help the Cuban people to obtain its liberation from Communist slavery.

IV. The 9th Conference of APACL expresses its sincere wishes to ABN on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of its founding (in November 1943) behind the Iron Curtain for success in its fight for the liberation of the peoples subjugated by Russian imperialism and communism and for the restoration of the independent national democratic states of those peoples.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, as indications of the types of programs and pronouncements we can look forward to on the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week, I include the following remaining material in the RECORD:

[From Freedom Torch, published by the American Committee for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, Los Angeles, Calif., July 1962]

#### THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Emil Onaca)

By a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the U.S. Congress has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July 1960, as Captive Nations Week, and to invite the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The resolution also urged the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. This proclamation—which is being issued every year—symbolizes America's interest in the freedom of all human beings; it is the proof that this great Republic shares the aspirations of all nations to become independent and free from all kinds of despotism and tyranny; it proves to the enslaved nations that Uncle Sam and Lady Liberty have not forgotten them.

At the time of the 1959 Presidential proclamation for the Captive Nations Week, 24 countries were victims of Communist tyranny, for various lengths of time. The enslavement of free nations by communism started even before the Red Russian Revolution of 1917 ended. After 1918, the Kremlin-headquartered communism enslaved the peoples of Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossackia, Idel-Ural and Turkestan, and forced them into the Soviet Union. In 1940, the Red Army of Stalin invaded and then enslaved Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1944, the hordes of the same Red Army invaded and then enslaved Rumania, Poland, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Yugoslavia. In 1947, over 600 million Chinese fell victims of communism, then North Korea, then North Vietnam, and then Tibet.

As we all know, since the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1959, no nation has achieved freedom, but several new nations have become enslaved. Cuba, at only 90 miles from the United States border, succumbed under the cruel Communist regime of Fidel Castro. In Asia, Laos is already the 26th member of the unhappy family of captive nations; South Vietnam is unfortunately not far from falling into the Communist slavery; and in North Africa, Algeria is the target of Communist conspiracy, infiltration and takeover even before enjoying 1 day of freedom. In Central Africa, Congo is the main

attraction of Communist maneuvering in preparation for chaos and Communist takeover.

But the activities of the Communists, in their drive to conquer the world, are not limited to the countries mentioned. The Communist fifth columns are busy and successful in their conspiracy in every Latin American country, and in Asia from Indonesia to Korea and from Japan to Iran.

On June 8, 1962, U.S. Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican of Nebraska, introduced a resolution in the Senate urging the President to proclaim again the Captive Nations Week, to take the plight of these nations before the U.N. General Assembly and ask the withdrawal of all Communist troops, agents, and controls from every captive nation; the return of all prisoners from Siberia and all concentration and slave-labor camps, and free elections in each country, under international control.

Now that the Western powers missed the unique chance offered by the heroic Hungarian revolt of 1956 to help the enslaved nations regain their freedom, Senator HRUSKA's Senate Concurrent Resolution 77 offers the President of the United States and his people another chance to free the enslaved nations by peaceful means. Armed with this resolution, President Kennedy has the historic mission of taking the plight of 1 billion people enslaved by the Soviet Union before the General Assembly of the United Nations and forcing the Assembly to make the captive nations cause No. 1 on its agenda. There is no other problem in the world today more important, more urgent and more humanitarian, than that of the captive nations.

It is ironic and shameful that while the tribes of darkest Africa, and even the cannibals of Dutch Guinea, are gaining their freedom and independence, 1 billion people of ancient culture and history are being enslaved by the Soviet Union.

Let our President test the usefulness and good intentions of the United Nations. This organization has been founded to promote freedom and independence for all mankind, yet since its birth in 1945 in San Francisco, 800 million freemen have been enslaved by the Kremlin.

Today, let us urge our President to expose before the world body the ugliness of Communist colonialism and its worldwide conspiracy against freedom and democracy; to tell the whole world how Khrushchev calls in the same body for an end to Western colonialism, while his Communist colonialism threw behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains 1 billion people, and works day and night to enslave the rest of the free world.

Let the world see if the leaders of newly independent countries of Asia and Africa will oppose free elections under international control, in each and every country under Communist domination. Let the world see those who will oppose freedom for the enslaved countries. Let them stand up in the U.N. General Assembly and be counted as opposed to freedom for the Russian colonies. Let the world see how a Nehru, a Sukarno, a Nasser (who so vehemently condemned the Western colonialism—after swallowing over \$6 billion in gifts from the United States) will stand up and say "no" to free elections in the Soviet colonies.

The heroic struggles of Poles at Poznan, of Hungarians at Budapest, of East Germans at Berlin—the forced labor and extermination camps in every enslaved country—are not they the strongest possible proof that the spirit and the struggle for freedom of the captive nations is more alive today than ever? Then let us help them.

Let us remind the Western powers, especially the United States, that this world cannot go on living half free and half enslaved; let us remember what Khrushchev told the American people: "We'll bury you. Your nephews will live under communism."

Freedom, the most blessed God-given gift, is being denied today to 1 billion human beings just like us. As long as their freedom is denied, that very freedom is endangered in Paris, London and in Washington.

The issue of our time is the issue of Communist slavery versus freedom. No other nation in history has been more qualified to identify itself with the cause of freedom for those who lost it, than the United States. This country has today the historic mission of organizing and leading the struggle to free the Soviet colonies. It has the power, the prestige, and the position—both in the United Nations (which it supports with many hundreds of millions of dollars) and in the Western World—to organize with its allies this drive for freedom.

If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers dollars on it.

Let us all hope and pray that this time the United States will use its prestige, power and abilities toward achieving freedom for all countries victims of Communist slavery. God bless America.

[From the Boston Record American, July 30, 1963]

BOSTON.—The otherwise timely and penetrating Record American editorial of July 23, "Crowded Summit," cannot be passed without comments.

The editorial limits itself to enumerating captive countries that fell under Communist rule after 1939. We cannot, however, forget those countries which were captured by Russian Communists after World War I. Among the latter was Ukraine, the first and the biggest victim of the new Communist colonialism. As a reminder here, Ukraine proclaimed its independence on January 22, 1918. Armenia, Georgia, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and other non-Russian countries also gained their independence.

Certainly, Ukraine's incorporation into the Soviet Union did not result from the exercise of free will of the Ukrainian people. Let us not divide captive nations under Soviet colonialism into groups; they all are in the same boat.

Let us support the establishment of a permanent congressional committee on Captive Nations, which was proposed by Congressman FLOOD (H.R. 14), DERWINSKI (H.R. 15), and supported by many Massachusetts Congressmen: MCCORMACK, O'NEILL, PHILBIN, CONTE, MORSE, BURKE, DONOHUE. Since last January, the subject resolutions have been pending before the House Rules Committee. Now is the time to enact these resolutions. The proposed committee will handle all matters pertaining to the captive nations.

Furthermore, our Government should make freedom and independence to all captive nations held in Communist captivity the issue in all negotiations with the Soviet government, direct and at the United Nations.

O. SZCZUDLUK,  
Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian  
Congress Commission of America, Inc.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings, July 12, 1963]

#### OUR CAPTIVE BROTHERS

(NOTE.—Last Friday, President Kennedy issued a proclamation designating the week of June 14 as "Captive Nations Week." But the full text of the proclamation was given no space in the news.)

(All that can be ascertained at this writing is that the President declared that "the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration" and that "this Nation has an abiding commitment to the



principles of national self-determination and human freedom.")

It may be questioned whether proclamations and protestations have great value, apart from any concrete action which might accompany them. But at least they serve as a reminder of purpose and of principle which may in some way arouse a latent fire.

Accordingly, we are somewhat cheered by the fact that our President last Friday designated this coming week as Captive Nations Week. It is true that news of this action was a bit obscured by other events crowding the recent holiday weekend, but it at last emerged.

These other events included an exchange of greetings between the Soviet Union and the United States on the occasion of our Independence Day. But the happy fact remains that, in spite of such pleasantries, the President faithfully adhered to a policy which has aroused Soviet ire in the past.

Established by joint congressional resolutions and presidential proclamation in 1959, the third week of July is a period dedicated to the renewal of concern for those peoples who languish in the grip of Communist tyranny. And the resolution adopted at that time requested that this observance continue each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Obviously and sadly, that time has not yet come. The original congressional resolution listed 22 nations as being deprived of national independence and subjugated "through direct and indirect aggression" of Communist Russia. It included Poland and Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, and Latvia, Estonia and Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany and Bulgaria, Albania, and others. A doleful list, surely, and a measure of the tragedy of our times.

More doleful yet, the intervening years have seen no shrinking of that list, but rather its expansion. The name of Cuba must now be added, from which unhappy island the threat falls upon others which are marked. And among the emerging nations of Africa, pressing forward toward freedom's light, the dark shadow of Soviet influence probes its way.

In the words of this year's proclamation, "the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration." We who have experienced the fulfillment of that aspiration may easily forget the lands where it is denied. And once we forget, then is our own fulfillment diminished and the breath of our freedom shortened and staled.

But it is not our selfish interest which should sharpen our resolve. These captive nations are people, engendered by the same Father as have we, endowed inalienably with the same rights as we possess, seeking the same destiny which we pursue in liberty. They are not alien to our race, strangers to the planet on which we live, cut off from the plan and scope of our common redemption and eternal hope.

They are people whose blood strains have flowed into our own veins to make us what we are. They are people whose history is as proud as ours, who once breathed the fresh morning air of freedom, walked upright in the open day, cherished the sunset glow. Now darkness lies upon them.

They are people who once worshipped God in simplicity of faith, raised their children in His knowledge without fear, lifted their temples to the sky. They are people who made the journey of their years with human dignity and bequeathed to their young a future of promise. Now they have no future, but only a past.

These are the captive nations. Our Congress and our President have proclaimed them such. While the high talk of co-

existence and conciliation goes on about the conference tables, we might ask, with whom do these poor people coexist? And with what fate would we have them reconciled?

Our President has asked the American people "to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities." He did not specify what these might be. But we would suggest that, at the far outer circle of propriety, there are certainly two things we must do for these enslaved people. We must remember them, and we must pray.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings, July 5, 1963]

#### NO U.N. CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK?

(By George N. Kramer, Ph. D.)

A joint resolution approved by both Houses of Congress July 17, 1959, authorized and requested the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July each year as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The President is therefore under obligation to issue this annual proclamation, and Captive Nations Week has been officially observed since 1959.

Since our Government's formal adoption of a policy of accommodation with the Soviet Union, the tendency has been to play down the importance of the proclamation by restricting publicity of it lest Khrushchev might be offended.

Last year, it was generally known that pressure from the State Department went so far as to urge the President not to issue the proclamation at all. But this would have violated a congressional request, even though refusal to issue a proclamation might not have been illegal or even a serious breach of executive responsibility.

As it happened, Captive Nations Week was proclaimed in a much weaker version than that promulgated in 1961. It came the weekend preceding the week to be observed and was almost obscured by headline news released by the administration at the same time.

At this writing the Presidential proclamation has not yet been made and there is no information when it will be made, although there is reason to believe that last year's pattern will be repeated this year.

#### VICTIMS OF RED TYRANNY

Obviously, a mere proclamation not backed up by positive action or even a positive policy of dealing with the problem will not free a single captive nation.

President Kennedy's remark in Berlin June 25 that "the winds of change are blowing across the Iron Curtain as well as in the rest of the world" can scarcely be taken seriously when one contemplates the world situation where the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union are still held captive and new nations of free people are still slipping behind the Red bars.

This point was well made in an article last year by Dr. Emil Onaca, president of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations. It is but a glimpse of the situation which has even worsened during the past 12 months.

"At the time of the 1959 Presidential proclamation for the Captive Nations Week, 24 countries were victims of Communist tyranny for various lengths of time," he wrote.

"After 1918, the Kremlin-headquartered Communism enslaved the peoples of Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossackia, Idel-Ural and Turkestan, and forced them into the Soviet Union.

"In 1940, the Red army of Stalin invaded and then enslaved Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1944, the hordes of the same Red

army invaded and then enslaved Rumania, Poland, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany and Yugoslavia.

"In 1947, over 600 million Chinese fell victims to Communism, then North Korea, then North Vietnam, and then Tibet.

#### END IS NOT YET VISIBLE

"As we all know, since the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1959, no nation has achieved freedom, but several new nations have become enslaved.

"Cuba succumbed under the cruel Communist regime of Fidel Castro. In Asia, Laos is already the 26th member of the unhappy family of 'captive nations.' South Vietnam is unfortunately not far from falling into Communist slavery, and in North Africa, Algeria is the target of Communist conspiracy. In Central Africa, the Congo is the main attraction of Communist maneuvering in preparation for chaos and takeover.

"But the activities of the Communists, in their drive to conquer the world, are not limited to the countries mentioned," Dr. Onaca observed. "The Communist fifth columns are busy and successful in their conspiracy in every Latin American country, and in Asia, from Indonesia to Korea, and from Japan to Iran."

Here are the cold facts, yet the U.S. State Department has announced and is carrying out a policy of accommodation while the Communists continue to enslave free peoples without serious protest from the rest of the free world. And the end is not in sight.

Dr. Onaca pointed out it is both ironic and shameful that while the tribes in Africa and even in Dutch New Guinea are gaining their freedom and independence, 1 billion people of ancient culture and history are being enslaved by the Communists.

Then he made this excellent suggestion:

"Let our President test the usefulness and good intentions of the United Nations. This organization was founded to promote freedom and independence for all mankind, yet since its birth in 1945 in San Francisco, 800 million free men have been enslaved by the Kremlin.

"Today, let us urge our President to expose before the world body the ugliness of Communist colonialism and its worldwide conspiracy against freedom and democracy; to tell the whole world how Khrushchev calls in that same organization for an end to Western colonialism, while his Communist colonialism thrust behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains 1 billion people and works day and night to enslave the rest of the free world.

#### LET ALL THE WORLD SEE

"Let the world see if the leaders of newly independent countries of Asia and Africa will oppose free elections under international control in each and every country under Communist domination.

"Let the world see those who will oppose freedom for the enslaved countries. Let them stand up in the U.N. General Assembly and be counted as opposed to freedom for the Soviet colonies.

"Let the world see how a Nehru, a Sukarno, a Nasser will stand up and say 'no' to free elections in the Soviet colonies. \* \* \*

"If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars on it."

A more reasonable suggestion could scarcely be made in the name of freedom, and yet not the slightest gesture in this direction has been taken by our delegates in the U.N., whereas we continue to suffer the humili-

ation of Soviet abuse and denunciations at every session of the U.N.

And we fear it will always be thus so long as we pursue a policy of accommodation with the Soviets. Meanwhile more free men will fall under the Red yoke.—G.N.K.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom and civil rights of all peoples remain in danger as long as the international Communist conspiracy continues its aggressive actions and holds in bondage millions of people in Europe and Asia. On the international scene, self-determination of peoples is an integral part of our foreign policy, and I believe the Rules Committee must take a long, overdue step, hold hearings, and approve a rule on the original resolution—House Resolution 14—introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, DAN FLOOD, for early House consideration.

Certainly suspicion might be aroused that the Rules Committee's inactivity in this field has been dictated by the House leadership at the request of the State Department, which shows a shocking disinterest in the plight of the captive peoples of communism.

Mr. Speaker, a typical example of the continued denial of "civil rights" to the people of the captive nations is illustrated by an article which appeared in the November edition of ELTA, published by the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, reporting on Soviet activities to repress the nationalistic forces in the Baltic nations. The report follows:

**WESTERN PRESS SEES SOVIET EFFORT TO AMALGAMATE BALTIC NATIONS**

The Soviets are now engaged in a campaign to fuse Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into a single gray Soviet entity and thus finally to eliminate the marks of their national identity. This was the contention of an article in the September 1963 issue of the magazine *Der Europäische Osten*, Munich.

The magazine bases its findings on the following facts. This spring a joint issue of the three Baltic Communist Party organs (Tiesa, Cina, Rahva Haal) was published with identical texts and pictures. The occasion for the joint issue was the creation of the so-called western economic region, which encompasses the Baltic countries and the Karaliaucius (Königsberg) region. At about the same time, the so-called northeastern power region was established. Somewhat later, the railway boards of the three Republics were merged and subordinated to Moscow.

*Der Europäische Osten* quotes the Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, A. Voss, who said that the merger of the Baltic Communist Parties is imperative not only because of the economic unification, but also since all Soviet Republics are gradually approaching a merger in a single body.

The predictions of the German monthly were echoed in the New York Times, on September 27, 1963:

"The Soviet Union is quietly pressing a far-reaching plan to convert the present structure of national republics into a system of regional federations that would deemphasize the distinctiveness of non-Russian ethnic groups.

"A conference in Frunze, according to the newspaper *Sovetskaya Kirghiziya*, condemned the 'pseudo-scientific theory' of linguistic purity, hailed the importance of the Russian language as a means of communication among the Soviet Union's ethnic groups and demanded an investigation of nationalistic

ideology that might oppose the intended mergers of peoples.

"No formal changes have yet been made in the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, where the drive for cultural, economic and political merger has been limited so far to joint conferences and cultural exchanges."

Meanwhile, the United Nations is busy with the abolition of colonialism in—Gibraltar and Malta.

I also include two articles from the December 14 edition of the *Denver Post*, detailing the oppression of individual citizens of Rumania and Lithuania.

[From the *Denver (Colo.) Post*, Nov. 14, 1963]

**A CRY FOR HELP FROM RUMANIA**

(By Nino Lo Bello)

CLUJ, RUMANIA.—"Help us. We are being slowly exterminated."

This written message was sneaked into the palm of my hand by a member of the Hungarian minority that lives here. Later we met and talked while sitting on a park bench near the Horia Street Bridge spanning the Somes River.

So another racial tragedy can be reported, this one from the Transylvanian capital. It involves some 2 million Hungarians who believe the Soviet puppet regime of Rumania has undertaken a systematic program of "biological extermination," since the collapse of the 1956 Hungarian revolt.

As soon as the uprising was squashed in Budapest, the Rumanian People's Republic opened a drive to reduce the number of Hungarians living in Transylvania, the high plateau that lies in northwest Rumania behind the wooded mountains of the mighty Carpathian Range.

Many of the Rumanian Hungarians were rounded up in mass arrests. Those not executed were given stiff prison sentences up to 25 years. The women and children of men so condemned were deported to Rumania's dreaded marshes of the Danube Delta, where many contracted malaria.

For the Hungarians who were "lucky" enough to have been allowed to stay behind, life has been nothing short of a Dante purgatory. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Hungarians are forbidden under penalty of imprisonment to practice their religion.

The Magyar minority finds it almost impossible to get work. Rumanian laborers are imported by Communist bosses into Transylvania to make job competition even harder. And "to rub salt in the wounds," Hungarians are being turned out of their homes and forced to double and triple up in other houses to make room for these official migrants.

"We are the lost people of Europe," my informant said. He said it with a stone face—this for the benefit of the pedestrians and some secret police milling about the street—but his eyes transmitted the message's impact. "No one knows about our plight. Please tell the United Nations about us. Tell the President of America. Tell Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. But please get our message to the outside world—we are being slowly exterminated."

Migrating into Hungary is absolutely impossible for this minority group of Rumania.

Cluj's more aggressive Hungarians have banded into an underground organization known as Independent Transylvania. Anyone remotely suspected of being involved in this secret group is likely to be slapped with a 7-year solitary confinement. Not long ago, when a petition was sent to Moscow asking the Soviet Union to annex Transylvania, Rumanian police intercepted it. Every one of the signers was sent to prison for 25 years.

The region known as Transylvania, which was at one time an autonomous country,

came into Rumania's hands as a result of a secret treaty with Russia, whom Transylvania helped during World War I. When Germany, Austria, and Russia lost the war, Transylvania, with its 16 million population, was taken from the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and given to Rumania.

Today one out of every three Transylvanians speaks Hungarian. The region's extensive pine forests, fertile valleys, and deep gorges have not yet been found by Western tourists.

Now everybody is welcome here—except Hungarians. And they can't even go home.

**AND A TALE OF MISERY FROM LITHUANIA**

(By Eric Geiger)

TORONTO, CANADA.—While some Western leaders are talking about a relaxation of East-West tensions, two Lithuanian sailors in Toronto this week told a grim story of starvation, oppression, and terror in their Communist-dominated homeland.

Jurgis Vaitkevicius, 31, and his shipmate, Allinas Vibrys, 30, arrived in this Canadian industrial city a few days ago to start new lives after jumping ship from the Soviet tanker *Alytus* in Halifax and subsequently being granted political asylum in Canada.

With tears in his eyes Jurgis, who was a diesel mechanic abroad the tanker, said "Lithuania is a prison and we just couldn't go back."

He added that thousands of crewmembers of Russian vessels would jump ships in Western ports if they knew they would find protection.

Political commissars assigned to every Russian ship, he explained, regularly hold indoctrination sessions designed to discourage sailors from escaping to non-Communist countries.

"All of us were told repeatedly that Western countries send all political refugees back to Russia," he said.

They decided to take a chance and leave the ship while it took on water in Halifax because they couldn't bear the thought of returning to the Soviet Union.

"The Lithuanians used to be a happy people," he said, "but ever since the Soviets took over, our homeland has become a sad and dreary place."

Both men, who had lived in the Baltic seaport of Klaipeda, said there is a serious shortage of just about everything in the so-called "Soviet Republic of Lithuania."

Jurgis snorted derisively when asked about Khrushchev's often-proclaimed promises to raise the standard of living of the Soviet worker.

"To earn enough money to buy a shirt, I had to work 7 days," he said. But most of his pay went toward food, he added, and there was nothing left for clothes.

Above all, he stated, the tight control imposed on the Lithuanians by the Soviet authorities has made life intolerable.

"You are being watched all the time. It's just like in prison," he said.

The two seamen then described conditions on the large, mysterious Soviet North Atlantic trawler fleet, of which their vessel was a part.

The morale of the crews is generally very low, said Jurgis.

There is no refrigeration on the ships he added, and the food consists primarily of potatoes and barley. "We saw no fresh or green foods for months and our teeth were beginning to fall out."

Crew members are rarely allowed to go ashore, he said, and the commissars watch their every move.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would start the new year right with very early consideration of both the civil



rights measure and a captive nations resolution. Thus, the House could work its will on both matters, and the cause of freedom throughout the world would be advanced.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people I represent here—all the people of Alabama—I extend to you our best wishes on the occasion of your 72d birthday.

Your inherent kindness, your fairness as presiding officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, your great patience, your compassion for the problems and the well-being of all Americans are greatly admired by every Member of the House.

It is the wish of myself, and I am sure of everyone else here this morning, that you have many happy returns of this day and much happiness in the years ahead.

Happy birthday, Mr. Speaker McCORMACK.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m., Saturday, December 21, 1963.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGOWN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 792. An act to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 250]

Abbott	Gray	Murray
Adair	Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Andrews,	Griffiths	Nelsen
N. Dak.	Gubser	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Hall	Osmer
Ayres	Harris	Ostertag
Baker	Harrison	Patman
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Philbin
Barrett	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Bass	Hawkins	Powell
Becker	Hays	Purcell
Beermann	Hébert	Quillen
Belcher	Herlong	Rains
Blatnik	Hoeven	Randall
Bolling	Hoffman	Reid, Ill.
Bray	Hollifield	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Hull	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Riehlman
Buckley	Ichord	Roberts, Ala.
Burke	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts, Tex.
Burkhalter	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Tex.
Cameron	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, Pa.
Cannon	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Carey	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Casey	Kelly	St. George
Cederberg	Keogh	St. Germain
Celler	Kilburn	Scott
Ciancy	King, N.Y.	Shelley
Clark	Kluczynski	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Kornegay	Short
Colmer	Kunkel	Sikes
Cooley	Kyl	Siler
Corbett	Landrum	Sisk
Curtis	Lankford	Slack
Dague	Leggett	Stephens
Daniels	Lennon	Sullivan
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Talcott
Dawson	Lloyd	Taylor
Derounian	Long, Md.	Teague, Calif.
Devine	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Donohue	McIntire	Thompson, Tex.
Dwyer	McLoskey	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Macdonald	Trimble
Evins	Mailliard	Van Pelt
Fascell	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Fino	Martin, Nebr.	Watts
Flynt	Miller, Calif.	Wharton
Foreman	Milliken	Whitener
Forrester	Minshall	Willis
Fraser	Monagan	Wilson
Fulton, Tenn.	Montoya	Charles H.
Fuqua	Moorhead	Wright
Gibbons	Morris	Wylder
Glenn	Moss	Younger
Goodell	Multer	
Grant	Murphy, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 263 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL H.R. 9499

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 598, Rept. No. 1086), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 598 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 598?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the rule on the grounds that under rule 11, section XXII, of the rules of the House this rule is not laid over before the House for 24 hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that clause 22 of rule 11 provides, in substance, that the House may consider a resolution on the same day as reported, if by a two-thirds vote.

The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 598?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 178, noes 50.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the House agrees to consider House Resolution 598.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour and after the Committee on Foreign Affairs spent weeks and weeks and months holding hearings on this legislation, and after the Committee on Appropriations held hearings and hearings for days and days, and then with the debate on the floor of the House, I do not think anything said at this late hour will change any votes here this morning. Any valuable information given to the Members here this morning will be whatever words the members of the conference committee have to say. I do, however, want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], and the members of the conference committee for the great work they have done in arriving at a determination on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, of course this is a very late hour in the morning and everybody is tired and we would like to adjourn, but by the same token this is probably the most important subject we are considering this session. We probably would not be here this late if it were not important. I do have some requests for time, and I would ask the indulgence of the Members of the House a little longer so that gentlemen can express their comments on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order and provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 9499, the foreign aid appropriation bill. As I understand it, the additional language which was added and which makes necessary this resolution by the Rules Committee is as follows. In speaking about the Export-Import

Bank this language, as I understand, is added:

Except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate.

In the short amount of testimony we heard a while ago before the Rules Committee, it was brought out that some of the Members suggested and felt that the language which the House earlier adopted when we passed the motion to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions, the so-called Findley amendment, is better than this particular amendment. In turn, some Members feel that there is no time limit in this broad statement as to the conditions precedent as to when President Johnson has to report to the two committees of the House and the two committees of the Senate or if he has to report before the Export-Import Bank makes the guarantee, that it is not specific enough on the requirement for the determination of the President. Others feel that Russia owes us money they have not paid back, and eventually, if the Export-Import Bank does this, possibly the U.S. taxpayer may have to pay the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the rules of the House and as I also understand the assurances that were given to the members of the Rules Committee before this rule was given, the minority will have a motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. We will have that motion to recommit before we finally vote on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of California. We may have some differences of understanding here. I might ask the Speaker about this. My understanding is that after the rule on this resolution is adopted and time is taken by the committee in explaining the conference report, when the motion for the previous question is made, at that time a motion will be in order to recommit the conference report to the committee with instructions to take the House version of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. That is my understanding of it. I want to make that clear.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not that is the understanding, so that we will all know as we proceed here?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the motion to recommit is in order after the adoption of the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of California. After the adoption?

Mr. HALLECK. After the adoption of the previous question, but not the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. If the gentleman will yield to me further, in order that my position may be very well understood, I supported the Jensen motion to recommit when this measure was originally before us. It carried by a very decisive vote here in the House of Representatives. It was originally offered in the Committee of the Whole by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. It lost on a tie vote. As far as I am concerned, I understand that a motion to recommit with instructions to insist on the House position will be offered. I shall support that motion. I hope it prevails.

Now otherwise I might say, that after too much delay, but having been here this long tonight and this morning, possibly we might as well go on and dispose of this matter and send it over to the other body. But again may I say I hope the motion to recommit will prevail to the end that the original recommit when we had the bill before us will be in the bill. Now as to what happens in the other body, I do not know. That is up to them. But so far as I am concerned, I am going to support that motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentlemen who are asking for a vote will have it soon and when they vote, I hope they will vote against this rule.

I recognize, gentlemen, that the hour is late but I also recognize the hour is late in the legislative history of this country in the matter of the delegation of power, and it is beginning to get us into a situation where we had better give consideration to this and if it is so important that you get home for the holidays and you are not willing to consider basic legislation that involves constitutional questions, then there is something wrong with this House of Representatives. May I say to you very briefly why I believe this rule is not in the best interest of the country. The motion failed by a vote of 133 to 133 to prevent the Export-Import Bank from making loans to sell wheat to the Communists. Then on the motion to recommit there was a prohibition against the financing of this wheat to the Communists; and it is in this bill regardless of what was said on this floor earlier today.

Now what does this amendment do? I say to you, if you vote for this rule, you are then voting against what you voted for several days ago. For what this rule does is to provide legislative authority for the President of the United States to make determinations. The rule provides that the President may determine, if he feels it is in the best interest of the Nation, then this financing can be done by the Export-Import Bank. May I point out what he does then is to notify the proper committees of both the House and Senate. There is nothing in the bill that says when he shall report and there is nothing you can do after he has reported. So you have completely wiped out the will of the House, as we passed it last week, when we voted for the motion to re-

commit. You now simply wipe that all out by turning this authority over to the President. It is a legislative authority that you are now delegating to the President of the United States. May I call your attention to section 1 of article I of the Constitution which provides that all legislative power shall rest in the Congress of the United States; and you are delegating that legislative power to the Chief Executive. Under the Constitution the Executive may from time to time send us a message on the state of the Union. Now we have gone down this road for some time about the delegation of constitutional powers of the rights of this House. The hour is late and you are unhappy with me for taking your time. But I say to you, and to those who want this vote, if an early vote is more important to you than the Constitution of the United States and its preservation—what are we doing here? I hope you will oppose the rule. May I say again that this bill does have money in it for Communist countries. There is money contained here that will find its way into Yugoslavia, Poland, and into Cuba and other Communist countries.

The reason this rule was necessary was because of the Export-Import Bank legislation money that might go into Communist hands. If you are against financing wheat to Communist countries, you will vote against this rule.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just one more request for time. I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposal demands our careful consideration because it goes right to the heart of our foreign policy. Monday we voted to ban subsidized credit for the Communists. The message was clear, and the people of the United States applauded.

Now what is before us? New language. What does it say? Nothing. It is a joke. It pulls all the teeth we put in Monday's amendment. It leaves nothing but a verbal vacuum. The President gets a blank check. He sets the policy, not the Congress.

Examine it. Look at the words in this new proposal: the President must determine it is in the national interest before taxpayers are forced to guarantee credit for the Communists. But do not hold your breath. The President has already made the determination. In a letter to the majority leader of the other body, dated yesterday, the President, speaking of sales to Communist countries, said, and I quote:

"In my judgment, sales of wheat and other farm commodities, on reasonable terms, are now plainly in the national interest of the United States."

He said "national interest." The very same phrase that appears in this proposed language.

The new language says that the President must report his decisions to various congressional committees. It does not say when. It can come long after the damage is done. But here again do not hold your breath. The President has already reported his determination.



Pull the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD out from under your seat. You do not have to wait 7 days to read it in the Federal Register. Turn to page 25144 of today's or, rather, yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There the President has already reported. You can see for yourself the full text of his letter.

The simple fact is this: the President has made his determination, and his determination is already on the public record.

What does this compromise language mean? Nothing. Words. Meaningless, empty words. The only way that we can stop subsidized credit for the Communists is to say so ourselves in plain, clear language, like the language we adopted on Monday.

Do we shrink from saying in clear language—no subsidized credit for the Communists? Is that asking too much of the elected representatives of the last, best hope for human freedom? Why are we here? What is our duty? To set policy or to shift it to the President?

Congress should make the determination and determine that forcing taxpayers to subsidize credit for the Communists is not in the national interest.

The Congress should make its own report—report to the American people—yes, report tonight to the American people and to all who love freedom that we will not finance Communist Russia out of a hole dug by its own repressive, dictatorial system.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is insisting upon the retention in this legislation of the amendment which he originally proposed when we were in the Committee of the Whole. Is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I correctly understand, in agreement with him, that the motion to recommit will restate the position of the House of Representatives in that regard, and if we have here the votes tonight to restate that position, then this conference report will be re-committed with an affirmative determination on the part of the House of Representatives to retain the amendment that the gentleman originally proposed?

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Having studied your own amendment very carefully, and the language adopted by the conferees, do you consider the language to be a compromise now, or would you say it was not a compromise?

Mr. FINDLEY. It has the effect of wiping out the entire content of the amendment we adopted on Monday. Maybe that is a compromise. To me it washes out the entire effect and meaning of that amendment.

Mr. DOLE. That is the way I understand it, and I agree with the gentleman. What was the vote on Monday on your amendment? Do you remember the vote on your amendment?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. The vote was 218 for the amendment and 169 against.

Mr. DOLE. Rather clearly the House position was not sustained then.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. To sustain the gentleman's position on the vote earlier this week, how should one vote on the proposition before the House at this time?

Mr. FINDLEY. The correct vote would be "aye" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to bring to the attention of the House a statement by the Department of State which shows that the Communists owe the U.S. taxpayers at this very minute \$10,800 million plus interest. The State Department agreed some time ago to take \$300 million and settle that big account. Yet the Communists have not been willing to settle for even that amount.

Now we are asked to extend further credit to these deadbeats of half a billion more of our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD this statement from the State Department which explains this matter quite in full.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE QUESTION OF A LEND-LEASE SETTLEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The following information has been prepared in response to many inquiries received about World War II lend-lease to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the efforts the United States has taken to seek a reasonable settlement by the U.S.S.R. of its lend-lease obligation.

Lend-lease was conceived and executed "to promote the defense of the United States," as provided for in the lend-lease law. The program was inaugurated on March 11, 1941 as our peacetime contribution to nations aiding our defense by resisting Axis aggression. After the United States was attacked, lend-lease became an instrument by which we strengthened our allies according to the strategic plans of the Allied Nations as a whole. Unlike methods used in previous wars, lend-lease focused directly on the aid to be rendered rather than upon the dollar sign to be placed on the war materials and services furnished by the United States. It was not a loan of money nor was it provided for the exclusive benefit of the recipient country. We helped other peoples under lend-lease because at the time their interests coincided with our interests.

In settling the lend-lease accounts with our World War II Allies, the United States has not made it a practice to obtain payment for the value of all equipment and services furnished other nations for use during the war. No compensation has been requested for articles and services which were lost, consumed or destroyed during the war, nor for combat items such as tanks, aircraft, etc., in the custody of the Armed Forces of our allies at the end of the war. It has been the policy and practice of the United States to require payment for lend-lease goods in the possession of other countries at V-J Day which were of a civilian type useful in the peacetime economy of the recipient country and for lend-lease delivered after V-J Day.

There were two phases of lend-lease with most of our World War II Allies: (1) lend-lease requested and delivered to our allies before V-J Day, and (2) lend-lease requested before V-J Day and for which procurement contracts had been placed but which was not produced or delivered to an Ally until after V-J Day. When World War II came to an end large quantities of such lend-lease supplies and equipment were in production or storage in the United States. Our Government informed its Allies that if they wished to obtain these lend-lease materials they would either have to pay for them or undertake to make payment upon terms to be mutually agreed before the goods would be transferred.

The Soviet Government has agreed to pay for lend-lease delivered after V-J Day. In an agreement signed on October 15, 1945, the U.S.S.R. undertook to pay for undelivered lend-lease articles which were in production or in storage in the United States before V-J Day. The total amount to be paid by the U.S.S.R. for these articles is \$222,494,574. This is to be paid in 22 annual installments, with interest at 2½ percent per annum. The Soviet Government has been making regular partial payments on this account and as of July 1, 1962, has paid a total of \$100,807,451. The United States did not complete deliveries to the U.S.S.R. under this agreement. In making annual payments on account, the Soviet Government deducts certain sums which it claims as compensation or damages resulting from the failure of the United States to complete deliveries under the agreement. In view of these deductions and since the question of the Soviet claims has not been settled, the U.S. accounting records show an arrearage of \$46,626,012.

The United States has been unable to reach a settlement with the Soviet Government for lend-lease assistance which was delivered before V-J Day.

The United States furnished approximately \$10.8 billion worth of lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union up to V-J Day. In seeking a settlement of this lend-lease account of the Soviet Government, the United States has followed the basic principles and policies, previously described, which governed lend-lease settlements with other governments. The Soviet Government has been asked to pay the reasonable value of civilian-type lend-lease articles on hand in the Soviet Union at V-J Day which would be useful in peacetime. Since the U.S.S.R. did not provide an inventory of such articles, the United States prepared one which showed the value as \$2.6 billion. An additional problem relates to the disposition to be made of 84 lend-lease merchant ships and 49 miscellaneous army and navy watercraft still in Soviet custody, the value of which is not included in the \$2.6 billion figure.

During the initial negotiations the United States in 1948 requested the U.S.S.R. to pay \$1.3 billion as the first step in the negotiating process. The Soviet Government had offered to pay \$170 million. During subsequent ne-

gotiations in 1951-52, the U.S. figure was reduced to \$300 million. In the interest of obtaining a prompt settlement, the United States indicated its readiness to reduce this sum further, provided the Soviet Government increased its offer, which at the time was \$240 million, to a sum more nearly reflecting the value of the articles in the peacetime economy of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. increased its offer to \$300 million. The United States did not consider this sum adequate and rejected the offer in 1952. The foregoing sums do not include settlement for any ships since these were to be dealt with as a separate part of the overall negotiations. No further settlement offer has been received from the U.S.S.R.

At the request of the United States, negotiations were resumed on January 11, 1960. The United States proceeded on the understanding that the negotiations were to deal solely with a lend-lease settlement. When the discussions began, however, the Soviet Government insisted that a lend-lease settlement could not be considered as a separate and independent problem. It took the position that any settlement of lend-lease would have to be accompanied by the simultaneous conclusion of a trade agreement giving most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union, and the granting by the United States of long-term credits on terms acceptable to the Soviet Union.

During the negotiations the United States explained why it is not in a position to negotiate on either a bilateral trade agreement or the extension of long-term credits. It was pointed out that existing law prevents the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union and that other laws and policies have an effect upon Soviet-United States trade. On the question of credits the United States took the position that legal and policy considerations made it impossible for the United States to discuss this matter in the lend-lease negotiations. The Soviet position remained unchanged.

Under these circumstances there was no agreement on the terms of reference to the negotiations and there appeared to be no common ground for continuing the discussions at that time. The last meeting was held on January 27, 1960. The United States informed the Soviet Government that it is prepared to resume negotiations for an overall lend-lease settlement at any time the Soviet Government is ready to negotiate on this as a separate and independent issue.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule, but I think in view of the argument that has been made the record should be set completely straight at this time. In the first place I think the entire amendment as changed by the conferees should be read into the RECORD at this time because it clearly illustrates the intention of the gentleman from Illinois as expressed in the amendment which he offered when this bill was before the House originally, that:

None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country.

The only difference in the amendment which is now before the House and the amendment originally offered is that regardless of whether it was in the national interest of the United States or

not, regardless of the need on the part of the President of the United States to make a determination that a guarantee of a sale was in the national interest, regardless of the necessity on the part of the President in the exercise of his leadership in the field of foreign affairs, it would be completely impossible to realize these aims if we should return to the language in the amendment as originally offered—

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall not yield at this time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, attention has been directed to the letter of the President of the United States to Senator MANSFIELD. The President of the United States stated in this letter:

I strongly urge that the Senate reject the amendment attached to the foreign aid appropriation bill which would prevent any use of the facilities of the Export-Import Bank in connection with all trade with Communist countries.

The Senate has before refused to accept this proposal, and it is even less justified now than before. In one of the last letters of his life, President Kennedy pointed out plainly that the Export-Import Bank has a record of judgment which fully justifies confidence in its ability to use its powers wisely, with a net gain to the taxpayer.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

The Chair has already counted a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the point here it seems to me is this: First, are we going to restrict the President of the United States in the exercise of his constitutional powers to speak as the voice of this country in foreign policy? Second—and I think this is most important, and most important to the Members who voted for the motion to recommit when this bill was before the House previously—those Members had no opportunity to vote for an amendment with an escape clause that would state the policy of this country and at the same time would give the President of the United States the opportunity to exercise his constitutional powers in the interest of, and after a determination of the interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this fact, it seems to me that we should go along with the conferees, that we should adopt this amendment, and adopt the conference report.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman, if I have time.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma mean to say that the Congress does not have the authority to lay down national policy and that we must do it through the President?

Mr. ALBERT. We are doing that very thing in this amendment. We are laying down basic policy, without infringing

upon the constitutional authority of the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have another request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time this year that I have taken the floor of the House. I do not want the year to end without wishing you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask a simple question. Do we know what we are doing here tonight? Here we are appropriating \$3 billion in foreign aid to fight, to resist, to stop communism in the world. That is the purpose of the foreign aid bill. However, in order to be sure that we have to spend that money, we are going to provide for \$500 million worth of credits by the U.S. Government to supply the Russians with wheat to make them strong throughout the world and to be sure that we have to spend this \$3 billion that we are providing for in this bill.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in one breath we are saying to the world we have got to appropriate \$3 billion of the taxpayers' money to fight communism and in another section of the bill we say we are going to provide the Russians with approximately \$500 million worth of credit with which to buy wheat so that they can keep their army in Poland, they can keep their army in Bulgaria, in Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and to continue their armies in Cuba 90 miles from our very shores.

Mr. Speaker, I, for the life of me, cannot understand why we are appropriating money in one breath to resist communism and in another breath appropriating money and providing credit to help communism. This is par for the other body. We expect things like that from them. But this House has to defend the people against their irresponsible action.

This bill is an insult to the people of America. It takes \$3 billion from the taxpayers to stop communism and then takes another \$500 million of taxpayers' money to help communism. To me this is nonsense. Let us awaken to what we are doing. Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House tonight will stand firm on its position barring any Export-Import Bank credit on any trade deal with Communist nations. There is more involved here than in getting an early start on our respective journeys home for Christmas.

Let us take a look at this Russian wheat deal. It was first presented to the American people by the late President Kennedy as a private, commercial transaction—a one-shot deal—for cash presumably gold, and it was supposed to help the American wheat farmer as well as the American taxpayer, and ease our balance-of-payments problem. There was even to be a side benefit to the hard-pressed American shipping industry in that the wheat was to be transported to Russia in American bottoms.

Now—in the space of a few short weeks—nearly all of this has been



changed. Our Government, through various of its agencies and officials, has been involved in the protracted negotiations with the Russians up to its bureaucratic neck. There have been ample indications that, far from being a single transaction, this wheat sale is to pave the way for a whole new concept of our hitherto restrictive trading policies with Communist countries—and all practically without any consultation with Congress.

That Russian gold has evaporated off the top of the "barrelhead," and, Russian commercial credit in this country being zero, it is now proposed that the deal be saved by the granting of a Russian credit guarantee to insure that the American grain-export dealers who are putting the deal together will not lose their money. In essence, this means that the American taxpayer will be underwriting, with his money, the good faith, the good intentions and the good credit of Mr. Khrushchev and his cronies.

How good is that Russian credit, which here will be to the tune of, perhaps, 80 percent of the total \$250 million wheat deal? Well, as I have said, Khrushchev's commercial credit—through normal international banking circles—is zero, and it does not seem to me that its government-to-government credit, and that is what we are now talking about, ought to be figured very much higher.

Why? Because as of June 30, this year, the Secretary of the Treasury reported that the Russians owed us a balance of over \$621 million on their World War I indebtedness to the United States, and in addition—according to my information—they received some \$11 billion from us in World War II aid, of which vast sum, after the war, they agreed to repay only some \$321 million, toward which we have so far received only about \$110 million.

I know this is the season for "good will towards all men"—and I am moved by that spirit—but I just think it goes beyond all reason and the proper limits of enlightened charity for us to be trying to so finance both sides of the cold war at one and the same time. For this reason, this limiting amendment—as originally passed by the House—had a proper place in the foreign aid bill, a bill financing a program that is supposed to have been designed and administered so as to combat and contain the declared Communist ambition to enslave the whole world.

It is clear that the Russians have gold with which to pay for our wheat—if they really want it and need it that badly. So far this year, they have "dumped"—or sold—some \$365 million worth of gold on the international market—nearly double the amount of their previous year's sales.

Already we have yielded to an undetermined degree on the American shipping requirement—to sell Khrushchev wheat at a cost of 56 cents a bushel less than the cost of the same wheat to an American buyer. What point is there in yielding any further on what was a dubious bargain to begin with?

The conferees are now suggesting to us that we give the President authority

to sidestep this restriction on credit—which was carried here in this body earlier this week by a substantial margin—whenever he finds it proper to do so in the national interest. And—take special note—the language they suggest would permit of such Presidential discretion not only in connection with this wheat deal, where it would undoubtedly be applied, but with respect to any and all future similar transactions, as well.

Now, I should not wish to be a party, in any way, in any move to restrict the President's power and right to determine upon and conduct this Nation's foreign policy, subject to such constitutional duties as are imposed upon him with respect thereto. However, the Constitution clearly states that it is the Congress that has the power to—and I quote from article I, section 8, thereof—"regulate commerce with foreign nations." I do not think, in the light of the precedent we may hereby be establishing, that we should lightly or hastily lay aside our responsibility in this respect. Most assuredly we should not do so on adjournment eve, when many of our colleagues are absent, and we are, perforce, operating under abnormal legislative conditions.

In my considered judgment, we should proceed to agree to the compromise amount suggested for mutual security purposes, hold fast to the position we have already taken here in this body on the question of credit to Communist nations, and hope that the other body will finally consent to let the matter rest here until we have reconvened in January, and can go into this whole question of cold war trading policies in a thorough and responsible manner.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are debating here a very important question which I believe deserves our most careful attention.

You will recall that some time ago, our Government indicated it would take under consideration any request made by the Soviet Union to purchase some of our surplus wheat. Several weeks of intensive discussion and study of the question followed. Every responsible public opinion poll showed that an overwhelming majority of Americans favored the sale of our surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, especially since most other countries, including our neighbor to the north, Canada, are now selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Finally, after hearing all of the evidence pro and con, our late President Kennedy suggested it would be in the national interest to sell Soviet Russia our surplus wheat under several conditions including one that the wheat would have to be shipped in American ships and that all sales would be on a cash-on-the-line basis.

President Kennedy said that since all other countries are selling wheat to the Soviet Union, we might as well get rid of our surpluses which cost us millions of dollars in storage fees, and at the same time strengthen our gold reserve position since the Soviets would have to pay for the wheat in gold.

President Kennedy's suggestion won overwhelming approval of the American

people. We all understood that every grain of American wheat that goes to Russia helps demonstrate again and again the complete bankruptcy of the Communist system. Our wheat is produced by American farmers who are free; Russia's wheat shortage is being caused by Soviet farmers who are slaves of communism.

The Soviet Union has begun negotiating with our Government for the purchase of \$300 million worth of our surplus wheat. At this moment we do not know if the agreement will be consummated.

We are debating here an amendment which is necessary if the sale is to be considered any further.

The amendment states as follows:

None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committee and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that this amendment differs only slightly from the original amendment offered a few days ago in the House. This amendment adds the additional language "except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest."

What this amendment actually does is expressed in unequivocal terms that the Congress is opposed to insuring any sales to the Soviet Union by American grain dealers unless such action is proven by the President to be in the national interest.

It should be remembered that the Export-Import Bank does not issue any loans per se. This agency is nothing more than an insurance agency which protects American exporters from losses in the event a foreign government defaults in its payments to an American company.

I personally am strongly opposed to extending any credit to the Soviet Union. But the Constitution vests in our President the responsibility of determining foreign policy. I cannot conceive any circumstance under which the President would be justified in extending any credit to the Soviet Union, especially since we are well acquainted with the Soviet Union's horrible record of keeping its word on agreements. But I do not have access to all of the facts regarding international relations which the President has. Therefore, while I personally oppose any credit to the Soviets, I do not want to deny our President—Democrat or Re-

publican—his constitutional right to determine foreign policy.

It should be remembered, however, Mr. Speaker, that the language provided in the amendment may never be needed in our proposed wheat sale to the Soviets. President Kennedy said all sales of wheat should be on a cash-on-the-barrel basis. This amendment in no way changes our original position. I, for one, shall insist that any sale of American surplus wheat to Soviet Russia must be on a cash-and-carry basis. What this amendment would do is that in the event some hitch occurs in the payment of funds by the Soviet Union to the American firms which handle the sale, these firms could be protected by the Export-Import Bank. But these firms have to pay the bank a premium for this protection.

The Export-Import Bank was created to encourage American firms to get into the export business without jeopardizing their investments in the event foreign countries default on payments to American firms. We have a favorable balance of trade; that is, we export more than we import. We have this favorable balance of trade because American businessmen are now willing to sell abroad because their contracts are protected by the Export-Import Bank. Exports mean jobs to American workers.

I believe the language in the amendment fully protects the American people. It requires the President to first prove to Congress and the American people that sales of wheat to the Soviet are in the national interest.

This resolution clearly states that we are opposed to any sale to the Soviets unless such sales are on a cash-and-carry basis, and credit can be extended only when it is in the national interest.

I believe we should not lose sight of the fact that this bill before us today reduces foreign aid by \$1.9 billion. This is the biggest cut ever voted in the foreign aid program and I am happy to support these cuts. I have stated throughout this session that the American people will support military and economic assistance to our allies but only when the American people are certain all waste has been eliminated. I believe this \$1.9 billion cut reflects our determination to phase the entire program out as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, statements have been made that this amendment would help feed Communists with American credit. I do not believe this is true. We have stated that our policy is to sell wheat to the Soviets only on a cash-and-carry basis. The Soviets are paying cash to other nations and while there has been some mention of a 25-percent cash downpayment, I can only reaffirm that my own position will be to insist all sales of wheat to Russia must be on a cash-and-carry basis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the vast number of Americans who support this sale of surplus wheat to Russia do so because they believe such sales clearly demonstrate how thoroughly bankrupt is the Communist system. I have said before and I will say again, we Ameri-

cans, as free people, have consistently been able to show how superior is our system as compared to the Soviet philosophy. I believe the very fact that we have wheat surpluses to sell to the Soviet Union demonstrates again the vigor of American free enterprise. I have not the slightest doubt that American freedom will ultimately bury Soviet Communist slavery. Those who oppose this demonstration of American superiority have little faith in the strength of America. I do not believe the Soviet Union can ever fully explain to its people how it is that America has such abundance under capitalism to be able to sell its surpluses to the Soviets.

I should like to emphasize again: President Johnson may never use this authority of the Export-Import Bank. As a matter of fact, I doubt if he will and I certainly hope he never will, but I do not believe we should tie his hands. The Constitution of the United States clearly states the President shall set foreign policy. This is a time when all Americans should join ranks to support our President in charting a course which will bring about the ultimate collapse of communism and the victory of freedom.

I have infinite trust and confidence in President Johnson. He is a dedicated American whose only goal in life is to see America and its free institutions triumph over Communist tyranny. He is our President and I can think of no more effective way to impede his dedication to America than to tie his hands at this crucial moment in history when it is becoming more and more clear that communism can be defeated without armed warfare.

I will take my stand beside my President and I am sure most Americans will support the President on this issue.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. Opponents of the amendment have tried to create the impression that this amendment somehow would pay for the wheat to the Soviets. May I emphasize that there is not a penny in the bill to buy wheat for the Russians. The amendment would in no way help the Soviets purchase the wheat, but this amendment would tie the hands of the Export-Import Bank, the very agency which was established to protect American firms which try to save the American taxpayer millions of dollars in storage costs by getting rid of our surplus wheat commodities.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of this rule. Once again the American people are being deceived, slapped in the face and insulted by the so-called foreign policy experts of this country. The State Department has once again had its way and this means that we will lose and the Communists will gain. The latter's declared purpose is to bury us and this aim will be augmented by the action of the Congress in capitulating from its position of earlier this week whereby we declared that the Communists should not get credit in their purchase of wheat from the United States. The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] fought a great battle but in the end his position did not prevail.

How dumb can we get? We are stupid to sell wheat to the Soviet Union in the first place but this stupidity pales into insignificance when it later comes to pass that we must furnish them credit to assure the transaction. Who in the United States except the State Department appeasers would believe that the Communist credit is worth anything? We were told in the beginning that this transaction would help offset our flow of gold, that we would improve our balance-of-payments position by selling this wheat surplus to our mortal enemies. As if this were not a mirage, the next step in this sellout was indicated in the Thursday, November 21, 1963 Washington Post in a front-page story under the heading "Threat Seen to Soviet Wheat Deal." The lead paragraphs tell the story:

Congress was told yesterday that the Russian wheat deal probably will fall through unless the Government can guarantee private financing of the transaction. The warning was given in testimony before the Senate Banking Committee by Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon.

Thus, we not only are called upon to subsidize the Communists to the tune of about 60 cents per bushel, we also must yield in the matter of ships flying the American flag, and, on top of that, provide for possible assurance of credit. Were a private citizen to propose such a deal he would be put in the insane asylum.

The Congress has shown a shocking propensity to compromise on basic principles. How can we possibly think we are protecting the interest of the American taxpayers by this weak-kneed compromise? There should be a positive prohibition in the law, not a statement of the will of Congress with a presidential exception. Bureaucrats have been calloused in their disregard of these pronouncements. We made the same error in the so-called Latta amendment whereby the positive prohibition offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio Representative DELBERT LATTI, was changed by this body into a statement of principle. I insert at this point a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman which should answer the question whether or not this compromise is meaningful. Of course it is not and we will get the same answer when the Export-Import Bank guarantees credit to the Communists. In fact this compromise is less meaningful since the President can waive it. Note, in particular, the fourth paragraph of this letter. It is always easy to skirt around a declaration by saying it is not binding.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 24, 1963.

HON. JOSEPH M. ASHBROOK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: This is in reply to your letter of March 28 regarding the transfer of certain nonfat dry milk for distribution to children and other needy persons in Cuba.

Five million pounds of nonfat dry milk have been made available to the American Red Cross, and an additional 5 million pounds are in the process of being donated,



to be distributed through noncommercial channels to children and other needy persons under the supervision of the Red Cross organization.

The American Red Cross requested and received the nonfat dry milk to which reference is made pursuant to section 1431, title 7 of the United States Code (as revised by sec. 302 of Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), which authorizes donations to approved non-profit voluntary agencies for distribution to needy persons in foreign countries. The containers for the nonfat dry milk are marked "Donated by the people of the United States of America," and the containers also bear the symbol of the American Red Cross. Local distribution is being made through the Cuban Red Cross.

With reference to the policy statement of the Congress as set forth in section 2(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1961, it is understood that this section is a general declaration of congressional policy which the legislative history indicates was directed toward commercial transactions other than those under Public Law 480, which are involved in the expansion of trade between this and other countries. Section 2(c) neither amends nor repeals any provision of law, and does not in itself constitute a statutory prohibition on action otherwise authorized by law. In this connection, it is noted that section 104 of the act which contains section 2(c) provides that "Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under other provisions of law or to establish or consult with advisory committees."

You, of course, are aware of the huge surplus quantity of nonfat dry milk in Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory, for which we are unable to find any available outlet. It was the judgment of those concerned that the exigencies of the situation warranted this particular movement of milk, and that the best interest of the Government was served thereby.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary.

This is no compromise in any sense of the word. We started out with the Findley amendment which was an absolute prohibition on the guaranteeing of credit to the Communists. The so-called compromise provides legislative authority to the President to authorize this credit when he deems it in the national interest. This is meaningless because in a letter to the Senate, he has already stated that he believes sales of wheat to the Soviet Union are in the national interest. It is worse than this because the language of the conference committee substitute provides no opportunity for the Congress to block this action once taken by the President. It simply requires that he submit a report to specified committees of the Congress when he makes such a determination, not even requiring a time limit for so doing. This is a broad delegation of authority, our authority, to the President and the State Department.

It seems a little ridiculous to me, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us would spend \$3 billion of our taxpayers money for the avowed purpose of bolstering the free world against communism and in the same bill we permit the President to authorize up to \$300 million in credit to these same Communists to buy our wheat. Why would they want our wheat? To strengthen themselves and be in a position to further spread their godless ideology throughout the world—the exact thing we are supposed to be

fighting in this same bill. Where could this happen except in Washington? Is it any wonder that people are losing faith in their elected representatives?

Can we not open our eyes? The letter from Secretary Freeman will be duplicated in regard to guaranteeing credit for this wheat deal. We will get the same answer—the declaration the Democratic majority is forcing through here tonight "neither amends nor repeals any provision of law and does not in itself constitute a statutory prohibition on action otherwise authorized by law." In other words, a statement of congressional policy is meaningless.

As far as that goes, the 1934 Johnson Act barring credit to countries which are in default of their obligations to the United States, the Export Control Act of 1949 which placed several important controls on exports, prohibiting trade which would not serve our foreign policy objectives or national security, and the 1951 Mutual Defense Assistance Act, better known as the Battle Act, which embargoed shipment of war materials and strategic goods to Soviet-bloc nations, are still on the books and overlooked by the present administration. There is little intention to enforce these legislative enactments. Who can be so foolish as to think the State Department appeasers will abide by a mere declaration of congressional intent?

This is no compromise in any sense of the word. The Johnson administration has won and the people have lost. The Johnson administration fought for the right to guarantee credit to our enemies. A logical question is whether or not Secretary Rusk and President Johnson feel that the Communists are, in truth, our enemies? Is the cold war over? Mr. Speaker, we cannot blame the Communists. It is certainly in their interest that this compromise be passed. The blame cannot rest with this band of liars, murderers, and thieves if they proceed to take our wheat, accept our credit, and then default. The sole blame rests with the Democratic majority in this Congress and the administration. I hope the American people will call them to account for this tragic retreat from principle.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said concerning the controversial Mundt-Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill that I feel clarification is in order. I realize full well that all sorts of clarifying statements have been made, but frankly, they missed the point.

By selling wheat and other commodities at subsidized prices to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries under conditions dictated by the Soviet Union and its puppet states, we are engaging in a tragic, self-defeating operation.

What the administration is demanding the Congress do is place the stamp of approval on direct support of an international bandit, the Soviet Union. If I may rephrase the point, we are directly aiding "Mother Russia," a totalitarian nation under the czars with its visions of world domination extended and refined by Communist dictators.

At a time when the Soviet farm economy is completely collapsing, our subsidy and aid has the effect of saving them from self-destruction. Arms are twisted, pressure of all sorts is brought to bear, the leadership on the Republican side is outmaneuvered by false promises, and final approval of a completely watered-down, meaningless amendment is a victory for communism.

The Johnson administration has now completely clothed itself in the mantle of foreign policy of the last 3 years which basically is coexistence with communism and a slow surrender to Red pressure in all parts of the world.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on House Resolution 598.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 95, answered "present" 1, not voting 156, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

#### YEAS—182

Addabbo	Fountain	Matsunaga
Albert	Fraser	Matthews
Andrews, Ala.	Frelinghuysen	Mills
Arends	Friedel	Minish
Ashley	Fulton, Pa.	Morgan
Ashmore	Gallagher	Morrison
Aspinall	Garmatz	Morse
Avery	Gary	Murphy, Ill.
Barry	Gathings	Natcher
Bates	Giaino	Nix
Beckworth	Gilbert	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bell	Gill	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Blatnik	Grabowski	Olsen, Mont.
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Olson, Minn.
Boland	Hagan, Ga.	O'Neill
Bonner	Hagen, Calif.	Passman
Brademas	Haley	Patten
Brooks	Halleck	Pepper
Broomfield	Halpern	Perkins
Burleson	Hanna	Pike
Byrne, Pa.	Hansen	Pilcher
Chelf	Harding	Pirnie
Cohelan	Hardy	Poage
Conte	Healey	Pool
Cooley	Hechler	Price
Corbett	Hemphill	Pucinski
Corman	Henderson	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Daniels	Huddleston	Rivers, Alaska
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Rivers, S.C.
Delaney	Jennings	Robison
Dent	Joelson	Rodino
Denton	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Karsten	Rooney, N.Y.
Dorn	Karth	Roosevelt
Downing	Keith	Rosenthal
Dulski	Kilgore	Roush
Duncan	King, Calif.	Roybal
Edmondson	Kirwan	Ryan, N.Y.
Edwards	Libonati	St. Germain
Elliott	Lindsay	St. Onge
Everett	Long, La.	Schwelker
Fallon	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Farbstein	McFall	Secrest
Finnegan	McMillan	Selden
Fisher	Madden	Senner
Flood	Mahon	Sheppard
Fogarty	Marsh	Sibal
Ford	Mathias	Sickles

Smith, Va.  
Smith, Iowa  
Springer  
Staeble  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Thomas  
Thompson, N.J.  
Watson

## NAYS—95

Abele  
Alger  
Anderson  
Ashbrook  
Ayres  
Baldwin  
Battin  
Beermann  
Bennett, Mich.  
Berry  
Betts  
Bolton  
Bolton, Frances P.  
Bow  
Brock  
Bromwell  
Brotzman  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Bruce  
Burton  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cameron  
Chamberlain  
Chenoweth  
Clausen  
Clausen, Don H.  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Cramer  
Cunningham

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hosmer

## NOT VOTING—156

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Auchincloss  
Baker  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bass  
Becker  
Belcher  
Bolling  
Bray  
Brown, Ohio  
Brown, Calif.  
Buckley  
Burke  
Burkhalter  
Cahill  
Cannon  
Carey  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clawson, Del.  
Colmer  
Curtis  
Dague  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson  
Derounian  
Devine  
Diggs  
Donohue  
Dwyer  
Ellsworth  
Evins  
Fascell  
Fino  
Flynt  
Foreman  
Forrester  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Gibbons  
Glenn  
Goodell  
Grant  
Gray

Weltner  
Westland  
White  
Whitener  
Wickersham  
Williams  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winstead  
Young  
Zablocki

Moore  
Morton  
Mosher  
Norblad  
O'Konski  
Pelly  
Pillion  
Poff  
Quile  
Reid, Ill.  
Reifel  
Rich  
Roudebush  
Rumsfeld  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Schenck  
Schneebeli  
Shriver  
Skubitz  
Smith, Calif.  
Snyder  
Stinson  
Taft  
Thomson, Wis.  
Utt  
Weaver  
Whalley  
Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wyman

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hosmer against.  
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Becker against.  
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Derounian against.  
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Short against.  
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McCulloch against.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kilburn against.  
Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.  
Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Cederberg against.  
Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Bray against.  
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Clancy against.  
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.  
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Glenn against.  
Mr. Slack for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.  
Mr. Burke for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.  
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Younger against.  
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Quillen against.  
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.  
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. King of New York against.  
Mr. Osmer for, with Mr. Hoffman against.  
Mr. Morris for, with Mr. Devine against.  
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. McLoskey against.  
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Hoeven against.  
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gray with Mr. Adair.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. McIntire.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Kyle.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hall.  
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Siler.  
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. St. George.  
Mr. Taylor with Mrs. Dwyer.  
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Watts with Mr. Belcher.  
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Goodell.  
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Wharton.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.  
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Ostertag.  
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Cahill.  
Mr. Randall with Mr. Dague.  
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Fino.  
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Wydler.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Tollefson.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Scott with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.  
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Talcott.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Riehlman.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Kunkel.  
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Hutchin-  
son.  
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Foreman.  
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. QUIE and Mr. MacGREGOR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."  
Mr. BELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who, if present, would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on

the bill (H.R. 9499), an act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1087)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 13, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$116,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$135,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$687,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment and insert "\$92,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this Title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency

So the resolution was agreed to.



or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 22, 25, and 26.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve  
on amendment No. 20),  
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve  
on amendment No. 20),  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
SPENCER L. HOLLAND,  
JOHN O. PASTORE,  
MIKE MONROE,  
GALE W. MCGEE,  
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY) Economic assistance

Amendment No. 1—Development grants: Appropriates \$155,000,000 instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$175,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the malaria control program.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—American hospitals and schools abroad: Insert language proposed by the Senate and delete language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—International organizations and programs: Appropriates \$116,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$130,903,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the Children's Fund.

Amendment No. 5—Supporting assistance: Appropriates \$330,000,000 instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Contingency fund: Appropriates \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$32,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Inter-American social and economic cooperation program: Insert language proposed by the Senate and appropriate \$135,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates \$375,000,000 instead of \$350,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$425,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Alliance for Progress, development grants: Appropriates \$80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Development loans: Appropriates \$687,300,000 instead of \$600,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of deobligated funds.

Amendment No. 13—Military assistance: Appropriates \$1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$977,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—Peace Corps: Appropriate \$92,100,000 instead of \$89,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$98,100,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that not to exceed \$19,900,000 shall be available for administrative expenses instead of \$19,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Ryukyu Islands: Provides that not to exceed \$2,300,000 shall be available for administrative and information expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—Assistance to refugees in the United States: Appropriates \$39,717,137 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$56,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—Investment in Inter-American Bank: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Amendment No. 20: Restores House language which was stricken by the Senate relating to the guarantee of sales amended giving discretionary authority to the President with the provision that such determinations by him be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

#### TITLE IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 21—Senate: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Insert heading and appropriate \$190,000 for miscellaneous items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

##### New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 27: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$150,000 for the Commission as there is no authorization for this appropriation.

#### TITLE VI—CLAIMS AND JUDGEMENTS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 28-33: Insert section numbers.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,  
J. VAUGHAN GARY,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve on  
amendment No. 20),  
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve on  
amendment No. 20),  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499), an act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous con-

sent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see above.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night or, rather, early in the morning, I shall limit my time in discussing this conference report.

I want to say that the conference agreement is the best job that it was possible for us to accomplish in the circumstances which exist.

This appropriation bill comes back to the House from the conference committee \$1,525,325,000 below the budget estimates. It is \$602,075,000 below the amount authorized by the legislation which the Congress passed just a week or so ago. It is only \$198,300,000 above the House appropriation figure, but it is \$273,203,000 below the Senate appropriation figure. The bill now before the House calls for a round figure of \$3 billion, which is the lowest appropriation made for foreign aid in many years, plus, of course, the usual carryover of unobligated funds, which amounts to approximately \$260 million. That figure is about \$45 million higher than the estimate which we gave the House previously.

Let me say now, Mr. Speaker, that I do not like a Federal Government wheat-sale arrangement with reference to Communist countries any better than any other Member of this House does. But with privileges comes responsibilities. And, as chairman of the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of protecting the position of the House in conference on this appropriation bill to the greatest extent possible, I must face up to my responsibility and endeavor to help reach the very best agreement that is possible. I believe that all of the conferees will concur that this conference agreement was the best that we could reach.

Let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker. The so-called Mundt amendment which was agreed to by the conferees requires two things specifically: The President must determine that financing such assistance by the Export-Import Bank is necessary, and the President must report each such determination to the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the House.

In addition, our Government would not be subsidizing the credit to the countries who will purchase the wheat, or whatever the commodities might be, but, rather, the Export-Import Bank will make a profit from such transactions.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana on

the role that he played in making certain that we would have an opportunity to have a clear-cut vote on the issue.

I am grateful personally for his help and assistance in this regard.

I want to ask the gentleman whether or not in his judgment the language which is proposed in the conference report requires the President to make a report to the Congress promptly after his determination.

Mr. PASSMAN. On each such determination such a report must be made. We must take into account, also, that the provision expires entirely on June 30, 1964, under this bill.

It is my understanding that the President will make a determination that will be promptly reported to the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. FORD. Are you saying that the determination and notification should be made simultaneously?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is, in effect, my understanding, that the actions will be virtually simultaneous. And there will be a report for each determination. If, for example, there are 20 such determinations, the President will report 20 different times to the four congressional committees specified in the bill.

Mr. FORD. The determination in each instance and the notification will be virtually simultaneous?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that the language of the so-called Mundt amendment relating solely to sale of American products to Communist countries is designed to limit the authority to guaranteeing, or insuring, loans in connection with such sales after an appropriate finding is made by the President. I think that this is a positive definition and limitation and I want the RECORD to so state.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to do a creditable job in conference on this bill, the very best that has been possible for us to accomplish.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that we are operating now under a continuing resolution and it extends until January 31 of next year?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, and at a ceiling of \$3.9 billion.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand they are doing a little better under the continuing resolution than they would do under this bill, and that is certainly something we should keep in mind.

Mr. PASSMAN. They may spend at the rate of \$1 billion a year better.

Mr. HALLECK. But, on the other hand, will the gentleman not agree with me that this matter of helping to finance the people we are supposed to be fighting is the sort of thing we ought to get settled right here and now?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say again that I do not like such a financing arrangement. But, and I repeat, this is the very best agreement that we could reach in conference. It would have been impossible in the circumstances for us to bring back any better bill than we have done.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that in the interest of maintaining the position of the House that at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon we got up and walked out of the conference room without any agreement at all?

Mr. PASSMAN. We certainly did.

Mr. GARY. And we subsequently went back into the conference room upon the urging of the Senate and upon the urging of the leadership of the House and finally reached an agreement?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. This has been the most difficult conference in which this committee has ever been engaged. We worked for hours and hours doing the very best that we could do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Will not the gentleman agree with me that if the motion to recommit, which is to be offered here and which we voted for by a very substantial vote here in the House is to be adopted—will not the gentleman agree with me that very likely we could get the other body to recede and concur in what we are doing?

Mr. PASSMAN. The other body has taken a very positive position in two previous votes on this subject.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to point out to the gentleman in the House that no one questions the tremendous ability of the gentleman from Louisiana to extract the most practicable dollar adjustment. The question is the so-called Mundt-Findley amendment. I would like to point out two things, and the gentleman will please correct me if I am wrong. One is, under the language proposed in the conference report, once the President makes the determination that the guarantee will be in the national interest, that ends it. There is not any recourse that the Congress has, so it is an empty gesture.

The other point is, early in October when the public was first told we feel that the Soviet Union and its satellites should be permitted to purchase, it was clearly stated it would be a cash-on-the-line deal. What we have now is a repudiation of the administration position of 2½ months ago. I do not believe the gentlemen on that side of the aisle wish to repudiate the position of early October.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that in the foreign-aid bill the

presentations are illustrative. Under the legislation approved by this House the witnesses could justify 25 projects for Guatemala, for example, and could then take that same money and start projects in Indonesia. Everything is illustrative. They can spend the money wherever they want to spend it.

Why the Congress has not tightened up this legislation before this time, I do not know. However, I have not heard some of my friends who are now complaining oppose giving the executive the authority requested in the authorizing legislation, to make money available, for example upon Presidential determination, to Indonesia and Egypt and Yugoslavia.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his efforts on holding down foreign aid expenditures, but I see my colleague from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] here on the floor, and I would like to remind the gentleman of the fight that Congressman HARDY put up to use the power of the purse to get information about foreign aid expenditures and that the House backed him up. However, in conference the gentleman from Louisiana yielded to the Senate, as he is now, and permitted an escape clause where the President could make the determination on wiping out all of the teeth that the House put in the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that we did not yield to the Senate.

Mr. MEADER. The Hardy amendment had teeth. When a department of the Government refused to give information to the General Accounting Office or to committees of the Congress and 30 days expired, their funds would be shut off. But the Senate put in an amendment saying that the President could certify that that information should not be given and it was agreed to in conference. This is precisely the same type of operation that is involved in this wheat amendment. We say one thing and then we say the President can decide it.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. For the sake of clarity it is important to understand exactly what happened in both bodies. The gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the conference on the House side, had to compromise with the other body. What happened? The other body voted on this amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a month or so ago and voted the proposition down by a substantial vote. On yesterday, by a bipartisan vote of 52 to 32, again the other body knocked out all of this language; not part of it and not an amendment thereto but all of it. So that the chairman of the conference on the House side was faced with Senate language which contained none of this. Now he



has come back with a proposal which is a limitation, so that for all practical purposes he has asked the other body to subscribe to something which twice it has rejected by a bipartisan vote. That is what the issue is that is before the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. We did the very best that could be done to protect the House position.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. BATTIN. I would like some clarification of the statement the gentleman made earlier.

Mr. PASSMAN. To what statement does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman stated that if, in fact, the Export-Import Bank guaranteed the credit it would show a profit to the bank.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BATTIN. Does not that assume that Russia will repay the loan?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that the terms, if credit is extended, will be 25 percent cash, 25 percent payable in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. The bank terms provide for one-fourth of 1 percent profit for guaranteeing the loan.

Mr. BATTIN. In the event Russia did not repay the obligation who, then, would make up the loss?

Mr. PASSMAN. The same people who are making up the loss of \$10 billion annually that foreign aid is costing us.

Mr. BATTIN. Are we not talking about the cash payment?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. BATTIN. Does not Russia owe us a great deal of money at the present time?

Mr. PASSMAN. So far as I know, every nation on the face of the earth owes us money. The bill before the House right now provides money for 100 nations around the world. I wish to note, in this connection, that I have never voted for the foreign aid authorization bill, but this does not mean, of course, that I am not going to face up to my responsibility as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to say right here and now that in my opinion the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] did as effective a job in negotiating with the other body as I have seen during my 11 years in this body. Let me point out the state of the Findley amendment, when we went into conference. We had adopted the Findley amendment in the House as a motion to recommit. The Senate struck out the language completely. There was nothing in the Senate bill on this subject. Therefore we had to start from scratch and negotiate something. And, Mr. Speaker, if you think that the language which we brought back came easily let me disabuse your mind of that

completely. This is the result of long and hard negotiation.

The gentleman from Louisiana has said that he is not satisfied with it. I am not satisfied with it. The gentleman from Michigan and I have reserved on this amendment and at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit it, because I feel the language of the Findley amendment which we adopted in the House is much better language and should be adopted. However, let me say in the next breath that there is much to be said for this amendment. In the first place, if you are going to have a foreign aid bill at all, in my opinion, this is the amendment best calculated to get it.

Now, a lot of you do not care whether we have a foreign aid bill or not. But let me remind you that the Government is now spending foreign aid money at the rate of \$3.9 billion a year. This bill is some \$900 million less. We could save money. I think practically all of us feel that foreign aid expenditures are too high. I am not sure that we would not be subject to some criticism if we were to delay too long in taking a bill which is as much lower than last year as this one is. This bill is \$900 million lower than the amount which was appropriated in the last year. Thus, as far as the figures of the bill are concerned, I do not think there could be very much in the way of dissatisfaction on the part of the House with the bill. The bill is \$3 billion, which is some \$197 million higher than the House figure but \$273 million lower than the Senate figure.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe that as far as the gentleman from Louisiana is concerned, he has done a magnificent job, and I commend the gentleman for it.

I would like now to reiterate the point which the gentleman from Michigan made in his colloquy with the chairman. If the President decided that he wanted to allow the Export-Import Bank to participate in a guarantee to a Communist country, he has to do two things: The first thing he has to do is to make a determination that it is in the national interest.

The second thing that he must do is notify the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. In other words, he has two things to do, and in my opinion and I think in the opinion of the other conferees, he has to do them simultaneously. So, there is nothing left hanging insofar as the time of the reporting is concerned before the President can avail himself of the authority which would be in this amendment to provide for an exception. He would have to do both.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FINDLEY. For the purpose of clarification, could the gentleman give me assurance that his interpretation of this language means that the President would have to announce his determination before making a final commitment on these transactions?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As far as I can tell that would not be the situation. As the gentleman has so well pointed out in his own statement, there is nothing in here which keeps the President from making the determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is nothing in here which keeps the President from making that determination. All he has to do is to notify the proper committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, there would be no opportunity for the Congress or its committees to come back and argue the merits of the determination; is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is precisely correct. However, of course, the Congress could, if it felt strongly enough about it, pass legislation which would have the effect of stopping such transactions in the future.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman not agree that the President as of yesterday clearly went on public record to the effect that he has made a determination that sales of wheat and other farm commodities to Communist Russia are in the national interest?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman realizes that a new determination has to be made with each transaction under the terms of this amendment?

The gentleman is correct, though, as far as the present state of mind of the President is concerned, as I would interpret it from his statement. He apparently does feel that it is in the national interest to make such guaranties.

Let me say this one further thing: It was said before, and I would like to repeat it. When the first idea of any sale of wheat to Russia came about, it was to be the payment of gold for the wheat. Then, after that it became "something" for wheat. Now we know what it is. It is 25 percent cash.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I do not really know what is meant by cash. If you mean rubles then I do not think that is cash. If you mean dollars it is. But the rest of it is credit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do intend to push my motion to recommit because, in my opinion, such transactions with Communists are not in the interest of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman has stated that he does not know whether it will be rubles or dollars. If I understand it correctly, if the Russians buy wheat in this country, they are going to buy it from the dealers. I do not know of any

dealers in the United States who would accept rubles. Would the gentleman agree that that is true?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not have any way of knowing what the deal would be. Certainly, if the dealer wanted to accept something besides dollars, he probably could.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further? If he wanted to accept rubles instead of dollars, that would be his choice. But I cannot imagine any dealer in the United States accepting rubles. Most of our dealers are pretty good businessmen. They want the cold cash in American dollars. The gentleman, I think, would agree with me that that is correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think, certainly, that it would be a good business deal for any grain dealer if he could get the kind of guarantee that is provided in these transactions.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I think we should make it plain that this is not an amendment that only applies to wheat. This talks about any product. I think many of us have confined it to a narrow limitation and that is to wheat alone. It would guarantee, in effect, the financing and the purchase of any product. The gentleman indicated that if we reject this there will not be any foreign aid bill. Does that mean there will be no foreign aid if we reject this?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No. Of course, there is a continuing resolution which would be good until the 31st of January. The expenditures would be at the rate of \$3.9 billion instead of \$3 billion, as provided in the bill. There is no reason to believe that further continuing resolutions might not be adopted after this one runs out; in fact, it would be entirely possible for an agency to operate for the whole fiscal year on a continuing resolution.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the plain facts are that if Congress adopts the language in the conference report the Congress of the United States of America is and will be abdicating our responsibility as representatives of the people and we will turn that responsibility over to the President of the United States. The American people will know that we, the Members of this House, are so afraid that we might create a feeling in the mind of the President of the United States that we do not trust him. That is not the case at all. It is our responsibility to legislate for the people of the United States. If we abdicate our responsibility we are not fit to sit in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let me just say in closing that I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, but I think I should point out that as of now the President of the United States has the authority to enter into these agreements if he so

desires. There is no inhibition as far as I know under the present interpretation of the law, against the President's entering into any of these guarantee agreements with Communists. I agree that the Findley amendment would be much better, but I would also state that the amendment which we brought back in the conference report would put us in a better situation than we have right now. At least we have here an important and vigorous statement of congressional intent. Also, we have here a provision whereby there would be at least notification to the committees of the House and Senate before such a guarantee could be made.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the plain truth is that probably the greatest job that our new President has is handling our relationship with the Soviet Union. Many would agree that probably this is his No. 1 job. Under the Constitution it is peculiarly within his jurisdiction. It is his responsibility under our system to represent our country in international matters.

As has just been pointed out so ably by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] under the existing law the President has every right to make these negotiations relating to sales of wheat to the Soviet Union.

There are certain prerogatives that are peculiarly within the purview of the Congress, such as the constitutional provision that we raise and equip armies, but our Constitution gives to the President the responsibility for handling problems with foreign countries. I realize we have some responsibility in this area, but it does seem to me that our new President should not be downgraded or appear to be downgraded in the eyes of the American people or in the eyes of the world by a vote which may be interpreted as a vote of no confidence in him in the handling of perhaps his biggest job; dealing with the Soviet Union.

The question before us is not whether we favor the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. The question is whether in the beginning of the period of service of the new President we will give him the flexibility which he has requested in the handling of foreign affairs. I for one, here in the beginning of his administration, am willing to give him this flexibility. He is able, informed, and experienced and he is going to be answerable to the American people. The correctness of his decision on these matters can be decided at a later date even perhaps at the ballot box. We ought not to deny the President the flexibility which he has requested in an area where he has a special constitutional responsibility.

Let me say that this is, therefore, no abdication of authority by Congress. This proposal, this limitation upon our President in the handling of an international matter, is more of an encroachment in a sense upon the President than an abdication by the Congress.

When we voted on the matter on Monday, we did not have an unequivocal

statement from the President as to his position. It is true that many of us have been disturbed over this issue, but on yesterday, rather the day before, the President in unequivocal language stated to the Congress that he opposed the language which the motion to recommit seeks to enact into law, the motion should be rejected.

The President did not say he was going to use the Export-Import Bank. He asked that he not be denied the flexibility of using the Export-Import Bank. So, Mr. Speaker, I think there is room here for agreement on the part of all of us regardless of how we may have voted on Monday and regardless of how we feel on the issue of wheat sales to Russia. There is room here for us to accept the compromise represented by this conference report. I think we can get together and support these men who wrote the conference report—support the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and his committee—and I commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for the statement he has made. I think we can support the conference report and support our President and give him the full opportunity to be our spokesman in this important matter involving foreign affairs.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me apologize to you for taking your time.

In the first place, to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who served on this conference committee, we owe them a debt of gratitude. You do not have to apologize for what you did. If there has been any mistake that has been made, we made it in this House when we adopted the so-called Findley amendment the other day, and the other body was exactly right when they took it out.

Let us get right down to the issue now. This motion to recommit ought to be voted down. As my colleagues must surely know, I am not in the habit of giving your money away. This is the first time I have voted for this bill in about 12 or 13 years—and you reduced it by \$1 million.

You gentlemen know they do not grow 1 bushel of wheat in my neck of the woods.

Gentlemen, the Constitution gives to the President the authority to conduct your foreign affairs. Why do you not, through the device of a limitation on an appropriation, come up and say that the President of the United States cannot open up an embassy in Moscow until the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate approve the amount of money that is going to be spent on that embassy in Moscow—that is exactly what you are doing here. Just think that over now. Would you also say by such a limitation on the use of funds—say to the President, "You cannot send the fleet to the Mediterranean until the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approves the amount of money you are going to spend"?

This is a matter of the conduct of our foreign affairs and, yet, we are trying to



come through here by a back-door device and say that this is a limitation on the expenditure of funds. It may be that, but certainly it is a limitation on the President's authority.

We have a new President now. Do you doubt him? He is trying to do a job. There is not one red cent appropriated here for the Export-Import Bank. And you know it and I know it.

Now we are aiming at the sale of wheat here. You are spending about \$1½ billion—and let us get down to the facts—on subsidies and interest, storage charges and transportation charges. It is running out of our ears. Now let us sell that wheat. If we do not sell it, Canada is going to sell it and some of our allies are going to sell it. Who are we? Are we a little bit "holier than thou"? Oh, yes, we are—sure we are—and if we do not sell it, then they will sell it.

Of course, if you are looking into your crystal ball and we are going to fight Russia in about 6 or 7 months, then certainly we ought not to sell it under any circumstances. But does anybody think we are going to war? Let us not tie the hands of our President. He is patriotic just like we are. His job is to keep us out of war—and he is trying. Let us not here take every tool that he needs away from him.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we ought not to take this authority away from our President. May I respectfully say to you to vote down this kind of provision and let our able friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, and his able Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body handle this matter. Do not do it through the Committee on Appropriations. Do not destroy your committee system and that is what you will be doing now if you adopt this restrictive language.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, along with 219 others, I voted for the Findley-Jensen motion to recommit. As has been mentioned here earlier, I refused to sign this part of the conference report, referring to amendment No. 20. The gentleman from Arizona did as well. On this vote I intend to vote for the motion to recommit.

Now, I would like to say without hesitation or qualification that everybody who wants to vote for the motion to recommit owes a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. Without his wholehearted cooperation it could not have happened, and I believe against his own personal wishes he made it possible for us to have this issue cleared. I compliment him on it and thank him for this help and assistance.

The alternatives, parliamentarywise, without his cooperation, would have been far worse. Because of his help, because of his cooperation, we now have on the line whether the vote taken on Monday will be upheld or whether this proposal that is in the conference report will be approved. The issue will be whether the House will give to the executive branch

of the Federal Government open end authority to deal with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations with the credit assistance of the Export-Import Bank. This is the issue. I feel that we, tonight, under all the circumstances, should meet it head on. As for myself, I intend to sustain what we did on Monday when 219 Members of this body voted for the motion to recommit, including 66 Members on the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Every once in a while we are lectured by our friends on the other side of the aisle about political consequences. I said earlier, and I want to say it again, I am not interested in financing arrangements to help the Russians or the Communists in their effort against us, and I do not believe that the American people are interested in that sort of an endeavor.

Much has been said about supporting the President. Well, I know President Johnson possibly just about as well as any of you, and I have for him the greatest respect and the highest regard. However, what we are doing here is appropriating the money of the people of the United States. I do not think it is incumbent upon us just to appropriate the money and not say in some way at least how it shall be used. I think it is our right, not only our right but our responsibility, when we see something that is proposed that we do not like, when we have the opportunity, to do what we ought to do to see to it that the money is spent in line with what actually would serve the best interests of the people as we see it.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question for clarification on this amendment No. 20. I would like to ask if the words "in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national" means just agricultural surplus commodities such as wheat and corn, and so forth, or does it include fertilizer and fertilizer plants?

Mr. FORD. The word "product" has a very broad connotation. I would hate in the limited time available to try and define precisely what commodities or other materials are involved within the definition of this word.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. Surely.

Mr. BEERMANN. It looks to me as though we are financing food for the Communists at the same time that they are getting ready to or they are purchasing products from us which would be fertilizer plants and getting in a position to produce that food. I think the amendment should be voted down, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FORD. I would hope that the definition intended here would be very restricted and very limited rather than

a broader interpretation. From past experience, however, you can get some "Philadelphia lawyers" down in the department and they can stretch the meaning of a word rather broadly. I only would counsel them that they ought to be very careful if this modified language is approved.

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

Mr. FORD. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that we already have on the books a law which prevents the sale of any strategic materials to Communist countries?

Mr. FORD. There is such legislation, but I do not think potash as a commodity would fall within that definition.

Mr. GARY. I do not know whether it would or not, but I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we already have legislation on the books which would prevent the sale of strategic materials.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And that provision can be waived by the President if he deems it to be in the national interest to sell strategic materials.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, I hope the motion to recommit prevails. I believe that when we appropriate money or when we as a legislative body deal in funds that had their origination from congressional action we have the responsibility and the duty to make certain decisions as to how it shall be spent. For that reason I support the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FORD. I yield to my Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. There are no appropriated dollars involved and there would be none unless there is a default; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. It is correct to a degree. But the money that we are dealing with at one point came from the American taxpayer. This being the case we have a responsibility to look at the problem and to make certain recommendations as to how such funds shall be used. So in my opinion we have a very legitimate area of responsibility. This is why I personally feel that, feeling as I do, we ought to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee has remarked this is nothing but a guarantee of credit to American citizens who are going to sell wheat.

In 1957 the Export-Import Bank negotiated a loan to Poland for \$30 million. One purpose was to buy a tinplate mill in this country. There was a 5-year grace period on that loan. Payments started

to come in last year; and at 4½ percent interest. In 1958 we loaned again through the Export-Import Bank \$25 million to purchase pharmaceutical products and other products in this country. In 1959 another \$6 million was loaned through the Export-Import Bank. If it is wrong today it was wrong then.

Let us not forget what happened then. We did not attempt to tie President Eisenhower's hands with restrictive amendments of this kind. I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the man who is now in the White House by this type of amendment.

Poland is adhering to the schedule of repayments for these loans. This amendment is unduly restricted and should be defeated.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall make my remarks brief. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] very frankly stated the issue when he said that this question goes right to the point of our foreign policy. Let us pause for a moment and realize the responsibility in the field of foreign policy and where that responsibility mainly lies. Under the Constitution the President of the United States is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs.

The Findley amendment simply ties the hands of the President of the United States in the matter that is involved in the issue before the House today. The compromise gives the President the right to exercise judgment, not when he desires it, but only in the national interest of the United States. That is the paramount question confronting you and me at all times, confronting all officials—the national interest of our country. The only time, under the compromise, when the President can make an exception is where the national interest of our country is involved in the foreign affairs of our Nation.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, called attention to the fact that when former President Eisenhower was in the White House, no attempt was made to try and tie his hands or to invade completely his constitutional responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. It has never been done with reference to any President that I know of in the past.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago a very tragic event happened in this country in the assassination of our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. His successor, President Johnson, has many trying problems confronting him. Uppermost in his mind is the national interest of the United States.

Are we going to deny to President Johnson what we gave to other Presidents? Are we going to deny to him the power to perform his duties under the Constitution? That is the question involved.

I hope my colleagues, without regard to party, will realize the serious question involved concerning the foreign

policy of our country; that is, whether or not we are going to take away completely from the President of the United States the exercise of judgment where the national interest of our country is involved.

It is a dangerous step to take, my colleagues. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this matter, as I am not a member of this committee. However, I think we ought to set the record straight.

The distinguished Speaker has just pointed out that this Congress has never passed any type legislation like this before, tying the President's hands. I know he would want the record to show that the 87th Congress, passed such legislation. I refer to the Agricultural Act of 1961, Public Law 87-128, August 8, 1961, which President Kennedy signed into law, and which states in its declaration of policy:

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to (c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance.

This Congress did make a similar declaration and President Kennedy signed the act containing it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say again that the Senate will not accept this bill with this amendment out. They turned it down on two occasions. They will turn it down again.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked 800 hours, and listen, if the Members will. I trust you will not recommit this bill. If you do, we are going to be here on Christmas eve.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 9499 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 20.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 141, nays 136, answered "present" 3, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—141

Abele	Feighan	Pelly
Alger	Findley	Pillion
Anderson	Fisher	Pirnie
Andrews, Ala.	Ford	Poff
Arends	Fountain	Quie
Ashbrook	Goodling	Reid, Ill.
Ashmore	Griffin	Reid, N.Y.
Avery	Gross	Reifel
Ayres	Grover	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baldwin	Gurney	Rich
Barry	Haley	Rivers, S.C.
Bates	Halleck	Robison
Battin	Halpern	Rogers, Fla.
Beermann	Harsha	Roudebush
Bell	Harvey, Mich.	Rumsfeld
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Saylor
Berry	Horan	Schadeberg
Betts	Horton	Schenck
Bolton	Hosmer	Schneebeli
Francis P.	Huddleston	Schwelker
Bolton	Jarman	Schwengel
Oliver P.	Jensen	Secrest
Bow	Johansen	Seiden
Brock	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Bromwell	Jonas	Sibal
Broomfield	Keith	Skubitz
Brotzman	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.	Knox	Smith, Va.
Broyhill, Va.	Laird	Snyder
Bruce	Langen	Springer
Burleson	Latta	Stafford
Burton	Lipscomb	Stinson
Byrnes, Wis.	McClary	Taft
Chamberlain	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Chenoweth	McMillan	Tuck
Clausen	MacGregor	Utt
Don H.	Marsh	Waggonner
Cleveland	Martin, Calif.	Wallhauser
Collier	May	Watson
Corbett	Meador	Weaver
Cramer	Michel	Westland
Cunningham	Miller, N.Y.	Whalley
Curtin	Minshall	Widnall
Derwinski	Moore	Williams
Dole	Morton	Wilson, Bob
Dorn	Mosher	Wilson, Ind.
Dowdy	Norblad	Winstead
Downing	O'Konski	Wyman

NAYS—136

Addabbo	Gill	Pepper
Albert	Gonzalez	Perkins
Ashley	Grabowski	Pike
Aspinall	Green, Oreg.	Pilcher
Beckworth	Hagan, Ga.	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen, Calif.	Pool
Blatnik	Hanna	Price
Boggs	Hansen	Fucinski
Boland	Harding	Rhodes, Pa.
Bonner	Hardy	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Healey	Rodino
Brooks	Hechler	Rooney, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hemphill	Roosevelt
Cameron	Holland	Rosenthal
Chelf	Jennings	Roush
Cohelan	Joelson	Roybal
Conte	Johnson, Wis.	Ryan, N.Y.
Cooley	Karsten	St Germain
Corman	Karth	St. Onge
Daddario	Kling, Calif.	Senner
Daniels	Kirwan	Sheppard
Delaney	Lankford	Sickles
Dent	Libonati	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Lindsay	Staebler
Dingell	Long, La.	Stagers
Dulski	Long, Md.	Steed
Duncan	McFall	Stratton
Edmondson	Madden	Stubblefield
Edwards	Mahon	Thomas
Elliott	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Everett	Matthews	Toll
Fallon	Mills	Tuten
Farbstein	Minish	Udall
Finnegan	Morgan	Ullman
Flood	Morrison	Van Deerlin
Fogarty	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Fraser	Natcher	Weltner
Frelinghuysen	Nix	White
Friedel	O'Brien, N.Y.	Whitener
Gallagher	O'Hara, Ill.	Wickersham
Garmatz	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson
Gary	Olsen, Mont.	Charles H.
Gathings	Olson, Minn.	Wright
Gialmo	O'Neill	Young
Gilbert	Passman	Zablocki
	Patten	



## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Mathias Morse Tupper

## NOT VOTING—153

Abbitt	Gray	Murphy, N.Y.
Abernethy	Green, Pa.	Murray
Adair	Griffiths	Nedzi
Andrews,	Gubser	Nelsen
N. Dak.	Hall	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Harris	Osmer
Baker	Harrison	Ostertag
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Patman
Barrett	Hawkins	Philbin
Bass	Hays	Powell
Becker	Hébert	Purcell
Belcher	Herlong	Quillen
Bolling	Hoeven	Rains
Bray	Hoffman	Randall
Brown, Calif.	Hollfield	Reuss
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Riehlman
Buckley	Hutchinson	Roberts, Ala.
Burke	Ichord	Roberts, Tex.
Burkhalter	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Tex.
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, Pa.
Carey	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Casey	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Cederberg	Kelly	St. George
Celler	Keogh	Scott
Clancy	Kilburn	Shelley
Clark	King, N.Y.	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Kluczynski	Short
Colmer	Kornegay	Sikes
Curtis	Kunkel	Siler
Dague	Kyl	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Slack
Dawson	Leggett	Stephens
Derounian	Lennon	Sullivan
Devine	Lesinski	Talcott
Diggs	Lloyd	Taylor
Donohue	McCulloch	Teague, Calif.
Dwyer	McDowell	Teague, Tex.
Ellsworth	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Evins	McLoskey	Thompson, Tex.
Fascell	Macdonald	Tollefson
Fino	Maillard	Trimble
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Van Pelt
Foreman	Martin, Nebr.	Vinson
Forrester	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Fulton, Pa.	Milliken	Wharton
Fulton, Tenn.	Monaghan	Whitten
Fuqua	Montoya	Willis
Gibbons	Moorhead	Wylder
Glenn	Morris	Younger
Goodell	Moss	
Grant	Multer	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

## On this vote:

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Tupper against.  
 Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Derounian against.  
 Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Mathias against.  
 Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
 Mr. McLoskey for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
 Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Philbin against.  
 Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Donohue against.  
 Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Nedzi against.  
 Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.  
 Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Multer against.  
 Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Ryan of Michigan against.  
 Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Gray against.  
 Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.  
 Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Miller of California against.  
 Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Clark against.  
 Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Moss against.  
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Celler against.  
 Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Burke against.  
 Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Barrett against.  
 Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.  
 Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Trimble against.  
 Mr. Wylder for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.  
 Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Randall against.  
 Mr. Osmer for, with Mr. Shipley against.  
 Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio, for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Burkhalter against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. McDowell against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Montoya against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Bass against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. Hollfield against.

Mr. Martin of Nebraska for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Foreman for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Slack against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Kastenmeier against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Jones of Alabama against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murray against.

## Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Roberts of Texas.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DEROUNIAN. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VAN PELT. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio,

Mr. McCULLOCH. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert:

## "OFFICE OF EDUCATION

## "Payments to school districts

"For an additional amount for 'payments to school districts', \$216,204,000."

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

Mr. LAIRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the House passed a supplemental appropriation bill containing some \$42 million to carry on the new comprehensive program to combat mental retardation which was authorized in two acts passed by the House and agreed to by the Senate this year. This supplemental appropriation bill was limited to funding the mental retardation program so that this program could be effective immediately.

The Senate in considering this yesterday added \$216 million, for schools in federally impacted areas, for which no budget request was submitted by the President of the United States. Earlier today—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 25400—I made a statement here on the floor of the House urging the President of the United States to submit a budget request for the impacted areas program under Public Law 874, and also funds for the National Defense Education Act student loan program. I also called the White House urging that the President sign a letter transmitting these two funding requests. These programs were both signed into law by President Johnson with a great deal of fanfare and publicity. Many people gained the impression he strongly favored these programs, but no budget request has been submitted by him so that they can be carried out. This is a strange situation.

I had a conversation yesterday with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He advised me that both of these requests had been forwarded to the White House and awaited the President's signature.

Also I was interested in reading what a Member of the other body had to say

in a hearing on last Wednesday on this subject. He said:

I thought that by all means this item should come in this particular bill and we could wait very properly for the facilities under Public Law 815 which also was extended for 2 years. I think I was stating the attitude of all four of the Senators who had discussed this matter this morning.

I also stated, Mr. Chairman, that I had talked yesterday on behalf of all of us to the Budget Bureau and to the White House and found that the Budget Bureau had completed its work on this matter and that their recommendation was on the White House desk for action if the President saw fit to take action immediately upon the signing of the authorization bill which was also on his desk and scheduled for signature this morning.

As of this hour the President has not requested any funds for the National Defense Education Act student loan program, nor has he requested funding for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas.

It seems to me that in view of the fact that the Chief Executive has rejected the Bureau of the Budget proposal for funding at this time we should not agree to the Senate amendment until we at least know his reasons for not requesting funds. So far as I know he has not even indicated why he is opposed to the requests of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which have the support of the Bureau of the Budget. To me this inaction is just incomprehensible.

It seems to me that if we agree to the program for assistance to schools in impacted areas now without the funding for the student loan program, it would be months before the funding for the student loan program would be made available. The funding for the student loan program is most important because there are many thousands of students that will be awaiting and needing these funds early in January. It seems to me the White House has made a grave error in not signing the letter of transmittal requested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of HEW. In view of this, I must object to the request at this time in hopes that such a letter of transmittal will be received from the President before this Congress adjourns.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers' table House Joint Resolution 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I raise the same objection to this request. The letter of transmittal with regard to the funds for the student loan program and assistance to schools in federally impacted areas

has not been received from the President. It seems to me that before we adjourn this Congress we should insist that that letter of transmittal on the student loan program be submitted by the President of the United States. The student loan program is the most pressing funding need facing educational programs. Going to conference without such a funding request would be a grave error. Therefore, I will object to going to conference until the request of the President can be presented and considered by the conference committee. This is our last chance to secure funds for the student loan program. I direct attention of the House to my remarks made earlier today—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 25400.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances I must object to going to conference at this time.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 875—making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and disagree to the amendment of the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, was a motion to reconsider the vote just taken on the motion to recommit tabled?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9499 making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was laid on the table.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6754), an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes which was ordered printed:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1088)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 32, 45, 46, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 17, 25, 29, 31, 35, 40, and 44, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$91,496,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$64,449,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,931,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$39,363,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,633,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$67,295,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,272,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$98,339,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$63,607,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,622,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,912,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,290,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,699,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$106,549,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,973,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,247,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$38,925,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,080,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,505,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 24, 27, and 38.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
WALT HORAN,  
ROBERT H. MICHEL  
(except as to amendment No. 37).

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
ALLEN J. ELENDEER,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,  
KARL E. MUNDT,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE *Agricultural Research Service*

Amendment Nos. 1 and 4.—Salaries and expenses: Eliminate House language providing for marketing research as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that quality research could be appropriately conducted under the Agricultural Research Service as indicated by the Department.

Amendment Nos. 2 and 3.—Salaries and expenses: Authorize construction or improvement of three buildings at \$45,000 each in lieu of five at \$40,000 as proposed by the House and two at \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5.—Research: Appropriates \$91,496,700 instead of \$94,045,000 as proposed by the House and \$91,811,700 as proposed by the Senate. The final amount is \$315,000 below the Senate recommendation and is a net reduction of \$2,548,300 below the House bill.

The appropriation proposed includes increases above the House bill as follows: additional pay act costs, \$563,000; staffing and operating farm research laboratories already in operation where the need is greatest, \$100,000; animal parasite research, \$50,000; watershed hydrology research, \$100,000; equipping (\$400,000) and staffing (\$280,000) of Fargo, N. Dak. laboratory; research on varietal decline of sugar cane, \$100,000; research on harvesting sugar cane, \$100,000; research on nosema disease in bees, \$37,500; soybean production research, \$100,000; sugarbeet production research, \$125,000; research on corn, \$25,000; staffing of Sydney, Mont., laboratory, \$12,500; soil and water conservation research at East Franklin and Sleepers River, \$25,000; research on cold hardiness (\$75,000) and harvesting aids (\$25,000) for

citrus; bee research, Laramie, Wyo., \$12,500; horticultural research, Cheyenne, Wyo., \$37,500; strawberry research in Oregon, \$12,500; safflower research, \$12,500; research on dried peas and lentils, \$6,200; improve road, Newell, S. Dak., \$15,000; research on control of marshland mosquitoes, \$100,000; research on cereal leaf beetle, \$50,000; tobacco research, \$25,000; research on harvesting aids for Kona coffee, \$12,500.

These increases are more than offset by the transfer of \$4,950,000 contained in the House bill for marketing research to the Agricultural Marketing Service appropriations.

The amount recommended also includes the following funds for items approved by the House and stricken by the Senate: peanut quality research at New Orleans, \$200,000; research at existing facilities as follows: Flue-cured tobacco in North Carolina, \$200,000; burley and dark tobacco, \$200,000; wheat and wheat products, \$200,000; cotton \$200,000; and corn and other grains, \$200,000.

Amendment No. 6.—Research: Eliminates House language providing funds for a Peanut Research Laboratory in Georgia. This item has been removed from this bill without prejudice. The managers on the part of the House agree to include an appropriation for this purpose in the amount of \$600,000 in the first supplemental appropriation bill for the coming year or the next regular appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, whichever provides the first opportunity for action by Congress.

Amendment No. 7.—Research: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$15 million for research, surveys, planning and construction of facilities as follows:

Expanded utilization research.....	\$5,000,000
Additional construction, including conversion of pilot plant, at Peoria Laboratory.....	4,500,000
Construction, alteration and equipment for the New Orleans, Albany, and Wyndmoor Laboratories, \$1,500,000 each.....	4,500,000
Enlarging and modernizing existing research facilities, \$250,000 each for Weslaco Fruit and Vegetable Laboratory, Olustee Naval Stores Laboratory, and Stoneville Ginning Laboratory.....	750,000
Survey, determination of need, and planning of additional research facilities as may be required for utilization research in the Southeast, and weed control research, not to exceed.....	250,000

Total..... 15,000,000

Amendment No. 8.—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates \$64,449,000 instead of \$59,505,000 as proposed by the House and \$67,071,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$395,000 for additional pay costs; \$2,750,000 for screw-worm eradication; \$200,000 for plant quarantine inspection; \$600,000 for eradicating hog cholera; \$74,000 for pesticide regulation; and \$500,000 for eradication of fire-ant.

In addition, \$125,000 is provided to evaluate the efficiency of plant pest control programs and to test the effect of residues on nontarget organisms such as people and wildlife. This will enable the Department to undertake activities recommended by the President's Science Advisory Committee in its report "The Use of Pesticides." In this connection, the Department is directed to work in close cooperation with officials of other agencies in the conduct of joint programs and to take such steps as are necessary to carry out its assigned role in this very important area. The conferees recommend

further that a high-level commission or board be established to evaluate and make final determinations as to the use of pesticides for pest control purposes. The Department of Agriculture should be adequately represented on such a board.

Also, \$300,000 is provided for eradication of sheep scabies. This amount, to be matched from local sources, is to be used for the purposes for which appropriated. Also, the Department is to explore the feasibility of dipping sheep moved in interstate commerce as a control measure and to prevent reinfestation.

The general reduction of \$750,000 is to be applied to the several programs financed under this appropriation item, including the increases discussed above.

**Amendment No. 9.—Plant and animal disease and pest control:** Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment requiring 50 percent matching of funds used for screwworm eradication. The conferees have agreed to the Senate language with the understanding that State and local sources will be given full credit for all funds heretofore and hereafter contributed to the program.

**Amendment No. 10.—Meat inspection:** Appropriates \$27,931,000 instead of \$27,638,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,126,250 as proposed by the Senate.

**Amendment No. 11.—Salaries and expenses (Special Foreign Currency Program):** Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, the amount of the appropriation to be \$1,250,000 instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Cooperative State Experiment Station Service*

**Amendment Nos. 12 and 13.—Payments and expenses:** Appropriates \$41,633,000 instead of \$40,383,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,883,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is the intent of the conferees to provide for the Federal share of salary increases for the balance of the fiscal year. In addition to the regular work of the land-grant colleges, the conferees recognize that research for other Federal agencies is also an important contribution of these institutions. They concur in the statements of the two Houses which request reports on research contracts and grants entered into beginning with fiscal year 1964.

#### *Extension Service*

**Amendment Nos. 14 and 15.—Payments to States and Puerto Rico:** Appropriate \$67,295,000 instead of \$64,590,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**Amendment No. 16.—Retirement costs for extension agents:** Appropriates \$7,272,500 instead of \$7,110,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Farmer Cooperative Service*

**Amendment No. 17.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$1,201,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,195,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *Soil Conservation Service*

**Amendment No. 18.—Conservation operations:** Appropriates \$98,339,000 instead of \$97,480,000 as proposed by the House and \$99,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$839,000 for additional pay increases. The conferees direct that soil survey reports be published within the amount of funds provided, exclusive of the \$20,000 additional which shall be available to strengthen existing facilities.

**Amendment No. 19.—Watershed protection:** Appropriates \$63,607,000 instead of

\$63,222,000 as proposed by the House and \$63,992,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes \$5,446,000 for planning of new watersheds. The conferees have agreed that States should be encouraged to contribute as much as possible for this activity, regardless of Federal appropriations.

The conferees concur in the Senate language calling on the Bureau of the Budget to give fuller review and coordination to river basin surveys. They are also concerned about the declining local share of the cost of constructing watershed projects and urge Department officials to require more adequate local contributions, more in line with the intent of the original act.

**Amendment No. 20.—Great Plains Conservation Program:** Appropriates \$13,622,000 instead of \$12,994,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,640,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase, \$28,000 is included for additional pay costs and \$600,000 is included for cost sharing assistance.

**Amendment No. 21.—Resource conservation and development:** Appropriates \$1,500,000 instead of \$1,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the appropriate committees of Congress should be kept advised of each proposed activity under this program in advance of commitment.

#### *Economic Research Service*

**Amendment No. 22.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$9,912,000 instead of \$9,832,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,965,700 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Statistical Reporting Service*

**Amendment No. 23.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$11,290,500 instead of \$11,079,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,486,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$49,000 for additional pay costs, \$100,000 to extend the long-range program, and \$62,500 for additional cattle-on-feed reports for the balance of the fiscal year. Additional requirements for cattle-on-feed reports will be considered in connection with the 1965 budget. Adequate funds have been provided to enable the Department to continue all reports now being furnished.

**Amendment No. 24.—Marketing research and service:** Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$42,498,975 instead of \$37,061,000 as proposed by the House and \$44,514,100 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House bill includes \$4,985,675 for marketing research; \$50,000 for quality research on field packed lettuce and citrus; \$333,000 for additional marketing service pay costs; \$50,000 for poultry inspection; \$11,800 for reimbursement to employee's compensation fund; and \$7,500 for a cooperative market news service in Louisiana.

The Department is requested to make a full study of the possible use of State inspection organizations to hold down the cost as well as to prevent duplication of poultry inspection.

**Amendment No. 25.—Payments to States and possessions:** Appropriates \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,425,000 as proposed by the House.

**School lunch program:** For the first time, funds for cash payments and section 6 commodity purchases are based on a rate of 5 cents per meal on the average for the number of meals expected to be served during the school year. In addition, \$2,070,000 has been included for administrative purposes.

**Amendment No. 26.—Section 32:** Authorizes the use of \$45 million for the food stamp program instead of \$40 million as proposed by the House and \$51,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**Amendment No. 27.—Section 32:** Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part

of the House will offer a motion to provide \$16 million instead of \$25 million as provided in the House bill. Of this amount, \$11 million shall remain available for construction and equipping of research facilities determined to be needed, including \$9,500,000 for a utilization research laboratory in the Southeast and \$1,500,000 for a weed control research laboratory. It is agreed that any new utilization laboratory shall not be used for quality research on peanuts.

#### *Foreign Agricultural Service*

**Amendment No. 28.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$18,699,500 instead of \$18,505,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,039,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes \$41,000 for additional pay costs; \$58,000 for international agricultural affairs; \$14,000 for export programs; and \$81,500 for commodity programs. The conferees request the Department to more closely supervise the use of market development funds for travel and other purposes.

#### *Commodity Exchange Authority*

**Amendment No. 29.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$1,095,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,093,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service*

**Amendment No. 30.—Expenses:** Appropriates \$106,549,500 instead of \$105,737,000 as proposed by the House and \$107,091,400 as proposed by the Senate.

**Amendment No. 31.—Expenses:** Approves language proposed by the Senate to restrict the use of funds for employees and committeemen for certain purposes.

**Amendment No. 32.—Agricultural conservation program:** Restores House language restricting use of funds for drainage of wetlands. In view of the action of the conferees, they instruct the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to expedite the implementation of action on types 1 and 2 where necessary to permit desirable drainage to proceed without unnecessary delay.

**Amendment No. 33.—Land-Use Adjustment Program:** Appropriates \$11,350,000 instead of \$10 million as proposed by the House and \$12,150,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that, in the absence of legislation expanding the pilot program for 1964, expenditures in fiscal year 1964 will be held to the 1963 level of operation and financed through direct appropriation.

#### *Office of the General Counsel*

**Amendment No. 34.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$3,973,500 instead of \$3,953,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,987,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### *National Agricultural Library*

**Amendment No. 35.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriates \$1,426,140 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,420,000 as proposed by the House.

#### *General administration*

**Amendment No. 36.—Salaries and expenses:** Appropriate \$3,750,000 instead of \$3,735,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,760,550 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that, beginning with fiscal 1965, separate budget requests for the Office of Inspector General and for the Office of Management Services shall be submitted to the appropriations committees and justified separately, and corresponding reductions shall be made in agencies from which transfers are made. For fiscal 1964, the expenditures of the Office of Inspector General shall not exceed \$9,883,000 and for the Office of Management Services shall not exceed \$2,314,000. In addition thereto, increased costs in fiscal 1964 resulting from the pay act shall be held to the



same level as pay act increases for the agencies from which these offices have transferred funds in fiscal 1964.

#### Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 37.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$11,247,000 instead of \$11,162,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,287,000 as proposed by the Senate. Regulations, including changes, to carry out provisions in the reports of the House and Senate Committees shall be printed in the Federal Register within 90 days of enactment of this act.

The managers on the part of the House disagree with the statements in the Senate report on pages 28 and 29 which require the Administrator (1) to certify to the Comptroller General and the Congress and (2) to give notice of applications to the committees 60 days in advance of approval. They agree that any REA cooperative which is an applicant for a generation or transmission loan shall be made a party to any subsequent negotiations between the Administrator and the power supplier on contract arrangements.

Amendment No. 38.—Rural housing loans: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$25 million for rural housing loans instead of providing it as additional borrowing authority as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39.—Rural renewal: Appropriates \$1,200,000 instead of \$1 million as proposed by the House and \$1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40.—Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2 million as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$38,925,900 instead of \$38,367,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,367,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provides \$339,500 for additional pay costs; \$205,000 for administration of loan

programs; and \$14,400 to reimburse employees compensation fund.

#### Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendment No. 42.—Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriates \$7,080,000 instead of \$6,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund: Provides for the use of \$3,505,000 of premium income for administrative and operating expenses instead of \$3,530,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 44.—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriates \$2,699,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,500 million as proposed by the House.

#### Foreign assistance programs

Amendment Nos. 45 and 46.—Public Law 480: Appropriate \$1,452 million for title I sales and \$52,515,000 for title IV contracts as proposed by the House instead of \$1,252 million for title I and \$79 million for title IV as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47.—International Wheat Agreement: Appropriates \$86,218,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$92,356,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
WALT HORAN,  
ROBERT H. MICHEL  
(except as to amendment No. 37),

#### Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6754) an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent

that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see above.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this represents the agreement between the House and the Senate on the Agriculture Appropriation bill for the present fiscal year, 1964.

There are quite a number of items in this report, but we have reached an agreement as is pointed out in the statement on all items, including those that were in controversy last year. The so-called peanut laboratory item is carried over without prejudice and that matter will come up early in the next session.

At that time we can consider that matter. The conference report is about \$144,384,785 below the budget estimates. As we all know, this is the bill that carries funds for meat inspection, research, school lunches, price supports, and all of the other programs of the Department of Agriculture.

A summary of amounts included in the budget estimates, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference report is as follows:

#### Agriculture Department appropriation bill, 1964

Title	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report	Conference report compared with—		
					Budget	House	Senate
Title I—General activities	\$1,582,417,000	\$1,530,934,000	\$1,564,207,340	\$1,548,973,315	—\$33,443,685	+\$18,039,315	—\$15,234,025
Title II—Credit agencies	58,061,000	52,529,000	55,504,000	79,872,900	+21,811,900	+27,343,900	+24,368,900
Title III—Corporations	2,806,610,000	2,506,950,000	2,706,610,000	2,706,480,000	—100,130,000	+199,530,000	—130,000
Title IV—Foreign assistance programs	1,921,667,000	1,889,044,000	1,721,667,000	1,889,044,000	—32,623,000	—	+167,377,000
Total	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	6,047,988,340	6,224,370,215	—144,384,785	+244,913,215	+176,381,875

Mr. Speaker, unless there are some questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 17, after "\$91,115,000" strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of lines 18 through 25 and insert: "Provided, That, in addition, not to exceed \$35,000,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to this appropriation, in accordance with the Act of June 29, 1948 (15 U.S.C. 714b), for utilization research and development, cost

of production research, and other related research designed to reduce surplus commodities held or to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and such amounts as are required for the construction, alteration, and equipping of research facilities for utilization research and development shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,*."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: "Provided, That, in addition, not to exceed \$15,000,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to this appropriation, in accordance with the Act of June 29, 1948 (5 U.S.C. 714), for utilization research and development, cost of production research, and other re-

lated research designed to reduce surplus commodities held or to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, including \$10,000,000 for the planning, construction, alteration, and equipping of research facilities, which amount shall remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 9, insert: "Provided further, That no funds shall be available for carrying out the screw-worm eradication program that does not require minimum matching by State or local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation, and release of the screwworm flies: *Provided further,*."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. It is rather late, so excuse me if I have the wrong directions. It seems to me we have been getting wrong directions lately, and I would like to straighten them out. Do I understand that this is a second motion to recede from a position that the House has previously taken on a piece of legislation that passed this House?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is. It is a technical matter, may I say.

Mr. DENT. Well, it was a very serious technical matter awhile ago, and I heard some very patriotic speeches about the will of the House and how we ought to stand behind the position of the House, but it seems that the convenience of doing what certain groups want done can change our position as quick as we can flick a twist of the wrist.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 6, line 16, insert:

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)**

"For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for market development research authorized by section 104(a) and for agricultural and forestry research and other functions related thereto authorized by section 104(k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(a) (k)), to remain available until expended, \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations for these purposes, for the purchase of the foregoing currencies: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this appropriation shall be available for purchase of foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a)."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of \$2,500,000 named in said amendment insert: "\$1,250,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 16, line 14, strike out lines 14 through 26 and lines 1 through 3 on page 17 and insert:

**"MARKETING SERVICES"**

"For expenses necessary to carry on services related to agricultural marketing and distribution as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith and for administration and coordination of payments to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; \$37,061,000.

**"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE"**

"For expenses necessary to carry on research and service to improve and develop marketing and distribution relating to agriculture as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith; research and development, including related cost and efficiency evaluations, and services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, \$44,514,100, of which \$1,600,000 is to remain available until expended for the construction of a peanut quality research facility and the acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation: *Provided*, That research investigations undertaken at the national peanut quality evaluation laboratory must be truly national in scope and must give equivalent treatment to the different types of peanuts produced and marketed in the major peanut producing areas: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 565a for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of erecting any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$20,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$50,000, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$7,500 or 7.5 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert:

**"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE"**

"For expenses necessary to carry on research and service to improve and develop marketing and distribution relating to agriculture as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith; research and development, including related cost and efficiency evaluations, and services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payment to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem under section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, \$42,498,975: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 565a for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of erecting any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$20,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$45,000, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed \$7,500 or 7.5 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 20, strike out: ", and (5) not more than \$25,000,000 for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply and hereafter such sums as may be approved by the Congress shall be available for such purpose."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: ", and (5) not more than \$16,000,000 for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply, and hereafter such sums (not in excess of \$25,000,000 in any one year) as may be approved by the Congress shall be available for such purpose, such authorization not to restrict authority in existing law, of which amount \$11,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and equipping of research facilities determined to be needed as a result of a special survey."

The motion was agreed to.



The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38, page 31, line 14, insert:

**"RURAL HOUSING LOANS**

"For rural housing loans, \$25,000,000, to be made available in addition to and in the same manner and under the terms and conditions applicable to funds provided under section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. **WHITTEN** moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

**"RURAL HOUSING LOANS**

"For additional rural housing loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND**

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report in the **RECORD** and to include tables.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that this conference report is \$244,912,215 over and above the bill passed by the House, which brings the total to \$6,224,370,214, or \$144,384,785 less than the budget figure.

Frankly, I wish that we could have made a more respectable showing in our reduction, but in all fairness it should be pointed out that \$1,889,044,000 is for title 4, foreign assistance programs. This is one big reason why I continue to vote against even the pared down figure of the foreign operations subcommittee bill.

As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. **PASSMAN**] has pointed out earlier during consideration of the foreign aid bill, there are a number of additional expenditures over and above his regular foreign aid bill, and this is one of the big ones.

I should like to point out also that \$2,706,480,000 of this agriculture appropriation is for reimbursement of Commodity Credit Corporation for sustained losses in the past year—an astronomical figure.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I should just like it to be known for the record that I signed the conference report with one exception and that is amendment No. 37, having to do with the Rural Electrification Administration. Personally, I believe the language in the Senate report is stronger than that of the House and that it has several very meritorious features. I will say, however, that our House report this year was the strongest it has ever been and it would be my fervent hope that those responsible for administering the rural electrification program would take heed to what the Con-

gress says, for we have proved conclusively in both bodies that our warnings in the past have not been ill founded.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee has worked long and hard to arrive at an acceptable compromise and while we cannot have everything our way, it is my feeling that the House position has been upheld in fine fashion by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. **WHITTEN**], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. **NATCHEL**] and my own ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. **HORAN**] and in view of the lateness of the hour, urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. **WHITTEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the **RECORD** on this report.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

**RESIGNATION OF MEMBER OF THE HOUSE**

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1963.

HON. JOHN F. MCCORMACK,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this my formal resignation from the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress in which I have served as the Member from California's Fifth District. This resignation is to be effective at 11:59 p.m., January 7, 1964. As you know, the reason for this resignation is that I have been honored by the people of my native city who have chosen me to be their mayor.

Taking leave of the U.S. Congress after having had the privilege to serve with you and all my other colleagues, leaves me with mixed emotions. Allow me through you to thank all those with whom I have served for their many kindnesses, for their cooperation, and above all for the privilege of knowing and working with them.

I look forward to seeking your advice and counsel in the pursuit of my new duties to the end that I may better serve the people of San Francisco.

With every best wish, I am,  
Sincerely,

JOHN F. SHELLEY,  
Member of Congress.

**HERBERT H. LEHMAN**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. **STRATTON**. Mr. Speaker, one of the really great citizens of our time passed away in New York City the other day, Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York and former U.S. Senator from New York.

At the time of his death Governor Lehman was 85. He had lived, to be sure, a full and distinguished life. He had

earned a quiet and peaceful retirement. Yet until the day of his death, Governor Lehman never lost his interest in forward-looking and progressive government, and he remained an active leader and counselor in the political and civic life of our State, and a source of inspiration to millions of Americans everywhere.

Characteristically, Governor Lehman was engaged in preparing to travel to Washington to receive from President Johnson the Nation's highest civilian award, the Medal of Freedom, when the end came.

No one more richly deserved this recognition for distinguished service to his country and to humanity.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, Governor Lehman was the antithesis of the popular impression of a successful politician. He was not a gladhander. He was not a spellbinder on the podium. And yet Herbert H. Lehman was one of the most successful votegetters in the history of New York State politics. What was his secret? Simply a profound sincerity and personal integrity that came across loud and clear to every man and woman in the State—here was a man who really cared, here was a man who said what he believed and believed what he said, here was a man you could truly have full and complete confidence in. Monumentally unconcerned with what we refer to these days as a political "image," Herbert H. Lehman was nonetheless the very embodiment of that rare combination of courage, strength, independence, and humanity which comprise the real leader of men par excellence.

Mr. Speaker, Herbert H. Lehman died only a few days after the tragic death of John F. Kennedy. It is most fitting that today we should be mourning them together, because together they fought for the same kind of tolerant, rational, and progressive America. And with both of them our greatest tribute would be to strive harder than ever before to carry through to completion the work for which they dedicated their lives.

**BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPEAKER**

Mr. **WICKERSHAM**. 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. **WICKERSHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I know all the Members are tired, but I take pleasure in calling attention of the Members to the fact that this is the Speaker's birthday.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

**TO PRINT FOR THE USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL**

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on water pollution control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.*

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRINTING OF COMPILATIONS OF MATERIALS RELATING TO ANNUAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE DEBATE TOPICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up S. 2311 to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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 the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to prepare compilations of pertinent excerpts, bibliographical references, and other appropriate materials relating to (1) the subject selected annually by the National University Extension Association as the national high school debate topic and (2) the subject selected annually by the American Speech Association as the national college debate topic. In preparing such compilations the Librarian shall include materials which in his judgment are representative of, and give equal emphasis to, the opposing points of view on the respective topics.*

Sec. 2. The compilations on the high school debate topics shall be printed as Senate documents and the compilations on the college debate topics shall be printed as House documents, the cost of which shall be charged to the congressional allotment for printing and binding. Additional copies of such documents may be printed in such quantities and distributed in such manner as the Joint Committee on Printing directs.

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

#### BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is it really true that this is your birthday? If it is, I am sure on behalf of all of us on both sides of the aisle we want to wish you many, many happy years of life and success. Now, by that I do not mean exactly that we want you to be Speaker

forever. I say this because we on this side of the aisle have a few ambitions in that regard ourselves.

But let me just say that, through a long day and a long night, you have again demonstrated your fairness and your great capacity to preside over this House of Representatives with that dignity and patience we all admire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

#### TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER ON HIS 72D BIRTHDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been preempted for about the fourth time in the effort I had hoped to initiate which was to wish you a happy birthday. We had planned tentatively to postpone these good wishes until noon today. But in view of the very fine tribute paid you by our distinguished minority leader, I think it would be in order to continue the discussion of this subject at this time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on this day when you are 72 years young you are the most admired, respected legislative leader in our country.

I think this is an appropriate occasion on which to pay the great man who presides over this House a brief word of tribute.

JOHN McCORMACK has demonstrated those unique qualities of mind, heart, and character which are essential to the speakership. First of all, as the minority leader has said, the Speaker has been eminently fair at all times. I am sure every Member of the House will agree with me that he has presided with utmost impartiality and with devoted consideration for the rights not only of the majority party and the minority party, but of every individual Member of the House.

The Speaker has had long experience as a legislator. He adds to that his boundless energy, his keen mind and his deep understanding of the responsibilities of this House. This year in particular we have seen him draw daily upon his great powers throughout what has been one of the longest and most arduous peacetime sessions in the history of the House of Representatives.

In the midst of issues as controversial and as complex as any upon which this House has ever had to pass judgment, in the face of frustrations necessarily attendant to the resolution of such issues, he has manifested a degree of patience seldom seen in human beings.

He has shown that unshakable resolve to do and to complete his job, and the results will be remembered long after those impatient, uninformed, and transient critics have passed into oblivion.

Under the leadership of Speaker McCORMACK we have written a great record this year and as a result the 88th Congress will go down in history as outstanding.

JOHN McCORMACK has long been an illustrious Member of the House. He has served with unusual distinction as Member, whip, leader, and Speaker. He has met all the tests of leadership. His colleagues have seen him in action in time

of war and in time of peace, in depression and in prosperity. They have seen him face up to issue after issue while under fire year in and year out. They have long known his mettle. Knowing him, they have bestowed upon him the highest tribute within their power to give.

No greater honor, indeed, Mr. Speaker, has any group of men to bestow upon a fellow man. There is no higher honor on earth than the office which our Speaker holds. There is no more important office in the legislative halls of the world than the speakership of the House. There is no man that ever occupied this office with more fairness, with greater determination, with greater understanding, and greater manifestation of the historic mission of his high position than JOHN McCORMACK.

It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a sense of personal pride that I join in wishing you a happy birthday.

#### WHAT CONGRESS DID THIS SESSION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think the finest method of complimenting the Speaker on his birthday is to include the legislative record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I therefore include with these remarks a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of today entitled, "What Congress Did This Session." It reads as follows:

#### THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD—WHAT CONGRESS DID THIS SESSION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress took the following actions in enacting legislation, disapproving bills or leaving measures for further moves in the 2d session beginning January 9:

##### ENACTED INTO LAW

Higher education aid providing \$1.2 billion for construction of academic facilities at public and private colleges and universities; \$1.5 billion for vocational education programs, extension of National Defense Education Act and assistance to impacted areas; \$175 million for expansion and improvement in medical and other health professions training.

A \$3.6 billion authorization for economic and military assistance to foreign countries.

Ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Senate.

Increased outlays for mental health programs.

A \$527 million manpower development and training program.

Continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps.

Extension of the draft law to July 1, 1967.

Requirement for equal pay for women and men employed in essentially the same work.

Legislation to avert threatened railroad strike.

Pay raise bill for the armed services.

One-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

A series of increases in the temporary national debt limit to \$315 billion.



Another 1-year continuation of Korean war excise taxes and corporation income tax rate to avoid \$2 billion drop in Treasury revenues.

Revision of the Silver Purchase Act to permit issuance of \$1 bills as Federal Reserve notes.

Coordination and development of recreation programs.

Apply Federal court jurisdiction to U.S. citizens charged with committing offenses abroad.

Honorary U.S. citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill.

Authority to mint 50-cent coins in commemoration of President Kennedy.

Permit returning travelers to bring duty-free goods up to \$100, instead of \$500, into this country.

Authorization for programs of housing for the elderly.

Additional funds for air pollution control programs.

Funds authorized for 11 river basin and flood control projects.

Establishment of seat belt safety standards.

Stabilization bill to help small producers of lead and zinc.

Requirement that various kinds of imported products and goods bear labels identifying country of origin.

Funds for Philippine war damage claims, with ban on payment to certain lawyers.

Increased allowances for telephone, telegram, stationery, and postage expenses for House Members.

Free mail privilege for House Members to send "occupant" mail to otherwise unnamed recipients in their congressional districts.

Provision for office staff, free mail privileges, and Secret Service protection for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

#### PASSED ONLY BY HOUSE

Tax bill with \$11 billion estimated reduction.

Fallout shelter construction bill.

Cotton subsidy bill to enable mills in this country to compete with imports from abroad.

Stricter regulation of congressional travel to foreign countries. And control over expense accounting and publication.

Tighter requirements for National Security Administration hiring and firing of employees.

Apply the sedition law to acts against the United States by American citizens abroad.

Life tenure for judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals.

Provide for 4,500 maximum enrollment at Military and Air Force Academies to conform with Naval Academy strength.

Increase in per diem pay for grand and petit jurors in Federal courts.

Authorize Medal of Honor awards for servicemen in the cold war.

Ban creation of new Government departments in connection with extension of the Reorganization Act.

Several District of Columbia bills including proposed Uniform Commercial Code, permission to use "reasonable force" corporal punishment on school pupils, suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils, and authority for Metropolitan Police to use more man-dog teams.

#### PASSED ONLY BY SENATE

Mass transportation bill.

Wilderness preservation bill.

Youth employment bill.

Water resources research fund increase.

Creation of a Senate-House Committee on Federal Budget.

A 15-year tenure for the FBI Director.

Additional \$455 million for area redevelopment programs.

National Service Corps bill.

Public defenders for indigent defendants in Federal courts.

Ban on location of foreign chanceries in certain District neighborhoods.

Designation of the proposed National Cultural Center as the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

#### DEFEATED OR SHELVED

House defeated a \$455 million Area Redevelopment Act extension bill; a 2-year extension of the Mexican Farm Labor Act but subsequently agreed to a 1-year extension; a Reserve Officers Training Corps reorganization measure, and bills for a District transit and subway project study and for greater power for the Alcoholic Beverages Control Board.

Senate voted against changing its rules to require a three-fifths instead of two-thirds majority to curb debate. The vote was 54 to 42 but fell 10 votes short of a necessary two-thirds majority.

Senate rejected a move for action at this time on proposed modernization of its rules and procedures.

House Rules Committee heard but tabled or took no action on bills to abolish Committee on Un-American Activities, divide the Education and Labor Committee into two committees, allow radio-TV coverage of House committee sessions, and ban the so-called back-door spending method of Treasury borrowings to finance various Federal programs.

#### CLEARED BY COMMITTEES

Far-reaching civil rights legislation, approved by the House Judiciary Committee and scheduled for Rules Committee hearings beginning January 9.

Public defender bill, similar to measure passed by the Senate, was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and cleared by Rules Committee for scheduled House action in January.

A bill naming the National Cultural Center the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been cleared by the House Rules Committee for expected House concurrence with Senate in January.

The tax reduction bill passed by the House awaits Senate Finance Committee action, perhaps by February.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 13, I was absent on official business and was therefore unrecorded on rollcall No. 240. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." I would like the RECORD to so state.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to what he can tell us about the program for the balance of the day, if there is any day left, and what we may expect today or tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. We expect to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HALLECK. Is there any possibility of having a sine die adjournment resolution tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. It all depends on the disposition of legislative business. The

gentleman realizes that we still have legislative business due to the action which the House took. We are hopeful of disposing of that business, but it will be necessary that we meet at noon on the next legislative day, which starts at 12 o'clock today. We will hope to stay in session until we have disposed of the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I think, then, that would mean very likely we might have a vote tomorrow, or today. I am a little confused. I do not know whether it is today or tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the gentleman that that does not rest solely with me or with the leadership or even with the House. We hope the conferees can meet, and we hope this matter can be back for disposition in the House at the earliest possible time.

Mr. HALLECK. Could I respectfully suggest that if the foreign aid appropriation bill is all we have left, and obviously we are in some difficulty about it, why not have a sine die adjournment resolution right now and take that bill up as the first order of business under the continuing resolution when we come back in January?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the disposition of this business is a matter of important urgency which should be handled in the first session of this Congress which we hope will terminate in a few days. We believe that the disposition of the matter to which the gentleman refers would have been quite different had Members been present. It is the duty of all Members to return here and complete the business of this session.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of all of us to stay here, but on the other hand, we are all people with some family connections and some responsibilities and, of course, everyone is ready and willing to stay here to do whatever needs to be done. But I must say that many Members have airplane reservations and train reservations and at this time of the year it will be extremely difficult for them if they forfeit their reservations to obtain reservations later to go home. As far as I am concerned, I hope all the people on our side of the aisle will stay here. I will stay here through the duration. But I must say that nothing would be better for the future conduct of the business of the Congress of the United States as far as the House of Representatives is concerned than to have a sine die adjournment and come back here as we have planned on January 7. I do not know of anything under the continuing resolution that is of such overwhelming importance as to indicate that we ought to stay here any longer.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I am mindful of everything the gentleman has said, and I am sure everybody is. I am certainly hopeful that Members will get a vacation. But I cannot imagine any personal matter of a Member of the Congress that is as important as the disposition of one of the most important bills that this

House must consider in this or any other year.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just say in response to that that for the last 6 months we have been operating on foreign aid under a continuing resolution. As I said the other day, I cannot for the life of me see why 2 weeks longer makes very much difference. As a matter of fact, it has been said that the administration could do better under the continuing resolution than they could under the appropriation bill that is presently before us.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL, for the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) from December 20 and for the balance of the session, on account of illness.

#### 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. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), for 5 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. POWELL.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. AVERY.

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

Mr. MONTOYA.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. PIKE.

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

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. JENSEN.

#### SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the fol-

lowing titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 439. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Angelo Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1445. An act for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Nina Carmela Pirritano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2073. An act for the relief of Roza Feuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoros (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief for Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; and

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins; and

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on December 19, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally;

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande;

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; and

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House that our dear friend and colleague, Honorable WILLIAM GREEN, passed away at 2:40 a.m. this morning. As most of us knew, BILL GREEN had been very seriously ill for some days. Even though I knew how grave his condition had become, his passing comes as a great shock.



We shall miss him greatly for he was one of our true leaders and a warm and kindly friend of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to his widow and his children.

Mr. Speaker, a further day will be set aside for Members to offer eulogies to our distinguished and beloved colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read H. Res. 599 as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That a committee of Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

*Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Morgan, Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Dague, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holland, Mr. Curtin, Mr. Dent, Mr. Nix, Mr. Milliken, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Toll, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Kunkel, Mr. McDade, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

The resolution was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m. on Saturday, December 21, 1963), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Saturday, December 21, 1963.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1464. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred for temporary storage of household goods for military personnel, Department of Defense, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

## 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. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2079. An act to provide for the striking of three different medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration in New York City, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3500. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; with amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 9076. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 298. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; with amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report on the bill, H.R. 9499; without amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1087). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 6754. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1088). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1524. An act for the relief of Hai Yung Jung and Johnny Jung; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; with amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leung Chi King; with amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8322. A bill for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7821. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Pytlak Jarosz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9545. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize certain provisions of law relating to veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9547. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments (including social security benefits) shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9548. A bill to prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9549. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9550. A bill relating to the rate of duty on plastic containers for clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9551. A bill to designate the Racine locks and dam on the Ohio River as the Chief Cornstalk locks and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9552. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the

100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9558. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 879. Joint resolution calling for continuation of the naval repair facility at San Diego, Calif., as a vital adjunct to the Pacific Fleet; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution providing for printing as a House document the publication entitled "Our Flag"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEITH:  
H. Res. 597. Resolution providing for printing as a House document, President Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 9553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maureen Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9554. A bill for the relief of Donatas Damijonaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9555. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Rossi Pacifico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9556. A bill for the relief of Ricardo R. Honrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

552. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul D'Ortona, City Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., to continue the operation of the Philadelphia Naval Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

553. Also, petition of William E. Hughes, International Lions Club, Gloucester City, N.J., urging that President Kennedy's birthday, May 29, be established as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

554. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to publishing certain material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

555. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to make an investigation of "oil money" in U.S. politics and political campaigns, especially that part of said "oil money" attributable to the infamous 27½-percent oil-depletion subsidy given oilmen and oil interests by the U.S. internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Rules.

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### Independence of Libya

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, Libya will celebrate the 12th anniversary of her independence. We wish to take this occasion to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I; and His Excellency, the Libyan Chargé d'affaires ad interim to the United States, Ben Jeleil.

When Libya was first proclaimed independent on Christmas Eve 12 years ago, world opinion held small hope for the rapid development, much less the continued existence, of the state. Having a per capita income estimated at \$35, Libya was described as the "poorest nation on earth," "little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand." Even the illiteracy was above 90 percent, with only 14 Libyan college graduates in the entire country.

By means of generous support from the United Nations, the United States, and Great Britain, the Libyan federation began its tortuous role as an independent state in the world community. The country was comprised of three Federal states, loosely joined under a central government, headed by King Idris I. Moreover, because of intense rivalry between the populous Cyrenaean and Tripolitanian units, separate Federal capitals had to be maintained in Benghazi and Tripoli, creating much duplication, confusion, and expense.

Today, the picture has changed. Almost overnight, remote cases have become boomtowns, "where cars outnumber camels." In the major cities, apartment buildings are mushrooming, with

supermarkets and highways servicing the expanding urban population. Furthermore, the per capita income now averages over \$100. The reason for this sudden prosperity is the discovery of vast deposits of oil in 1959.

Guided by the experiences of the other oil producing countries of the Middle East, the Libyan Government has established a development council to supervise and coordinate economic development. To this council is allocated 70 percent of all oil revenues, which, by 1965, will total \$300 million. Public utility development projects will comprise 40 percent of the council's funds; agricultural schemes will receive 30 percent; while the remaining 30 percent will be granted for education, health, housing, sanitation, and welfare.

This almost overwhelming prosperity has also created a sense of stability. Recent changes in the Constitution, agreed to by popular consent, transforms the nation from a federation to a unitary state. The province system has been abolished, with the Federal state being broken into districts. A new administrative capital is being constructed at al-Baida to eliminate both rivalry and expense. Confidence in the Government is apparent throughout Libya.

Relations with the United States since independence in 1951 have remained warm and cordial. Since 1954, when Wheelus Air Force Base was established, over 10,000 U.S. servicemen and their dependents have been stationed in Libya. The oil industry has brought several more thousand Americans to Libya, to live and enjoy the friendship of the Libyan people. Then, too, U.S. aid has specifically fostered agricultural and hydrological projects to increase the benefits for the farmers. Working with the knowledge that Libya was once the granary of the Roman Empire, American technicians have resurrected Roman

irrigation plans, at times using the original systems laid out 19 centuries ago. Furthermore, model farms have shown the farmer what can be accomplished with little capital.

Work in these fields as well as in education and public health has earned for the United States the amity of a grateful people. Therefore, as the Libyans celebrate their 12th anniversary of independence this December 24, let us, too, salute their achievements and wish them continued success and rapid development as allies of the free world, as participants in and staunch supporters of the Organization of African Unity, and as friends.

#### Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury Retires

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury retires this day as California Professor of Church History at San Francisco Theological Seminary, a position which he has held since 1938. It is a great contribution when a man gives this much of his life to the teaching of students, and Dr. Drury has been a man who was loved by his students. However, his work has extended far beyond the classroom.

Clifford Drury was born and raised on a farm in Iowa; from there he took his undergraduate degree at Buena Vista College in Iowa. He first served his country as private, U.S. Army, during World War I. In 1919 he entered San Francisco Theological Seminary, where he was later to teach, as a student.