

(6 out of 10) of the American public." It adds, however, "many persons who support foreign aid in principle voice criticism of certain aspects of the current program."

The latest poll shows greater popular support for aid today than 5 years ago, and it points to majority approval in all regions of the Nation and by Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The exact question follows:

"In general, how do you feel about foreign aid—are you for it or against it?"

	For	Against	No opinion	Total
1958—March.....	51	33	16	100
1963—February.....	58	30	12	100
Republicans.....	54	35	11	100
Democrats.....	59	28	13	100
Independents.....	61	28	11	100
East.....	60	27	13	100
Midwest.....	58	33	9	100
South.....	55	29	16	100
Far West.....	59	32	9	100

CRITICISMS

"One theme running through many of the comments," says the Gallup release, "is that the United States should be a little more discriminating in its dispersal of foreign aid funds—to insure, in effect, that we get our money's worth." The release adds: "Of particular irritation to some Americans are cases where countries receiving such aid have turned against us in international disputes."

AMOUNT OF AID

The release reports widespread misinformation about the amount of money the United States spends annually on foreign aid—with a tendency to inflate the proportion of the budget such aid constitutes. Only 9 percent of the public cited a figure that was close to \$4 billion, and only 9 percent know that this is 5 percent or less of the budget. As many as 49 percent think the proportion is greater—ranging up to one-fourth and even half of the Nation's yearly outlay.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

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

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for that great day in our national life when we are again united to commemorate the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with gratitude and pride as we think of his intrepid spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the prin-

ciples of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice that he bore witness to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to keep alive within their breasts that little spark of celestial fire called "conscience."

Above all we are thankful for his humble and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge in order that he might know how to march and keep in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen and sustain the soul of our Republic and constrain us to labor in faith and faithfulness for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1(a)(1) of Public Law 87-586, had appointed Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS to be members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider on Wednesday, February 27, a special resolution and report from the Committee on Appropriations which will provide supplemental funds for Public Law 480 and Commodity Credit Corporation operations for the balance of the fiscal year 1963.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date?

Mr. WHITTEN. Wednesday of this week, February 27.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an emergency situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an emergency situation. The Corporation is just about out of funds, and unless these funds are made available they will have to notify the Nation that no more funds for the commodities now supported will be available unless action is taken in the next week or 10 days. What we are doing here is bringing forward from next year's budget request funds to enable them to operate at the present time and not have to stop all price supports. There has been talk about reducing price supports on certain classes of cotton. Then, in regard to corn, they have on hand about 400 million bushels which they could sell, but at the present time,

to dump it on the domestic market would have a depressing effect on the market.

In effect it is bringing forward into this fiscal year some of the funds which were requested for the coming fiscal year so as not to have all of this chaos in regard to it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does this bill in any way deal with pending special privilege legislation relating to cotton?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; no, this is directed to the Commodity Credit Corporation in order for it to have funds with which to operate for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question: Is not this advance or transfer of funds that would be due for price-support purposes for agricultural products in fiscal year 1964 to be used in this fiscal year 1963 because the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, found it impossible to make good on the very glorified promises he made the American people and the American farmers about a year ago as to how he was going to reduce the cost of farm price supports? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that there are other factors involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that one of the factors involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly the situation is not as good as I had hoped it would be, and as the gentleman from Ohio hopes, but in actuality the Congress last year reduced the budget request by some \$800 million, and that is about \$300 million more than is being restored here.

There are a good many factors that enter into it. We tried to hold it down. However, unless we give them some relief, we will have chaos throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly did not properly estimate his needs for price-support money last year, and did not inform the Congress properly; is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: That the Department and the Bureau of the Budget erred on the side of too much, because they requested \$800 million last year and the Congress approved. And, may I say the Congress approved the amount I recommended. We tried to hold it down. But the request was far more than we permitted. This restoration will leave them with \$300 million less than the Bureau of the Budget requested last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is still more than the Secretary pledged the American people it would be, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly there are many places where I do not think it has worked out as many people hoped. As the gentleman from Ohio recalls, I did not vote for the farm bill because I did not see soundness of paying cash, when we had surplus commodities. I also differed in other respects.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that millions of farmers have a contract with Uncle Sam which Uncle Sam must honor. The only way Uncle Sam can keep his word and make that contract good in this instance is for Uncle Sam to pay the bill which he promised to pay; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, we have to honor the contracts. May I say in this situation as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, on the one hand the law says they have mandatory obligations. They have to support prices as fixed by law. Then they have another statute which says if they do support them and they do not have the money, then they violate that law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am receiving letters from many farmers saying that Uncle Sam has not delivered the checks to them that were promised under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will have to carry out those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an obligation, and if Uncle Sam makes a contract with 1 American or 1 million Americans, it is our duty as Representatives in the Congress to see that Uncle Sam does keep his word.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Under the conservation reserve the Government entered into a contract, and it is an obligation that must be honored.

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

There was no objection.

OAS AWAITS U.S. LEADERSHIP BEFORE ACTING ON CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday on a national television network the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. Gonzalo Facio, reiterated his plea for U.S. leadership before the OAS can act on the Cuban problem. The OAS leader said that the OAS can only play a role secondary to the United States in relations with Cuba.

In addition to these encouraging statements, the OAS President stated that growing dissatisfaction with the Cuban military and civilian establishment makes anti-Castro moves particularly timely. He recommended internal action as an adjunct to concerted action by the nations of this hemisphere.

As a further indication of OAS receptiveness for U.S. initiative, Dr. Facio stated that in his judgment the hemispheric organization would even go as far as supporting a total U.S. blockade of Castro's island, thus placing Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than 3 years of Castroism in Cuba, we have seen this island reinforced almost daily under our very noses. There have been heightening cries for action from the Congress and other areas of prominence such as the press throughout the Nation. However, this is the second time this year that the president of the international organization has called for solid U.S. initiative.

I reiterate my call that the United States close its seaports to ships calling in Cuba as a first act of U.S. leadership. After so doing, this Government should then turn to the OAS quickly, proposing that the hemispheric body adopt the following U.S. recommendations:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Third. Ban relay of telecommunication messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Impose a travel curb on movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Latin America awaits U.S. initiative while we engage in a debate of semantics as to whether or not Russian military strength in Cuba is offensive or defensive. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. Whenever the question comes up of whether Soviet missiles, rockets, jet fighter planes, tanks, rifles, and troops in Cuba are offensive or defensive, we would do well to recall the incident of last week when the Cuban Mig's fired on the unarmed U.S. shrimp boat *Ala*. The sting of that incident is still with us.

Should such an attack happen again, "Remember the *Ala*" should be the signal for blistering U.S. retaliation.

CHICAGO, FISK UNIVERSITY AND LEONTYNE PRICE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a great city, a great university and a great singer. It is a story in Americana that projects the true image of our beloved country. It was related, 92 years after its inception, by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago.

The occasion was Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in the vast auditorium in McCormick Place before the largest and perhaps the most wildly and enthusiastically applauding audience in Chicago's musical history. Leontyne Price had come to sing at a benefit to raise money for Fisk University. The response was recordbreaking. It followed the pattern in the many foreign countries and in the American cities

where a public admiration and adoration of Leontyne Price reflected the universal sentiment of millions. The needed money raised for Fisk University also was recordbreaking as the proceeds from a single concert.

But this was the climax of a story that started 92 years ago, a story told by Mayor Richard J. Daley as he spoke briefly at the concert, welcoming Leontyne Price. In 1871, the year of the great fire in Chicago, the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. Every cent of their fee, \$50, they sent to the then Mayor Joseph Medill to help out the homeless, suffering people of the metropolis that fire had all but wiped out.

And when Leontyne Price came to the city that had been rebuilt from the ashes, came to raise money for Fisk University, that in the intervening years like Chicago had been growing and expanding and servicing mankind, Mayor Daley paid back the \$50 gift of the Fisk Jubilee Singers of 1871, with interest. This is Americana.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following review of Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in Chicago by Claudia Cassidy in the Chicago Tribune:

LEONTYNE PRICE'S FISK BENEFIT LURES \$41,000
GROSS AND A DIVIDEND FROM MAYOR DALEY

(By Claudia Cassidy)

Leontyne Price came back with honey in the mouth and fire in the heart, an enticing combination. She enticed a capacity audience and a gross of \$41,000 to the Fisk University benefit in the big house in McCormick Place yesterday afternoon, when there also was a visit, a brief speech, and a dividend from Mayor Daley.

The mayor said that back in 1871 the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. It was in Chillicothe, Ohio, and their total, inclusive fee was \$50. Then they heard of the Chicago fire and they sent every penny of it to Mayor Joseph Medill, to help out. Mayor Daley returned the gift, with interest, but he did not say how much, and neither did Edward W. Beasley, who thanked him for the check. On inquiry, it turned out to be \$500.

No one had quite known in advance what even a singer of Miss Price's potency would make of a song recital in a theater seating 5,000. At least where I sat on the fifth row it worked out surprisingly well. The gray steel curtain had been lowered, the piano pushed out front, and a kind of "Aida" or "Cleopatra" effect set up by five tall pillars in muted fireglow, with discreet lighting for shadows. Except for occasional slight huskiness in the low voice—it blurred the Mozart trill—Miss Price was singing superbly, and the quality projected even when she spoke.

If you thought, as some did, that you never had heard her to better advantage, it was partly because in opera she so often sings dramatic soprano roles, while in recital she could cling to her true realm of the lyric or lirico spinto. It was also an advance in musicianship, in presence, in ease before a large audience, but primarily it was voice. This is one of the loveliest voices in the world, in its luster, its purity, its soaring excitement, its sudden depth of feeling, and the way it can wrap opera right around its little finger.

That last happened when she invaded Renata Tebaldi's domain for the two caressing arias from Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur"—for even poison caresses Adriana before it kills her. Here for just a second Miss Price

turned into the tiger cat coaxed out when Hervert von Karajan conducts. Her Donna Anna was more stately than when she does the role with him, but no less beautiful.

Her program was rather a brave one for a benefit performance, Schubert, with "An die Leier," "Liebesbotschaft" and "Die Allmacht" outstanding; an interesting group of Poulenc songs programed before his death and sung in his memory and to do him honor; four Samuel Barber songs set to poems by James Joyce, "Nuvoletta" in particular done with a special and capricious skill.

At the back of the house for the spirituals, acoustics backfired. What had been David Garvey's dull piano sounded fresher, but you would not have recognized Miss Price.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pleasure and of pride to all the Members of this body when one of our colleagues, regardless of the side of the aisle he occupies, is accorded editorial commendation all must regard as richly deserved.

ROMAN PUCINSKI was an Air Force pilot. He led his bomber group in the first B-29 bombing raid over Tokyo. In all he flew 48 combat missions over Japan. Now as a distinguished Member of the Congress he was called upon that wartime experience to render a service that well may result in the giving of greater safety to travel by air and the minimizing of the number of plane crashes.

I include in my remarks the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 23, 1963, that tells the story and pays to the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, a tribute in which I am sure the Members of the House will join.

PUCINSKI COMMENDED

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, is to be highly commended for winning his long fight to establish crash-proof tape recorders in commercial airliner cockpits. The installation of such devices should go a long way toward clearing up the mystery of the last few moments in any future air tragedy.

PUCINSKI is a former Air Force pilot who led his bomber group in the first B-29 bombing raid over Tokyo. He flew 48 combat missions over Japan and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with clusters. PUCINSKI has been fighting to install such tape recorders in airline cockpits since 1959. He maintains, and his judgment as a flyer is sound, that in the last few moments preceding an air tragedy the cockpit crew is far too busy trying to save their aircraft and passengers to make formal reports to a ground station. A crashproof tape recorder, operating automatically during flight will preserve a record of everything said in the cockpit for the investigators.

Australia has already made such an instrument mandatory for their airliners. The United States should follow swiftly and it is to be hoped that no airlines resistance is encountered. This measure is for the best interests of the traveling public.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE IN MICHIGAN

Mr. STAEBLER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This is a companion bill to the one recently introduced in the Senate by Senators McNAMARA and HART.

We in Michigan pride ourselves on being known as the "Water Wonderland." Outstanding among our natural assets are the water resources available for recreation along our shorelines.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area, because of its many unique features, has been designated as an area worthy of national preservation. Here there are sand dunes, scenic islands, unexcelled stretches of Lake Michigan shoreline, examples of natural history reaching back across the ice ages, and scenic vistas across inland lakes unequaled in beauty anywhere in the Great Lakes region.

It is the objective of this legislation to preserve and develop this natural beauty while at the same time providing for continued private ownership of the existing homes and cottages within the suggested boundaries.

The bill proposes that Congress, building on the experience already gained in the establishment of national seashore areas on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, provide a law under which both the public and private interests will be adequately protected in the preservation and development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area.

I am confident that, with the growing support evident in Michigan and throughout the Nation for the prevention of this segment of our fourth shoreline, sound and reasonable legislation can be enacted by this Congress. I will work toward this end with my colleagues in the House and with the Senators who have spent so much time in recent months giving leadership to the effort to find solutions to the many complex problems which always arise when we consider the establishment of new national park areas.

We, in Michigan, have another very real interest in bringing this Federal investment to the northwest corner of our State. There is an increasing tendency for tourists and summer vacationers to seek out the most scenic and remote spots for their trips. The system of interstate highways today brings these parts of our country, and even of Canada, within a few hours drive of most Midwestern cities.

The economic importance to Michigan's tourist industry of this national development at Sleeping Bear has been estimated as equalling that gain from the establishment of 10 average-size Michigan industries within the area. A thriving tourist industry is of the great-

est importance to the total economy of Michigan.

We seek, then, the dual objective of preserving a unique corner of America for ours and future generations, and obtaining for Michigan this Federal investment in park and recreation land so sorely needed in our populous area of the Nation.

RECIPROCAL TARIFF TREATMENT OF BREAD IMPORTS

Mr. DULSKI. 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. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposal to provide reciprocal tariff treatment of bread imports. It applies specifically to pan loaf bread or pan-type loaf bread made with the use of yeast, whether sliced or not, and imposes a duty of 7½ percent on these imports.

For many years, bakers in the Buffalo area have suffered because of bread imports from Canada. I understand other areas along the Canadian border have been faced with this problem also.

This imported bread has sold at lower prices than bread produced in Buffalo. While our country grants duty-free treatment to bread imported from Canada, Canada maintains a duty on U.S. bread amounting to 7½ percent last year. I do not think this is fair and if Canada continues the tariff on this product, then certainly we should not hesitate to place the same tariff rate on their bread.

My bill would also provide that the 7½-percent duty would not apply during any period that Canada may extend duty-free treatment for U.S. bread.

SUPERVISORS AS EMPLOYEES UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. DULSKI. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am again reintroducing a measure which will permit supervisors in private industry to be considered as employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. My bill would strike out the definition of "supervisor" which is depriving the foremen in American industry of all the benefits provided by this law to other employees.

Today we have strong representation for management at the top. We have strong representation for the rank and file worker at the bottom. In the middle, we find a group of foremen who have no representation at all.

There is no reason why the foremen of America should be denied the right of collective bargaining. They deserve

equal status with all the rights and privileges accorded to the rank and file worker. Correction of this injustice is long overdue, and I urge speedy enactment of this legislation.

TAX REFORMS CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. POFF. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to those proposed tax reforms in the President's message which I fear will have an adverse impact upon charitable contributions to educational institutions. Essentially, they are three in number.

First. The President proposes a so-called 5-percent floor under itemized deductions, that is, itemized deductions will be authorized only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5-percent floor will have the effect of reducing the amount deductible on the average of 20 to 30 percent. In other words, in the average case, more than one-fifth of the taxpayer's charitable contributions will be disallowed as a tax deduction. The overwhelming majority of substantial contributions to educational institutions comes from taxpayers who itemize their deductions. The 5-percent floor will significantly curtail the incentive which the present law offers.

Second. Present law authorizes certain individual taxpayers in high income brackets to take unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. The President proposes to erect a so-called 30-percent ceiling on deductions for contributions made by such taxpayers which he says would increase Government revenue by some \$10 million. That revenue figure illustrates the magnitude of the total charitable contributions which might be lost to colleges and other institutions if the ceiling is imposed.

Third. Present law authorizes taxpayers to take an additional 10-percent deduction over and above the basic 20-percent limitation if the charitable contribution is made to an educational institution, a church or a medical facility—as distinguished from other types eligible charitable organizations. The President recommends that this preference be discontinued and that all types of charitable organizations stand on the same 30-percent footing. Congress authorized this bonus deduction and granted this preference for a specific, legitimate, legislative purpose; namely, to encourage citizen support of institutions regarded as most essential to the Nation's growth and welfare. If the President's proposal is adopted, it will have the effect of diverting donations heretofore received by educational institutions into other charitable channels such as, in the President's own words, "symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers."

One final point needs to be made. To the same extent that these three tax reform proposals will curtail citizen support of our educational system, they will intensify our educational system's dependence upon governmental appropriations. Philosophically, some may view this as a desirable objective. I do not. On the contrary, I view the converse as the best goal. Tax deductions, and/or tax credits, for educational purposes should be increased, rather than decreased, in order that the people might be encouraged to finance their own educational system and thereby retain control over its curriculums, its standards and its performance.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. HARSHA. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with continued deep concern for the welfare and security of our Nation, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the re-statement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution calls upon the United States, bilaterally or unilaterally, to take whatever steps are necessary to rid the hemisphere of the Castro Communist threat.

The proof is in the pudding. Surely, after the shrimp boat incident, even the eggheads in the State Department should be convinced that whether a weapon is offensive or defensive is determined solely by the state of mind or intent of the individual controlling the weapon.

The evidence is conclusive that Cuba is a Communist outpost from which dedicated efforts are being effected to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

At a recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev stated:

Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist, Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba.

The United States is spending hundreds of millions of dollars and risking American lives daily in an effort to halt communism in Vietnam, yet our effort to combat that same menace within throwing distance of our own shores is very feeble.

The recent OAS Security Committee report indicates that Russia, through its bastion of operation in Cuba, has given orders for unremitting subversive pressure against Latin America. The presence of approximately 14 training camps for saboteurs, subversive and infiltration agents is confirmed in the report.

This all constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine as being the policy of the United States and any attempts on the part of a Communist country to extend its sys-

tem to any portion of this hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety. The resolution urges the President to take jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to fully implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The American people are fed up with the futile policy of spending billions of dollars in foreign aid, ostensibly to defeat and combat communism throughout the world and, at the same time, assuring the Communists of a base of operations in Cuba from which to enhance their activities.

If the defeat of communism is a valid reason for spending billions in foreign aid, then certainly that same reason is ample justification for implementing the Monroe Doctrine, to say nothing of the protection of our own freedom.

MR. TRUMAN ON THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. JOHANSEN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the oracle of Independence, Mo., on the subject of Cuba.

In a syndicated newspaper article published yesterday, Harry S. Truman essayed the double role of history teacher and prophet of hope.

On both counts he was a dismal flop.

He would have rendered a far greater service by silence.

In this article, believe it or not, Mr. Truman undertook, among other things, a dissertation on the Platt amendment.

One provision of this Platt amendment, incorporated in the Cuban Constitution on our insistence after we liberated Cuba from Spain, asserted:

The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence [and] the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

Having called attention to this provision, Historian Harry offered this comment in yesterday's article:

It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

But Mr. Truman overlooked, or chose not to mention, one other historical fact. The Platt amendment was not there in 1959, when Castro took over in Cuba. It had not been there for a quarter of a century.

The Platt amendment was abrogated by the United States in May 1934, at the specific behest of Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And one of the direct effects of this action was a downgrading, in both national and hemispheric respect, of any unilateral dedication of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine.

I happen to believe that the Eisenhower administration is open to criticism in its handling of the Cuban situation and the Castro takeover. I have been saying so publicly since October 1959. I deplore its overhasty recognition of Castro, its disregard of clear evidence of his Communist ties, and its tardy declaration that the United States would not permit establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet this declaration was made by President Eisenhower in July 1960. And I do not now propose to accept Mr. Truman's Monday morning quarterbacking invocation of the Platt amendment as the basis for action we ought to have taken—the selfsame Platt amendment which Mr. Truman's immediate predecessor in the Presidency consigned to the ashcan and which fact Mr. Truman conveniently forgot to mention.

I might add that Mr. Truman's evaluation of much more recent history is equally deficient.

He declared:

The Cuban crisis provided the United States with an opportunity to make clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

Stand firm? By a declared willingness to give a no-invasion pledge? Stand firm? By a complete backdown on our on-site inspection demand? Mr. Kennedy, in his February 7, 1963, press conference, acknowledged that this demand is "now a dead letter."

Stand firm? What has happened to the President's repeated pledge that "Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated?" The record is abundantly clear that this, too, is another "dead letter."

As much a dead letter, Mr. Truman, as the Platt amendment.

And what of Mr. Truman's attempted role, in his syndicated article, as a prophet of hope? His contribution on this score also leaves a great deal to be desired—alike by the American people and the tragic people of Cuba:

Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all.

Not only are there no specifics offered toward this desired goal but there is an aura of hope deferred, of fantastic resignation, of larger problems which must first be solved—again with not specifics offered. Mr. Truman wrote:

Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

Unmistakably true—but hardly a solution.

Mr. Truman also said:

The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians.

This assessment brings to mind President Kennedy's equally glum and nega-

tive appraisal of the situation in his February 7, 1963, press conference—a sequel to the October "triumph" of "firmness":

I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination [of communism in Cuba]. I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war.

Mr. Truman did go one step beyond President Kennedy's wait-and-see policy:

It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy; namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

How ironical that it was the let-the-dust-settle variety of a wait-and-see policy, in President Truman's own administration, that saw China lost to the free world. On December 1, 1961, President Kennedy told his press conference:

I always have felt that we did not make a determined enough effort in the case of China.

Belatedly, Mr. Truman has identified the real enemies, even though he seems to persist in the illusion that the internal revolt which will not work in Hungary—or Cuba—will somehow accomplish miracles in Soviet Russia and Red China.

But there is still a strange reluctance to suggest specific policies of firmness and bold action from without.

His statesmanship of victory—the same statesmanship which first hamstrung and then fired MacArthur—consists of the plaintive litany:

We, of course, continue to hope that somehow, somehow.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BECKER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, because of the use of the term "bipartisan foreign policy" I believe there is a great misconception in the minds of many people, including some Members of Congress. I have asked for a special order for today, and immediately after the regular order of business and the special orders heretofore entered I intend to discuss what I believe to be bipartisan foreign policy, or my idea of it. I want the RECORD to be straight because when I take the floor, as I did a couple of weeks ago, I do not want anyone to say I am violating bipartisan foreign policy or bipartisanship in our foreign policy. If any Members want to participate in this discussion, I shall be glad to yield them time during that special order.

EIGHTY-EIGHT MEMBERS OF HOUSE SIGN JOINT LETTER OPPOSING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INCREASE IN OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY BY BACK-DOOR METHOD

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter over the signature of 88 Members of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is holding committee hearings today and tomorrow on H.R. 3872. This bill would increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and likewise would extend the period within which the Bank may exercise its functions.

Since this legislation would provide \$2 billion additional authority to expend from public debt receipts or, as it is generally called, by the back-door spending method, a group of 88 Members of the House are urging that instead, any additional financial provisions found necessary for the Bank be made through the normal traditional appropriations procedure.

For the general information of the Congress, I include at this point the text of a joint letter to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee expressing our opposition to the back-door spending provision and listing the names of the 88 Members of the House whose names are appended to this letter.

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in opposition to the financing provisions contained in H.R. 3872 and represents the views of 86 Members of the House of Representatives whose names are appended below. We are hopeful that your committee will give consideration to our views and make this letter a part of the record of the hearings which we understand are being held on February 25 and 26.

We understand that the only significant recommendation from the President in the pending budget for new obligating authority through the so-called back-door procedure is the \$2 billion additional authority for the Export-Import Bank to expend from public debt receipts, for which provision would be made in H.R. 3872 now pending in your committee. We strongly recommend that any additional financial provision found necessary for the Bank be made through the traditional congressional appropriations process.

After some years of debate and contention about the dimensions and undesirable characteristics of the various back-door practices, the last session of the 87th Congress produced the most significant results from past efforts to alert the Congress and the country to this diffusive method of legislating the finances of the Government. According to available tabulations, only 2 such bills were enacted, to the amount of about \$437 million, in sharp contrast to the year before when the Executive requests in 11 such bills totaled \$28,670 million plus; some \$19,673 million plus was enacted into law.

Discontinuance of the practice, it seems clear, undeniably enhances the opportunities to legislate for functions of Government in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. As you doubtless know, the other body has indulged heavily in some recent years in the origination of back-door bills.

It is of course true, as in the case of some other going programs no longer funded through back-door methods, that the borrowing and lending authority for the Bank has heretofore been furnished through public debt authorization carried in legislative, rather than the regular appropriation, bills.

But there is recent parallel for the change we now urge. Last year the President was supplied, through the usual legislative authorization (Public Law 87-490) and appropriation method (Public Law 87-872), with \$2 billion additional for subscription to the International Monetary Fund; U.S. participation in the Fund had theretofore been furnished by public debt expenditure authority carried in a legislative bill. In fact, as you know, this change in method of funding for the IMF was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. We are not aware of any hind-sight dissatisfaction with the change. Nor can we perceive of any valid objections to a similar change for the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriation bills—as are virtually all other Government corporations—and in the last two, limitations on certain expenditures, as was contemplated might be done when the corporation budget law was adopted, have been written into the bills by the Committee on Appropriations and approved by the House without objection or without apparent adverse results to necessary operations of the Bank.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration; additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills.

With the recent significant progress made by the House in the matter, we believe it especially important that the pending bill authorize the necessary appropriation in lieu of a direct public debt expenditure authority and we earnestly hope that your committee will see it that way.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

The following Members of the House have authorized the use of their names as co-signers of this joint letter:

Hon. HOMER E. ABELE, 10th District of Ohio.
Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON, 16th District of Illinois.
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District of New Jersey.
Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY, Second District of Kansas.
Hon. WALTER BARING, Congressman at Large, Nevada.
Hon. WILLIAM H. BATES, Sixth District of Massachusetts.
Hon. JAMES F. BATTIN, Second District of Montana.
Hon. FRANK J. BECKER, Fifth District of New York.
Hon. E. Y. BERRY, Second District of South Dakota.
Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, Eighth District of Ohio.
Hon. BILL BROCK, Third District of Tennessee.
Hon. JAMES E. BROMWELL, Second District of Iowa.
Hon. JAMES T. BROYHILL, Ninth District of North Carolina.
Hon. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, 10th District of Michigan.

Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District of Colorado.
Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, 12th District of Florida.
Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Third District of New York.
Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Fourth District of Illinois.
Hon. SAMUEL L. DEVINE, 12th District of Ohio.
Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, Third District of South Carolina.
Hon. JOHN DOWDY, Seventh District of Texas.
Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, First District of Virginia.
Hon. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Third District of Kansas.
Hon. GERALD FORD, Fifth District of Michigan.
Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY, Third District of Virginia.
Hon. MILTON W. GLENN, Second District of New Jersey.
Hon. H. R. GROSS, Third District of Iowa.
Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER, 10th District of California.
Hon. EDWARD J. GURNEY, 11th District of Florida.
Hon. JAMES A. HALEY, Seventh District of Florida.
Hon. DURWARD G. HALL, Seventh District of Missouri.
Hon. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Congressman at Large, Wyoming.
Hon. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Sixth District of Ohio.
Hon. RALPH HARVEY, 10th District of Indiana.
Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Sixth District of Iowa.
Hon. WALT HORAN, Fifth District of Washington.
Hon. FRANK J. HORTON, 36th District of New York.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, 32d District of California.
Hon. CHARLES R. JONAS, Eighth District of North Carolina.
Hon. CLARENCE E. KILBURN, 31st District of New York.
Hon. CARLETON J. KING, 30th District of New York.
Hon. JOHN C. KUNKEL, 16th District of Pennsylvania.
Hon. JOHN KYL, Fourth District of Iowa.
Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, Seventh District of Wisconsin.
Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, 24th District of California.
Hon. ROBERT MCCLORY, 12th District of Illinois.
Hon. CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Second District of Maine.
Hon. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, 19th District of Illinois.
Hon. CLARK MACGREGOR, Third District of Minnesota.
Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Sixth District of Maryland.
Hon. CATHERINE MAY, Fourth District of Washington.
Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, 40th District of New York.
Hon. ANCHER NELSEN, Second District of Minnesota.
Hon. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD, First District of North Dakota.
Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, 37th District of New York.
Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, Fifth District of Louisiana.
Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, 39th District of New York.
Hon. ALEXANDER PIRNIE, 32d District of New York.
Hon. RICHARD H. POFF, Sixth District of Virginia.
Hon. ALBERT QUIE, First District of Minnesota.

Hon. CHARLOTTE REID, 15th District of Illinois.
Hon. BEN REIFEL, First District of South Dakota.
Hon. JOHN J. RHODES, First District of Arizona.
Hon. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, 34th District of New York.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON, 33d District of New York.
Hon. RICHARD L. ROUBEUSH, Sixth District of Indiana.
Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, First District of Wisconsin.
Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, 17th District of Pennsylvania.
Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, First District of Iowa.
Hon. DON L. SHORT, Second District of North Dakota.
Hon. EUGENE SILER, Fifth District of Kentucky.
Hon. M. G. SNYDER, Third District of Kentucky.
Hon. BILL STINSON, Seventh District of Washington.
Hon. ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Congressman at Large, Ohio.
Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE, 13th District of California.
Hon. VERNON W. THOMSON, Third District of Wisconsin.
Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Sixth District of Washington.
Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK, Fifth District of Virginia.
Hon. JAMES B. UTT, 35th District of California.
Hon. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Sixth District of Wisconsin.
Hon. J. ERNEST WHARTON, 28th District of New York.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Seventh District of New Jersey.
Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Third District of Mississippi.
Hon. BOB WILSON, 36th District of California.
Hon. JOHN W. WYDLER, Fourth District of New York.
Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, 11th District of California.
Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK, 17th District of Ohio.
Hon. JOE D. WAGGONER, Jr., Fourth District of Louisiana.

NUCLEAR HELP FOR COMMUNISTS

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the United Nations Special Fund is planning a project in Communist Yugoslavia that would use American tax dollars to strengthen a nation dedicated to a bloc that says it wants to bury us.

The project has been approved by the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund and calls for a Federal center—in Yugoslavia—for nuclear research.

I have studied a publication of the U.N. Special Fund in which I find these statements, and I have pursued development of the project by checking with the U.S. Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Atomic Energy Commission.

This proposed 3-year U.N. project is planned for a total cost of \$1,752,400 with

\$546,000 of that coming from the Special Fund, and the rest from Yugoslavia. As has been widely noted in the past few days in this House, the Special Fund receives 40 percent of its funds from U.S. contributions.

Even more shocking is the fact that this provision for nuclear assistance to a Communist-bloc nation apparently has been neatly disguised as only an agricultural project.

The project, which will be administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency if final details are agreed to by that Agency, Yugoslavia and the Special Fund, is designed in the words of the Special Fund to:

Assist in extending research and training facilities at the Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun, near Belgrade.

However, in the first sentence of its project analysis—which interestingly enough is marked by the United Nations for "Restricted" distribution—the Special Fund calls not only for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture, but also for a Federal center for nuclear research and training at the Zemun Institute.

The plans of the Special Fund call for financing which would increase the staff of the nuclear research Institute from 32 resident scientists to 90 by 1965. It also calls for an expansion of buildings, more equipment, 12 research fellowships, and for providing of a "phytotron" to Yugoslavia.

A phytotron is an uncommon instrument for plant research used in connection with radioactive isotopes in creating artificial environments.

My colleagues, even if the American taxpayers were not being asked to pay in large part for a nuclear center in a Communist nation, it is highly unclear to me why they should be asked to subsidize solution of agriculture problems which, if solved, will enable one of our enemies to grow stronger.

The Special Fund itself notes that the Yugoslav plan is to increase from output by 41 percent within just 4 years, mainly in production of grain and livestock.

We have a quite unbelievable farm subsidy program right here at home. If the United States has any extra money left in these deficit days, it would be well for us to apply it to our own agriculture problems—not to give it to the U.N. for use in alleviating Communist problems.

This Yugoslav project would concentrate in its agricultural phases on soil fertility and plant nutrition, plant breeding, and animal husbandry. But the project plan leaves a loophole whereby agriculture may not be the only goal of this research.

I note that the educational program under the project calls for training of about 25 Yugoslav nuclear research specialists at the graduate level. Presumably these graduates, once trained, could work on things other than farm problems.

Here is a breakdown of the moneys programed by the United Nations Special Fund for the Yugoslav project:

Experts, \$180,900. Fellowships, \$60,000. Equipment, \$258,700. Miscellaneous,

\$10,900. Overhead of the International Atomic Energy Agency, \$32,500. Preliminary investigations, \$3,000.

The American officials with whom I have checked about this project tell me they presume that the agricultural research under this program would involve the use of radioactive isotopes, but they remain uncertain about just where these isotopes for Yugoslavia will come from.

As this House knows, I am a doctor. As a doctor I am familiar with the many uses for isotopes in medical research. I know also that such tracer isotopes are equally valuable in plant and animal research and in work with fertilizers.

Most of the isotopes used in the United States are produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge, Tenn., Laboratories. But I have been told by the AEC that it is highly unlikely that a license could be issued and American isotopes provided to a Communist bloc nation.

However, isotopes are available from any nation that can produce them via nuclear reactors or electron accelerators. The United Kingdom sells some commercially, I understand, and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia also have reactors.

Yugoslavia also has a small research reactor, but it is not certain whether that reactor can produce the isotopes necessary for this United Nations program.

It must be noted here that isotopes once provided have many other uses than agricultural research. They can be used, for instance, to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, and to test and measure strengths and dimensions of metals and other materials. Isotopes also can be used in studies of insecticides and other biological and chemical materials including materials for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

In short, these radioactive, nuclear isotopes are not the sort of thing which American taxpayers should be helping to provide or to buy for the use of the Communist bloc.

The Members of this House may be assured that I am continuing my investigation into this vital matter concerning nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia subsidized by the American taxpayer. One would think that even our one-worldly State Department would have learned the lesson of experience long ago—that there no longer is any justification for wooing or trying to purchase the loyalty of another sovereign nation, particularly a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the uses of radioactive isotopes, I am including at this point in my remarks portions of an article from a special report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission listing a number of the uses for these isotopes in industry, medicine and agriculture:

AGRICULTURAL USES OF ISOTOPES

In agriculture, radioisotopes are an important tool that is helping scientists to unlock secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the pests and diseases that injure or destroy them. They are contributing to increasing productivity and better economy. They have been applied in a variety

of research on plant nutrition, crop diseases, fertilizer application and effectiveness, soil conditions, animal diseases, milk production, insect eradication, and development of new plant varieties through mutations. Over \$5 million per year of agricultural research is performed with radioisotopes.

Agricultural research often requires years to mature because of crop cycles, and additional time which elapses before results can be applied on the farms. Except in a few instances, the agricultural benefits of isotopes lie chiefly in the future.

MEDICAL USES

Following the discovery of radium in 1898, medical researchers soon recognized the possibilities of using radioactivity.

The supremacy of radioactive elements as tracers to define physiological processes is readily apparent in medical and biological fields. The tracers correspond in size and kind to the thing they trace. They are not foreign or chemically different—they are the material or a true part thereof. Some disease processes that have been studied are cancer, leukemia, heart malfunctions, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, anemia, gout, and nutritional deficiencies.

In addition to such universal use of tracers for biomedical research, radioisotopes have made possible some advances in medical diagnosis. Dynamic tracer diagnostic tests of the functions of organs in patients have been developed for thyroid, heart, liver, kidney, bone marrow, and spleen. Tracer tests are used routinely for the total volume of plasma, blood or water in the body, for lifetime of blood cells, and for localization of tumors, particularly of the brain. Over 2,000 hospitals or medical groups use isotopes for diagnosis.

In the area of radiation treatment, radioisotopes found early applications in medicine. Many of the therapeutic uses, particularly in cancer treatment, follow the principles established with X-rays and radium. Radioisotopes have greatly extended these treatments. At the end of 1959 over 300 radioisotope teletherapy units were licensed for use in the United States alone. These units may contain as much as several thousand curies of either cobalt 60 or cesium 137.

INDUSTRIAL USES

Most of the widespread applications of radioisotopes that industry has developed use very little radiation and fall into two categories: radioisotopes for tracing, and small radiation source for gaging or testing.

Radioisotopes are used now in use include: wear and lubrication tests to find best lubricants and conditions of operation, involving piston rings, gears, and machine parts; wear tests on paints, varnishes, wax coatings, and other protective agents; study of detergents and various cleaning agents on cloth and fabrics; finding leaks inside complicated systems and underground gas storage depots; tracing flow in pipelines, streams, catalytic crackers, chemical processing plants, and fluid or slurry systems.

In the area of radioinspection, industry has expanded radioisotope radiography as an efficient and cost-saving way of meeting the higher quality and greater safety specifications required for many products today—both for civilian and military use. Welds are routinely radiographed with radioisotope cameras on ships, tanks, pipelines, and containment vessels. Such radioeyes also are used to tell whether the fuel in rockets meets the rigid requirements of uniformity so necessary for successful operation. Construction of a single ship often requires the radiographing of as many as 10,000 welds. The savings in rejects and elimination of destructive tests for welds, casts, and other fabricated products, is significant. Even more important is the greatly reduced chance

of failures and accidents. Another important factor is radiation beam inspection of rapidly moving packages, cans, sheet material, metal strip, and fluid products. Isotope gages have been developed to penetrate through or reflect from material to measure levels, content, thickness, or density of a number of kinds of products.

A broad scope of products now is controlled and improved by isotope gages. Since they permit products to be made much more uniform and of higher quality, the user or consumer benefits directly as well as indirectly through the assistance isotopes can give to improved efficiency and productivity to aid segments of the economy.

High intensity radiation is starting to receive its first routine uses, but its full development depends on considerable research. The intense radiation from large quantities of fission products may ultimately find use as a new industrial process reagent and create new products. Some types of grafted plastics, such as selective ion exchange membranes used in desalting sea water, can best be produced by irradiation.

DEVELOPMENT OF RADIATION INSTRUMENTS

Since the human senses cannot detect nuclear radiations except at extremely high levels, the development of systems of detection and measurement of radiation has been essential to development of the practical applications of radioisotopes. The design and manufacture of such instruments was the first branch of the private atomic energy industry established. Many instruments originally were designed and manufactured in the Government's atomic laboratories, but immediately after the war the Commission supported development of commercial manufacture. Significant advances have been made by industry in the development of more stable and sensitive circuits for radioisotope measuring applications. By 1959 some 120 companies were manufacturing a variety of instruments, detectors, special components, and accessories.

Nuclear radiation detectors developed to date may be classified according to several types.

In pulse systems, the output of the detector consists of a series of signals, each of which represents the interaction of a nuclear particle or gamma ray with the detector. The well-known Geiger counter is an example of a pulse detector. Another is the proportional counter which is able to identify different radioisotopes according to their characteristic radiations. Still another example is the scintillation counter which operates on the principle that when ionizing particles pass through certain crystals, liquids, or organic polymers, flashes of light (scintillations) are emitted. An electron multiplier phototube picks up the faint scintillations and amplifies the resulting pulses to be detected and identified by the measuring apparatus.

In nonpulse detection systems, the output is the average of the cumulative effects due to many interactions of radiation with the detector; no attempt is made to resolve the individual events. The current-producing ionization chamber is a good example; the output is proportional to the total ionization current produced within the detector. Another example is the photographic system. When a piece of film is exposed to radiation, the emulsion reacts in the same way as when struck by visible light. The amount of radiation can be estimated from darkening of the film. Colorimetric detection is another example. When radiation reacts with certain chemicals containing chlorine (i.e., trichlorethylene and water, or chloroform and water), hydrochloric acid is formed. This causes a change in color of certain dyes, and the degree of color change produced is dependent upon the amount of radiation received.

Several other detector systems have been used for specialized problems. These include cloud chambers for laboratory studies, nuclear-track photographic emulsion plates, crystal conducting counters, chemical detectors, and colorimetric devices for detection of large doses of radiation. In addition, a number of systems have been designed to detect and measure neutrons. Most of these have used boron, lithium or cadmium, in conjunction with one of the detector types discussed (except colorimetric), to detect the secondary radiation resulting from neutron capture by these materials.

In the field of low-level counting, university work on radiocarbon dating of archaeological materials was important in early developments. Noteworthy in this field was the pioneering research on the screen wall counter by W. F. Libby at the Universities of California and Chicago. Libby's technique involved placement of the sample inside a counter that operated on the sensitive and simple Geiger principle.

In more recent years, some investigators have substituted acetylene gas synthesized from radiocarbon samples used in proportional counters for the screen wall counter. Other techniques are based on a variety of liquid scintillators that respond well to soft beta radiation when the sample is mixed with the liquid scintillators.

These developments in low-level counting are pointing a way for applying these techniques to industrial processing. Present-day instrumentation is suitable only for laboratory needs, and designs must be modified to meet the rigid requirements of industrial applications.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PEREZ JIMENEZ

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest among some of my constituents about the plight of Perez Jimenez, former President of Venezuela, now in Florida, who is involved in extradition proceedings brought by the U.S. Government.

One of my constituents has sent me an article dealing with this subject from the Wanderer of January 10, 1963, with the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

I have also studied the State Department paper on this subject and, although I may not agree entirely with either treatment of the matter, I think it will serve a useful purpose to place them here side by side.

The article follows:

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ
(Condensed from an account in Popular, Miami Spanish-language weekly, December 30, 1962.)

Certain legal cases, due to a strange series of incidents, coincidences and paradoxes, tend to become famous in the annals of jurisprudence. The case of Marcos Perez Jimenez has all the indications of becoming one of these cases. The former President of Venezuela is now languishing in a Dade County jail, held virtually incommunicado, and subjected to the treatment usually accorded highly dangerous convicted felons.

Why?

No person in authority can give, or dares to give, a reasonable answer.

Has the ex-President violated any U.S. law? No.

Has the ex-President been convicted in Venezuela? No.

Has the ex-President, holder of the U.S. coveted Legion of Merit, with the rank of commander in chief, broken any conditions imposed upon political exiles in the United States?

Again, no.

Then why is he imprisoned and denied benefit of bond? There are many apparent answers. For one thing, his arch-enemy, President Betancourt of Venezuela, has hired a very influential law firm in Washington in an effort to satiate his vengeance on Perez Jimenez. The law firm is headed by Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson.

Perez Jimenez has been denied the right to post bond. Spies and saboteurs are granted this right in the United States. Why is it denied in this case?

Betancourt of Venezuela wants it that way.

As a former Communist leader, Betancourt can do no wrong. He's even the darling of most of the U.S. press which consistently views Communist dictators as "premiers" or "chairmen," never as bloody autocrats. This name is only reserved for the rightist dictators friendly to the United States. As the Turkish Ambassador recently said in Washington: "Americans love their enemies and despise their friends."

Every believer in the sacred principles of the U.S. Constitution, its Bill of Rights and what used to be a government of laws and not of personalities would do well to study the strange pattern of the Perez Jimenez case.

BACKGROUND

Who: Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, President of Venezuela, 1952-58, now behind the bars of Dade County jail.

Age: Forty-eight.

Family: The former Venezuelan President lived at 4609 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., with his wife, the former Flor Chabaud, and four daughters: Margot, 17; Florangel, 14; Maria Sol, 10; and Flo de Maria, 6.

"It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be a part of this community," said Gen. Perez Jimenez.

Church: The entire family regularly attends St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Miami Beach.

Friendship with the United States: Gen. Perez Jimenez, was one of the United States of America's staunchest supporters in this hemisphere.

In 1954 he was awarded the highest rank of the Legion of Merit by the United States for "his sound foreign-investment policies," and his government was cited by the late Secretary of State Dulles as "an example to other countries in Latin America."

Under his administration, American companies and individuals found Venezuela an ideal business climate for investment and operation. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, those investments were drastically cut back in 1957 after Romulo Betancourt came into power. The country went from a policy of encouragement to one of discouragement where essential foreign investment was concerned.

Anti-Communist record: Not only was communism outlawed under the administration of Perez Jimenez, but members and sympathizers left Venezuela and their activities were practically nonexistent. The general severed relations with Russia and other satellite countries.

During this period the Accion Democratica and Communist parties entered into a coalition to overthrow the anti-Communist Perez Jimenez government.

It is interesting to note that the Communist Party had been officially recognized during the years 1945-48 after Betancourt headed a seven-man ruling junta. With Betancourt's return to head of the government in 1958, communism again became legal in Venezuela and is flourishing there right now. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that the number of Communists in Venezuela jumped from 20,000 in 1957 to 35,000 in 1959 and to 40,000 in 1960.

Status in the United States: Perez Jimenez entered the United States with a valid visitor's visa. Subsequent events in Venezuela made it impossible for him to return to that country. Consequently, he overstayed his temporary visa. Deportation proceedings were instituted and then deferred pending action on his application for permanent residence in the United States.

Perez Jimenez also applied for stay of deportation in formal proceedings, provided by law on the ground that he would be subject to political persecution if deported to Venezuela. All immigration proceedings have been deferred pending outcome of the extradition matter. The Immigration Service had never required that the general be placed under bond, nor were his actions substantially restricted.

Attempts to extradite: General Perez Jimenez and his family came to the United States in 1958; thereafter sought political asylum. The general remained unmolested until August 25 of that year when extradition proceedings were formally instituted by the Betancourt regime. It is ironic that while the country seeks the return of Perez Jimenez, his wife and children are political exiles and are not permitted to return to Venezuela. It is also ironic that during Perez Jimenez' regime his government prepared for the extradition of Romulo Betancourt as a result of an assassination attempt upon the general's life; Perez Jimenez halted the proceedings to avoid involving the United States in his country's internal politics.

The Venezuelan Government has charged Perez Jimenez with complicity in the alleged murder of four persons and alleged misappropriation of funds. Upon completion of extradition proceedings in June 1961, U.S. District Judge George W. Whitehurst found that Perez Jimenez had no connection with the alleged murders but found probable cause as to the alleged financial charges. Evidence in the proceedings has been forwarded to the U.S. State Department. A petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by counsel for Perez Jimenez which was predicated upon, among other things, a statement by Judge Whitehurst that he had in fact not read the evidence in the financial charges.

Appeal to U.S. court of appeals: The habeas corpus petition was denied on August 23d by U.S. District Judge William A. McRae, Jr. An appeal was made. A \$100,000 bond was posted by the general.

The general, in a recent press conference, announced his intent to use every legal remedy at his disposal to remain in the United States.

Military career: Perez Jimenez graduated from military school in Caracas in 1933 as the most prominent student during 3 years of studies. He was given the rank of sublieutenant on July 5, 1933; entered the artillery division. He was then made professor of ballistics, professor of armaments, and professor of military information at the military institute and served at the school as staff officer until 1939. He went to Peru and continued his military studies; received his diploma as an officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has received decorations from

Venezuela, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, and the United States.

Political career: Following the 1945 revolution which deposed President Medina Angarita, Perez Jimenez launched his political career by opposing the seven-man junta headed by Romulo Betancourt. He continued to oppose the Gallegos regime of 1947, and the Leftist Accion Democratica. In 1948; when the Accion Democratica government was forced to retire, he became Defense Minister and a member of the military junta that ruled the country and which later became the Independent Electoral Front. In December of 1952 he became Provisional President of Venezuela; was elected Constitutional President in 1953. He held office until January 1958, when the Government was overthrown by a coalition opposition which included Accion Democratica and the Communist party.

Prosperity under his administration: Venezuela experienced astonishing material progress under the Perez Jimenez regime; reported a surplus in the national budget in 1954 of \$64 million. Petroleum production in that year was at a high of 2,112,000 barrels of oil per day. Fifty-seven percent of the national income was used to build highways, housing projects for workers, schools and hospitals. The Venezuelan Treasury at Perez Jimenez' resignation contained \$750 million.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica: "The Perez Jimenez regime concentrated on the development of cities, stimulating the growth of an urban middle class * * * during this period the Nation boasted the highest per capita income among the Central and South American countries."

According to the New York Times: Perez Jimenez was "a man with a mission" who had "dedicated himself to make Venezuela, a tropical underdeveloped country of 6 million inhabitants, the economic and social center of Latin America."

According to Life magazine: The economy under Perez Jimenez "enabled many Venezuelan workers, whose average wages have doubled in 10 years, to replace their rope-soled sandals with shoes, buy canned goods in the supermarkets and satisfy a craving for chicken and ice cream."

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The spectacular economic boom continued unabated. After earmarking an additional \$23 million for public works in 1957, the richest country in Latin America looked around for impressive projects on an international scale. The Government pledged money at the United Nations for the proposed Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development * * * it gave credit to Paraguay estimated at \$30 million and another \$15 million loan for development went to Ecuador."

According to the National City Bank of New York: Venezuela was in sound financial condition, and it distributed to its depositors a report that recommended the country for foreign investments.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "Venezuela (under Perez Jimenez) was never more prosperous. It has new iron mines, manufacturing, a steel mill, oil refinery, new railroads, highways, and ports. The Government enjoys more than a billion dollars a year in revenue from the oil industry alone. This wealth has permitted a spectacular public works program."

PUBLIC WORKS

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The multimillion-dollar income from the foreign petroleum companies completely transformed Caracas and other cities with the largest program of public works ever undertaken anywhere in Latin America. Old buildings were torn down by the hundreds to make way for wide avenues and skyscrapers. Hillside slums were being cleared away and occupants were moving into modern apart-

ments bought on easy terms. Superhighways were carved through the mountains to connect seaports with interior industrial cities. In 10 years, Venezuela quadrupled its highway mileage and had more good roads than Brazil, a country nearly 10 times as large."

Because slums were created by the sudden influx of agricultural workers to the industries in the cities, "the Government organized Banco Obrero, built 10 low-rental apartment houses in 1954 and transferred 30,000 families from shacks into new quarters. Construction was started in 1955 for about 30 more blocks to accommodate 15,000 more people."

According to the Book of Knowledge: "In April 1953, Venezuela adopted a new constitution * * * 2 days later, Marcos Perez Jimenez was elected President. He launched a program of countrywide improvements. In the 1950's, for instance, Venezuela invested hundreds of millions of dollars in public projects such as housing, waterworks, schools, highways, harbor improvements, churches, buildings, and agriculture. Income from petroleum furnished the money for almost all of the projects. Huge housing projects have changed the living habits of thousands of people in the northern highlands. Many people have moved from tiny shacks into comfortable Government-built apartment buildings."

Venezuela encouraged immigration, and more than 340,000 immigrants came from Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Austria.

Relations with Betancourt: Shortly after Perez Jimenez assumed the Venezuelan presidency, former President Romulo Betancourt started an 8-week tour of South America, making protests and charges against the new regime. Simultaneously, the Accion Democratica and Communist Parties commenced agitation, and this resulted in decrees that outlawed both and made their political activities illegal. The two parties had fomented strikes in the oil industry with a view to crippling it and creating economic crisis. The strikes were accompanied by acts of sabotage and violence on a nationwide basis. Colonel Delgado Chalbaud had been killed in ambush in 1950; there were four attempts on the life of Perez Jimenez in the period from 1952 to 1954.

THE EXTRADITION CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ BACKGROUND

Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez served as President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958.

He fled from Venezuela to the Dominican Republic early in 1958 when his government was overthrown. He applied for admission to the United States on March 28, 1958, as a visitor. He entered the United States in a parole status pending determination of his eligibility for admission. On January 7, 1959, he was admitted to the United States as a visitor until February 15, 1959, and that visit was extended to March 13, 1959. Further requests for extension were denied and, when he failed to leave the United States within a reasonable time after expiration of his lawful stay, deportation proceedings were instituted against him. After full hearings, Mr. Perez Jimenez was ordered deported and that determination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was affirmed on appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals on September 8, 1959.

EXTRADITION REQUEST

While the deportation proceedings were pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Government of Venezuela, on August 25, 1959, filed a formal complaint in extradition under the United States-Venezuela Extradition Treaty of 1922 and section 3184, title 18, United States Code, seeking the return for prosecution of Mr. Perez Jimenez for alleged complicity in 4 homicides

and for approximately 15 financial crimes such as embezzlement and fraud by which he allegedly obtained in excess of \$13 million. He was arrested at Miami pursuant to a warrant issued by the U.S. district court at Miami and was immediately released on bond.

PROCEEDINGS IN U.S. COURTS

The extradition hearing before a U.S. district judge sitting as an extradition magistrate extended over a period of almost 2 years and resulted on June 16, 1961, in the determination by the extradition magistrate that probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez' guilt of the financial crimes had been established but that his responsibility for or complicity in the homicides had not been shown. Pursuant to section 3184, title 18, United States Code, the extradition magistrate certified his finding and the record of the extradition hearing to the Secretary of State and ordered the commitment to jail of Mr. Perez Jimenez. He was immediately released on bond pending a decision on his petition for habeas corpus challenging the finding of the extradition magistrate.

Hearings on the habeas corpus petition were heard before a U.S. district judge on August 23 and 24, 1961. At the conclusion of the hearings the district judge found that the extradition proceedings had been conducted in accordance with law, that due process had been accorded Mr. Perez Jimenez, that the evidence presented showed probable cause to believe Mr. Perez Jimenez committed the financial crimes charged, that the crimes charged were crimes enumerated in the treaty between Venezuela and the United States which, had they been committed in this country, would be offenses against our laws and that the offenses were not political in character and thus not exempt from extradition. Accordingly, the petition for habeas corpus was dismissed. Mr. Perez Jimenez was again released under bond pending further order of the court.

Appeal was taken by Mr. Perez Jimenez to the U.S. court of appeals. In a lengthy opinion released on December 12, 1962, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's judgment. Immediately upon such affirmation and on the same day that the decision was announced, the district court, on its own motion, entered an order revoking the bond under which Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty and he was taken into custody. No doubt the action of the court was based, in part, on the consideration that his continued liberty on bond would enable him to flee which might result in this Government being unable to fulfill its treaty obligations should the final decision in the case be that extradition should be granted.

BAIL

The laws of the United States make no provision for bail in an international extradition case. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that a court's discretion to grant bail in such cases should be exercised only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances prior to the holding of the extradition hearing and that allowance of bail after a finding of probable cause is inconsistent with the extradition laws of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty on bail not only before but after the extradition magistrate found that a proper case for extradition had been made out under the treaty and U.S. law and remained at liberty on bail until first the U.S. district court and then the U.S. court of appeals, on habeas corpus proceedings, had reviewed the case and rendered their decisions which, in effect, affirmed the finding of the extradition magistrate.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

The admission into the United States and the continued presence in the United States of aliens is governed by the laws of the United States, principally the Immigration

and Nationality Act. These laws contain no provision according an individual a right to remain in this country because he claims "political asylum." Whether a person in this country is subject to extradition to a foreign country where he is accused of crime is unrelated to his status under the immigration laws or his status as an alleged "political asylee" or whether he has committed a crime in this country but is dependent upon the application of the extradition treaties and related laws of the United States.

EXTRADITION TREATIES AND LAWS

In the extradition treaties the countries agree to surrender, on a reciprocal basis, persons found in one country who are charged in the other country with any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty. These treaties and laws prescribe the procedure which must be followed and the requirements which must be met to obtain the extradition of an alleged fugitive from justice. Under these treaties and U.S. laws the alleged fugitive, whether alien or U.S. citizen, has the opportunity to resist extradition in the courts to the full extent of the law with, in accordance with traditional standards of American justice, the assurance of equal treatment under the law. Among the issues the alleged fugitive may raise in opposition to the request for his extradition is that the offenses charged are political in character and thus not a proper basis for extradition. This was among the issues raised by Mr. Perez Jimenez at the extradition hearing and in the habeas corpus proceedings. The courts found against Mr. Perez Jimenez.

Under the laws of the United States the extradition of an alleged fugitive may be granted only for those offenses for which the extradition magistrate has found probable cause. Under the extradition treaties of the United States, including the United States-Venezuela Treaty, a person extradited may be tried only for those offenses for which extradition has been granted. In addition, like most extradition treaties of the United States, the United States-Venezuela Treaty prohibits the punishment for political offenses of persons extradited under the treaty. In the case of Mr. Perez Jimenez, he can be extradited and tried in Venezuela only for the financial crimes for it was only with respect to these crimes that the extradition magistrate, the U.S. district court and the U.S. court of appeals found that the probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez had been shown.

DECISION ON EXTRADITION

Mr. Perez Jimenez may petition the U.S. Supreme Court for review of the decision of the court of appeals. In the event that the final decision of the courts is that extradition is warranted under the laws and the treaty, the determination as to whether Mr. Perez Jimenez' extradition is required under the United States-Venezuelan Treaty will rest with the Secretary of State. In making that determination careful consideration will be given to every aspect of the case.

MR. PEREZ JIMENEZ' ANTICOMMUNIST POSITION

It has been noted that many of the individuals expressing sympathy or support for Mr. Perez Jimenez have pictured him as a staunch anti-Communist. From the standpoint of objectivity, it should be noted as well that Mr. Perez Jimenez, while President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958, headed one of the most brutally repressive and corrupt dictatorships in recent Latin American history.

While the record clearly shows that Mr. Perez Jimenez' government undertook action against many leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party, it was even more severe in its harassment of democratic opposition

groups. Moreover, there were indications in the final years of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship that it was coddling Communists in organized labor, the press, and in education. It apparently did this to make of them a counterfoil to the dominance of democratic opposition political groups in those key fields whom it considered a greater threat to itself than it did the Communists.

As a result of infiltration during the Perez Jimenez dictatorship, which became apparent after the overthrow of that regime in January 1958, the Communist Party of Venezuela emerged more strongly entrenched in labor, journalism, and education than ever before.

Since 1959, under a representative government, democratic political groups have managed to restore their position of dominance in labor, journalism, and education and greatly reduce Communist strength in these fields.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT

It has also been noted that many of the persons expressing sympathy for Mr. Perez Jimenez have done so in apparent belief that the present Government of Venezuela is Communist and pro-Communist and seeks to have him extradited to wreak its vengeance on him for his purported anticommunism. The similarity of their allegations suggests that they may be responding to solicitations from an organization or organizations conducting a campaign to discredit the Government of Venezuela and its President, Romulo Betancourt. Their allegations about the present Venezuelan Government are not supported by the facts and are at considerable variance with accurate information which has reached the Department of State from numerous reliable and competent close observers of Venezuela for many years.

The present Venezuelan Government is a coalition of the Democratic Action (AD) Party of President Betancourt, the Social Christian (Christian Democratic or Catholic) COPEI Party and political independents who are among the democratic leaders of the professional and business community.

The former Communist affiliation of President Betancourt during the beginning of his political career in the early 1930's has been common knowledge for many years. However, it is equally well known that he severed his connections with communism more than a quarter of a century ago, subsequently organized his own political movement, the AD Party, and formulated a political program based on democratic concepts of social reform related to the unique character of Venezuela's national problems.

The AD Party in its formative years was influenced by Marxist ideas and some of its leaders have been avowed radical Marxists of the extreme left. However, the leftwing extremist leadership has been expelled from the party or has bolted from it. As presently constituted, the AD, under President Betancourt's leadership, is a nationalistic mixture of moderate social democrat and liberal. It advocates political, social, and economic changes through representative democratic means and does not seek to abolish the free enterprise system or private property. It is a "polyclass" party which stands for basic reforms by constitutional means which permit the participation of all democratic groups in the political process. It does not advocate revolution through class struggle.

Since its founding 23 years ago, the AD Party under Mr. Betancourt has been a bitter political adversary of the Venezuelan Communists and a target of international Communist attack. Mr. Betancourt's firm stand against communism in general and particularly against its most recent manifestation in this hemisphere, as represented by Fidel

Castro, has been clearly and forcefully demonstrated many times during his Presidency.

Mr. Betancourt's government has been subjected to severe and continuing attacks by the Communist Party of Venezuela and an allied left-extremist group which had been expelled from the AD Party. Since late 1961 the Communist Party and its ally, the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, have embarked on an all-out campaign of terrorism, sabotage, crime, and guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

As a result, the Venezuelan Government in May 1962 banned the activities of these two subversive, conspiratorial groups. More recently, the Government petitioned the Supreme Court to declare them illegal on the basis of evidence which it has supplied; and has undertaken increasingly severe and energetic security measures to counter Communist insurgency.

During the recent Cuban crisis, the Venezuelan Government strongly supported the U.S. position and contributed two warships to the naval quarantine of Cuba. In reprisal, Venezuelan Communists severely sabotaged some of the petroleum installations which are Venezuela's economic mainstay. The Venezuelan Government brought this Communist-directed sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Cuban regime, to the attention of the Organization of American States.

Indicative of the opinion of the resident U.S. citizen in Venezuela (about 30,000 in number), the English language Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, whose publishers include several leaders of the U.S. community, carried the following editorial on November 7, 1962, which stated in part:

"North Americans all over the world can expect, these days, to be in the front line, and should not be surprised if Fidelistas and Communists attack them. Their answer should be compounded of composure and commonsense and appreciation of the fact that the vast majority of Venezuelans are with them.

"They can also remember that the President of Venezuela has said that attacks on American companies are attacks on the economy of Venezuela, no more and no less.

"North Americans have good reason to hold their heads high. Their country has been the symbol of the fight against tyranny. And Venezuela has joined it in that fight."

The Communist Cuban regime has been carrying on a propaganda campaign against the Venezuelan Government, and particularly against President Betancourt, that is exceeded in its ferocity and provocation only by the Castro Government's vilification of the United States. The Communist Cuban regime has clearly sided with the terrorist insurrection of the Venezuelan Communists.

A recent communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela stated that "the principal enemy of the Venezuelan people today is the government of Betancourt, through which U.S. imperialism and its allies, the local privileged classes, effect their rule. The plenary session of the central committee calls for joint action with all opposition groups against Betancourt." This theme is being echoed by the propaganda organs of international communism.

PRESIDENT BETANCOURT'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Venezuela was the first Latin American country which President Kennedy visited after his inauguration. He went there in December 1961, as a guest of President Betancourt to dramatize the cooperative effort being made by the United States, Venezuela, and the other Latin American countries to accelerate their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The President's trip demonstrated the intense concern of the United States for the programs of the Venezuelan Government

aimed at improving the welfare of the greatest number of its people.

President Kennedy recently invited President Betancourt to visit the United States. President Betancourt has accepted this invitation and will come to Washington on February 19 and 20. This visit will enable President Kennedy to reciprocate the hospitality of the visiting chief of state of a country with which the United States has formed so many close and cordial ties. It will also afford the two Presidents an opportunity to exchange views on matters of mutual interest.

The Venezuelan Government of President Betancourt has demonstrated a firm desire to maintain the traditional friendly relations between our countries. Our friendly cooperation has furthered our mutual interest in the following objectives which are the antithesis of international communism: (a) extension of representative democracy, (b) accelerated economic, social, and cultural development within a framework of free institutions, and (c) inter-American cooperation in the defense of the security of this hemisphere against aggression or subversion.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, has demonstrated its active interest in assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. It apparently is making strong efforts to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people and to strengthen democratic institutions. And it seems firmly determined to maintain the political independence of Venezuela. Such independence, of course, is contrary to the objectives of international communism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. First, that the distinguished Speaker may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD on the subject of Estonian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is one of the three Baltic countries in northeastern Europe, and the Estonians constitute one of three Baltic peoples. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population of not much more than 1 million, Estonians have always figured as one of the smallest nationality groups in all of Europe. But to these gallant and gifted people mere size in numbers has not been of any real account. They have always faced their far more powerful enemies, invariably many times their size, with courage and determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous and sacred cause. They have fought courageously against all their foes, and even in defeat they have made themselves glorious and great. In the course of their eventful history, when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, they refused to bow their heads to their conquerors and overlords. During the two centuries before 1918 they were subjected to cruel treatment at the hands of Russia's callous agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and the ideas they advocated, but these dauntless champions of freedom

and liberty could neither be silenced nor subdued. They clung to their ideals until the time came for their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their national independence on February 24 of 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought about many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the disheartening change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy to many peoples. Unfortunately Estonians could not defy their fate. Early in 1940 Estonia was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and soon it was made part of the Soviet Union. In the course of the war the Estonians exchanged their Communist overlords for Nazi invaders, but that did not change their lot; they suffered equally under both. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned with more force and unbridled fury, and there they remain to this day. They have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians work for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. They are completely cut off from the free world, and we really know little of their actual status. Without any personal and political freedom, under abominable conditions, they lead a miserable life. But they have not lost heart, and they still hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we ardently hope and fervently pray for their freedom and independence.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Second, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and March 1, 4, and 5.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is going to be the business of the House on those days? Does the gentleman have any idea whether there will be important legislation before the House on those days?

Mr. ALBERT. There may well be important legislation on some of those days, but I would like to advise the gentleman the reason for this request, as I understand it, from the Committee on Banking and Currency is to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done, and that is to process the committee part of legislation and get it to the floor so that we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we all want to proceed with the business of the House, but not at the expense of Members being in committees and not on the floor of the House when important legislation is being considered.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman recognizes that this permission for the committee to sit extends only to such time as

the House is engaged in general debate and not while the House is considering legislation in Committee of the Whole on amendments under the 5-minute rule or during the consideration by the House of any other matter pertaining to the actual processing of bills and other legislative matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this request but later when the legislative machinery starts to roll, the gentleman from Iowa will be constrained to object to projecting unanimous consent requests of this nature into the unknown future.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the press reports that the matter to be taken up by the Committee on Banking and Currency is this so-called mass transportation bill that is to cost a minimum of \$500 million to take care of some of the transportation problems of some of the large cities at the cost of all the taxpayers of the Nation. Is that the bill to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not prepared to advise specifically what legislation will be involved here, but like the gentleman, and like the party of the gentleman, we are all concerned with the problems of the city as we are concerned with the problems of other elements of our society.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are concerned just a little bit with the budget situation and the situation of the Federal Treasury too. There are some of us who may not be quite as inspired with the idea that we ought to pay for mass transportation of the great cities as some of the rest of you. I am just wondering if this is an attempt to speed up consideration of legislation of this type, and whether or not it should not follow the orderly procedure of handling legislation here in the House so that Members would have an opportunity to attend hearings and know exactly what is going on. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not prepared to answer the specific question of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I will object, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not press the other consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I renew the request made on behalf of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the latter request until I know what the committee is going to take up and discuss during the time the House is in session on other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When that information is furnished me I will discuss the withdrawal of the objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the several bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled for today are being put over until tomorrow at the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I may add that two of these bills will come at a later date, H.R. 2862 and House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to advise the House that the first order of business on Wednesday will be the supplemental appropriation bill, commodity credit, Public Law 480, and also that on Wednesday the Committee on House Administration will bring up several resolutions, including the following:

House Resolution 239, Agriculture.

House Resolution 146, Armed Services.

House Resolution 204, Banking and Currency; Housing.

House Resolution 202, District of Columbia.

House Resolution 243, Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 80, Government Operations.

House Resolution 165, House Administration.

House Resolution 135, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 226, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 35, and House Resolution 100, Judiciary.

House Resolution 30, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 152, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 236, and House Resolution 237, Public Works.

House Resolution 177, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 222, Small Business.

House Resolution 249, Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 74, Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 227, Ways and Means.

There may be some additional resolutions from this committee which will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If more are added they may be programmed for Wednesday and the balance of the week also.

I may advise, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions may not necessarily be called up in the order in which I have announced them, and I would like also to advise the House again that any further program for the week will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suggest that he submit the request which I attempted to make earlier and to which the gentleman from Ohio objected.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in addition to the time already granted, on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and on March 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what bills are coming up?

Mr. PATMAN. We have the Export-Import Bank hearings going on now. We will also take up mass transportation Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That will go over to the end of this period. This is just for afternoons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What length of time will the gentleman have on the mass transportation bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have probably a week of hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that a statement we can depend on?

Mr. PATMAN. We will finish the hearings on March 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. Will the chairman arrange for an opportunity to be given to those persons who oppose this proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. This morning one came in and wanted to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will not be a hearing in which the proponents alone will have the opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have fair hearings in our committee, and we hear both sides. We give every witness an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much money is involved?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the terms of all the different bills. There are several bills. It is quite a sum.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the amount mentioned is \$500 million to start the program.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But I think it is contemplated that only a small part will be available the first year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the first year. Then the total cost will run into millions?

Mr. PATMAN. The \$500 million is the outside figure. Only about \$10 million will be taken up the first year. I would not like to be committed to that, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will run into the millions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. It will run into millions of dollars, yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the chairman wants to have the hearing and will assure the House there will be at least 1 week of hearings, with an opportunity for opponents to be heard also, I have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I so assure the gentleman.

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

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be allowed to sit during general debate in the afternoon session of the House for the balance of the week.

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

There was no objection.

SPACE PROGRAM—ANYTHING GOES?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, news coverage in recent days, which states that NASA has failed to entice away from the Air Force two of its top space aces with hefty pay increases, fails to give a true picture of what is happening. There is another word for this. It is called pirating. NASA has unlimited funds and too little concern for cost. This action must be called disregard for the American taxpayer. Military space programs are, in the opinion of many, even more important than NASA's programs. Bidding by Government agencies against each other for personnel is a bad practice for all the Government. When that takes place, the only answer is for each agency or service to try to outbid the other and to do so each must constantly justify to Congress higher grades and bigger salaries. We, in the United States, seem to have gotten ourselves into a dangerous attitude over space efforts. Anything goes as long as it is for space. This is not conducive to sound accomplishment and it plays havoc with budget problems. Someone upstairs needs to talk to the space people about realism.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 24th day of February, the Estonian Republic would have celebrated its 45th anniversary.

I use the term "would have celebrated" since obviously, the Estonian people now held in bondage by the Soviet Union are not free to celebrate the legitimate anniversary of their freedom. Certainly, they are no longer a free people but do look forward to the day when their legitimate desire for self-determination will once again produce a free and independent Estonia.

However, it is noteworthy that Estonian refugees from Soviet persecution scattered around the continents of the world continue to observe this anniversary and remain a vigorous, forceful, and effective voice in the maintenance of the spirit of the captive Estonian people. Their heroic struggle for freedom and their perseverance equip them well to continue the struggle; their militant anticommunism and their desire to be free from Soviet Russian oppression make them one of the leading voices calling for restoration of freedom to all the peoples of the captive nations.

In the United States, the Estonian National Committee serves as a very effective spokesman for Estonian groups, and their counterparts in other lands are equally effective.

In paying my respects to the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Estonian Republic, I voice the hope and the prayer not only of the Estonian people but of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, that the people of Estonia and the other nations which suffer tyranny under Communist rule, will soon see the day when their freedom is restored. To this end they and we pledge ourselves.

PARTISANSHIP IN SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BELL. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure last week that the White House was considering applying a patronage clearance system to summer student employment has evoked considerable newspaper comment by impartial observers.

Foremost among these are three articles which under unanimous consent I will include following my remarks. The first of these is the original story on the patronage clearance operation appearing in the Washington Star of Wednesday, February 20, and written by Joseph Young. The second is an editorial condemning the proposed practice which appeared in the February 21 Washington Star. Finally, there is an excellent column by John Cramer, which was published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 22.

In his column, Mr. Cramer calls attention to the need for a complete reevaluation of summer employment practices within the Federal Government. He contends that of the 10,000 or 12,000 positions available, the majority are make-work jobs which benefit neither the student nor the agency. The disclosures of last week, and Mr. Cramer's comments, have led me to several conclusions.

First, there is a need to take as many of these summer jobs out of the patronage pie as possible, placing them under a merit hiring system within civil serv-

ice, with greater cooperation between the hiring agents and school placement officers. I am certain that the number of partisan policy making positions open to summer employees is rather limited in number.

Second, an evaluation of the reasons for hiring summer help should be made. If Mr. Cramer's observations are correct, and I have occasion to believe they are, a majority of the present jobs are unjustifiable, unless simply excused as a patronage tool or a madework project. I would assume that an investigation by the General Accounting Office would be appropriate if the executive branch does not put its own house in order. To my knowledge, no appropriations measure has ever passed this body which authorized any agency to set up a summer version of the Youth Conservation Corps or the WPA.

There are legitimate reasons, of course, for some hiring. One obvious reason is to take up the slack left by vacationing employees. Another is a commendable effort to interest young people in a Government career, through an internship approach. Some agencies plan their work in such a way that with respect to routine matters a backlog is built up which is erased by summer staff members.

Third, there is a need to provide the serious minded student with opportunities to enrich his knowledge of the process of Government and the science of politics and administration. White House seminars, filled with 1,500 students, with famous New Frontiersmen as speakers, are inadequate substitutes for informal, small, seminar sessions under the guidance of an objective organization such as the American Political Science Association or the younger member section of the Federal Bar Association. The number of students motivated to participate in such seminars would be small in relation to the past White House program participants, but the rewards both for the student and, ultimately, the country, would be infinitely greater.

That is why in December of last year, I suggested such an approach to the American Political Science Association. The association has expressed a lively interest in the possibilities. I hope that this program would not be limited to those participating in the White House program, but would include summer students working with Congress, the political parties, and private associations with an interest in Government. However, cooperation by the White House personnel, particularly Mrs. Dorothy Davies, is essential if the program is to have a chance at success.

There are some who may wonder at the amount of response students would show for such an activity. Those who participated in last year's program, while interested in some phases, did not find it entirely to their liking. Even the so-called representatives from among the students in each department who were asked to evaluate and make suggestions in reports to Mrs. Davies, I am sure, were not completely happy with the program as their reports would disclose.

I should like to call attention, furthermore, to the cocurricular programs of seminars and speakers within our colleges and universities. Many of them, such as the Yale Law School Forum and the UCLA public administration seminar program, are student run. They all suffer from two obstacles: first, the difficulty of getting speakers who are not, generally, in close proximity to the campuses; and second, the competition with regular school work for the intellectual interests and time of the student.

A summer program in Washington, D.C., nearly eliminates these obstacles. The availability of participants is obvious. As the excitement of the first contact with government work wears off, and routine becomes the rule rather than the exception, there are many students who would welcome voluntary, informal, intellectual opportunities in the evening which are missing during the rest of the week.

Hopefully, the White House will see fit to cooperate in this educational experiment. Those who have instituted the spoils system with respect to summer jobs should be warned that no amount of cooperation with impartial outside groups will cover up this disgraceful partisanship. The American college student is not so insensitive that such a cynical display will go unheeded. Indeed, I can think of no better way to discourage qualified graduates from seeking Government employment in the future. The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE—CIVIL SERVICE NOT TOLD OF MEETING WHICH SET UP CLEARANCE SYSTEM
(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student halls, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the student's talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to

pass civil service exams for clerical, typists, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the Civil Service Commission has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half-dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearance system, Mrs. Davies said it was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Mrs. Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 21, 1963]

PATRONAGE AT A PRICE

"The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women" (1960 Democratic platform).

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very

Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of superemployment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 22, 1963]

CLEARANCE PLAN ON JOBS IS SCORED
(By John Cramer)

As might be expected, there's outcry against the word that the White House plans to clear the youngsters appointed next summer to temporary, student-type jobs in the Washington area.

The first cry comes from Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

He's most concerned about the impact on the so-called summer interns, graduate students and serious undergraduates contemplating Government as a career.

He calls the White House move an attempt to "brainwash the American college student." He says the loss to "students, faculty, and the nation will be incalculable."

INSTRUMENTAL

Representative WIDNALL goes on to say that he, personally, was instrumental in getting the American Political Science Association interested in conducting after-hours seminars next summer for student interns.

The APSA, he says, was ready and eager. The White House, he says, didn't show much interest.

He said:

"Although this is not the first time that such a political clearing house operation has been employed by the administration in terms of summer jobs, it is the first to be enacted openly and on an overall scale."

Mr. WIDNALL can be nothing but right.

The clearance program obviously is the invention of White House people with time on their hands. Nothing better to do and little judgment.

NOT PLEASANT

The truth about summer, student-type jobs in the Washington area—about 11,000 last year—isn't pleasant.

The truth is that about 5,000 jobs may be justified. The rest are padded and made jobs.

For years, Federal agencies have made it a practice to save up routine tasks, and unencumbered funds, so as to be able to provide summer employment to the sons and daughters of agency bigshots and others favored.

There is excuse for hiring summer replacements for necessary employees who are on vacation.

There's no excuse for the summer job racket which has grown up, or for the ill-advised White House attempt to take advantage of it.

BECKWORTH BILL

The worst solution of all has been offered by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative BECKWORTH has Congress all set to vote a Texas millionaire bill to control the summer jobs.

Under it, the jobs would be allocated to the various States on the basis of population.

Members of Congress find it hard to vote against such a proposition.

But what they'll be voting for is a proposal that the summer jobs be restricted to the sons and daughters of the wealthy youngsters whose parents can well afford to pay their college bills—kids who think a work-play vacation in Washington would be a lot of fun.

Many could find equally well-paying summer Government jobs in their own localities. In the longrun, happily, the White House clearance program is all to the good. It focuses attention on a messy situation which needs cleaning up.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees.

Under present law, the widower of a deceased female Government employee must be dependent upon her for his support in order to receive an annuity in the event of her death. However, the widow of a deceased male employee can receive such an annuity regardless of need.

Similarly, under the Employees Health Benefit Act, a married female employee with nondependent husband must pay a greater share of her health insurance premium than the male employee, regardless of his wife's need. For instance, a married woman whose husband is self-employed pays a monthly premium of \$13.42 for her family plan health insurance, while a male employee pays only \$10.70 for the same insurance, regardless of his wife's need.

I hope favorable consideration will be given to this legislation to eliminate the present discrimination that has existed since the enactment of this legislation.

THE DEATH OF A PEACE CORPS MAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in this distinguished body will be moved, as I have been, with an

article from the Quincy, Mass., newspaper written by Nicholas Gage.

The article describes in detail the personality and devotion of Peace Corps Volunteer Dave Mulholland who died in the Philippines while working for the Corps.

Dave's death was a tragic occurrence coming as it did at such an early time in his life. Yet, it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon what he accomplished in this short time.

Shortly before his death, as Mr. Gage relates, he wrote to a Filipino friend and urged him to "Try someday to do something that is immortal, and perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

This Peace Corps man, Mr. Speaker, did do something that was immortal, and I pause here today to pay tribute to this courageous young man who did not, indeed could not, give up the battle of decency, charity, and genuine human fellowship among men.

As one of the earliest and most active supporters of the Peace Corps, I sincerely hope that every Member of this body will read the moving story of David Mulholland's life.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD, this article about his life from the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger of December 21, 1962:

PEACE CORPS WORK IS QUINCY MAN'S EPIGRAPH
(By Nicholas Gage)

(NOTE.—Nicholas Gage, author of this article, was a close friend of the late David Mulholland's when both of them worked for the Worcester Evening Gazette. He worked with him just a year before Mr. Mulholland died in the Philippines as a member of the Peace Corps. Mr. Gage gathered much of the material for this article from the personal letters and mementos of the Mulholland family in Quincy.)

"Try someday to do some little thing that's immortal," Dave Mulholland wrote a Filipino friend. "Perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

REACHED GOAL

In an abbreviated life Dave Mulholland found his immortality and purpose in a novel experiment called the Peace Corps. He was the first to sacrifice his life to this idea in the Philippines and became a "martyr to peace" and a symbol of quiet heroism and dedication.

He was among the first to join the Peace Corps and was sent to a "hardship post" in southern Philippines in October of 1961 as an educational aid. When schools closed for the summer in April of this year, he refused the vacation due him to help start the first free summer camp for children in the Philippines and head a journalism seminar for high school teachers.

The unrestrained energy he poured into these and other projects began to undermine his health and he was offered a less strenuous position at Peace Corps headquarters at Manila. He refused to abandon his work. Shortly after, he contracted amoebic dysentery and died June 10 in a Manila Air Force Hospital from a resulting liver infection. He was 23.

Just a year before, Dave was working with me on the reporting staff of the Evening Gazette in Worcester, Mass. He was lanky and boyish but his character embodied a mature sensitivity and perceptiveness that touched those who knew him.

He had seldom left Massachusetts—he was born and grew up in Quincy and joined the Worcester paper following graduation from

Tufts University in Medford—but he had a hungry concern for the whole world.

SHY, BUT STRONG

He was basically shy, despite his strong convictions, but was quickly and deeply moved by sincerity and friendship. We would often have lunch at a Greek restaurant where Dave was always enthusiastically received by the Greek immigrants who frequented it. They would joke with him uninhibitedly, offer him wine or coffee, teach him Greek card games. Such spontaneous gestures never ceased to delight and amaze him.

But what marked Dave Mulholland was a rare combination of two qualities—an anger at things wrong and a drive to do something about them. He singlehandedly took on John Birch Society supporters in Worcester County when he was with the paper. The group sponsored weekly discussions in the county on anti-Americanism based on Birchite invectives. Dave attended every meeting, never allowing any point of extremism to pass unchallenged. "The Mulholland Crusade," we called it in the city-room.

He took the first Peace Corps exams and was accepted in late July of 1961. "I feel like I've been in prep school for 22 years, and I'm finally getting acceptance to life," he said.

He left for special training at Pennsylvania State University July 27; the 6-week course was an academic nightmare he told his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mulholland of 29 French Street, Quincy, when he returned home for 10 days in late September. There were classes from morning to evening, 7 days a week. Those who didn't wash out were notified during the home visit.

"David was so anxious," his mother told me, "he never left the house until the acceptance telegrams came."

RECALLED WELCOME

With 218 other volunteers, he arrived in the Philippines October 12 after a long plane trip and was greeted by a vicious rainstorm and "the wildest, most wonderful reception ever imagined. All along the route," he wrote home, "school kids were lined up, waving flags, shouting 'Mabuhay' (welcome) and showing school notebooks at us for autographs. All this in a rainstorm."

He was assigned as an educational aid at the elementary school in Ilog, an isolated barrio (small town) surrounded by a river, about 350 miles from Manila, at Negros Occidental Province in southern Philippines. "I have been told this is a poor, depressed, disease ridden and generally undesirable 'hardship post,'" he wrote. "I have found only sincerity and unbelievable hospitality."

But the misery was there. Shortly after arriving, a group of volunteers found a young girl on the road, dead from malnutrition. As they placed her on the bier for the funeral, her jaw swung open and her mouth released a mucous ball packed with worms.

CHILDREN MOVED HIM

"It was the children that got David," his mother said. "He would ask his classes about a missing student. 'Oh, he died,' they would tell him. 'It pains me to watch these kids come to school shoeless and pale with hunger,'" he wrote in one of the four letters he sent me from the Philippines.

"I have to travel 3 miles to get to school," he said. "I ride a bike to the river, put it in a banca (dugout canoe with outriggers), cross the river and ride through sugarcane fields to school. For someone whose only communion with nature was the Boston Common, this is quite an adventure."

"I am teaching at the elementary school in Ilog, assisting native teachers under conditions less than ideal. The reader I use in one of my classes was published in 1923.

Students are provided only desks in schools here and must furnish their own chairs."

He started a chair-building campaign to alleviate the shortage, volunteer John Lagomarsino, who was one of Dave's closest friends, reports from the Philippines. There were 7 teachers instructing 300 students in the crowded school. Dave taught part of his sixth grade class in the schoolyard to avoid the congestion.

He reached the children from the first. "Call me Dave" he told his pleasantly shocked students, forged in the rigid protocol of Philippine schools. "He delighted them by going to their desks and sitting near them while he taught," a friend wrote his parents.

When Dave arrived at the school the day before Christmas vacation began, each class presented him with a gift. "I received from one class a cellophane bag of four soda crackers, a face cloth from another, five pearl eggs, a handkerchief, a bar of soap. That little bag of soda crackers from grade 5 is among the most precious gifts I have ever received."

With the arrival of Christmas, Dave became the town hero. It is the custom of Filipinos in towns and villages to build a nativity scene at Christmas time for display in the plaza. Judges travel from town to town and give prizes to the best efforts.

The nativity scene in Ilog never won a prize. It was traditionally carved from wood and therefore small. Dave suggested this time they make a big one by using papier mache figures. Everyone agreed and placed him in charge of the project.

"In my enthusiasm, I forgot I didn't know anything about papier mache," he wrote his mother. "Fortunately, I had an old science text which gave instructions. * * *

When the project was finished, he was asked to lead the dedication procession. The judges gave it third prize for the area. Ilog was ecstatic and so was Dave. "Unlike the United States," he wrote, "where a town decorates by buying the latest plastic materials and hires workmen to put them up, here everyone contributes and everyone takes pride. One can say, 'I made Joseph's lantern,' another, 'I painted the donkey,' 'That's my star.'"

RECOGNIZED PROBLEMS

Dave recognized the particular qualities of the Filipinos and fought their weaknesses. When the parent-teachers group which virtually controls progress in Philippine schools, showed little energy in improving conditions in Ilog, he called the local group together.

"Today you face not the challenge of an invading army," he told them in terms they understood, "not the fury of a raging river, but a challenge perhaps less obvious, but every bit as threatening * * * the threat of complacency, the temptation to resign to defeat." They responded.

As the school year came to a close (in April at the Philippines because of early hot weather), Dave prepared for completion exercises. The salutarian in his sixth grade class missed rehearsals for a week and Dave went looking for him. He found him working in a sugarcane field covered with ashes from the waste fire he was tending in 110° temperature.

The boy told him he had to work if he wanted to go on in school. Dave knew his family would not accept his personal help. ("They are painfully proud here"), so he set up a scholarship fund for the boy. He did the same for others, sending one to a university and hoping to send others to America.

"He saved what little we could send him to give the scholarships," his mother told me. "It only costs \$35 for a boy to go to college for a year in the Philippines." With contributions from friends, his parents are expanding the scholarship program Dave established.

When school ended in April, he dismissed all suggestions of rest and exhausted his strength in two new projects.

With 17 volunteers, he helped establish Camp Brotherhood—the first free summer camp in the Philippines. "The Government gave us a plot of land by the site of a volcano and left the rest to us." The volunteers built a mess hall and swimming pool, set up tents for the boys, shelters for nature study and handicrafts, and quarters for the staff.

MATURE JUDGMENT

While working at Camp Brotherhood, he also taught journalism to high school teachers at a summer seminar at La Salle College. "Though he had a boyish look," a student remembered, "he was respected. His judgment was mature."

The endless work he put into Camp Brotherhood, the journalism seminar, and his scholarship program soon began to have its effect on Dave's health. But when he was offered a less demanding post at Peace Corps headquarters, he quickly refused. "I have decided," he wrote a friend, "I would rather stay at my assignment. I have projects and commitments I would not cancel."

Soon after he contracted dysentery and was rushed to Clark Air Force Base in Manila. His parents flew to him. He began to show signs of improvement, but his condition suddenly turned and he died at noon on June 10.

Two hours before his death, he asked his doctors when he could return to his work in Ilog. "I have much to do there," he told them.

In one of his last letters he wrote prophetically: "Maybe I will die in the Philippines. It seems a good place to die."

His death was felt by everyone who knew him and many who recognized the significance of his sacrifice, including President Kennedy, Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines William E. Stevenson, Philippines President Macapagal, and Vice President Emannuel Palaez, who offered Dave Mulholland's most fitting epitaph:

"He was a martyr to the cause of winning the peace."

EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE CLASH OF IDEAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the clash of ideas between the executive branch and the legislative branch has dominated our political history. Thinking back over this period, one remembers best the Supreme Court packing, growth of executive initiative in legislative programs, the constant battle between the legislator and the bureaucrat for control of the Government and the direction government is to take.

Mr. Speaker, it is also apparent that in this battle of ideas and approach to government, the legislative branch is badly outnumbered and outfought in getting its ideas to the people. Consider the multitude of executive agencies, the wealth of funds available to them, the organization at national and lower levels and the ability to concentrate this tremendous organization to attain the goals of the executive leaders.

I think it is safe to say that over 100,000 employees in the executive branch are in the business of supplying information to the public, perhaps twice that

number. I do not say that they are all public relations and mass media experts. Far from it. But they are there, and they are in business, and they constitute a powerful and frighteningly large force for propaganda.

We are faced under this administration—even more than in previous administrations of either party—with an admitted view that managed news is here to stay. This admission has caused concern among the American people.

We find the Inter-American Press Association's executive committee condemning the concept of "managed news and news as weaponry." According to press reports, this group finds such practices "endanger the very foundations of a free and responsible press."

The president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Lee Hills, said Friday that the administration should end the debate over "managed news" by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy. And Arthur Krock of the New York Times, writing in the March issue of Fortune magazine, accuses the President, of whom he is "absolutely personally fond," of managing the news with "cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history."

There is concern in Congress also over this managed-news policy. It carries one step further the practices of earlier administrations to promote and publicize the administration position to the exclusion of all others. And for the first time, it now uses not only top political appointees here in Washington, but tries to force career civil service employees to promote the party line.

Some may shrug this off as part of the art of politics, and to a degree that is the case. But under this administration I fear it has been carried to new lengths and is being extended to "friendly" members of the press to the exclusion of "uncooperative" reporters.

It is also being carried to new lengths in the degree to which various Government agencies through their press releases, statements, and leaks to the press mimic the New Frontier approach to economic, legislative, or other areas.

Indeed, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, has said:

The American taxpayer is the victim of the greatest publicity snow job of our time.

Douglass Cater in his book, "The Fourth Branch of Government," wrote in 1960 about congressional efforts to investigate and expose secrecy in the executive branch. But, he commented:

A more fruitful course for government would be to consider how the flow of information may be better timed and coordinated so that the public receives a balanced story. Too often the real damage caused by public disclosures comes from the fact that the information is partial and biased.

Cater also wrote:

More and more in recent years the Washington correspondent has been aware of the managed news event which he is expected to report without paying attention to the props and staging devices.

It could well be argued that all publicity efforts by executive agencies are

illegal, for we find in title 4, United States Code, this language:

No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose (sec. 54).

Congress has concerned itself from time to time about these activities, as found in these comments from "Secrecy and Publicity" by Francis E. Rourke, written in 1961:

Over the years Congress has used a variety of techniques in an effort to curb what it regards as improper activity on the part of executive agencies in the field of publicity, including prohibitions upon the employment of publicity experts, legislation forbidding certain Government agencies from sending information through the mail except in response to specific requests from the public, and restrictions upon the use of appropriated funds for public relations activity. None of these barriers to executive publicity has been altogether effective as is evident from the fact that it has proven necessary to reenact such restrictions so frequently over the past half-century, and no one has ever been prosecuted for violating any of these statutes. The ban on the employment of publicity experts, for example, has been commonly evaded by giving these employees somewhat different titles, including information specialist, director of public relations, and chief educational officer.

The first Hoover Commission studied this area, faced facts, and reached the conclusion that no matter what you call it, Government information is controlled. To quote from the Hoover Commission:

All programs of education by the Government tend eventually to reflect official thought, official opinion and official aims. In these circumstances, the function of education inevitably is diluted by the pressures of politics and propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, thoughtful reporters and commentators of all shades of political thought have examined this situation. We are presently faced with a President who has the know-how, personality, family and staff to dominate national publicity. James Reston of the New York Times summed up this situation in these words:

It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Reston pointed out that Congress has been overshadowed by the Executive in the news field. He expressed concern for the views of the loyal opposition. It is an opposition which received 48 percent of the votes cast in the recent congressional elections and within a hair of 50 percent of the votes for President. Yet it is an opposition that is up against a well-planned, well-financed—by tax dollars—and well-executed publicity and propaganda program of benefit solely to the legislative and economic goals of the executive branch.

David Lawrence comments that "criticism was never more important to the administration and to the country" and states what we all must certainly agree with—that voters want to know "the real impact of national and international policies on their own lives and on the future of their children."

It is impossible to determine just how many persons are involved in the pub-

licity apparatus of the executive branch. Estimates in recent years as to the size of the information and/or publicity staffs in executive agencies range from 1,400 to over 100,000. It is difficult to determine, because each survey has its own guidelines.

But as I have said, in my judgment there are at least 100,000 tax-supported Federal employees who spend at least a portion of their time propagandizing the voters, and the vast majority of them are propagandizing in such a way as to try and make a favorable impression for the executive branch and its programs.

Now I do not stand here and claim for 1 minute that each day President John F. Kennedy now or any other President in the past issues his secret orders for the day's publicity campaign, and that hundreds of mimeograph machines, teletypes and eager messengers then spread the word throughout official Washington and to the far reaches of the executive empires. Far from it.

My point, and it has been made by those much closer to the news business than I am, is that there is this huge propaganda information publicity apparatus in being; I do not think there is argument about that. And it can be and is being used consciously or otherwise to promote the legislative program, economic and political theories, and odd ideas in some cases of the top echelon in the executive branch.

Let me refer to Thomas J. Bennett, who spent some time on this matter and devoted his doctoral thesis to the subject of Government publicity. Dr. Bennett wrote just last year in his thesis:

Most of those interviewed agreed that two factors contribute to the de facto uniformity of administration public pronouncements. First of all, although there is little or no coordination of public information officers, there is close consultation among their superiors, at least in the case of the agencies that are properly part of the executive. It makes little difference whether Webster at Agriculture is in touch with Manning at Treasury, if their immediate superiors, from whom they take their orders, and upon whose pleasure their positions depend, meet regularly.

Dr. Bennett put it on the line for us later in his thesis:

It would seem from this that the testimony of the newsmen and the publicists interviewed, which indicated a lack of formal centralization of Federal publicity, was correct in adding that such centralization is unnecessary in view of the localization of issues within a few agencies. It no longer seems unreasonable to speak of the single voice of the Federal Government.

And he winds it up this way:

It must be concluded, therefore, that the publicity operation of the National Government is big enough, active enough, and important enough to warrant concern by the critics.

Let me refer now to the New Leader. In an article in 1960 concerning interservice rivalry, the comment was made in its pages:

What is more, the chief consequence of successfully stifling all public demonstrations of interservice controversy would be the exposure of a single administration view of national security policy. In an area of governmental activity where the executive holds

all the trump cards, where the requirements of security classification can be used to bury legitimate opposition within the Government, where there is no pressure group that can make a meaningful impact on the policy process without help from the executive departments, and where such a tremendous part of national resources are being devoted, democratic controls over executive power would become weaker than they are already.

A responsible opposition is necessary in this country, as it is in every country and under any form of government where the people decide their course, directly or indirectly through their representatives. It is the constitutional duty of Congress as a full partner in the Federal Government to explore and develop the alternatives, to present them to the people, and to cause and encourage full discussion of such matters. When only one side is present, when the alternatives are stifled, when one view is preached from all sides, there is not the choice available for the people. Yet one of the most common expressions in this country is that there are two sides to every story.

There might be little we in Congress can do, no matter what party we belong to or what party controls the administration, to effectively and truly cut back the executive's information-publicity-propaganda staffs and activities.

But certainly we should allow full debate in our own processes, full development of alternatives by the minority, full exposure to the people of the two or even more sides to every story. To do otherwise is an indication that the majority is afraid of the other side, that the minority has right on its side.

And I must remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that there are other battles than those between the parties, or between major blocs in the Congress. There is this constant battle, pulling and tugging, between the executive and legislative branches. In this battle all in Congress need to be alert to what is happening to the constitutional rights of this equal partner.

The people are being brainwashed by the Executive's tremendous power of publicity, propaganda, and persuasion to believe that it is time to change the historic proposition that the President proposes and Congress disposes.

How important is this presentation of both sides? It has been called the basis of representative government by a former Senator:

An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy.

So said Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960.

In his new book, "Washington Cover-Up," Clark Mollenhoff assesses the importance of information about government:

No single factor is more important to the strength of our democracy than the free flow

of accurate information about the government's operation. The citizen in a democracy must know what his government is doing, or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties.

A recent issue of the Economic Council Letter was addressed to the problems of Congress in this tug of war with the executive branch. It commented:

As we have said repeatedly, the executive branch of the American Government has been operating, since 1933, at an accelerating rate, above the Constitution and the law. The only power in the Nation which can stand against a militant executive establishment with unlimited resources of men and money, is the Congress.

A great many arguments can be raised against this statement, but they have no validity. When all is said and done, the only political force which can oppose the growth of governmental absolutism is the body directly representing the people not in government.

It is possible Congress may not be able to stand against the increasing pressure of big government. The answer to that is known to no living man. It is true Congress cannot stand alone. It must have the support of the people. But the people cannot come to Washington and tell the bureaucrats what to do. From election to election the voters are dependent on their representatives to speak for them.

We said in our last council letter that the planners (who do control executive policymaking) are making a revolutionary change from limited to unlimited government without our knowledge or consent. Of necessity, the planners are engaged in a war against Congress. But Congress does not yet realize it is engaged in a war with the planners.

It is good for responsible political leaders to avoid factionalism, or anything that smacks of it, as long as possible. But if the planners do not desist from their attacks, someone must come to grips with them. They refuse to settle the issue by open and free debate.

How can a Congress made up of two Houses and nearly 600 Members come to grips with a hierarchical executive branch which operates under a command structure not unlike an army, and supported by a propaganda machine and militant pressure groups equal to those of wartime?

While we fight our legislative battles in these Halls, while our own district interests operate to put us in one group or another at various times, let us remember that we are always engaged in another battle.

We are for better or for worse, in economic sickness and health, wedded to the executive and judicial. But each member in this three-sided marriage must be independent. When the legislative branch fails to exert its independence, it is the people who lose their voice in day-to-day government. The courts remain, but there is no remedy there such as that which the people have in Congress, with its great controls and grants of authority to set policy.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I, like millions of Americans, have been listen-

ing for many years over our news media, in the press and in statements made by Members of Congress, and people in political life, about a bipartisan foreign policy.

The phrase "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the greatest misnomers that could possibly be used. Everyone knows our foreign policy is strictly and solely in the hands of the President under the Constitution of the United States.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" implies in my mind, and I am sure it implies in the minds of many of our citizens, because of letters I have received and questions I have been asked, that the President of the United States when he is discussing the matter of a particular policy in our foreign affairs, would call in not only his own Cabinet members, not only the congressional leaders of his own party, but leaders of the opposition party. And this applies to previous administrations as well as this one.

Now, to my knowledge, the President just does not do this. I have written a report this week which I am going to read. I sent this to all of my weekly newspapers, because of recent letters I have received, in which I have been asked: Were the Republican Members of Congress a party to the foreign policy announced in respect to Cuba, in respect to Canada, in respect to the Skybolt, England, and with respect to our policy insofar as France is concerned?

My report reads as follows:

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?

I receive many letters in which people ask: "What is meant by bipartisan foreign policy?"

The Cuban fiasco again has pointed up the complete fallacy of what the Kennedy administration likes to put on a sanctimonious pedestal in the guise of "bipartisan foreign policy."

Believe me, there is no such thing.

Certainly, when the President of the United States, who has sole constitutional authority for our foreign policy, makes an irrevocable agreement, even though it may be dangerous, as he did with Castro, all Americans, regardless of politics, back him up.

But, that doesn't mean that his errors are the result of what some of the eggheads like to call bipartisan foreign policy.

What the President does is to make his decisions and then call in the responsible people of both parties and say, in effect: "Well, I've done this. Now, you must be good Americans and go along with me."

This may imply that the opposition sit back and say and do nothing. Well, as an American and as an elected Representative of the people, I never have and never will do that.

The Cuban mess is a good example. So are southeast Asia, Katanga, etc. The President set a policy; then he told us what he had done and expected us to say amen.

Finally, in October of last year, he did what I and others had recommended—he blockaded Cuba. It should have been done long before that, but anyway he finally did it. So, we pledged our full support to a measure which was overdue, but to which there was no alternative. In the pitifully inadequate measures which followed, we were told nothing—not even the real facts about the Russian buildup in Cuba.

What, then, would have been the result if some of us had swallowed the high-sounding philosophy of "bipartisan foreign policy" and said nothing.

The thousands of Russian troops which are still there would have gone unnoticed. Castro would have gone blithely along, uninterrupted to set up, with Russian help, the Communist base from which to infiltrate all of Latin America, which is his real aim, all the time prepared to protect himself against any U.S. interference because he had missiles which could devastate our cities and the Russian technicians who knew how to operate them.

This, in truth, would have completed the Communist lease of Cuba which President Kennedy all but signed when he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba.

Certainly, there was no bipartisan approach to that noninvasion policy. The President simply did it and then told us so.

So, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. There shouldn't be and I'll never be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, particularly those on the Republican side, who believe in a sound foreign policy, should be told what is going on, if our foreign policy is to be bipartisan in its preparation and in its actual conduct. I know that under the Constitution, both past and present, this has not been done. I am not asking that it be done. But, at least what we should understand and what our people should be told, is that these decisions are the decisions of the President. The President has full and complete responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was issued by the State Department pulling the props out from under the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, by insisting that nuclear warheads go into Canada.

Now, I understand that the President was furious about that statement when he was apprised of it in the press. Yet, I did not hear that anyone lost his job. I did not hear that Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who stated that he would accept the full responsibility for the statement, discharged anyone. I did not hear the President denounce anyone or deny the validity of the statement. Nor did I hear that anyone was discharged who was responsible for preparing or releasing the statement.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State had every means to find out who was responsible for it.

The decision was made at a meeting, or prior to a meeting down in Bermuda, between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. It was decided to stop the production of the Skybolt missile, a missile that England was preparing its bomber force to use. No one I know of who had Republican Party responsibility, was called in, prior to that decision, and I am not sure that anybody with Republican responsibility was called in after the decision or informed that the decision was being made.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country we should as Members of Congress advise our constituents just what this so-called bipartisan foreign policy means. I am not, at this moment, just talking about the present administration. The term seems to be used almost every day. Only last week I read in the press about 'Kennedy pledges leaders at secret session at the White House.'

And down further in the article there is one very significant paragraph:

There was some speculation at the session . . . was an effort by Mr. Kennedy to slam the door on any charges that his foreign policy was more partisan than bipartisan.

I am not in agreement with that paragraph because I do not charge the President and his foreign policy with being just a political foreign policy in that it is partisan politically. I merely say it is a fact that he makes the decisions. It is his responsibility and the decision is not bipartisan. There is no basis for the implication that Republican leadership as well as Democratic leadership of the Congress had agreed to that policy before the decision was made. This is the point I am trying to make. It is the point I am going to insist upon. It is the point I am going to constantly and continuously advise the people in my district about whenever and wherever I can get the information across.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the gist of what I have to say. I want that to get in the RECORD just the same as the statements I shall issue from time to time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word "bipartisan." My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word "bipartisan" as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the 7th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in

recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star, "Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News." I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that the gentleman speaking to us at this time will include the article just mentioned as part of his remarks?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to include, after my remarks, the article by Arthur Krock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, the title of which I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? The gentleman has hit on the most salient point of my discussion and what I am trying to do. It is simply this: Our people, by a virtually controlled press, it would seem, or news media, on news and information not only from the White House but from our departments of Government, including the State Department and the Department of Defense, are no longer being apprised of the facts and the truth of what is happening throughout the world. If we are going to let this go by under the guise of what is called bipartisan foreign policy then I say that we are subject justly to the wrath of the people. We should be condemned not only as individual Members of Congress but as individual citizens because we are not living up to our responsibility and to the oath that we have taken on this floor in every session since we became Members.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to return for just a moment to the reference that was made to the article in the Washington Star of yesterday by Mr. Krock. I think first it should be made clear in the RECORD at this point that Mr. Krock himself states that he is a personal friend of the President and has been a personal friend of the family for many years. So certainly this very pointed criticism by Mr. Krock should not be viewed as a partisan comment. This was an observation of a highly respected and senior member of the Washington press corps. I think it should be pointed out in connection with this that apparently Mr. Krock's article drew some attention from the administration, because it is my understanding from an article in the Washington Post of Saturday morning that the administration now, under the direction of Mr. Sallinger, has proposed a "retreat" from spokesman for the administration and the press corps, so that either the press corps may better understand the administration, or else the administration may better understand the press corps.

I would hope however that whatever transpires at this retreat near Warrenton, Va., that representatives of the press will carry out the historic responsibility of that profession in America to defend their right to speak out and keep the public entirely informed.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I would hope the press would resume its responsibility from the publishers to the editors to the newsmen in publishing the news, in publishing and reporting as they always did the news and the facts as they see them, and not accept the brainwashing when they get down to this retreat.

Mr. AVERY. I think we ought to point out now that this controversy should not be confused with the Moss committee's 5-year project to guarantee the "right to know." As I understand the objective of the Moss committee, it is not the management of the news but relates to the Executive privilege of not making available to the press such information that is classified. The objection to making classified information available is entirely separate from the management or misrepresentation of the news as described by Mr. Krock.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In regard to Cuba, it seems to me as though we miss the point when we take so much time arguing about whether they have missiles or whether they have cannons or airplanes. It makes little difference whether they have those or whether they have slingshots. The Communists want a base of operations. Their technique and their method of operation is not military but is intrigue, infiltration, and sabotage. As long as any one Russian is there that danger exists. Is that not true?

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that I do wish the American people had been better informed as to our objectives in imposing a blockade last year in Cuba, not merely to protect the security of the people of the United States from a missile attack but because this was a kickoff base not only to infiltrate subversively in all the countries of Latin America and South America but to help formulate guerrilla forces in those countries, to induce guerrilla operations and revolution in those countries from a Communist base in Cuba. This is what we tried to do all last year and are still trying to do, but we still cannot get the show on the road, so to speak.

I might refer the gentleman to an article by a great and knowledgeable lady, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report. The author I refer to is a distinguished former Member of the House, Clare Booth Luce. The article last week deals with this very effectively. I am inserting the article in its entirety in the Record.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman further realizes that a submarine base there is far more important than some of the missiles and other things?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but we get into the area now of asking: Do we have proof the submarines are there? We do not have proof the submarines are not there. Do we have proof that missiles are there? We do not have proof missiles are not there. In other words, we have no proof. We tried to get it on the demand of the President last fall when he set up the blockade of Cuba. He should have stuck to his guns and insisted upon on-site inspection. If we were not strong enough to do it then, we ought to give up.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman, and congratulate him on his remarks and upon bringing this subject to the attention of the House.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has addressed the House on the subject of bipartisan foreign policy. I think the Record should show that the father of the bipartisan policy, Senator Vandenberg, made it very clear that he expected that foreign policy should be debated fully. I think his words actually were that it should be debated totally down to the water's edge. I think we should all remember that we do have a responsibility as a minority to discuss this subject fully but not to go out of our way to try to use any partisanship in our arguments.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution referring to the late Senator Vandenberg, because that was his position. I want to make this abundantly clear, that when the President made the decision on October 22 to blockade Cuba, we backed him up, but that does not mean we should roll over and play dead when he did not follow through.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. It would be a serious act on our part to sit here and do nothing. That is what I think the gentleman from New York was trying to bring out. Does the gentleman think there is any correlation between the timing of the announcement on the Cuban crisis, which happened just before the election, and the possibility this might have been done for a political reason or a party reason?

Mr. BECKER. Far be it from me to charge President Kennedy with politics. Actually, I think he is one of the most astute politicians on the American scene in many, many a year.

While I do not know the President's intent it was certainly in my mind at the time and it did have its political effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the Record with my remarks an article concerning Arthur Krock in the Washington Star of yesterday and an article by Claire Booth Luce, former Member of this House and a great lady and former Ambassador to Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hagan of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HALL. With reference to the last point raised by our colleague about the timing and the political implication of the Cuban quarantine, or blockade, or whatever you want to call it, has the gentleman considered what a reversal of 2 weeks might have done to the November 1962 election—if instead of bringing out the Cuban situation 2 weeks before November 6 and the \$7.8 billion deficit 2 weeks after, if those 2 items had been reversed? I wonder what the complexion of this House would have been today in such an event. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to those two alterations of simple facts and timing from the political point of view?

Mr. BECKER. Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri who is very astute, that I am never averse to considering political consideration and statements made and the timing of them. Certainly, I will say with all the sincerity at my command that I believe the President of the United States waited until the most dangerous time in all history to order the blockade of Cuba on October 22. This should have been done months before—not when we knew all these missiles were in there—and launching pads were being built. And as to the great distortions of facts, the question is going to come up in the next couple of weeks as to the time when we knew these missiles were in there, when photographs were taken. I am sure some factual material will come out in the next couple of weeks. As to the other part of your question, the \$7.8 billion deficit that was announced 2 weeks after election, I do not know whether in the minds of the people this would have had as much offsetting effect—I am talking about the political

effect—as the Cuban blockade announced on October 22 because we all as American citizens were forced to make statements backing up the President's action at that time. We could not have done otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say I was among the first to back the President and say that the die had been cast and we should rally and not let partisanship interfere with us or go beyond our shoreline at that particular point. Of course, I expected we would finish the job when we "drew the mark," and had everything in our favor. But I think if history is to be objective and to describe where the error was made, it will not be on this question of elections of last year, but will go clear back to the Bay of Pigs, April 17, 1961. Finally, I would say it takes more than a bad cold in Chicago to make one change the course of history and come back from the campaign trail and invoke a quarantine. It takes the feeling of the American people, and I would hope that just as the gentleman in the well of the House, my esteemed colleague from New York, is today bringing up the question of the amorality of not debating foreign policy, be it good, bad or indifferent, so would history in its objectivity point out when you expect to have a \$500 million excess in the budget as predicted in the state of the Union message and in the campaign message and in the 2d session of the 87th Congress budget message, then suddenly it turns into a \$7.8 billion deficit, announced like this—afterward instead of before the election—it has its moral or lack of moral implication. I commend the gentleman on his exposé and his expertise today in the well of the House.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. We sit on the same committee and I know how well he does on that committee. Let me point this out. You have brought out something which is most important, when the President—and this talk goes on all the time—about bipartisanship—particularly in this administration—I wonder what he called it during the campaign of 1960 and prior. Senator John F. Kennedy went from one end of this land to the other bemoaning a missile gap, day after day—one of the most dangerous things that any Member of this or any other body could do. He was telling our enemies that we were not prepared with missiles and that there was a great missile gap between what we had and what they had. And then Senator John F. Kennedy was going from one end of the land to the other constantly harping about our loss of prestige and about how low our prestige was in the world.

Well, I say to President John F. Kennedy: If you felt that way about our prestige at the time of the election how do you feel about our prestige today? You do not have to take any poll to know how low our prestige is now. If that was bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker, then I am right in what I am saying about biparti-

sanship today and that is why I think more of our Republicans must make their voices heard so the American people will have no doubt as to the facts. I want to call these facts to the attention of the American people, for it is badly needed.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his cogent remarks on bipartisanship. During the course of the gentleman's remarks the question of "news management" suggested itself. I had prepared for delivery in the House today some remarks on news management. They include the article about Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished New York Times correspondent which has been referred to by the gentleman. Also an Associated Press article regarding the Cuban news situation reporting the views of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. Finally, a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. I wonder if their relationship to news management would not be a little more effectively presented if the three articles were set out in the RECORD at one place?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman wishes to insert it following my remarks?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes; if it can be done at this time.

Mr. BECKER. I am about finished. I have no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do? Is he attempting to spread his remarks among those of the gentleman from New York, or afterward?

Mr. BECKER. After.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Star]

KROCK CALLS KENNEDY BOLD, CYNICAL ON NEWS

(By the Associated Press)

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsmen, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsmen says: "If Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, the principal onus rests in the printed and electronic press itself."

Mr. Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'information directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said that "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won show-downs—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

HITS "SOCIAL FLATTERY"

Mr. Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by "social

flattery of Washington reporters and commentators," and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office."

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Mr. Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem which, Mr. Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Mr. Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, the President said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news, if that is what we have been trying to do."

LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. Krock has been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In his Fortune article, Mr. Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsmen, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

"1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been indorsed more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war."

"2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me."

OUTLINES KENNEDY METHODS

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to 'prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.' Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious.' (But nobody gets fired.)"

In conclusion, Mr. Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods . . . by which 'management of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public-relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio

broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers, and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA CRISIS AND NUCLEAR ARMS—WHY DE GAULLE GOES HIS OWN WAY

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

The President was asked in his press conference [on January 24] what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had, indeed, been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called peculiar logic.

But, after Cuba, not only "some, in some parts of Europe," but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the U.S. commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that, once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coastline.

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion Mr. Kennedy repeatedly warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for U.S. domestic political consumption, boldly seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the "nuclear aggressor." He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds—and popular fronts of all kinds—could be built on the foundations of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear-peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-a-vis the U.S. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted than Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a "great statesman" and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He

realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him—Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.

A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to "bury us," this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States, or Europe, but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the U.S.A. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear-peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The United States press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexus. The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

FRANCO-RUSSIAN DEAL? "PREPOSTEROUS"

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous. If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities.

Was he threatening to pull out of the grand alliance if the United States invaded Cuba?

Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.?

Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba?

Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But" he added, with some extraordinary peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back that, when we were in difficulties, President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear war—if risk there was—by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that, whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final U.S. political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily.

The significance of the two Kennedy back-downs over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the 1950's when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany.

But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a limited war area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation.

Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment.

He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "Why England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that, above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength even of its allies to save it from destruction.

IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT OF EUROPE

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "Why England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world holocaust—and its own destruction—yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France

from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a United States nuclear colonial area and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the United States nuclear nursery.

Mr. BELL. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my view bipartisanism in foreign affairs is wrong. Agreements may indeed occur between members of both parties inasmuch as Americans do indeed stand together as a Nation in a hostile world. The ties that bind Americans are far greater than the divisive forces at work in the world today that separate us from Socialist-Communist societies. Our Republic and our people, blessed with freedom are a world apart from Communists and those dictatorships that deny freedom and self-determination to their people.

But agreements that result in bipartisan harmony must never preclude, foreclose or in any way or to any degree limit freedom of speech. Most of all, in foreign affairs we must freely express our views. More heads are better than a few. Our free criticisms result in a final policy which Americans will support as we have many times. But these decisions and policies were amalgams of many and various views, sometimes highly critical. Our Republic's strength is in our differences and contrasts of views that result in thorough analysis. If now we must abandon our right to speak freely and criticize then indeed our constituents are voiceless, are not represented and we have a dictatorship—the very form of government we abhor the most. Let us not adopt the enemy's views in order to discredit and defeat him.

Indeed, our very lack of policy today—the so-called no-win policy, the bewildering conflicts of U.S. sovereignty and U.N. decisions, the countless forms of aid to the enemy that we give in many kinds of foreign aid, the suicidal acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, the supine refusal to stand up for U.S. sovereignty as we back down in concessions to countless demands by Communists—these and more partially demonstrate, I believe, our error in having adopted a posture of so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] said, the unilateral decisions of President Kennedy are not the policies and decisions of Republicans. The mistakes under this administration in foreign policy are not, therefore, Republican mistakes. Nor should mistakes—and there are now many—be white-washed or buried from view by blocking criticism by accepting a policy of bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, on the contrary, the administration should right now be championing a foreign policy so firm, so clearly

understood by all, so protective of U.S. sovereignty, that it could withstand all Republican criticism—or if it cannot—then the valid criticisms of Republicans should be recognized, analyzed, and adopted.

It is at this point that this administration's lack of policy breaks down so clearly. The lack of overall policy and the fitful reacting without a basic policy to the various threats to freedom and peace as they arise in the world are now the reason, apparently, for the President calling for bipartisanship—so that the mistakes will be glossed over and the blame not cast on him. The President cannot escape this responsibility but more important—the countless mistakes of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, France, Canada, and Latin America must be corrected. So it is that the President's only hope, as I see it, is to call on the Republicans—correct the continuing mistakes and protect our Nation and her people. Not dodge, delay, or sidestep the continuing errors that need correction now.

As a starting point let me suggest that we reimpose the Monroe Doctrine, clarify the Vietnam war where Americans are being killed in a war that is not a war, eliminate the foreign aid that goes to the enemy, the Communists, and stop supporting the United Nations aid to the enemy.

There are other solutions available to troublesome problems if the President would first not worry about covering up criticism by bipartisan appeals; second, contradict those in the administration who say it is proper for government to lie to her people; third, get about really protecting U.S. sovereignty instead of apologizing for U.S. determination to protect freedom, justice, and decency, and finally stop managing the news, preferring at last to confide in the people, telling them and us, their representatives, what world situations really are, so that we can all join in protecting ourselves and our beloved land.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, expanding means of communication have created a promise of better news coverage for Americans. From a technical viewpoint, we must applaud such achievements as Telstar.

However, in the age of Telstar, Mazors, and the like, a new phenomenon has arisen known as news management. Some aspects of news management are reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland called attention to this phenomenon in a statement on the House floor February 21, 1963.

The reprint of the statement follows:

WASHINGTON "CON" MEN

Mr. MATTHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is ignoring a confidence game being played in Washington and so we must warn the public about it. The object of the game is to use the people's money to bamboozle them on a national scale. The scheme is simple. An administration tipster calls a political favorite who has played no prior part and breaks the news of the award of a

Government contract in his State. The favorite then calls the news media at home and releases the glad tidings with at least the implication that he is making a personal benefaction to his constituents.

Honest citizens who are familiar with complex Government procurement procedures are not impressed. Reporters, editors, and newscasters are not fooled by this hocus-pocus. Let us hope that they will expose it for the deception that it is.

On Sunday, February 24, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald printed the views of the distinguished columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, concerning news management. It says:

KROCK CHARGES CYNICAL NEWS MANAGEMENT, DISTORTION TO KENNEDY

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsmen, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsmen says, if Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, "the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'informational directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office."

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which, Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, Mr. Kennedy said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news if that is what we have been trying to do."

When the questioner, correspondent May Craig, remarked that she doesn't believe in managed news at all and thinks "we ought to get everything we want," the President brought a laugh by replying: "Well, I think that you should, too, Miss Craig; I am for that."

Krock, 76, first covered the National Capital during the administration of William Howard Taft. As chief of the Times Wash-

ington bureau, 1932-53, he won two Pulitzer Prizes and a citation equivalent to third.

He has been a long-time friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In writing that quotable exclusive interviews with the President no longer are rare, as they formerly were, Krock recalls the protests that arose from the Washington press corps when President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave one in 1937, and President Harry S. Truman gave another in 1950. Both interviews were obtained by Krock.

Asked whether he believes those Presidents did wrong in giving the interview and whether he feels that he should not have participated in them, Krock said:

"Not at all. It served their (the Presidents') purpose and they were doing me no favor."

He said the two Presidents felt that "the best and most effective medium" of publicizing what they had to say was the New York Times.

In his Fortune article, Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsmen, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press.

"Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.

"Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower Administration.

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious' (but nobody gets fired)."

In conclusion, Krock says: "But it is the indirect methods . . . by which 'managements of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator.

"Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

On the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a story entitled "Representative Pelly Says State Misled Congress, Press."

The statement is herewith inserted in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE PELLY SAYS STATE MISLED CONGRESS, PRESS

A Republican Member of Congress charged the State Department yesterday with deliberately misleading Members of Congress and the press last fall on the Cuban situation.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington, registered his complaint in a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.

Last September 25, PELLY said, the State Department informed Members of Congress that there was no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet-bloc country. On the same day he received his summary, PELLY said, Assistant Secretary of Defense William Bundy was telling a House Military Appropriations Subcommittee in secret session that missile sites of an offensive nature were being constructed in Cuba.

"I believe the facts regarding the offensive military buildup in Cuba were in the possession of the Department of State when you issued the summary stating there was no evidence of Cuban offensive capabilities, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles under Soviet direction or guidance," PELLY said in his letter to Dutton.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the State of Wyoming became the 36th State of the Union to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Thereupon, three-fourths of the several States had acted favorably in pursuance of a joint resolution of the Congress to authorize a Federal income tax. The U.S. Senate had passed this resolution on July 5, 1909, and by a vote of 318 to 4, the House had passed it a week later.

Mr. Speaker, little did the Members of Congress of that day realize the extent to which their action would change Government and the Federal system. Little did Cordell Hull and other supporters of this tax realize its ultimate effect. Actually, it was believed the tax would never exceed 2 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Ways and Means is holding hearings on proposed reduction and reform of the income tax, and for me, as for my colleagues and the taxpayers we represent, it is a time for us to decide as to what is best in the way of lowering and improving the tax structure.

In this connection, I have been reading the proceedings of the 61st Congress, 1st session, and have reviewed the debate on the resolution to amend the Constitution, which was Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Actually, the issue was not one of taxing incomes of individuals equally, but

rather to overcome a U.S. Supreme Court decision which held that under the then language of the Constitution, Congress was not authorized to levy a tax on corporations, because that would not be apportioning the taxes equally as between States.

Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment, according to its advocates, was to be a war power that could be vital to the existence of the country. But it was not to be a peacetime tax.

I want to read today to the House in commemoration—if that is a proper term—and in any event in sadness, certain excerpts from the House debate on Senate Joint Resolution 40, but I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that this was a tax measure which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution. Most of our fiscal problems, in my opinion, have originated in the other body. If only the House had originally been given sole and exclusive power by the Constitution over taxes and expenditures, there would be no national debt of any consequence today, nor any need for such a burdensome system of taxation, requiring at the moment admittedly much in the way of reduction and reform.

However, Mr. Speaker, then as now, there were some wise heads in the House. Listen to what Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, said on July 12, 1909. Compare the vision and views of this erstwhile Member of the House with the opinions and political foresight of some of Massachusetts' sons and political leaders of today.

Here are Mr. McCall's words as to equal taxation and representation in regard to the proposed change in the system of taxation:

In the Constitutional Convention, States having only one-third of the population of the country were in a majority; but today States having only one-sixth of the population elect a majority of the Senate, and yet it is proposed to throw away incontinently this important safeguard of the Constitution, this great democratic feature, and the Democratic Party proposes to take a hand and throw the rule of apportionment to the winds. I submit that if you are going to give up the rule of apportionment, you should confer upon the representatives of the people some compensating power to take the place of the safeguard you take away. You should at least provide that the House and the Senate should not amend them; that its power should be confined either to vetoing or accepting them—the power which the House of Lords in Great Britain has in reference to all tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, again let me quote Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts. His arguments made against the income tax amendment are interesting:

So, Mr. Speaker, while they say that they desire this power for time of war, we see today in time of peace the attempt to exercise the power to its utmost extent. And why not, then, limit it expressly to time of war? Why not, for the just protection and the equal rights of the people of New York and of the other great States of this Union, five of which probably will pay nine-tenths of an income tax, although they will have only one-ninth of the representation in the Senate—why not preserve the limitation upon the power of the Central Government? Why drag every governmental

power to Washington so that a vast centralized government may devour the States and the liberty of the individual as well? I say this amendment should be more carefully considered than it has yet been considered.

It is liable to go into the Constitution of the United States and be forever a part of the organic law in the form of which it has been. I may almost say, extemporized or improvised. The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to observe that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial, but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the State, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. The individual citizen will be called on to lay bare the innermost recesses of his soul in affidavits, and with the aid of the Federal Inspector, who will supervise his books and papers and business secrets, he may be made to be good, according to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington. And, incidentally, since every business secret in the country can be had access to by the authorities at Washington, the citizen may be made to see his political duty if you happened to have a President who confused the attainment of his ambition with the highest good of the universe and was willing to abuse his power in order to coerce the citizen. You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail.

A statement by a Member from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, is worth reading. In his remarks, he said:

I am a firm believer that in times of peace the revenues of this country should be derived from customs duties and internal-revenue taxes, and that if these are not sufficient, as prudent people we ought to reduce our expenses to a point where they will be covered by such revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read also from the remarks of Representative Harrison, of New York. He favored the bill, but listen to this wishful bit of thinking. Mr. Harrison said:

If the resolution prevails, it should be incumbent on the conferees upon the tariff to drop immediately from consideration the proposed corporation tax put into the bill by the Senate. This resolution now before the House provides for the taxing of incomes from whatever source derived. That means taxes upon incomes of corporations as well as individuals. In my opinion the corporation tax as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional; but if this resolution prevails, and the States give us the constitutional right to pass a law taxing the incomes of corporations as well as individuals, such doubts will be at once removed. Moreover, as it now stands, alone, without an individual income tax, the corporation tax is the most grossly unfair impost ever levied by motion of either Chamber of Congress. It is unfair because it will allow one man with a \$100,000 income to go free, while another man who may get \$10,000 in income must pay the tax because his business is incorporated. It allows the man conducting a grocery business upon one corner of the street to go scotfree, while another man that carries on the same business on the next corner of the same street is obliged to pay a tax because he has incorporated his business. It thus violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that its burdens should be equally distributed.

Mr. Harrison's remarks bring to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that an inequitable and heavy burden of taxes such as constitutes the income tax today was one of

the major objectives of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote their guidebook to communism in 1848, and one of their key points was to tax the middle class into submission. In his directive to the proletariat, Marx flatly said a heavy progressive or graduated income tax was essential to destroy capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it must be recognized that under the cold war conditions and continuing world crises, the Treasury of the United States needs revenue. However, when we hear the advocating of tax cuts without any spending curtailment in order to increase the employment and stimulate business, I keep thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Would not all this massive spending with no tax revenues to provide for it delight those two masters of mischief?

On this 50th anniversary of the income tax, let me show the progress in the direction urged by those two men. Here is a tabulation of per capita Federal tax receipts showing the changes in tax rates in selected fiscal years from 1789-1962. This table is from "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It indicates the trend toward Marxism:

Per capita Federal tax receipts

Year	Per capita
1789-91	\$1.12
1800	1.92
1810	1.22
1820	1.61
1830	1.75
1840	.81
1850	1.75
1860	1.73
1870	9.72
1880	6.31
1890	6.03
1900	7.07
1910	6.89
1920	54.81
1930	29.78
1940	43.56
1941	59.28
1942	101.16
1943	168.54
1944	314.63
1945	334.04
1946	308.53
1947	285.71
1948	295.72
1949	278.60
1950	268.32
1951	342.22
1952	431.67
1953	454.60
1954	447.78
1955	415.15
1956	461.64
1957	484.30
1958	474.93
1959	466.69
1960	527.17
1961	530.97
1962	550.64

In discussing the results of the income tax, I think mention especially should be made as to its effect on Government. On this subject, let me quote from an address of Alfred J. Schweppe before the North Carolina State bar on October 26, 1962. Listen to this:

Actually the first big step in the direction of unlimited Federal power was the 16th amendment adopted in 1913 authorizing Congress to levy, without limit, a tax on incomes from whatever source derived. Those

persons who at the time strongly objected to this unlimited taxing power were soothed with the pious declaration that it was inconceivable that the tax on incomes would ever go over 2 percent. Congress passed the first Income Tax Act in 1916. Within 2 years during World War I it went up to 85 percent on the highest incomes, and is today, and for many years last past, has been in the same general area. So far as the 16th amendment is concerned, it permits a 100-percent confiscation of all incomes and the reduction of the American people to the status of recipients of Government doles.

The 16th amendment authorizing an income tax without limit was, in the judgment of many, a great mistake. But all efforts to impose a limitation belatedly have proved and will probably continue to prove abortive, because governments do not give up powers, particularly taxing powers, once deferred; rather they stretch the powers they already have.

Mr. Speaker, I think the caliber of the present members of the House Committee on Ways and Means is very high. The comments I receive from my constituents on the President's tax proposal are far from favorable. I hope and I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means will not report out such a bad bill as has been proposed. Rather, my fear is that Congress may not reduce Federal expenditures sufficiently to justify any tax cut.

It seems to me the very desirable objective of stimulating business and increased prosperity can only come through a combination of reducing both taxes and Government spending. I would favor about \$5 billion cut in each.

If, however, this Nation really wanted to improve employment and step up the economy, the corporation tax is the place to do it.

When, Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, the deterrent to business and industrial expansion and growth by killing profit incentive began. I suggest that if the current movement to repeal the 16th amendment should prevail, the machinery of business in this country would start to hum and employment would increase as never before in the lifetime of any of us.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, a substantial cut in the corporation tax, with a reduction in nonessential Federal Government spending will help a great deal.

Yesterday the Washington Post printed an article, "Stified Cheers Will Hail Income Tax 50th Year," by Harry Gabbett.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article as a rather fitting conclusion to my comments:

STIFIED CHEERS WILL HAIL INCOME TAX 50TH YEAR

The Internal Revenue Service marks a big milestone Monday—and if the printer should make that "millstone" he won't be changing the meaning very much.

On February 25, just 50 years ago, the State of Wyoming became the 36th to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

That was the income tax amendment and by its authority last year the Internal Revenue Service collected almost \$100 billion from you, yew, and y'all. The rousing success of last year's drive has inspired IRS to conduct it again this year and it takes no seer to suggest that this will be another banner year.

IRS concedes that it will be entirely fitting that this year's milking should outproduce all others. It will impart that much more significance to the golden anniversary of the process.

It is probably no accident that nobody is known as the "father of the income tax." The idea had long smoldered in a variety of legislative breasts, but Abraham Lincoln was the first President to use it on anything like a grand scale. He considered it the only way the Civil War ever would get paid for, and when that crisis eased, the income tax was allowed to expire without much fanfare in 1872.

During the next several years the Government was able to keep its financial head above water with the proceeds from excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco and customs duties from tariffs. But advocates of the income tax still believed it the more equitable means of meeting the country's growing financial obligations.

Congress finally took a shot at it in 1894, enacting an income tax as part of a tariff law passed during Grover Cleveland's administration.

Levied was a flat 2-percent tax on individual incomes in excess of \$4,000 and on corporate incomes in excess of \$5,000, but the Supreme Court held in 1895 that the tax was illegal and it never was collected.

The landmark decision held that an income tax was a direct tax and as such could be levied only by apportionment among the States on a basis of population.

In 1907, however, President Theodore Roosevelt observed publicly that "most great civilized countries have an income tax and an inheritance tax. In my judgment, both should be a part of Federal taxation."

Two years later supporters of the tax launched a congressional drive to have the 1894 law reenacted and President William H. Taft called for the constitutional amendment which would get around the Supreme Court's apportionment objections.

Taft's suggestions were incorporated into the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909—a piece of legislation which served mightily to cloud paternity of the income tax as it operates today.

Alabama ratified the proposed amendment the same year and with Wyoming's "yes" 3 years later the United States was in most everybody's business.

Corporations were taxed 1 percent on net incomes in excess of \$5,000 and the Supreme Court in 1911 called it an excise tax on the privilege of doing business. Individuals were allowed a \$3,000 exemption—\$4,000, if married—and there was a graduated surtax on incomes over \$20,000. At those prices, less than 1 percent of the population was affected, however, and it wasn't until World War II that everybody began to feel the bite.

In 1939 only 4 million individuals paid an income tax, but in 1945, 43 million out of 50 million filed returns were taxable. About 62 million personal income tax returns were filed last year.

Progressive rates of taxation, a key feature of the 1913 legislation, have been retained through the years, making the income tax—in the words of an early champion of the tax, Senator Joseph W. Bailey, Democrat, of Texas, the only tax ever devised that "rose or fell with a man's ability to pay it." Current individual tax rates, changed but little from World War II, range from 20 to 91 percent.

By 1965, IRS expects to be coping with the annual flood of income tax paperwork completely on a pushbutton basis. High-speed computers, electronic memory systems, and magnetic tape will be calling the painful shots each spring and IRS offices are abuzz with not-so-incredible rumors of wonders to come.

High school teachers are pretty much in agreement that the 16th amendment to the

Constitution presents a consistent stumbling block for pupils who somehow are able to identify the rest of them with little or no trouble.

They are also pretty much in agreement that there is no accounting for this blind spot, especially in view of the fact that no other amendment to the Constitution has done more for or to so many citizens of this country in the 50 years since Wyoming put it on the books.

LEGISLATION TO REGULATE SALE OF SECURITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes.

The District of Columbia has, for a considerable time, needed such legislation. Questionable practices by a small minority of dealers in securities has made this legislation necessary.

May I say that by and large the great majority of the stock securities dealers in the District of Columbia have been honest and above reproach. However, the number of complaints that have come to the members of the District of Columbia Committee in the past few years has been considerable. Let it be to the credit of the National Association of Credit Dealers that they have filed complaints in many cases in an attempt to give some kind of self-enforcement and integrity to the responsible securities dealers in the District. In 1960, this association filed complaints against 25 percent of the District members. This is considerably above the national average of only 8 percent. This gives some idea of the necessity of adequate legislation to govern the industry in the District. In view of this large percentage of complaints filed by the National Association, it certainly behooves the District of Columbia to take some action which is legally enforceable and will protect the investors within the District of Columbia.

Almost all of the States of the Union have "blue sky" laws. It is unfortunate that the District of Columbia itself has not had this legislation in the recent past. The lack of this legislation has made it possible for many unscrupulous dealers in securities to operate within the District. Many investors in the small, medium, and large fields have been bilked by these unscrupulous people.

There ought to be legislation on the books which will make regulation possible and correct this unfortunate situation. The Commissions of the District of Columbia have submitted a draft bill and that is the one that I have introduced today.

I think as a result of hearings on this bill we could bring out more fully the situation as it has existed in the Dis-

trict in the past few years. Through those hearings, I am sure we can bring forward some kind of legislation that will be helpful and will protect the investing public in the District of Columbia. This is the purpose of the legislation.

WALTER KRAWIEC, EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, CHICAGO'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. WAGGONER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening Walter Krawiec, editorial cartoonist for the Chicago Polish Daily News was honored by that newspaper and the people of Chicago and Illinois as the Man of the Year for 1962.

In an elaborate banquet in the grand ballroom of the Sherman House in Chicago, Mr. Krawiec was presented the annual Veritas et Caritas Medal by the Polish Daily News for his 50 years of work as an editorial cartoonist for this fine newspaper.

Mayor Richard J. Daley, speaking for the people of Chicago, and Gov. Otto Kerner, speaking for the people of Illinois, by personally appearing at this magnificent tribute, in their own messages described the depth of gratitude and respect which all of the people in our community hold for Walter Krawiec.

He indeed exemplifies the spirit of truth and charity.

In receiving this highly coveted award, Mr. Krawiec joins the ranks of former famous Men of the Year selected by the Polish Daily News who include President John F. Kennedy and Mayor Richard J. Daley.

It is fitting that Walter Krawiec, an editorial cartoonist, should be selected as the Man of the Year. During the span of five decades this man, through his unique grasp and understanding of world events, has been able to bring to the people of Chicago a quick understanding, in his daily editorial cartoons, of those complexities in our society which authors of books and papers frequently require volumes to describe.

The editorial cartoon has played a singularly important role in civilization's efforts to better understand the complex nature of our society. Walter Krawiec exemplifies the very essence of his noble profession. Even though he is an accomplished artist in his own right and is recognized as one of the great illustrators of the modern circus, he has earned world renown for his oil portraits.

Walter Krawiec has won numerous awards as a frequent exhibitor at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C.; the National Academy in New York; the Chicago Art Institute, and museums throughout the country.

I prefer, however, to honor him as a chronicler of world events. Soft spoken by nature, he is transformed at the easel

into a veritable crusader; pen and ink, brush and paint become weapons which he wields forcefully and courageously against evil in the world. The downtrodden and oppressed find in him a champion, while the evildoers feel the full force of his struggle for truth and justice.

Walter Krawiec is a deeply religious man and he employs his art for the noble enrichment of life. He does not permit man or society to be disillusioned, substituting purely material progress for Christian perfection. Yet as a great poet or musician would, Walter Krawiec has the unique capacity to settle into artistic serenity when there is no need for a crusade; when critical times pass, painting, and drawing with warmth and understanding the persons and places of everyday living.

In the five decades that he has served as editorial cartoonist for the Polish Daily News, Mr. Krawiec has recorded the most spectacular half-century in the development of our Nation.

We Americans are that much richer for having the panorama of American and world progress recorded for posterity by men such as Walter Krawiec. We as a Nation are that much wiser and better equipped to understand the great challenges of a complex world because men like Walter Krawiec are able to reduce this complexity through the use of a few bold strokes of the pen to an understanding which even those with a very limited education can grasp.

His editorial cartoons in my very humble judgment have helped translate the very essence of democracy to the people of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the brief but meaningful remarks delivered by Mr. Krawiec in accepting this award will describe this ingenious man better than anything I might say. In his brief acceptance speech, Mr. Krawiec demonstrates at once a lifetime of fruitful contributions to society and a humility which has made his work a testament to his life.

His speech can serve as an example to students of speech because its depth of thought is nurtured in a concept of brevity. Mr. Walter Krawiec's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF WALTER KRAWIEC IN ACCEPTING VERITAS ET CARITAS AWARD IN CHICAGO FEBRUARY 23, 1963

Mr. Toastmaster, Father Provincial, very reverence and reverend Fathers, distinguished guests and friends, there was a time more than half a century ago that the seed of this eventful day was sown. It was a day in which my career took a formal step at the suggestion of some firemen, who watched me sketch some horses on rough cardboard at the firehouse.

These good men urged me to go to the Art Institute where I could develop a talent they thought I had. Maybe because I saw them jump to action so often that I too that afternoon followed their advice promptly.

Somewhat antecedent to today's "hike" craze, I walked from Chicago and Milwaukee Avenues and up to the art institute. Up to this moment, I was all determination, all courage. But standing barefooted in what seemed a different world, I experienced that frightful feeling that I didn't belong. It was long, but a friendly hand touched my shoulder. You know something—that

same frightful feeling is back again here, at a speaker's rostrum.

For the man who by habit has expressed himself through pictures all of his life, I find this spotlight too bright. Yet, the aura of this spot is somewhat dispelled by the realization that I am surrounded by friends. You must be true friends to give me an evening like this.

If I had my easel at hand, I would sketch a cartoon something like. I would picture myself in a little world of my own, standing with my mouth wide open in amazement as people of great stature and noble hearts came to me as if from another planet and they brought with them the friendly handshake, good wishes, honors and appreciation, and as they passed, I would murmur, "Thank you for your kindness."

Yes, thank you to the Resurrection Fathers and their great newspaper for this signal honor of the Man of the Year, and thank you, friends, for this warm gathering.

I have no regrets this evening, only a humble satisfaction that I have tried to use whatever talents God gave me to add, however small the contribution, to a better world. In my 50 years with the Dziennik Chicagoski, I have been a privileged spectator in watching the world change from a horse and buggy existence into a space age of rockets.

I spoke in pictures to each generation as best I knew how; particularly did I speak to my own ethnic group as it slowly transformed from a small band of immigrants into a powerful group, loving their fatherland, but putting their shoulders to the plow of the great American way, until they have emerged into dutiful sons and daughters of America.

In this growth of our people, I remember sad moments as my editorial cartoons went on page 1—sharp, critical, and at times denouncing—because a sin is not to be covered but exposed and eradicated. But then what a pleasure it was to present persons and groups as they progressed to goodness and greatness.

On my board I saw the rise of the great fraternal and charitable organizations, the magnificent churches and schools, the men in politics and other services. To all these, I spoke and I say the privilege was mine.

So this evening as I accept the Truth and Charity Award, grateful to all of you who made this possible, I cannot forget the great men and women who give substance to my work. Thank you all very much.

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. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26.

Mr. WEAVER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26, 1963.

Mr. PELLY, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAs (at the request of Mr. WAGGONNER) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$270.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. ALGER.

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

Mr. DINGELL.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

At large

George Grant.
George W. Andrews.
Kenneth A. Roberts.
Albert Rains.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
Carl Elliott.
Robert E. Jones, Jr.
George Huddleston, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Ralph J. Rivers.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. George F. Senner, Jr.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don W. Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. J. Arthur Younger.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Harlan Hagen.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Ronald Brooks Cameron.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Everett G. Burkhalter.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Harry R. Sheppard.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. Patrick Minor Martin.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giallomo.
4. Abner W. Sibal.
5. John S. Monagan.

At large

Bernard F. Grabowski.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Claude Pepper.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.
9. Don Fuqua.
10. Sam Gibbons.
11. Edward J. Gurney.
12. William C. Cramer.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Vic) Forrester.

4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. Charles L. Weltner.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. John W. Davis.
8. J. Russell Tuten.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII
At large

Thomas P. Gill.
Spark M. Matsunaga.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. Ralph R. Harding.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Roland V. Libonati.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Edward R. Finnegan.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. Elmer J. Hoffman.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert T. McLoskey.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. J. Edward Roush.
6. Richard L. Roudebush.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Donald Cogley Bruce.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. James E. Bromwell.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Charles B. Hoeven.
7. Ben F. Jensen.

KANSAS

1. Robert Dole.
2. William H. Avery.
3. Robert F. Ellsworth.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Eugene Siler.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.

4. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. Gillis W. Long.

MAINE

1. Stanley R. Tupper.
2. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

At large

Carlton R. Sickles.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. Lucien N. Nedzi.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. James G. O'Hara.
8. James Harvey.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Harold M. Ryan.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

At large

Neil Staebler.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. Alec G. Olson.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. John Bell Williams.
4. Arthur Winstead.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.

9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Ralph F. Beermann.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. William T. Cahill.
2. Milton W. Glenn.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. George M. Wallhauser.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Joseph M. Montoya.
Thomas G. Morris.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Steven B. Derounian.
4. John W. Wyder.
5. Frank J. Becker.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Eugene J. Keogh.
12. Edna F. Kelly.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. John V. Lindsay.
18. Adam C. Powell.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William Fitts Ryan.
21. James C. Healey.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Charles A. Buckley.
24. Paul A. Fino.
25. Robert R. Barry.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. Katharine St. George.
28. J. Ernest Wharton.
29. Leo W. O'Brien.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Clarence E. Kilburn.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. R. Walter Riehman.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Harold C. Ostertag.
38. Charles E. Goodell.
39. John R. Pillion.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Charles Raper Jonas.
9. James T. Broyhill.
10. Basil L. Whitener.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Hjalmar C. Nygaard.
2. Don L. Short.

OHIO

1. Carl W. Rich.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Homer E. Abele.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

At large

Robert Taft, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Robert B. Duncan.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Herman Toll.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. George M. Rhodes.
7. William H. Milliken.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. John C. Kunkel.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Elmer J. Holland.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. James D. Weaver.

25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. W. E. (Bill) Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. Ed Foreman.
17. Omar Bureson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.

At large

Joe R. Pool.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.
7. K. W. (Bill) Stinson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack, Jr.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. Elizabeth Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Shadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

459. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 64th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Peoria, Ill., September 9 to 13, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. 73); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

461. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1962, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1963 Report of the Office of Coal Research, on coal research activities, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report of the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 347 of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill permitting the

Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relating to the providing of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1962, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

469. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report from the Office of Emergency Planning relating to positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, which has been received since transmitting our annual report under a letter dated January 29, 1963, pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove restrictions on charges for forms, copies, and certifications"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4147. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4148. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4149. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4150. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend section 104(b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4156. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4157. A bill 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4158. A bill to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Personnel," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and its civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to \$75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4163. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4167. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to show the nicotine content and the tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services for aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4170. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for

more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions, service on the Mexican border before World War I may be included in determining whether a veteran meets the service requirements applicable to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4174. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the status of air freight forwarders as air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for the certification of air freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4183. A bill to declare a policy as to the existence of public domain in Wisconsin in lands erroneously meandered and lying between the original meander line and the lakeshore, and to protect the rights of landowners whose title to water-fronting property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4188. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4190. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4193. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4195. A bill relating to the reclassification and sale of certain desert land on which entries have been made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4196. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon request made by a State or political subdivision thereof, surplus real property will not be disposed of until such State or political subdivision has had not less than 2 years to perfect a plan of use for such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4199. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4200. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 4201. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4204. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4205. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4206. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN (by request):

H.R. 4207. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 263. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings of committees of the House under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota to give immediate attention and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to all legislation similar to H.R. 7640 of the 87th Congress, relating to imposing further Federal controls in the field of unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting approval of appropriation for the planning and developing of Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States relative to presenting the automation of outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States relative to requesting congressional action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Leandro Pastor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wielkosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4211. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Surrender Lal Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lee (also known as Lee Fung Yew and Lee Shiu Keong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Barbara Bukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Takeshi Morozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Margaret M. Kaaua, county clerk, Hilo, Hawaii, requesting Congress to authorize further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Stennis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Virginia Chapter, Sons of the Revolution, all members of which are descendants of officers in the Army of George Washington, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country last Friday evening in Richmond, and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was the guest speaker. I was privileged to introduce Senator STENNIS and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my introduction and the brilliant speech he made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT DINNER MEETING OF SONS OF REVOLUTION, RICHMOND, VA., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Nearly 16 years ago, JOHN STENNIS promised the people of Mississippi that if they elected him to the U.S. Senate, he would "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of the row."

As we all know, Mississippians elected this former State legislator, district attorney, and circuit judge, in 1947 to represent that State in the Senate and we have all benefited because he has kept his plow deep and his furrow straight.

In the Senate, he has compiled a record of diligent, dedicated, and devoted public service, and has honored the seat which Jefferson Davis occupied, when he was a Senator from Mississippi.

Your speaker tonight is a ranking member of the Armed Services, Appropriations, and the Space Committees of the Senate. Two years ago, he was given the key assignment as chairman of the powerful Preparedness

Investigating Subcommittee, the "watchdog" committee that oversees our national defense program. At the present time, he is conducting hearings on the conflicting reports about the buildup of Soviet military forces in Cuba to determine the true facts about that threat to our national security. He is the most qualified man I know for that vital assignment.

While the name STENNIS is synonymous with national defense and military preparedness, he is also an authority on constitutional law. He serves as permanent captain of one of the three southern teams organized in the Senate to lead the fight to protect the sovereign rights of the States and to preserve southern traditions and constitutional government. Last year, he played a key role in the defeat in the Senate, after weeks of debate, of vicious legislation to abolish the literacy test established by Mississippi and 20 other States as one of the qualifications for voting. An encroachment on the rights of the States to determine these qualifications. Only a few weeks ago, he was one of those leading our successful battle to preserve rule 22 and the right to engage in extended debate in the Senate, thus assuring our right to be heard and to protect our people against vicious and ill-advised legislation. He was one of three authors of the southern manifesto, and this declaration of constitutional principles, signed by more than 100 Members of the Congress, remains unchallenged as the most forceful statement of the position of the South.

He has been frequently mentioned as a future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Former President Eisenhower named him as one of three Democrats qualified to serve as President of the United States.

JOHN STENNIS is esteemed and respected by his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats.

And I am proud to say that Virginia had a major role in the career of JOHN STENNIS, for it was in our State that he obtained his legal education and spent 3 key years of his life. Anyone elected to membership in the University of Virginia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa has earned that honor. Senator STENNIS is truly Virginia's third Senator.

It is with gratitude and pride that I present to you a truly great American, a distinguished statesman, U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi)

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight in celebration of the 231st anniversary of the birth of Gen. George Washington.

The tributes paid to George Washington are legion. Perhaps the best known is that expressed by Gen. Henry Lee when he characterized his beloved fellow Virginian as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Having spent some fond years at the university at Charlottesville, I developed a great admiration for the wisdom of the Sage of Monticello. The keen insight of Thomas Jefferson into men and governments has helped shape the destiny of this country. It was he who fought to preserve the integrity of the States in our Union—and would that there were more modern-day Jeffersons to help regain that measure of respect for the sovereignty of the States that he struggled so hard to establish in the founding days of this Republic.

And it was Thomas Jefferson, who, to my way of thinking, paid the highest tribute of all to his friend, George Washington. Jefferson said:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision."

This observation indicates the sensitive regard of Washington to the public trust implicit in the office of the President. He abhorred any possible violation of this trust by the suggestion of interest or bias in the administration of this office. This fine example set by our first President should be closely followed by Chief Executives of our time and future times.

Jefferson continued:

"He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. * * * On the whole his character was, in its mass, perfect * * * in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Certainly it is most fitting and proper that we meet together tonight to consider this great man of history. He is indeed a man of history, for he, like all history,