scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are "realists" who do not "go off half-cocked," we have developed a moral gap between the beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance. This moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

It is in this context that I see a special responsibility and opportunity for American Negroes. For in the course of removing our national curse of racial discrimination, the Negro can force all Americans of good conscience to reexamine their own sense of values.

And so the leaders in the civil rights struggle can help to bridge the dangerous gap which increasingly exists between beliefs and actions. They can reawaken in their fellow Americans a commitment to the moral objectives on which our society was founded—and this reawakening can give a new tone, a new vigor, and a new honesty to the American Nation.

Regardless of color, most Americans now know in their hearts that the time for explanations is over and that the time for action is here on the great frontier of civil rights.

The challenge to the American Negro is enormous.

Today we see him increasingly accept that challenge, and in so doing set a standard for all Americans to follow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until noon on Thursday of this week.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that the motives, which daily impel our thoughts and actions and the aims and aspirations, which dominate our lives, may not be at variance with Thy will and the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Inspire us with a passionate desire to devote and dedicate our strength of body, mind, and heart to every worthy enterprise and forward movement that will minister to the health and happiness of all mankind.

May we never seek to avoid and escape our responsibilities to have a share in promoting not only the material and physical welfare of humanity but in elevating and enforcing its moral and spiritual well-being.

To Thy Name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we shall give all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE SHOWS SUPPORT FOR ACTION TO ISOLATE COMMUNIST 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the conference of Central American leaders meeting with the President and congressional representatives recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, has produced evidence that a firm basis for hemispheric isolation of Communist Cuba not only exists, but cries for leadership and action.

The exuberance and warmth which our President and delegation received in Costa Rica dramatically proves that the hopes and aspirations of our Latin neighbors are riding with the United States, a fact which is given additional credence by the unanimous support which this Nation received in the Organization of American States last October during the Cuban missile crisis.

But the Communists are organizing rapidly in Latin America, ironically they plan to convene in Brazil shortly, a country which is at this moment pleading for U.S. financial aid. In the face of this threat to the freedom of this hemisphere, we cannot withhold a solution to the Cuban problem.

As the President has now stated, our immediate policy is the isolation of Cuba. It is gratifying to see that one of the topics discussed at Costa Rica included measures I have long recommended as necessary to place Cuba in solitary confinement—namely the ban on movement of Castro agents and propaganda, and the restriction of Cuban Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the United States assume the first step of leadership by closing U.S. ports to nations which engage in sea trade with Cuba, then make the following proposals to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First, close hemispheric seaports to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba,

Second, close hemispheric airports to airlines flying into Cuba,

Third, ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America,

Fourth, ban relay of unofficial telecommunications messages to and from Cuba, and

Fifth, freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this plan by the Organization of American States would effectively place Cuba in solitary confinement. Isolation of Cuba is now a matter of official U.S. policy, and the above steps are our only immediate recourse to the Cuban problem short of an act of war.

If we are serious about fighting communism in this hemisphere, we will act quickly in the coming days with a concentrated, hard-driving campaign to place the policy of isolating Cuba into practice.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered into for tomorrow and Wednesday be carried over until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would those that were scheduled for tomorrow come first then on Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. That would be my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the majority whip whether his request was to the effect that all special orders for today and tomorrow go over?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the request is for those special orders for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, relative to the protection of the Vice President of the United States.

The letter follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
U.S. SECRET SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In response to your request for my comments on the remarks yesterday by Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, regarding the Secret Service's appropriation request for additional staff to carry out its responsibilities under present law which calls for the protection of the Vice President, may I say that a number of questions were raised that need clarification.

As you know, the present law states: "Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President, or the Vice President-elect; protect a former President, at his request, for a reasonable time after he leaves office."

This law was approved October 15, 1962.

The request to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made on March 11 of this year, was the first time that the Secret Service sought, in the routine presentation of its operating needs for the coming fiscal year 1964, the funds it had determined as needed to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

At the hearings last week I furnished the subcommittee the number of personnel the Service had determined was needed, after careful consideration of the responsibilities and nature of duties required. As this testimony was made in executive session, and has not been made public by the subcommittee, I feel I must stand upon my position as outlined to the subcommittee.

At this point it is appropriate to point out that Vice President JOHNSON had not made any requests for the protective services proposed nor was he consulted concerning the number of personnel determined to be necessary to properly protect the person of the Vice President. The request for appropriations was made because the present law, Public Law 87-829, broadened considerably the scope of the Service's protective responsibilities which in turn requires additional personnel to carry out its provisions.

The present law differs markedly from the law under which the Secret Service protected the Vice President during the previous decade. On July 16, 1951, spurred by such events as the assassination attempt upon President Truman at the Blair House, the law which set forth the protective duties of the Secret Service was amended to include protection of the Vice President at his request.

The new law has three objectives: To close loopholes that existed in the old law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line for the Presidency. Second, to remove from the Vice President the discretion as to whether he should or should not receive Secret Service protection. Third, to authorize Secret Service protection of a former President for a reasonable time after he leaves office.

Therefore it was clear that the intent and purpose of the present law was to focus upon the inadequacies of the old law regarding the succession to the Presidency, by authorizing adequate protection to the President and the Vice President, or in the event of their deaths, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, etc. The law closed the gap by recognizing the reality that Presidents in the past have been killed, or died in office, and so have officers in the sequence of possible succession.

Further than that, the new law took heed of the fact that in the period 1951 to 1962 the President had no choice whether or not he was protected by the Secret Service. But as to the Vice President, he was to be protected only upon his request. Should he not choose to request it, the Secret Service was not authorized to furnish it.

The reasoning behind this phase of the law was clear: If a Vice President did not ask for protection, he was highly vulnerable to attempts upon his life. When he asked for protection only upon occasion, this kind of part-time protection was highly unsatisfactory, and indeed, ineffectual. Anyone who wanted to harm him need only plan to do so at a time when the Secret Service was not guarding him.

A bill to eliminate the discretion of the Vice President as to whether or not he will receive protection was first proposed in 1960, and was passed by the Senate in that year, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. When the law was first proposed, the Treasury Department, in its transmittal of the legislation, expressed the opinion that the existing law, providing protection for the Vice President only at his request, "presents an untenable situation." The Treasury further pointed out that part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded.

The bill was again introduced in 1961, and lay pending until it was passed by the Senate and approved on October 15, 1962. In retransmitting it the argument was again put forth that gaps in existing legislation needed closing with respect to those individuals who were next in line to the Presidency.

I would like to further emphasize that the growing importance of the Office of the Vice Presidency, the troubled times in which we live—marked by international plots and counterplots, the possibility of actions of the mentally unstable—all have fortified my belief that the assignment of Secret Service agents to the protection of the Vice President is in the best interest of the U.S. Government.

Congressman CONTE referred to the difference between the number of men assigned to protect Vice President JOHNSON prior to the passage of the current law, and the number now being requested. In the light of my experience over the past 24 years, and through the accumulated experience of our agents in protecting Presidents of the United States, I feel that I am in a position best suited to make such plans and prescribe the manpower needed.

Under the old law, the protection by the Secret Service was intermittent, and not around the clock. To provide the manpower needed, the Service drew upon its existing personnel, generally from the field offices. Now that the law calls for adequate, full-time protection, it is obvious that more individuals are needed.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Secret Service must now provide full-time around-the-clock protection for the Vice President's residence and for his person. To provide such protection on a minimum basis it estimates 36 persons will be required on the basis of a 40-hour working week for each agent, plus time off for holidays, sickness, and annual leave.

Congressman CONTE indicated he would agree to protection of the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but that no more than two agents should be made available to do this entire job except when the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission. Such a limited number of agents, of course, could not even begin to provide protection on an around-the-clock basis, 365 days a year.

I agree as to the inadvisability of taking agents away from their duties in the field in order to provide protection. This is just what our request for personnel is designed to avoid. The only way to insure adequate protection is to establish a detail specifically charged with the task, and not to rely upon part-time services from personnel assigned to other duties.

The issues raised by Congressman CONTE are sensitive ones. No one impugns the courage of the President or the Vice President, or any of the gentlemen covered by the provisions of the law. This is not a question of their courage, nor of their own desire for privacy or freedom from the burden such protection necessarily imposes. The responsibilities we face are the safety of the men who stand at the highest elective posts in the land. We must adequately plan to meet such contingencies as accidents, or deeds of violence, as unpleasant as they may be. The Secret Service as the organization which must meet this full-time responsibility, cannot do so on a part-time basis.

It is clear that the protection called for in the law, and for which we have asked the necessary appropriations, is not for the individual, but for the position of the Vice President—a position second only to that of the Presidency of the United States—the position from which the Nation will draw its next Chief Executive in the unhappy event that this would become necessary because of death.

There are a great many Americans whose lives may be in greater potential danger than that of the Vice President, as Congressman CONTE said, but they are not the President nor those who would be, in the event of tragedy. We in the Secret Service feel strongly that this is what the law considers in assigning us the responsibility of providing the necessary protection.

If Congress does not wish to provide the funds necessary to carry out the mandate of the new law, it should be repealed. As long as the law is on the books, however, I feel that it is my duty to provide for its proper administration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. ROWLEY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Treasury Department today said that the request of the Secret Service for 36 positions in order to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of protecting the Vice President has apparently been subject to misunderstanding because of the nature of protective work.

There will not be 36 agents accompanying the Vice President at once. There will normally be only 4 assigned at any one time to protective duties, which means advance work as well as on-the-spot protection. The protective organization would also include two agents assigned to the Vice President's Washington residence and one agent to his Texas home.

How, then, does the total figure come to 36? Because there are three 8-hour shifts to be filled, because the weekends must be covered as well as week days, and because sick and annual leave must be taken into account. The overall number includes supporting personnel bringing the total to 36.

Under the old law, Vice Presidents were furnished protection upon request (not necessarily the request of the Vice President, but also of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury). This was unsatisfactory because a Vice President or other people acting on his behalf should not be required to make the decision as to whether or not he needs protection. That is the reason for the legislation giving this responsibility to the Secret Service through the Treasury Department. It was first proposed and passed by the Senate in 1960. It became law last October.

The following points will also help clarify recent discussions of this matter:

1. The Secret Service as an interim measure assigned 19 agents to the protection of the Vice President last fall after the new legislation was approved. In order to meet its responsibilities to the extent possible in the absence of any appropriated funds, it became necessary for the Secret Service temporarily to draw agents from the field for this purpose.

2. The law authorizes rather than directs this protection of the Vice President. This provision is identical to that authorizing protection of the President. The purpose of last year's legislation was to give the Secret Service responsibility for protecting the Vice President in the exact same manner as it already had the responsibility for protecting the President.

3. Under the former law, Vice President JOHNSON refused to request full-time permanent protection. He made only occasional requests for oversea travel and where large crowds or other special circumstances made temporary protection necessary in domestic travel.

GRATEFUL MEMORY AND HOPEFUL FORECAST

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the centennial year of Boston College. Boston College has exercised a mighty and beneficial influence upon the intellectual and moral thought of our country and has been a glory and credit to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. All sacrifices of the past in establishing this institution are vindicated as one beholds this magnificent higher institution of learning as it stands today.

A nobler civilization is the dream of all men through the ages and it has been this high hope that Boston College has served so steadfastly. Beginning humbly, it has flourished in the great traditions set down by Jesuit educators some four centuries ago. Prompted by the age-old search for truth, goodness, and beauty, its endeavors have enriched our civilization.

I recall once reading an anniversary address by Henry Van Dyke in which he said: "The occasion is one of grateful memory and hopeful forecast." Such an event is this. Grateful memories of a heritage won by toil, hopes, and prayers, and hopeful forecast for a better world won by the search for truth and the attaining of wisdom.

Boston College has been fortunate indeed in the dedicated and talented men who have been associated with her through the years. I might add that Father Walsh, who is providing one of the richest periods in the history of Boston College, is a worthy successor to the great men who built this school.

A small but determined group of men led by Father John McElroy saw their hope for a college to serve the large Catholic community of Boston materialize with approval of a charter for Boston College on April 1, 1863. The years ahead were filled with struggle but the college grew and the city grew around it. The enrollment increased steadily each year and by 1905 it had reached 500. Cramped college facilities led to the building, under the leadership of Father Gasson, of this loveliest of campuses at Chesnut Hill and the first classes were held there exactly 50 years ago. The school continued to expand and today the original faculty of six Jesuits has grown to become the largest collegiate teaching community of Jesuits in the world.[1]

Although the history of Boston College is not unique in its growth amidst tremendous hardship, it is a towering monument to the devoted men of the Society of Jesus who have made this community of learning possible. The test of the ages imparts confidence in the Catholic system of education where the teaching of Christian morality is never lost sight of and goes hand-in-hand with the mental training of youth.

While recognizing the value of specialized skills, Boston College has adhered to the Jesuit belief in the excellence of a liberal arts education. In his "Idea of a University," Cardinal Newman wrote:

> A university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspirations, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility.

This has been the function of Boston College.

The 100th anniversary of this institution brings forth grateful memories of great men and great ideas which have been fulfilled throughout the years of growth and maturing. And the occasion also brings to mind illustrious men who have passed through the portals of this college as students, such as our beloved Cardinal Cushing and the honored and eminent Cardinal O'Connell who exclaimed as a student:

> I am more in love with the college than ever. There is plenty of hard work, but there is happiness and fine feeling all around.

Because of its solid foundation and rich heritage, Boston College offers today a hopeful forecast. In these critical times, with the ever increasing needs for an educated citizenry, Boston College is a fortress of broad and humane learning, a kind of learning which is often overlooked in today's clamor for vocationalism in American education. With higher learning so essential to our democratic way of life, the role of the private college becomes vital. The Jesuit school, particularly, provides the necessary well-rounded mental development for coping successfully with the deepening complexity of our age. The undergraduate and graduate schools of Boston College must continue to send out men and women who will provide leadership for our Commonwealth and other parts of the world. Our American way of life depends upon these graduates sent out as well equipped teachers, priests, lawyers—serving as judges, legislators and attorneys, and leaders for industry, business, and the community.

A century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson penned these lines:

> Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
> Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
> And marching single in an endless file,
> Bring diadems and fagots in their hands,
> To each they offer gifts after his will,
> Bread, kindom, stars, and sky that holds them all.

Our age brings days of unlimited opportunity—days in which our moral strength and intellectual power can be used to shape a better and more peaceful world despite pessimistic moods and alarm over the development of nuclear weapons, inordinate scientific knowledge, and precarious international relationships. The days bring gifts of greater challenge than ever before. In a recent writing, Cardinal Cushing warned:

> The urgency of the times makes it imperative for us to take counsel, to sharpen our thought in regard to the specific ideals for which we stand. This is a period of transition, of realinement. We are seemingly at the end of a civilization.

The times are dangerous, but there is hopeful forecast in a university such as this one, dedicated as it is to truth and wisdom, both human and divine. The

---

[1] Frost, Jack, "The Crowned Hilltop," Boston: Hawthorne Press, 1962.

knowledge and morality imparted by Boston College will be of no small value in the contests which face us. We echo the words in Proverbs:

Through knowledge shall the just be divided.

I congratulate Boston College on its splendor and successful achievements. My sincere hope is that Boston College may continue to develop and prosper, that the sphere of its influence may ever increase, and that the sons and daughters of Boston College will be found in the coming years, as in the past, leading useful lives, doing good to their fellow men, ever faithful to the teachings of their glorious alma mater, and improving and strengthening our institutions of government.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 142d anniversary of the Greek war of independence. I am pleased to pay tribute to the Greek people and their indomitable spirit. Greek learning, philosophy, science, and drama have had a profound impact upon our modern civilization. In the United States we live under a system of government propounded from Greek culture—democracy, a word held sacred by all Americans.

In their homeland, the spirit of ancient Greece resides in the hearts of all the inhabitants, just as it did when their nation was a conquered territory under the rule of Ottoman might. The Greece of 1821 was governed by Turkish officials and had been since the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century. The populace was not unduly persecuted by their Muslim overlords; in fact, many Greeks had attained responsible positions in the government of the Sublime Porte. Yet ethnic mores and deeprooted traditions recalled to the citizens of the Hellenes that their land was the home of the hero, of democracy, and freedom. Bondage could not and would not be tolerated forever.

The weakening of the Turkish Government gave to the conquered peoples of the empire an opportunity to seek autonomy and, as in the case of Greece, independence. Borrowing from their heroic past, a group of peasants armed with clubs, scythes, and slings, and led by the Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of liberty at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and declared their fight for freedom. Ships, so important to the defenders of Athens against the forces of Darius and Xerxes, were employed to defend the coastlines against invading armies from Turkey and Egypt. Familiar terrain was used to great advantage against alien troops by selecting in advance propitious sites for battles to be fought. Rebellion soon spread across the Isthmus of Corinth to Attica and Boeotia.

The nations of the world first became cognizant of this struggle when the Greek Orthodox patriarch, Gregorious of Constantinople, was executed. His execution was followed by a series of massacres of Christians which the Russian czar, as Protector of the Orthodox Church, took as a personal affront. The cause then became one for all of Christendom.

In the United States the sympathy of the American people was so great that cities and towns were named to honor this struggle for liberty. Thus we have several Athens, a Spartansburg, Corinth, an Ithaca, and 31 Troys. Groups of Philhellenes sprang up throughout America to fill ships with much needed clothing, medical supplies, and food. Daniel Webster spoke in the House for official support of the Greek patriots, while President Monroe inserted in his famous address, which contained the Monroe Doctrine, a section expressing America's sympathy and urging aid for the Greeks.

The ranks of the insurgents, swelled by volunteers from America and Europe, including the poet, Lord Byron, were at first highly successful. The Acropolis at Athens, the symbol of democracy for the world, was seized, as were many other cities throughout the Peloponnesus. A constitution was proclaimed in January 1822 with Prince Alexander Mavrocordato presiding over the first national assembly at Epidaurus. The Turks, in retaliation for their losses on the mainland, attacked with full force some of the islands and proceeded to massacre the inhabitants. Chios was used as an example to the others, as a threat not to join with the rebels; 25,000 inhabitants were slaughtered, and 45,000 were sold into slavery. This warning only enraged the Greeks to greater ferocity; so when Turkish garrisons fell into their hands, all were put to the sword. The reciprocal atrocities left the land ravaged and war torn.

There followed a period of internal strife among the victorious Greek forces. Mavrocordato was discredited and challenged by other leaders, which led to civil war between the Greek parties. The Government, though, was able to suppress the internecine strife and prevent the Turks from reconquering any territory.

In 1824, the sultan, unable to check the advance of the insurgents, called upon Mehemet Ali, Governor of Egypt, for succor. The pasha's son, Ibrahim, eluded the Greek fleet and, on February 24, 1825, landed at Modon in the Morea with a well-equipped army of 4,000 regular infantry and 500 cavalry. There followed a series of victories for the Turks, and the Greek forces retreated to the cities which they held in the south. Missolonghi was besieged for 12 months and capitulated only when command of the sea was lost. Athens, too, was taken, but the Acropolis held out until forced to surrender 9 months later.

It was now the turn of the European powers to enter into the fray. England, France, and Russia had pledged on May 6, 1827, that Greece should be given autonomy under Turkish suzerainty. Fearing now that the Porte would again enslave the populace, a joint British-French-Russian fleet entered Greek water and attempted to relieve the besieged rebels. At the battle of Navarino on October 20, 1827, the allied fleet completely destroyed the Turkish ships, thus preventing supplies from reaching Ibrahim's troops. When the hard-pressed sultan called for a holy war against the insurgents and their allies, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and proceeded to attack the Porte from the north. The command of the Greco-allied fleet in the Peloponnesus was entrusted to Lord Cochrane, while the land forces were put under the command of General Church.

Now on the defensive, the sultan agreed by protocol, signed on February 3, 1828, and implemented in the treaty of Adrianople, September 1829, to complete independence for the Greeks. Turkish troops soon began evacuating Greek territory, and independence became a reality. The rebellion had lasted many years. Victorious but utterly devastated, Greece emerged as a sovereign state, created and sanctioned by the Convention of London on May 11, 1832.

The years following independence were ones of internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Greek-inhabited Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. Dissension between the Greek people and their Bavarian Prince Otho, who had been selected by the convention powers to be ruler, brought about the deposition of the king and the election and installation of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title George I of the Hellense, the progenitor of the present king. When he took his oath of accession, he promised to uphold a new constitution which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

With the advent of World War II, much of what had been accomplished since independence was destroyed. On October 28, 1940, the Italians invaded the country from Albania, and were immediately repulsed by the Greek army under the command of Alexander Pagapos. The Germans, though, came to the aid of their stricken ally and soon overran the entire mainland and islands. The King and his government fled into enforced exile. During the 3½ years of occupation, the country suffered severe economic damage. The merchant marine, the lifeblood of the nation, was reduced to one-quarter of its size. Industrial production fell by 80 percent, while half the roads were destroyed and railroads were completely immobile.

Resistance to the Germans began with passive noncooperation, which soon developed into sabotage and the formation of guerrilla bands. Severe reprisals by the invaders only instilled in the people greater determination and courage. When the Germans finally retreated in 1944, they left behind them a situation comparable to 1821—complete chaos and devastation.

Peace was not yet destined for the war-weary Greeks. Guerrilla bands in the north, lured by Communist propaganda and promises, refused to surrender their arms to the central Government. Abetted by aid from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, these Communist bands seized towns and carried out acts of terrorism against those loyal to the regime in Athens. To insure complaisance in the regions under their control, children were captured and held as hostages. It has been estimated that over 24,000 boys and girls had been spirited into Yugoslavia and Albania by the guerrillas. The Communist forces were so successful as to lay siege to Athens. On December 24, 1947, the Communist leader Markos Vifiades felt confident enough to proclaim a provisional government.

The central Government, an unworkable coalition, was unable to decide on a course of action. Moreover, when the army did take to the field, obsolete methods and armaments proved ineffective against the elusive guerrillas.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman asked and received from Congress authority for immediate financial and economic aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action against the Communists. By 1949, with the defection by Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, the last of the Communists had surrendered or had fled into Albania.

At the conclusion of the civil war the Government was able to turn its attention to internal development and the alleviation of the financial crisis caused by the two wars. It was only by means of massive aid from the United States (almost $1 billion granted under the European recovery program and other aid programs) that recovery was effected. A visitor touring Greece today sees much construction work. Port facilities, piles of rubble a few years ago, have now been cleared and enlarged to accommodate increased shipping. Large factories rose in the cities and the countryside to increase an already expanding industrial production.

Perhaps the most phenomenal recovery has been the merchant marine. In 1946 the fleet totaled only 500,000 tons. Today shipping is surpassing the 5 million ton mark. The Greek flag, a white cross and horizontal stripes on a field of blue, is seen in ports-of-call throughout the world, flying from the masts of freighters, tankers, and liners.

Tourism, too, has played an important part in Greece's resurgence. Emphasis is placed on the ruins of their ancient past. In Athens the Acropolis and the partly restored Agora are the major attractions. Dramas are held in the Roman theater built on the side of the Acropolis by one of Rome's conquering Emperors. Elsewhere, Delphia and the ancient Greek city-states of Thebes, Corinth, and Sparta, receive their share of the tourists' curiosity. A booming resort center is attracting many to Rhodes, where Greco-Roman architecture mingles with Crusader fortification.

To America and the Western World, Greece is more than just a tourist spot. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is a link in the chain encompassing the Soviet bloc, a bulwark for democracy and the free-world. The United States has strategic bases on the Greek mainland. The country joined NATO in order to increase its security against Communist aggression from within and without. With the combined allied weapons to support its claims, Greek security is thus safeguarded.

Greece continues to be a bridge between Europe and Asia. Militarily, because of its strategic location, it is the link between NATO and CENTO. Its people, though, have remained primarily unchanged. As in 1821, Greece is a nation of small farmers. With all its contributions to civilization, the average Greek tilled his few acres and raised enough food to support his family. Population increases have demanded that every available acre be cultivated. Where none existed, terraced plots were hacked from the mountain sides or gorges. Unfortunately, the land could not support its own people. Emigrants by the hundreds of thousands left their homeland and settled in other parts of the globe. Those who came to America brought with them their religion and their crafts. Throughout the United States, Greeks and descendents of Greek immigrants form an integral part of the community, be it mayor, representative, restaurateur, or wine grower. These people of Greek origin have been told the story of how their forefathers fought for liberty during the war of independence in their homeland. They know that the Greek nation celebrates its independence day on March 25, the day when the glorious struggle for freedom began. We in the United States, whose own forefathers strove for Greek sovereignty, extend to our friends and allies in the Hellenes greetings on their independence day. We, too, remember our past and salute with pride the Greek nation.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Saturday called attention to the seriousness of the unemployment problem, which he termed the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem for the 1960's.

The proposed tax cut will certainly provide a stimulus to economic activity. But the extension of the accelerated public works program would have more immediate and tangible effects than a tax cut. I believe that Congress should not only appropriate the $500 million which the President has requested to meet the current authorization, but should extend the accelerated public works program another year. On February 4, I introduced H.R. 3311 providing that an additional $900 million be authorized beyond the $900 million currently authorized for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the beneficial results from this program. Men have been put back to work on useful, productive work. More than that, these projects—water and sewer lines, sewage treatment systems, public buildings, streets, and other projects, have made communities all over the Nation better places to live and more attractive to the expansion of industry.

I therefore urge that Congress take action to appropriate the $500 million requested by the President, and also to extend the authorization of the accelerated public works act.

Perhaps the excellent report of General Clay on foreign aid will give the Congress some ideas on how we may obtain the necessary funds to carry on the accelerated public works program.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate on March 26, 27, and 28 of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DENIAL TO THE FEDERAL COURTS OF JURISDICTION IN LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT CASES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recently proposed in a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature.

This proposed amendment would deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction in legislative reapportionment cases in States affording direct initiative by the people in voting on this subject. It would restrict Federal court activity in this traditionally State area to cases in which a

State does not provide to its citizens a procedure whereby they can directly initiate a vote on State legislative reapportionment.

Control of this issue by the people is fundamental to our Federal system. This is basically the business of the people, not of the Federal courts, and as long as a State provides a rational means for the people to express their will the Federal courts should stay out.

This proposal is not an attack on the Tennessee decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. In cases where there is no recourse of initiative from the acts of the State legislature the amendment would not apply.

It may be that the Supreme Court does not now have jurisdiction in this field. But I believe the Oklahoma Legislature is right in its stand that a point of such significance should be specifically resolved.

THE ROYAL GREEK DECREE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I read a release from the Royal Greek Embassy and Information Service dated March 16 announcing that "a royal decree has been issued banning vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports." My enthusiasm rose as I completed reading the first paragraph. Immediately I was reminded of President Truman's determined action to save Greece in their hour of greatest peril. President Truman engaged in no if's, and's, or but's. He made no exceptions. He decided the road ahead was clear—we must not permit the Communist takeover of Greece. Pursuant to his determined stand, he initiated a historic program which stopped the Communist takeover of Greece as well as Turkey, and which has preserved the national independence of the Greek people. I could not help but feel that here was an act of real reciprocity in the cause of freedom.

My enthusiasm was chilled as I read the second paragraph, coming as it did like a cold, biting, friendless storm out of the north. That paragraph stated, and I quote:

> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.

The effect of the royal decree was thereby nullified. Anyone with an iota of commonsense understands that the need is now to stop all, and I repeat, "all," merchant vessels entering Cuba flying any flag of the free world. We are not primarily interested in what countries may do to help our cause; that is, the cause of the whole Western Hemisphere, in the next year or two ahead. Our interest is what are they doing to help the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere now.

I ask that the Greek Government make a full public disclosure of the number of vessels flying the Greek flag which are under time-charter contracts to anyone who has shipped cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. That disclosure should include such time-charter contracts with any government or individual. That disclosure also should divulge the length of time left on each contract for every vessel authorized to sail under the Greek flag which has carried any cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. Anything less will confirm my judgment, and the judgment of any reasonable person who understands the realities of international commerce, that the royal decree is made meaningless by the second paragraph of the news release which I have quoted. This is a necessary disclosure, a practical disclosure to which the American people are entitled, concerned as they are by the Russian beachhead in Cuba.

The record shows that the American people, among other things, have contributed nearly $3½ billion to Greece since 1945. The Presidential advisory committee, which has made its report to the President, makes note of the fact that Greece stands 10th among all the nations of the world in terms of the amount of money received from the American taxpayers.

No one, in honesty, can say that the American people have not been generous toward the Greek nation in its hour of greatest need, as they have been generous to all who are willing to fight for freedom. That record suggests that the Greek Government should move with haste to make public the information which I have requested. Any response short of 48 hours would make an equal sham of the word "haste."

SUMMARY OF THE NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 (AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1963) COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1963

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I include the second monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of February 28, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000, over actual budget revenues for fiscal 1962. Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,051,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $33,537,000,000 in the 4 months, March–June 1963. In the corresponding 4 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues were $33,497,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal 1962, of which $1,901 million is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,644,000,000, of which $2,323,000,000 is for national defense and $2,412,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,757,000,000—slightly less than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 4 months March 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $32,249,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,062,000,000 during the 4-month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,757,000,000 in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average in the 4 months, March–June, could rise $305,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 8 months without exceeding the budget total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. On the other hand, the table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average for all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison to this, in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 8 month average of fiscal 1962 by $580,000,000. Stated another way, in the first two-thirds of the fiscal year about 71 percent, or $4,644,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual deficit is $10,099,000,000, or $593,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will, of course, vary each month between March 1 and June 30 in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget), 8 months of fiscal 1963 versus 8 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 8 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	1963	1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	51,963	47,912	+4,051	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	34,603	32,371	+2,232	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	27,459	25,047	+2,412	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	62,062	57,418	+4,644	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,099	−9,506	−593	−8,811	−6,378	[1]−2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,325			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,432			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,757	7,177	+580	7,859	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the budget predicts an increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Feb. 28, 1963.

THE GREAT FLOOD OF THE MIAMI RIVER IN 1913

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week in Ohio, citizens in the Miami River valley are assembling in many meetings to recall and discuss the great flood which took place 50 years ago, between March 22 and March 27, 1913, in which more than 300 persons lost their lives in the floodwaters of the Miami River and its tributaries. Cities such as Dayton, Middletown, and Hamilton were inundated; thousands of homes and factories were destroyed or greatly damaged; commerce and industry were brought to a standstill. Smaller communities, such as West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Piqua, and Troy, were virtually turned into ghost towns.

As a young law student, I went into the devastated area as the floodwaters receded to make reports for the great Bradstreet credit concern and saw firsthand the catastrophe that had struck that section of Ohio. I heard and I saw there how men and women of all walks of life worked and labored against great odds to save lives, to take care of the injured and the sick, and to feed the hungry.

Once the waters had receded it would have been easy for the citizens of many of these cities and towns to have turned their backs on their home communities and to perhaps move elsewhere to start a new life. Yet, they came from a hardy stock of pioneers and made their own hard decision to stay and to do what they could to see to it that there would never be another such major catastrophe in that area.

They did not appeal to the Federal Government. Instead, they sent their representatives to the Ohio General Assembly in Columbus, which had been called into an emergency session, and requested that legislation be enacted under State law to permit those in the flooded areas to solve their own problems through the establishing of a conservancy law under which the Miami Conservancy District came into being. This conservancy district built a huge system of dams to hold back floodwaters in the future and to give protection to the communities that had been destroyed in 1913. The conservancy district was given the authority to levy taxes against the properties that would benefit from this great new flood-control program. Rich and poor, alike, working together to attain freedom from future flood disasters, contributed more than $2 million to the project. At a cost of more than $33 million, the great Miami Valley was given flood protection through huge dams and levees which ever since that time have withstood the ravages of recurrent storms and high water and have given flood protection to the communities in that area of Ohio.

As a result, the people of the Miami Valley have prospered. Today the valley is a great industrial and commercial center, growing and thriving, equaled by few areas in the United States. All this has come about by the courageous reaction of the Miami Valley people in 1913 and their willingness to meet themselves the tremendous cost of attaining the flood protection they desire. No Federal funds were sought or used; no State funds were made available. Instead, the miracle that was accomplished—one of the greatest engineering feats in modern times—came about through men and women who stood on their own feet and met their own responsibility to solve their own area problems.

So, this week, many citizens of the great Miami Valley are looking back 50 years to the time of death, destruction, danger, and despair. All of those who personally experienced the disaster, or learned of it from their elders, are recalling the great efforts that were made to restore the valley and its cities to that which they had been before 1913; and, in rebuilding, to build even better communities than ever before. As a result of their efforts their great homeland in western Ohio has prospered, and also the State and the Nation have benefited, through the readiness, the willingness, the courage, and the faith of Ohioans to meet their own problems and to create the great Miami Conservancy District which has protected the valley from floods and permitted their dreams to be fulfilled, their families to live in safety, and to so rebuild as to make the Miami Valley one of the most productive, one of the most prosperous, one of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the whole Republic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a lad nearly 14 years old at that time I have many vivid memories of the terrible flood disaster which struck the great Miami Valley 50 years ago on March 25, 1913. My father owned a rather large grocery store located on the northeast corner of Broadway and Riverview in Dayton. Wolf Creek, usually only a few inches deep, crossed Broadway about a block south of my father's store and as it began to rise higher and higher toward the top of its banks everyone became alarmed. One of the first thoughts was, naturally, to get in a supply of food. People began to crowd into the store in such numbers that the clerks could not get around to wait on them. It finally became necessary, in fairness to all, for my father to close the doors from time to time and limit the amount of food that could be sold to each customer. This was my first experience, Mr. Speaker, with a distribution system similar to the food rationing restrictions that were put in effect during the war years later.

The floodwaters continued to rise until they finally got up as high as the handrails of the old iron Wolf Creek bridge there on Broadway. The water came up Broadway almost to my father's store and reached the second floors of the homes south of the bridge. Boats began to appear as though by magic and folks of all ages in both good and bad health were rescued from the second floors, attics, and rooftops in spite of the very treacherous crosscurrents. Deeds of bravery without number could be cited. As the boats reached shallow waters men and boys would wade out

to help the folks disembark and get them to the homes of friends or strangers who provided them with food, shelter, and medical care. Schools, churches, and other public buildings were immediately pressed into use to care for the victims. Farmers and other folks from the surrounding higher areas came to their aid with wagonloads of food, clothing, and other needed supplies of all kinds. I shall never forget the great thrill, Mr. Speaker, of seeing all those people open their hearts, their homes, and share their possessions with the flood victims without any hesitancy and with no thought whatsoever of being repaid. It was a time and experience I shall never forget.

After the first fright and removal of the victims from the scene, new dangers began to appear. Explosions occurred—buildings were destroyed—the sky was lit by fires in areas where it was later discovered there were people who could not be reached for rescut. People prayed—some had forgotten how but they prayed anyway and God did answer them. The rains slackened; the floodwaters began to recede a small fraction of an inch at a time until finally the great Miami and its tributaries were once again within their banks.

Gradually, Mr. Speaker, many amazing stories came out about the work that was done during the tragic disaster. The National Cash Register Co., for example, under the personal direction of its founder and president, the late John H. Patterson, had made all its facilities available to the flood victims. Boats were built to use in rescue operations. A hospital area was set up in the plant and a number of babies were born there. One baby, appropriately named "Cash" Durst, grew up to become employed by the National Cash Register Co. Mr. Patterson, a man of tremendous vision and ability, devoted his energies after the flood to developing plans for preventing any recurrence of such a disaster in the Miami Valley area. As soon as his plans were well underway Mr. Patterson set about revitalizing the economic growth of the entire valley, improving its governmental structure and its educational facilities and programs. We who live in that area owe much to the vision, leadership, wisdom, and energy of this great man. Inspired by John H. Patterson, others have followed his example and continue to develop the potentialities of the area to an extent never equaled in any other part of the country. Mr. Patterson had many close, personal friends who gave generously of their time and resources in helping him spearhead a drive to raise a fund to study the problem and do something about it. In a community just prostrated by a great calamity, the raising of funds by public subscription was a tremendous undertaking. Nevertheless, the people, poor and rich, young and old, contributed $2,156,616 within 3 months following the flood. Goaded by the leadership of the Honorable James M. Cox, who resigned after serving two terms in the U.S. Congress to become the Governor of Ohio, the State legislature in a special emergency session enacted a law that has withstood the tests of courts and time, the conservancy law of Ohio. This later led to the formation of the Miami Conservancy District, which was administered by a board of directors headed by Col. Edward A. Deeds, its first president. One of the board members was the Honorable John A. McMahon who had been an illustrious and distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives for three terms during the years between 1875 and 1881. It was he who actually drew up the Conservancy Act. Arthur E. Morgan who, you probably know, at one time headed the Tennessee Valley Authority and later became the president of Antioch College, was appointed the chief engineer for the conservancy district. It was he who masterminded the whole complicated flood prevention plan that has protected and will continue to protect the Miami Valley area from disasters such as occurred in 1913. We who live in that area take justifiable pride in the success of this unique and effective flood prevention program. I say "unique" because every cent, amounting to more than $34 million, to provide this protection has come from the residents of the valley. Not 1 cent has come from the Federal Government or the government of the State of Ohio. Even now, as the citizens of the area desire to improve the system, they pay for it themselves.

This week in Dayton, Ohio, and in the entire valley, one of the major industrial and commercial centers of our Nation, an observance of the 1913 flood is in progress. We are not celebrating a flood anniversary—we are proudly recalling and recognizing 50 years of economic recovery and progress unequalled in our Nation's history. Yes, we are remembering that the "Promises Made In the Attic" were kept and that hard work, adherence to the underlying sound principles of our Nation, cooperation with our neighbors, and love of our homesites have produced a valley of vitality and progress. On behalf of the people in the Third District of Ohio whom I have the privilege of representing here in the Congress, I am happy to join my colleagues from our neighboring districts in paying tribute to those great men in the past whose vision and leadership brought about the establishment of the Miami Conservancy District and to those dedicated men who now administer the program so effectively.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it will, in my opinion, serve a useful purpose to reflect upon a major disaster in the great Miami Valley a half century ago, and what was done to prevent its reoccurrence.

The unprecedented and uncontrolled floodwaters of that river from March 22 through March 27, 1913, brought death and destruction to the Miami Valley from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, with all of its attendant suffering. Cut off from the rest of the world by the devastating floodwaters, the residents could only seek shelter and food from their neighbors and pray for better days. But these hearty souls, after the floodwaters receded, refused to abandon their homes and communities to seek homesites elsewhere. They chose to remain and begin anew, and this they did in a manner and with success never previously attained.

These citizens, through their elected representatives in the Ohio Legislature, enacted into law the authority for a system of flood control unequaled in excellence and accomplishment in the United States, if not in the entire world. The Ohio Legislature provided the legal system—through the Ohio conservancy law—but the local people, by approving and paying tax assessments against their own property in accordance with individual benefit to each parcel within the flood plain, insured completion of the project and its completely satisfactory operation ever since completion.

Today, the valley is free from floods in its urban communities. Five huge earthen dams, levees, and channel systems provide complete protection for the major communities. Unbelievable as it may be to those who say that an all-powerful Central Government is needed to solve all our problems and to pay for the solution of them, in part, at least by deficit financing, this great flood control system was conceived, planned, executed, and paid for by the people within the flood plain of the great Miami Valley without any help from State or Federal Government.

This week the valley citizens are observing the flood date of 50 years ago, but they are celebrating the effective conquering of the elements and with justifiable pride. They can without reservation point out that this undertaking was accomplished by local people for the benefit of the valley, the State, and the Nation, and it has served as a model for much of the world.

The valley is now one of America's industrial, commercial, and educational empires and the people did it by and for themselves.

Lest my colleagues and others who may hear and read our story think we have magnified our performance, I wish to incorporate in my remarks the objective editorial found in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of November 16, 1946. I quote the editorial in its entirety.

THIS FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT WASN'T ON THE CUFF

When the spring rains start washing down the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi River Basins next year, residents of nine western Ohio counties will not be obliged to grab their cots, frying pans, and chicken coops and scramble for higher and drier ground.

Their security was assured by their own action 30 years ago when the Miami Conservancy District completed five dams and improvements of channels in the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers. There have been no serious floods in the district since 1917, although neighbors in the Ohio Valley each spring prepare to pack up and leave with the first thaws and heavy rains.

Unbelievable as it may be to many American communities today, the Miami Valley this year completes this course in self-treatment for a $100 million flood headache without once calling in Dr. New Deal or any of his interns. The local remedy was applied after a 1913 flood swept through the rich agricultural lands and busy industrial centers of Dayton, Troy, Middletown, and Hamilton. Four days later, as they kicked at the mud and debris, the stunned citizens counted the actual damage at $100 million, plus 400 lives lost, business as stagnant as the pools of dirty water in the streets, thousands of head of livestock drowned, and tons of good black dirt gone forever.

Despite this heartbreaking disaster there was no anguished cry for aid from Washington or the State capitol at Columbus. True, the refinements of Federal aid had not been thought of then, but Congress was only too happy to logroll a hodgepodge of river and harbor bills to relieve localities of the costs of local improvements. Instead of calling on the logrollers, the thoroughly drenched Miami Valley citizens took the quaint stand that control of the river was their job, and not a legitimate burden on the taxpayers of Montana or New York.

All they asked from the lawgivers at Columbus was permission to form the conservancy district, with power to levy taxes for the purpose of keeping the rivers from their doors and barnyards. That permission was granted by the State legislature. No appeal of any kind went to Washington, and the only entrance of the National Government came when a Federal district court ruled that the United States had no objection.

The district issued almost $34 million in bonds. Proceeds were used for construction of dams and channel regulation, and that ended the floods for the Miami Valley. In this engineering project there were no extras such as hydroelectric power, swanky fishing and recreation resorts or resettlement projects. Flood control was what the Miami Valley people paid their money for and flood control is what they got.

Today, as the district prepares to levy the final assessment for retirement of the last bonds, the flood-free communities, farms, and individuals of the Miami Valley are pretty proud of their accomplishment. It's theirs and they paid for it without outside help, advice, second guessing or the nostrums of the District of Columbia school of medicine. Equally pleasing to most is the fact that the district provided no plum tree for anxious jobseekers. Only 56 persons are employed on the entire project, hardly enough to staff the public relations office of almost any Washington bureau you care to name.

COMMUNISM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens in this country will argue that communism is negotiable. The people using this argument are usually those who have only a surface understanding of communism. The following article from the Northwest Progress, of Seattle, Wash., very graphically points out our current stance against communism:

NOT NEGOTIABLE

If there is any lesson that can be learned from Castro's takeover of Cuba it would seem to be this: That as far as our State Department goes, we have learned absolutely nothing at all.

The U.S. policy in Cuba is based upon the same political principle that has determined our dealings with atheistic communism in China, Hungary, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Poland, and all the other nations that have fallen to Red aggression.

Our State Department has always operated on the principle that communism, however dangerous, is negotiable. As long as that principle is maintained as a modus agendi by the U.S. Government, regardless of the sincerity of the men involved or the name of the administration, what happened in Hungary had to happen in Cuba and what has happened in Cuba must happen in all of America, North and South, unless we change our policy.

Communism is not negotiable. The reason for saying this is not political but philosophical. Despite the new "nice guy" mask Khrushchev is wearing, he is still a Communist. As such, he will be content with but one objective: mastery of the entire world. He has told us this, he has set about scientifically and methodically to prove it. Cuba is just one more step along the way.

Communism understands but one law: force. And brute force is not negotiable. Force is only countered by counterforce. The brief blockade was a beautiful example of this simple fact.

We have been told that we must not "fear to negotiate." Where communism is concerned, dare we make such a statement? It might be good rhetoric—but what about the logic? It would seem that in dealing with Khrushchev, negotiation ought to be our greatest fear. If Cuba has not taught us this, it has taught us nothing.

Our verbal threats against Russia's presence 90 miles off the Florida coast are beginning to sound about as dangerous as the "do that again and I'll spank" of an indulgent mother to her spoiled child.

Soviet presence on the island of Cuba cannot be tolerated. Everybody in the free world agrees to this. This presence cannot effectively and completely be removed by mere negotiation. Recent history attests to that.

An editorial in this week's issue of Life magazine outlines some excellent steps that could be taken to rid ourselves of Castro's so-called defensive Russian army.

While the Life editorial's specific recommendations may not be in every instance as carefully conceived or outlined as those of a military strategist, still the principle upon which they are based is absolutely correct. The editorial rightly contends that "It is time for deeds as well as negotiations * * *."

BRAZILIAN LOAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, again we have been had. The Brazilian Government has announced plans for hemisphere Communists to hold a conference in Sao Paulo starting today.

On March 18, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I called to the attention of Congress the fact that Brazil was going to host the second Communist-inspired continental congress of solidarity with Cuba. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

This is obviously giving aid and comfort to the enemy of democracy, and literally thumbs the Brazilian nose at the United States.

Furthermore, in a speech on the floor of the House on March 21, I called attention to the fact that three members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, two others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secreary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger. Regardless, the State Department will loan Brazil the money she requested.

While we heard anguished cries from the Brazilian Government when the State Department announced Communist infiltration of Brazil, it has yet to refute these charges.

As far as I am concerned, Brazil should not get a plugged nickel from the United States.

YUGOSLAV MILITARY ATTENDING ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our citizens know that a uniformed military officer from Communist Yugoslavia attends the regular Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I wonder if they know that no less than four general officers of the Yugoslav Army are graduates of our top staff college. I wonder if they know that clearance for this must come from the White House. I wonder if they know that this has been happening for some years.

Mr. Speaker, what goes on here? Even the most uninformed among our citizenry knows that such military men have sworn allegiance to a Communist flag; that everything they learn at our General Staff College goes right back to Communists; that Yugoslavia is in close military liaison with the Soviet general staff.

Whether or not attendance at classified classes is barred to these men, the vast military knowledge they gain in a full course at Fort Leavenworth is undeniable. It is the sheerest lunacy to condone educating Communists about the operations of our general staff on the theory that it encourages splinter groups within the Soviet periphery.

I believe that we should investigate so that we can know just who cleared this assignment in this administration as well as under whose individual direction and initiative this sorry practice was initiated years ago. It is not the Army's

fault. Orders for such inanity come from on high, not from the Army, of that we can be certain.

This is further glaring evidence that the present administration does not understand that all genuine Communists are deadly serious in their fanatical desire to destroy the United States. This is so whether they are Russian Communists or Chinese Communists or Yugoslav Communists. One does not appease a rattlesnake by inviting him into his house.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest, over the weekend, the Clay report on foreign aid and think that there is much of value in it. Many of the things that it points out are matters which some of us in the Congress who have been studying the aid program have been saying for years.

Perhaps, the thing that catches the attention first is the suggestion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut from the annual programs without damaging them. In fact, the inference is clear that the programs would be better for having reduced amounts of money to spend.

But, there are other, less obvious, but equally important proposals. One of those relates to the selection of the countries which receive our aid. From the report, I gain the very strong impression that the committee feels that we should be much more selective in the matter of our aid and should concentrate our efforts in those countries with which we have a community of interest and which will not treat our assistance as a mere basis for bargaining with the Communists to get aid from them also.

Reference is made to the participation of the private sector of our economy and here again is a matter upon which most of us in the Congress acted a year ago over the strong protests of the Agency for International Development and the State Department. Now, the committee finds that this action has been helpful. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, one feels anew that before we act upon the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills this year most careful scrutiny should be given to the whole program to the end that, as a minimum, very substantial dollar reductions be made and that the recipients of our assistance be more carefully chosen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stated dedication of higher echelon personnel in the Peace Corps, I offer the following news article without comment:

TOP PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL TO TAKE 2-WEEK RETREAT

Some 160 executives of the Peace Corps will spend 2 weeks at the Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, reports Deputy Director William Moyers.

"The idea is to spend 2 weeks in a close and familiar setting with the volunteers and also to balk desk flabbiness," explains Moyers.

While on the Caribbean island they will collect their regular salaries ($11,000 a year and up) and have their expenses paid.

WHY THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE 15-ACRE FARMER, MR. FREEMAN?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I expressed my fears to this House that Freeman and company would attempt to use a double set of standards for our Nation's farmers in the forthcoming wheat referendum in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers. My fears were not unfounded as the Department of Agriculture has now filed its "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the Federal Register to amend existing regulations relative to voting in the 1964 wheat referendum. The Department is proposing that the regulations be changed to read as follows:

(4) WHEAT

Any producer who has a farm acreage allotment shall be eligible to vote in any wheat referendum held pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1336, as amended: *Provided*, That a producer on a farm with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres shall be eligible to vote only if the operator on such farm files with the county committee, not later than 7 days prior to the date of the referendum, an election in writing to be subject to the wheat marketing quota for the farm.

Should this regulation be put into effect by Mr. Freeman it would mean that our Nation's 15-acre wheat producers would have to agree in writing at least 7 days before they voted that they would comply with the administration's program—should it be approved in the referendum. If they did not so signify their intent to comply with these new Freeman rules, they would be ineligible to vote. Large wheat farmers would be eligible to vote on election day automatically without previously signifying their intentions to do so.

Is it consistent for the administration to protest the inability of some citizens to vote in general elections due to unnecessary and discriminatory voting regulations and then to arbitrarily place such regulations in the paths of the Nation's small wheat farmers to keep them from voting in a referendum?

Why double standards for our American wheat producers, Mr. Freeman? Is it necessary to make first- and second-class citizens out of our wheat farmers in order to make your supply-management theory work? If so, this is another good reason why your supply-management approach for agriculture should not be adopted.

What is the real reason for this preelection signup for our 15-acre wheat farmers, Mr. Freeman? You cannot argue that you need this information in order to ascertain who these 15-acre farmers are as your county committees already have this information. It cannot be argued that a farmer could not just as easily and as quickly signify his intent at the time he came in to vote. It could, however, be argued that since your program will be extremely detrimental to our small wheat producers and as a consequence they will probably not look upon it with favor, that the powers that be do not want them to vote and this accounts for these additional and burdensome regulations being placed upon them. It also could be argued that a 7-day open season on our 15-acre farmers who do sign up will be needed in order to launch an all-out, concentrated attack upon them in the hope of convincing them to vote right. If this is the case, someone has misjudged these farmers as they do not succumb to badgering and cajoling.

Whatever the reason for this proposed regulation, it is not sufficient to warrant such rank discrimination among the wheat producers of America. I therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, in fairness to these small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

THE NEW FRONTIER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the President's speech made at Chicago on Saturday, I am wondering when he is going to stop his changing moods and let the American people know when and where he expects to find the New Frontier. On Saturday he said that perhaps if we do not have a tax reduction we may not have a recession, but here he changed his mood. He went on to say:

But, if we do not have tax reduction our unemployment may go from 6 to 7 percent.

In the campaign in 1960 President Kennedy promised he was going to end

unemployment, but I say seriously that in his changing moods and changing course of action, he might at least let everybody know what the New Frontier is and whether he ever expects to find it. His changing mood is giving the American people and business the jitters. Perhaps if he stopped changing his position so frequently, business could settle down, expand, and be in a position to put more people to work and end the rise in unemployment.

CAN WE CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN YOUR DISTRICT?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much talk about the need for reducing Federal expenditures for years, but getting very little action.

Although the talk still continues, the fact remains that in fiscal 1963, out of a total Federal budget of $94 billion, the following appropriations were passed unanimously: About $50 billion for national defense, $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, and $3½ billion for space exploration. These items, together with interest on the national debt which is a fixed charge, account for approximately 75 cents out of every tax dollar.

Because of the unanimity with which these appropriations were endorsed by my colleagues, those who are calling for decreased spending evidently want cuts to be made in the appropriations which consume the remaining 25 cents out of every tax dollar.

Since each Congressman knows his own district the best, I would appreciate hearing from each of my colleagues about his suggestions for cutting down on Federal spending in his own district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to total the suggested amounts and pass the information along to my chairman.

If a flood control or land reclamation project which is scheduled for construction in a Representative's district is considered unnecessary by him, I would appreciate hearing from him about it. Likewise, those of my colleagues who object to their districts receiving area redevelopment funds or moneys for their local schools under the aid to federally impacted areas legislation should not hesitate to let me know about it.

Those of my colleagues from farm areas should feel free to tell me how much less they want spent in their own districts for price supports, and those who represent urban districts should similarly advise how much less they wish their districts to receive for urban renewal.

Does any Congressman wish to file objection to the spending of money in his district under the Federal road program? If so, just let me know. For that matter, I should also like to hear from anyone who dissents from the expenditure of Federal funds in his area for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

Naturally, I should also welcome any information from anyone who would like a large defense contract terminated in his district.

When I total all the response, I shall announce the result. I doubt that I shall require an adding machine.

WASTING MONEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, I have been advised that a number of bills will be considered tomorrow. This has reminded me of a wasteful practice that has gone on for years and which is proposed to be perpetuated in another way. I am referring to the printing of calendars which are distributed to the Members. Now that is a small item and I will probably be branded as a nitpicker. But we are spending $27,473 a year to print calendars to be distributed to the Members, and each one of us gets 10 of these calendars and more if we request them. To me that is an utter waste of money and I intend to try to stop it. If there are others who concur in my views with respect to this, I would appreciate it if they would so inform the Subcommittee on Printing stating that they do not endorse this waste of money. With millions of calendars of every conceivable size and design being distributed by all types of businesses as well as individuals, I cannot believe that anyone is being denied a free calendar, and for that reason can see no reason why the Congress should approve this waste of money. This is just one of many small ways in which Members of Congress can effect small savings, which total a substantial sum. The greatest good that can come from this action of discontinuing this practice is that it would indicate Congress' desire to practice economy—and once we make the start, I believe it will result in greater and substantial savings.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HYPOCRISY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the partisan statements of Republican leaders in reference to the President's tax reduction and budget proposals border on political hypocrisy.

They have apparently forgotten, in their zeal to discredit the Democratic program, that the largest peacetime deficit in history occurred during a Republican administration in 1959 and totaled $12.427 billion.

They have apparently forgotten that the cumulative deficit during the Eisenhower Republican administration was $21.953 billion.

They criticize the President's efforts to stimulate the economy with a tax reduction at a time when a deficit will occur.

I would call their attention to the year 1954—during the Republican administration—when there were tax reductions totaling an estimated $7.4 billion. This came at a time when it was obvious there would be a deficit, and there was a deficit.

The tax reduction included removal of excess profits tax, reductions in individual income taxes, reduction in excise taxes, and revisions of the Federal Revenue Code.

The Republican leadership now takes the position that tax reduction in the face of a deficit is an unpardonable financial sin.

But in 1954, when the economy was lagging, the Republicans turned to tax reduction and the economy showed a substantial upswing. With the healthier economy, the Republicans were able to achieve surpluses.

The Republican leadership questions an increase in the national debt ceiling. Yet during the Republican administration the debt ceiling was increased for fiscal 1955, for 1958, for 1959, and 1960.

So it is apparent that the criticism of the Republican leadership stems from sheer partisan politics. When a Republican President called for tax reduction, an increase in the debt ceiling, and a deficit budget, this was acceptable, even praised.

But when the Democratic administration in office attempts to stimulate a lagging economy and increase Federal revenues looking toward ultimate balancing of the budget, then—in the Republican view—an outrageous financial crime is being committed.

The facts are that we are falling $30 to $40 billion short of our potential in national output, $18 to $20 billion short in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. We have an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and persistent, large budget deficits.

Failure to act now to stimulate the economy is inviting another recession. Our high tax rates are repressive. A tax reduction is needed urgently.

Certainly our expenditures should be carefully studied. They have been carefully studied. Some reductions are being made. But to achieve the sort of budget reduction the Republicans advocate would seriously hamper our defense efforts—because that is where the bulk of the budgetary increases have been.

The best way to balance the budget is to balance the economy. The increased economic activity from a tax rate will produce more revenues which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

The Republican leadership would do well to lend its support to a sensible economic program of this kind, rather than devoting its time to irresponsible sniping for political purposes.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to correct what I believe to be a serious inadequacy in this legislation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall include in his standards for designation of counties under this act, standards based on the migration out of the county.

The present law provides that this shall be one of the things considered in formulating the standards. But it is very necessary to make counties eligible on this basis alone if we are to stem the tide of migration to already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

The many communities which are losing population today because of a lack of jobs would like to be able to retain the young people who are leaving today. With just a little help, such as assistance through the Area Redevelopment Act, these communities could establish new industry and provide new jobs for these young people.

The figures on unemployment and income do not show these counties to be within the standards adopted by the Secretary of Commerce for designation under this law. However, the fact is that many of these counties which are rapidly losing population are in very serious trouble. What has happened is that, instead of hanging on, these people who have lost jobs have moved out of the county. Those who had businesses have shut them down and gone elsewhere, usually to work for someone else rather than open a new business.

The net effect has been that the unemployment rate and the income rate in the counties do not reflect the total situation. Those who are unemployed show up on the rolls of a big metropolitan city. They show up on the welfare rolls of these cities. The effect is the same on the national economic picture. The people are still unemployed. The county still is deteriorating from lack of industry and employment opportunity. And we are now doing nothing about it.

The expansion of this program, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the bill I have introduced today, will have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy of many rural areas across our land just because of the existence of this provision. The effect when the provision is implemented with proper funds and administrative action would be tremendous.

When people want to help themselves, I feel we should assist them in this effort. That is the purpose of this bill. I hope my colleagues will give it their prompt and serious consideration.

COMMUNIST INSPIRED CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF SOLIDARITY WITH CUBA MEETS IN RIO WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES MORE AID TO BRAZIL—TO BUILD TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Members of this House of Representatives had the privilege over the weekend of visiting Guantanamo Bay, the American military base in Cuba. I do not want to make that particular visit the principal subject of my remarks, but it does have a relationship to the subject which I do want to discuss rather briefly and that is the question of the proposed foreign aid to Brazil, particularly in view of the announcement which we see on the UPI ticker just today, to the effect—it has been known before of course, but the number of countries attending has not been known—the fact that the Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity With Cuba meets in Rio de Janeiro the 28th of this month, Thursday of this week, and who is going to be in attendance—78 countries have decided to attend at this meeting which is commonly known as a meeting for the purpose of ultra liberals and some Communists to carve out a solidarity with Cuba—that means Communist Cuba program. Included in these 78 countries are Cuba itself, Russia and Red China, and a number of other countries are to be involved including many in this hemisphere. Representatives from 78 countries are attending. Despite this and other evidence of the growth of communism in Brazil as even stated by the State Department itself in Brazilian Ambassador Gordon's testimony before the Selden subcommittee to the effect in Brazil the Government has been infiltrated with Communists, the student movement has been infiltrated with Communists as well as the labor union movement.

Of course, there was an effort by the State Department to claim that this testimony which appears in the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs was taken out of the context and did not really mean what it says. Anybody who reads it will note that it is very clearly stated that there has been Communist infiltration in the Government, in union movements, and in student groups—on page 247 of the hearings I quote "The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government staff there has been infiltration. The student movement in another major area of penetration with the National Student Union now being dominated by Communists."

What does all this amount to? And I am going to take a few minutes to review the extent of Communist infiltration and buildup in Brazil. As a matter of fact, the fearless reporter who had the intestinal fortitude to state the facts of what is going on in Brazil was just recently declared to be persona non grata by the Government because he had the intestinal fortitude to put in the record for all to read the story of the Communist buildup in Brazil. I am sure most of you have read that article by Mr. Stein with regard to the amazing Communist buildup in Brazil which is, I believe, self-explanatory. I include the article at the close of my remarks.

Here is what happened, for instance, in Costa Rica during the visit of the President on March 20 with regard to our policy in giving foreign aid to these Latin American countries who still recognize and do business with Castro's Cuba and who do not do all they can to oppose Communist subversion within their countries, but, as a mater of fact, in some instances are even encouraging it.

Here is what one Costa Rican student stated at the time of this visit at the University of Costa Rica:

> It is foolish for you Americans to give money to corrupt, oligarchy-controlled Latin American governments without supervising the expenditure of every dollar. You're throwing money down the drain, and in the end you'll lose both the money and the country. And you shouldn't make an exception of our own Government, however advanced it might be.

These were students in a university in a country with a long history of democracy and social progress, conditions lacking in most Latin American countries. This was the advice of students given to reporters at the time of the President's visit at the Costa Rican Conference on March 20, 1963. Good advice, I believe, but advice which we are not heeding these days.

Who is going to be in attendance at this conference in Rio, in a country to whose Government we are proposing to give $55 million of a $1½ billion program for the purpose of building up the economy of Brazil so she can continue to trade with Soviet Russia? I understand, although it has not been officially announced at the movement, by the wire services, that the President is expected to make a pronouncement concerning it sometime today that this $55 million to Brazil has been agreed to as the first installment despite the fact the Government of Brazil refuses to condemn this conference, as a matter of fact is going to let it go on in Rio de Janeiro, is weakening in its opposition to communism, is doing business with Russia, and continues to recognize Castro.

Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this conference? I think this indicates the extent of the infiltration of communism in the country. Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this Red continental congress?

There is going to be Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party. Another is General Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; and Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants' Leagues.

Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers,

and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal Chamber.

Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command. Mario Shemberg, a well known Sao Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

Where did this list come from? This list came from a list of those expected to be in attendance, taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. It was taken from his luggage by Carlos Lacerda of the city where the convention is going to be held; namely, Rio de Janeiro. His public security officers were the ones who got possession of these documents. No one has denied them. There is not any question but what in all probability these persons named are not only going to attend but it also gives best evidence of their background and their inclination.

Many of them are very substantial people in the Goulart government. How could these people maintain these positions under the Brazilian Government setup if the President did not agree to their receiving these positions, because the appointive power in Brazil is with the Executive, not even subject to confirmation by the legislative branch.

So these people are in the government at least by sufferance of the President himself.

I am not going to read in detail, but I have in my possession a document that reviews the history of the buildup of the Communist Party and of Communist subversive activities in Brazil, starting back in April of 1960, when Francisco Juliao, whose name I just mentioned, and Santos Morais, accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate on his visit to Cuba in April 1960.

During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was to not support the leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government.

The reason I am spreading this information on the RECORD is I believe our Government should seriously reconsider any approval of a loan to Brazil until Brazil shows its ability to clean out the Communists that are known to have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, and insist that Brazil withdraw recognition of Castro's Communist government and stop doing business with him and to side with the forces of freedom—having opposed the United States at Punte del Este and during the quarantine refusing to join it.

I made a similar request that related to Mexico the other day. Until Mexico stops permitting the inflow of persons for subversive purposes—including U.S. citizens—through the open door of subversion out of Mexico City and the Cuban Embassy, we should not give it any aid. Even the CIA Director himself admitted there were individuals going to Cuba for training purposes in 1962, at which time I brought out the fact that there were some 73 Americans as well going down there in violation of the U.S. laws—and unprosecuted.

After a strong protest, that aid should be withdrawn from Mexico until this open door is closed.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend him for the statement he has just made. For the life of me I cannot understand how this Government can seriously consider giving one thin dime to Brazil under the circumstances that exist. The Finance Minister of Brazil and the Ambassador of that Government in Washington told our subcommittee that Brazil would not hold the Continental Congress for Cuban Solidarity or whatever the specific title of that meeting, the Communist meeting in support of Cuba. But now the meeting is to be held, apparently, with the sanction of the Government of Brazil, and President Kennedy and this administration ought not to give Brazil one single dime as long as this meeting is in the works.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, he is an authority on this subject, being a member of the Selden subcommittee, at least to that extent, and I am glad that he placed on the RECORD the fact that assurances were made to that committee. This is something I did not have knowledge of myself, that Brazil did make assurances that this congress would not be held, which obviously seems to me to be a condition precedent in Alliance for Progress funds being seriously negotiated at this time. And, I will say to the gentleman further that I called the State Department, Mr. Moscoso's office, and I inquired in regard to the Alliance for Progress funds and I tried to get some information even in regard to what requests had been made, and that was denied me. As to the conditions that were being considered, they would not even discuss that. I said, "Are you going to attempt to gain assurances that if they get this money, they are going to fight communism instead of permitting it to grow in that country, as part of the policy of the United States, and what should be the basic policy of our Alliance for Progress funds" and I was denied any information of any kind at that time and have received none subsequently.

So far as the buildup is concerned, I could quote, for instance, from the Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday, March 17. And that happened to be the very weekend that I was asking for this information, the very weekend that the State Department was trying to expunge from the official records of the Selden committee the testimony of its own Ambassador to Brazil to the effect that there was infiltration in the Government, in the unions, in the student movement. Here is what the Worker said on that very Sunday, March 17, when the papers reported the fact that the State Department did not mean what it said. This is a report by Art Shields:

Brazil Communist Party's strength doubles in 2 years, says Carlos Prestes.

The very man I was just referring to who is going to this Rio conference:

Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture.

Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general-secretary.

They say in the last 2 years that the Peasant Union has expanded from 50,000 2 years ago to 600,000 today.

Further quoting from the article:

The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.

I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

Further quoting from the article:

Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.

The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.

"The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes, who used to be an army colonel himself.

Further quoting from the article:

The big job internationally is to win socialism with the least sacrifices. "But socialism" he said, "cannot be prevented." He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

This was the very day the State Department was trying to expunge from the records of the Congress its own testimony with respect to the Communist buildup in Brazil.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman made a request of the State Department to give the gentleman information as to the amount of money we have spent in Brazil in this Alliance for Progress program?

Mr. CRAMER. No; that information is readily available to everyone, including the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from Florida is well aware of it. What I asked for was how much they are now negotiating for; how much have they requested? The news

reports vary as to the amount of money involved.

I was told that I could not get this information—that I was not entitled to it—and they would not discuss what the Brazilian Finance Minister asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, how long ago was that request denied to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMER. That was on Saturday, March 16, 1963, the very day before this Worker article came out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I ask this is the fact that I have a constituent who is interested in the amount of money being proposed that we spend in Brazil. He asked me that question in a letter.

Has the gentleman from Florida any information or is the gentleman going to place in the RECORD the amount of money that has been spent heretofore in Brazil?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado if the gentleman will look at my remarks of March 18, 1963, page 4428, the gentleman will see that information, indicating that some $450 million to date is to be repaid by Brazil, and they are asking for forgiveness on that. He is asking, according to the press, for release of $84 million to the $553 million U.S. aid which was given to Brazil since 1951. And according to today's report, $55 million more is requested as the first of three yearly amounts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman discussed with them the question of the request that had been made, did they give the gentleman any substantial reasons why they would not give the gentleman the information?

Mr. CRAMER. They said negotiations were underway and that they had no information to give, even though my request related to the request of the Brazilian Government at the outset of the negotiations which, at least speculatively, was printed in the press time and time again. But a Member of Congress is not entitled to have this information. Mr. Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress administration, would not advise me as to present demands or negotiations which were made even at the outset, and this I cannot understand.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. However, permit me to say before I yield to the gentleman that my interest is obviously not only a personal one but I believe the people of this country are entitled to know that information under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the asking price of the Brazilians is the round figure of $500 million—one-half billion dollars. That is what they want.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from testimony which is available that the asking price now by Brazil is that they want one-half billion dollars for next year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to take my word for that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh; surely.

Mr. GROSS. The asking price, the Brazilian asking price, is in round figures $500 million. This is on top of, as I understand it, somewhere near $1.5 billion already made available to Brazil in various financing deals. And from the $500 million there would be a refinancing, as I understand it, of payments to Soviet-bloc countries of certain short-term credits that are due or very shortly coming due. In other words, they would like to obtain money from U.S. taxpayers to refinance their obligations to the Soviet-bloc countries, among other things.

This is a rather complicated thing, but it boils down to the asking from this country in various ways of refinancing, new money, and so on and so forth, approximately one-half billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. To substantiate what the gentleman from Iowa says on trade with Russia as part of the Brazilian deal it was reported from Rio de Janeiro in the press that just before Dantas, the Finance Secretary, came to this country to negotiate as follows:

> Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance.

The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may be increased to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman, with reference to his treatment by the State Department, that Mr. Martin, who is Chief of the Latin American Desk in the State Department is the same Mr. Martin who not too long ago stated in hearings before our own subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that he had proceeded to carry out one program, having to do with Brazil, by the way, without any regard to the wishes of the Congress or even, for that matter, taking the trouble to bring the matter to the attention of his superiors as under the law he was supposed to do.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I believe that the American people are entitled to this information. That is why I requested it, as well as because of my concern over the statement of the Department of State itself to the effect that Communist infiltration in Brazil had reached what I would call serious proportions and still existed, which is found in the record of the hearings of the Selden Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about training schools for subversives in Cuba, by Castro and the Communists. This report which I am placing in the RECORD gives an example in very specific detail of how these schools are carried on, how the students are brought in, and even names some of the students. They follow up their activities in Brazil, after their training.

For instance, from July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

This was way back in 1961. The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were, for instance:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the state of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aide of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "SUDENE," a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado.

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvelho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions included daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The "students" were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand, and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of "Molotov cocktails" and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

> Some theoretical classrooms were operating in Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz [Saiz Brothers People Farm] under the direction of Major Franco, where the "students" attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held

the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the "students." These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jimenez, and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreira, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

It goes on to describe the balance of the course and how they were hidden in the hotel and were taken out on a 1-day basis for the trip, so it would not appear they were other than tourists:

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961, arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines, and Paraguayans was overfilled, because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching São Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free, together with the propaganda, on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants' Leagues in Brazil—

And that is what has been happening—

transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban Revolution. In the meanwhile Juliao would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants.

They set up a general headquarters in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel. I will put those names in the RECORD.

They went on with the initiation of the establishment of Peasants' Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. The name of the head of this movement to maintain contact with the Cuban movement and the description of these activities likewise will be in the RECORD.

Quoting again:

Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed, in Goiss, Maranhao, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahis, Rio, and Rio Grande de Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianopolis Farm in the State of Goias, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

It goes further through the buildup of the Peasant League movement, how they operate, the training they receive, the contact they have not only with the Cuban Embassy but the Embassies from Russia and Red China and Communists from throughout the world as well.

I think you will find this heretofore unpublished documentation in detail of the buildup in the Peasants' League, a Communist organization in Brazil not only interesting reading but essential information in connection with this consideration of a loan to Brazil at this time. This entire history of the League from which I have taken excerpts appear at the end of my remarks. This comes from a source I consider beyond question—and related to known incidents reported to the press and from other sources.

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PEASANTS' LEAGUES IN BRAZIL—PROOF OF SUBVERSION IN BRAZIL

Deputies Francisco Juliao and Clodomir de los Santos Morais accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate, Janio Quadros on his visit to Cuba in April 1960. During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was not to support the Leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these Leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese Government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government. This financial aid would not be extended under the heading of support to the rural organizations led by Juliao in Pernambuco, but would be for the purpose of creating and developing the guerrilla groups in Brazil which would be capable of spearheading a violent revolutionary movement with the objective of overthrowing the Government of Brazil.

Juliao returned to Brazil at the end of December 1960, and immediately left for Cuba in order to attend the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. When he returned later to Brazil, he selected Clodomir Morais to head the revolutionary groups of Peasants' Leagues, while he acted as the figurehead of an organization ostensibly dedicated to the peaceful promotion of interests of the Brazilian farmers. In his speeches and statements to the press in the beginning of 1961, Juliao said that he hoped that the P.S.B. Socialist Brazilian Party and the P.T.B. Brazilian Workers' Party, presided by João Goulart and the Communist Party would be able to unite in their efforts to bring about agrarian reform through peaceful means. When he was reminded of the belligerent nature of communism, Juliao answered the reporter by stating that "communism is different in Brazil."

While Clodomir Morais was engaged in the work of the basic organization of establishing the mechanism of guerrilla warfare, Juliao alternated his tasks between making speeches in favor of the Leagues and traveling between Brazil and Cuba. In 1961 Juliao made three trips to Cuba. In June and July of that year, Morais selected 11 members of the Peasants' Leagues to accompany him to Cuba, where they were taken for a specialized course in guerrilla warfare.

This group of 13 Brazilians left Recife on July 21, 1961. They traveled together with a group of Argentines and Paraguayans in a Britannia plane chartered specially by the "Compañía Cubana de Aviación." The plane made a stop at Rio de Janeiro to take on other passengers, also making another stop at Port of Spain, for refueling before landing on July 22, at the José Martí airport in Havana.

The group were welcomed and shown around by representatives of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with Nations (ICAP) an organization which ostensibly promoted the trip. The group pretended to be members of the Brazilian delegation to attend the 26th of July celebrations.

They were lodged in the hotel Riviera in Havana. During the first few days they took an active part in all the various festivities commemorating the 26th of July anniversary. On the afternoon of July 24, a reception was held in honor of the Soviet's cosmonaut, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who was visiting Cuba, followed by a public dance, that night. On July 25, a sports parade was held; the following day, the 26th, a huge public demonstration was held and on the 27th, the visitors were taken on a tour of Cuban beaches in Havana. On the night of July 28, together with representatives from other Latin American countries, the Brazilian left the hotel and riding in official Cadillac cars they were taken to the instruction camps for guerrilla warfare, where they were divided into nationality groups and lodged in different instruction centers.

From July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues, there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were the following:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the State of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aid of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "Sudene" (a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado).

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonille, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date, as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions include daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The students were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Same theoretical classrooms were operating in (Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz)

(Saiz Brothers People Farm) under the direction of Major Franco, where the students attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the students. These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jiménez and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreire, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

When the other students asked why this special treatment for the Panamanians, they were informed that the group from Panama were being prepared to act as saboteurs in the Panama Canal Zone.

In order to maintain their appearances as tourists, the students returned to the point of their departure, the Havana Riviera Hotel. While there, they told everyone who asked that they had been visiting the interior of the island on a tourist jaunt. The students in the hotel made contact with delegations of Czechs, Russians, and Red Chinese, who were introduced to them as "technicians." The guerrilla students had little contact with these visitors from the Iron Curtain because they remained aloof and unfriendly, limiting their encounters to more social amenities.

On completing the course, the Brazilian students were told that they had passed the course with exceptional qualifications and as a premium for this achievement they would be given the honor of an informal meeting with Fidel Castro in the Cienega de Zapats, where they were taken in Fidel's personal helicopter. Castro congratulated them on the splendid results they obtained from the course, relating some of his own experiences as a guerrilla fighter and entered into the discussion of the political scene in Latin America. He exhorted them not to be deceived by apparent measures of agrarian reform, such as those proposed by Janio Quadros, of Brazil, but to continue fighting for revolutionary and radical reforms.

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961 arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines and Paraguayans, was over-filled because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return, remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching Sao Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free together with the propaganda on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants Leagues, transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban revolution. In the meanwhile, Julião would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants. In this interim, the major part of Cuban money poured in for the organization of guerrilla fighters. Julião and Morsis decided to adopt the following measures to give shape to the leagues:

1. To enlarge the general headquarters of the leagues in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel:

Francisco Julião: Honorary president.

Maria Ceares Barreto Novais: Secretary (also consulting attorney in the Economic Department of SUDENE).

Jonas Alburquerque Sosa.

José Severino Cunha.

Dzacy Megalhaes Florencio: Treasurer (Recife attorney and member of the state committee of the Communist Party of Pernambuco).

Emmanuel Egberto de Araujo.

Rivadavis Braz de Oliveira: One of the group trained in the guerrilla warfare course in Managua, Cuba.

Luis Serafín los Santos.

2. Initiation of the establishment of Peasants Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. In various regions, Julião procured and obtained the support of ex-student leaders. In 1961, the leader of the Deliberative Council of the Peasant Leagues, was Tarzan de Castro, 25 years of age, who had formerly presided over the Brazilian Union of High School Students (U.B.E.S.). Jarbes Miranda de Santana, ex-president of the U.B.E.S. was made head of the Deliberative Council of the Leagues in 1961.

3. Formation of a movement to serve as the convert sector through which recruits for guerrilla training was conducted. This organization was known as Movimiento Revolucionario Triadentes (MRT) (Triadentes Revolutionary Movement). The two principal recruiting officers of the MRT were Clodomir Morais and Joaquín Ferrairs Filho. Both had attended the guerrilla course in Managua, Cuba. Later the MRT was transferred to the offices of La Liga, the official newspaper of the Peasants Leagues, directed by Julião, and managing director, Antonio Avertano. La Liga leases the buildings 1001 and 1002, situated at No. 15 Alcino Guanabera Street.

4. Julião established an agency in Rio de Janeiro in order to maintain contact with the Cuban Embassy. Regina Coelho de Alburquerque and Nives Borges do Brazil, were in charge of the agency. Regina Coelho's apartment in Avenida Rainhe Elizabeth No. 587, became a frequent meeting place for the leagues as well as a nightly stopover for members of the league who were traveling. Regina Coelho was the recipient of all correspondence and verbal messages of representatives arriving in Rio de Janeiro. She immediately contacted Nives Borges do Brazil passing on all information received; on the other hand Nives Borges contacted a member of the Cuban Embassy, usually the Third Secretary, Ana Sermiento, who was informed of the matter in question.

In December 1961, Nives Borges do Brazil left for Cuba in order to receive special instruction in clandestine activities, in preparation for becoming the intermediary between the leagues and the Cuban Embassy. Notwithstanding the extreme caution exercised by the personnel of the Cuban Embassy to separate Regina and use Nives as intermediary, at times Regina was invited to participate in receptions and other social functions given by Embassy personnel. Besides representatives of other Embassies of the Communist bloc, such as Ludwick Nekar of the Czech Embassy, were occasional visitors to Regina's apartment, generally for the purpose of meeting Julião and Morais. These two, during a certain period, frequently spent the night in Regina's apartment; later, fearing that their activities might be under scrutiny, Julião changed his temporary residence in Rio for the home of Osny Duarte Ferreirs, Magistrate of the Court of Appeals.

5. Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962, six separate locations existed in Coiss, Moranhöa, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahia, Rio, and Rio Grande do Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Disnapolis Farm in the State of Goiss, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

Later, this farm was turned over to Carlos Montalrroyo. The Farm of Naranhäo was directed by Carvalho through his assistant Cleto da Conta Campolo Neto. The farm in Parana was directed by Diniz Cabrel Filho, another longtime member of the U.B.E.S. who joined the leagues. The farm at Rio Grande do Sul was under the supervision of Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, Secretary of the State Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party of Rio Grande do Sul.

6. Morais continued in his purpose to recruit candidates for guerrilla instructors selecting from them a group which was to be sent to Cuba for intensified training. In a general way, the procedure covering the trip to this group was similar to that of the first group of the Peasant Leagues trained in Managua, Cuba. The candidate traveled to Cuba as a delegate from Brazil to one of the many Cuban anniversaries. Frequently he stayed at one of the best hotels in Havana, visited the city for several days as a tourist, and then began his training in Havana itself or in nearby surroundings. After approximately 1 or 2 months training, the candidate returned and began to put into practice in one of the farms belonging to the leagues, the new technique just learned.

Morais and Ferreira attempted to evaluate each candidate before final acceptance and providing training. Before being invited to join the leagues, the candidate was usually subjected to a test on several questions to be answered, such as:

Do you believe in a social revolution for Brazil?

Would you swear to dedicate yourself, even at the expense of your own life, to the success of your objective?

Have you any other interests which would interfere with the bringing about reforms for your country?

Do you consider it advantageous in the event of having to take part in guerrilla warfare in order to introduce these reforms in Brazil?

On November 8, 1961, Josquín Hernándes Armas, new Cuban Ambassador in Brazil, presented his credentials to President Goulart. Already at this time, the Ambassador was aware that his government was giving support to the guerrilla groups of the leagues.

On December 8, 1961, when the major number of the farms were being opened, the translation by Mauricio Grabais, of Che Guevara's book, "The War of Guerrillas," was published. This book became the basic manual for all guerrilla activities undertaken in the farms belonging to the leagues.

On December 27, 1961, Alexina Line Crespo de Paula, the wife of Julião and her two children left Brazil for an extended trip to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Korea. Alexina acted as messenger for the leagues, which she had frequently done in Brazil. On this trip she spoke to Mao Tse-tung, giving him information on conditions existing in Brazil, all of this mission was confided to her by Morais. Alexina told Mao that the leagues counted on the support of many high ranking officers of the army; that the leagues were in possession of arms, munitions and money necessary to explode a violent revolution. When Alexina returned from China and related what she had told Mao to various members of the leagues, her statements caused a great feeling of animosity against Morais among

leaders of the leagues. In the opinion of these dissatisfied leaders, the optimism of Morais had cost them valuable financial support from Red China.

In January 1962, the Brazilian Army discovered that arms, manufactured in Czechoslovakia were being introduced into the country for distribution, possibly among the Peasant Leagues.

On the 22d of April, Julião issued a statement of his convictions in his "Declaration de Ouro Preto," in which he said that the Brazilians should aspire toward giving their lives for the creation of a new society, which he said would be "like the dawn."

On April 30, 1962, the Communists Jaos Amazonas de Sosa Pedroso and Mauricio Grabois arrived in Havana to participate ostensibly in the celebration of Labor Day, but this was only a pretext to cover their real objectives. They both attended the guerrilla course. In the middle of August 1962, two more Communists, Carlos Danielli and Angelo Arroyo arrived in Cuba to take the same course.

At the end of May 1962, Pedro Mota de Barros, another member of the leagues, who accompanied Morais to the Cuban training camp in Managua, left Brazil on a trip to establish links between Julião and other Communists revolutionaries throughout Latin America, Mota de Barros visited Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, where he met with revolutionaries who had trained with him in Cuba. In several interviews he asked them what type of support they could give to the leagues and what could the leagues give to them.

In the beginning of July 1962, the farm in Parana was closed after one of the men who had been trained in Cuba, was mortally wounded by local farmers. The victim was 19-year-old Antonio Thiago Filho. Upon learning of this assassination, Morais instructed the leaders of the farm to bury the young man and to close the farm, without giving the news of his death for publication.

In August 1962, the revolutionary plot of the Peasant Leagues began to appear. The first incident took place in Pernambuco when Joel Arruda Camara and Manuel Tertuliano, brother of Julião, and 12 other members of the leagues were arrested by the Brazilian Fourth Army. When arrested, they had in their possession documents revealing guerrilla operations plans prepared against rural properties located in nearly 30 municipal districts of Pernambuco. Julião reacted by stating that the imprisonment and the documents were part of a lie created by reactionaries against the leagues, and sent a telegram to President Goulart, protesting the Army's action.

The second public manifestation took place in August when Rivadavia Bras de Olivera, the same person who attended the training course in Managua, together with Atausipa Alves de Lima and José Bartolomeu de Souza, were served with a prison warrant in an office belonging to the leagues in Rio de Janeiro, situated on 496 Russel Street, apartment 803, which had been rented by Paulo Bezerra de Andrade, and employee of the newspaper A Lig, official organ of the Peasant Leagues. On that occasion a large quantity of Communist propaganda was found in the office.

The third manifestation of this revolutionary plot was the discovery of one of the farms of the leagues in Dianopolis, in the State of Goies on November 23, 1962. Guerrilla operation plans again were seized.

Temporary imprisonment was decreed against 26 members of the leagues by Judge Moreira Marquez. Among these were Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Amaro Luiz de Carvalho and Joaquin Ferriers Filho, all of whom had been trained in Managua, Cuba. Besides these, another training companion was included, Clovis José Estevez de Souze.

The fourth manifestation was the imprisonment of Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Celia Lima and José Francisco da Silva on December 13, 1962. Clodomir was arrested while transporting a shipment of arms to members of the leagues; he carried a visiting card of Antale Chardin, chief of the consular section of the Soviet Union Embassy on which Chadrin had written a note apologizing for failing to keep an appointment with Julião. Celia Lima, who had been traveling companion of Morais for some time, was more than just a companion. Morais had included her in his guerrilla activities, giving her the supervision of what she called School of Revolutionary Development, situated in a house in the northern zone of Rio de Janeiro, where courses ranging from ideological indoctrination to sabotage were held.

The fifth and most recent manifestation of the guerrilla activities is the contents of the documents found in the wreckage of the Varig plane which crashed near Lima, Peru, on November 27, 1962. The documents will explain many of the leagues' problems, in the development of their guerilla capacity as well as their overall program.

Beginning in 1962, many of the leagues' leaders commenced complaining about the activities of Morais, accusing him of dedicating more importance to his own interests than to those of the leagues; of not concerning himself with the welfare of the leagues' members, and what is even more important, of diverting funds given by the Cuban Government for promoting guerrilla activities, for his own personal use.

During the development of the Peasants Leagues, the Cuban Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, constantly directed their activities. The official of the Cuban Embassy, principally responsible for the operations of the leagues, was Miguel Brugueras del Valle, in reality a member of the Cuban Secret Service in Brazil, acting under the pretext of his post of cultural counselor of the Cuban Embassy. At times, Brugueras had two other assistants—"cultural attachés," Felix Pita and Arturo Garcia Rodriguez. They maintained constant contact with Morais and occasionally with Julião. Haroldo Hall, representative of "Prensa Latina" in Rio de Janeiro, also helped Brugueras in his contact with the leagues. Brugueras directed the Cuban subversive operations which involved Brazilian Communist organizations, through the mediation of such well-known Communists as Mullis Bandsire, Joëo Amazonas and Maurico Grabios. In July 1962 Brugueras accompanied a group of Brazilians on a trip to Cuba to attend the celebration of the 26th of July anniversary. On August 24, 1962, Brugueras accompanied the Cuban Ambassador, Josquin Hernándes Armas, to Goisnis, where the Ambassador addressed the law school. On this occasion, Brugueras met with Tarsan de Castro, head of the Deliberative Council of the Peasants Leagues of Goise. This meeting between Brugueras and Castro is referred to in one of the documents found in the wreckage of the plane which crashed in Lima. Brugueras and Tarsan maintained frequent meetings to discuss the actions of Morais, with which they were not in accord. Later, they continued their frequent meetings to discuss the disagreements occurring in the leagues during the last 6 months of 1962. Brugueras wrote two letters to his chief (Petronio) in the Cuban Government in 1962, explaining the then existing conditions in the leagues, signing them with his pseudonym, "Gerardo." Brugueras gave the two dispatches, with a copy of a letter in which he complained of the actions of Clodomiro Morais to the postal messenger, Raúl Capero Bonilla, who headed the Cuban delegation in the recent Congress of the FAO, held in the Copacabana Palace Hotel, shortly before the delegation departed on their ill-fated journey. These dispatches have been recovered, the material referred to showing subversion in Brazil has been summarized in the press. Brazil frantically tried to cover up the dispatch report and to keep it secret because it documents Communist activities in Brazil.

NOT EVEN THE REDS FORESAW THEIR RISE TO POWER

(By Louis R. Stein)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazilian Communists wield more power today than they would have dreamed of when President Joao Goulart took office a year and one-half ago.

The man most responsible for giving a leg up to the Communists is the President himself.

Sr. Goulart has named numerous Communists and fellow traveling nationalists to key administration jobs and facilitated election of Communist slates in labor unions formerly controlled by more conservative leaders.

Yet anyone in Brazil will tell you the President is not a Communist.

The 15-man Cabinet contains three notorious Marxists: Hermes Lima, Foreign Minister; Joa Mangabeira, Justice and Interior Minister, and Almino Afonso, Labor Minister. Two doubtfuls in the Cabinet are Celso Furtado, Minister for Planning who was a Communist in his youth, and Jose Ermirio de Moraes, millionaire industrialist who financed the election campaign of Miguel Arraes, Communist governor of the northeastern State of Pernambuco.

DECLARED

Raul Riff, Sr. Goulart's press secretary, is a self-declared Communist. Evandro Linse Silva, director of the presidential secretariat, is closely linked with the Communists.

The most important labor organization taken over by the Communists since Sr. Goulart's inauguration is the National Industrial Workers Confederation which unites most industrial unions in the country.

Sr. Goulart personally intervened in the last CNTI election on behalf of the Communist-backed slate led by Dante Pelecani.

Sr. Goulart named Francisco Mangabeira, an extreme leftwing nationalist son of the Justice Minister, to be president of Petrobras, the Government oil monopoly. Petrobras is the largest single firm in Brazil.

"Watermelons" (green outside, red inside), a term used here to describe fellow travelers, hold many lesser posts in the Government.

NO VETS

Congress has no control over composition of the Cabinet or choice of government agency directors. It can summon ministers to give an accounting but cannot veto nominations.

Sr. Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party has assisted election of Communists to Congress. Communist Party leader Luis Carlos Prestes says the current Congress contains 17 Communists. Most ran with PTB backing.

There were only 16 Communists in the Federal Legislature at the time the Party was outlawed in 1948. Sr. Prestes, then a senator, was among those who lost his mandate. The Party still is officially illegal but operates openly without interference.

It is feared in democratic circles here that Sr. Goulart is riding a tiger. Leftist forces around him could cause considerable trouble and possibly destroy his austerity program if they decided to actively oppose it.

Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas, now in the United States for money talks, has already run up against leftist criticism which, for the nonce, is being held in check by Sr. Goulart.

All efforts to bar Commmuists from the armed forces and Government jobs have been thwarted.

The latest attempt was a bill written by Social Democratic Party (PSD) Deputy Mendes de Morais. It was killed in committee.

NAMELESS

Sr. Prestes said this month that since the Cuban revolution Communists sympathizers have increased six-fold in Brazil.

The Prestes' estimate may be high, there is no denying that there are more Communist sympathizers in Brazil today than ever before.

And, if Sr. Prestes had spoken the whole truth he would have added that the bulk of the new strength yearns for revolt instead of a silent revolution through subversive infiltration.

The mellowed chief of the bloody 1935 revolution now professes to believe the Communists can eventually bring off a bloodless coup in Brazil.

Sr. Prestes wrote the 1958 party manifesto laying down a new nationalistic, anti-American policy to bring the party into line with Nikita Khrushchev's program of subversion as opposed to revolution.

The new line split the party and fostered the formation of several deviationist groups. The strongest of these is led by veterans Joao Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois.

Their weekly newspaper Classe Operaria gives extensive play to Chinese communism and ignores Russia except to criticize the Kremlin. So does the weekly Politica Operaria, published by the Frente Operaria, another splinter group.

The Chinese and Castroites are flooding the country with propaganda. Castro portraits unfailingly appear at student rallies and meetings of the revolutionary rural leagues, led by self-proclaimed Marxist Deputy Francisco Julião.

In his latest comment on the subject Sr. Julião said, "The only way out for the oppressed masses is armed struggle."

No one in Brazil could hope to mount a successful coup without control of the armed forces.

The Communists know this. Leftwing nationalist officers also appear to realize it.

Hence, both groups are courting the noncommissioned officers.

Sr. Julião flatly stated recently that "we expect to carry out our revolution with the help of the sergeants in the armed forces."

BRASS

The importance of the noncoms as an emerging new power within the armed forces was stressed recently by the presence of high brass sitting down front at a noncommissioned officers meeting.

On hand were: Admiral Pedro Araujo Suzano, navy minister; Brig. Reynaldo de Carvalho, air minister; Gen. Osvino Ferreira Alves, first army commander; Admiral Candido Aragao, marine corps commander.

The generals applauded political speeches by noncoms who criticized Congress and the courts. The military code actually prohibits any person in uniform from making political statements.

All the officers present were leftwing nationalist supporters of President Goulart. Fellow officers call Admiral Aragao a Communist while General Alves proclaimed at a public gathering that he and fellow traveling Labor Minister Afonso "have the same ideology."

Several sergeants were elected last October to state assemblies with nationalist and Communist backing and one was sent to the Federal House of Deputies.

Although the electoral laws require that they resign from the service before they may be seated they are fighting in the courts to retain their military status while serving as congressmen.

BRAZILIAN ENVOY GIVING EXPLANATION

Brazil's Ambassador Roberto Campos today said his hour-long talk with Under Secretary of State George W. Ball yesterday had "helped to clarify unwarranted misunderstandings" of a U.S. charge that Communists had infiltrated the government of President Joao Goulart.

But the Brazilian envoy sternly warned that "one should be extremely careful in making these accusations."

The controversy has cast a shadow over a visiting mission's efforts to get U.S. aid for Brazil's 3-year multimillion-dollar economic reconstruction program.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FROM COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I brought to the attention of the House the fact that our President has not taken the action which section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act clearly requires him to take. Section 231 requires that the President shall withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from Communist Yugoslavia and Poland and require that the products of these countries be dutiable at the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. Although this is a matter of principle more than anything else, I want the House to understand that it is not just a demand for action based on legality alone, but that the factual situation is such that serious injury is being caused to domestic industries because of the failure of the President to act in accordance with the explicit requirement of the statute.

There are two rolled zinc plants in Indiana. One is located in Greencastle and the other in Muncie. These plants manufacture zinc sheet and zinc strip. There is substantial production of zinc strip by these plants. Formerly there was substantial production of zinc sheet but imports now have ruined the zinc sheet business in this country. In 1962 more than half of the imports of zinc sheet were of Yugoslavian origin. These foreign zinc sheet imports had an average declared foreign value in 1962 of only 12.1 cents per pound—less than the price which my constituents must pay for the metal from which to manufacture zinc strip and zinc sheet. In 1952 imports of zinc sheet represented a quantity equivalent to only 1 percent of domestic industry production. For 1962 zinc sheet imports represented a quantity equivalent to 48 percent of domestic industry production. I am presenting zinc sheet import statistics and not zinc strip import statistics because the Bureau of the Census only collects data on zinc sheet imports. Zinc strip imports are in a category with a number of other products even though interestingly enough, zinc strip production is many times that of zinc sheet.

Employees in rolled zinc plants in my State, I am pleased to say, are well paid. Their wages are more than eight times the wages paid in metal industries in Communist Yugoslavia. With a situation such as this, combined with the fact that the raw material in the United States costs more than the declared Yugoslav value of the finished manufactured product, it is no wonder that domestic zinc sheet manufacturers virtually have been put out of business and that domestic zinc strip manufacturers probably will suffer the same fate if the President does not act at once to require Communist Yugoslav products to be assessed the same full-duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Under the circumstances, I ask you, why does not the President act? Even if the law were discretionary and he only had authority to act to assist an American industry confronted with ruinous import competition from Communist Yugoslavia, you would think he would act. But this is not a discretionary matter. The law clearly requires that the President shall take this action. He has not acted, and he has given no indication of when he is going to act. This is one of the greatest affronts Congress has ever received from a President. A law is passed which the President signs, and then he does not act as the law specifically provides that he shall act.

New, let us be completely fair about the matter and see if there is any basis for the President failing to act. In 1951 in the Trade Agreements Extension Act the same language was used to require the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from countries which are members of the world Communist movement. This involved 13 countries and yet President Truman was able to complete action and issue the necessary directives within 2 months—August 3, 1951, Proclamation No. 2935, 16 Federal Register 7635, and 16 Federal Register 7637. You see, most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland at that time because it was determined that these countries, while Communist countries, were not members of the world Communist movement but instead, so-called independent Communist countries—an interesting refinement and distinction.

Because of this distinction and the fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland under the 1951 act, it was necessary to include an additional provision in the 1962 act which directed that most-favored-nation treatment be withdrawn from any Communist country irrespective of whether or not the country is a member of the world Communist movement.

Five months have now elapsed since the effective date of the law. Only two countries are involved and yet the President has not acted. President Truman

was able to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from 13 countries within a 2-month period, but President Kennedy has been unable to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from only 2 Communist countries in 5 months.

Are we Members of Congress going to do nothing while the President disregards the explicit requirement of the law and American industries are being ruined by import competition from Communist countries?

Zinc strip produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1959	32,364	32,221	10,773,634	1,052	242	459,716	$2.37	$0.48	$2.85	14.55	$505,347
1960	30,843	30,433	10,823,882	637	228	392,573	2.44	.49	2.93	14.63	(73,197)
1961	31,902	31,890	11,028,920	761	236	407,691	2.47	.51	2.98	13.70	(98,273)
1962	33,924	34,056	11,635,416	1,016	220	405,171	2.56	.54	3.10	13.67	116,920

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheet produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1952	6,930	6,864	4,281,164	299	349	635,493	$1.71	$0.18	$1.89	21.98	$52,571
1953	6,881	6,700	4,098,844	449	334	655,710	1.81	.24	2.05	28.85	205,229
1954	6,129	6,101	3,671,196	292	320	587,668	1.85	.30	2.15	30.55	160,057
1955	6,583	6,442	4,118,618	339	320	642,008	1.90	.30	2.20	28.53	126,104
1956	5,888	6,013	4,063,219	367	315	612,658	2.03	.33	2.36	29.72	6,350
1957	4,640	4,596	3,367,451	335	276	511,653	2.11	.37	2.48	32.90	63,408
1958	4,214	4,175	3,024,755	294	259	428,353	2.21	.40	2.61	34.62	37,774
1959	3,825	3,756	2,849,939	221	245	430,992	2.26	.46	2.72	36.68	(130,826)
1960	3,356	3,276	2,575,121	224	223	380,767	2.30	.48	2.78	33.65	(251,348)
1961	2,647	2,933	2,194,504	164	188	279,641	2.36	.54	2.90	32.66	(421,886)
1962	2,699	2,752	2,026,750	172	157	279,478	2.43	.62	3.05	33.70	(357,641)

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheets—Imports by volume and value, average value of imports in terms of cents per pound and imports as percentage of domestic production

Year	Imports		Average foreign value of imports (cents per pound)	Imports by volume as percent of domestic production
	Tons	Dollars		
1952	47	23,557	25.0	1
1953	196	76,751	19.5	3
1954	259	88,010	17.0	4
1955	431	148,389	17.2	7
1956	450	170,416	18.9	8
1957	732	244,722	16.7	16
1958	823	262,324	15.9	19
1959	950	310,855	16.3	25
1960	904	301,667	16.6	27
1961	1,177	350,200	14.9	44
1962	1,298	363,916	14.0	48

Source: Imports by tons and dollar value are as reported by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce Commodity Classification 6559000 except that for the years 1952 through 1958 they have been revised in accordance with the findings of the U.S. Tariff Commission in Report on Zinc Sheet—Escape Clause Investigation No. 81, dated January 1960, table 12. Other data as computed by Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association. Excludes quantities erroneously reported as having been entered from Canada.

1962 zinc sheet imports—quantity, value, and average foreign value by country of origin in terms of cents per pound

	Belgium	Japan	Netherlands	West Germany	United Kingdom	Yugoslavia
Quantity (pounds)	235,638	1,788	223,011	541,395	42,557	1,552,513
Value	$35,250	$626	$33,559	$99,585	$7,300	$187,596
Average value (cents)	14.9	35.0	15.0	18.4	17.1	12.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Zinc sheet imports by country of origin

[In tons]

	Yugoslavia	West Germany	Belgium	Netherlands	United Kingdom
1956	----------	323	43	75	----------
1957	236	314	78	103	----------
1958	267	361	112	141	17
1959	222	450	113	155	6
1960	411	251	92	58	5
1961	769	244	67	92	5
1962	776	271	118	111	21

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. First, I would like to say that I am completely in agreement with the fine statement the gentleman from Indiana is making, because I know he is well aware I represent the community of Greencastle, Ind., that has one of these zinc mills. I know firsthand of the tremendous damage, the tremendous loss of employment and business which has resulted from interfering foreign imports of zinc. I want to commend the gentleman for the wonderful job he is doing in explaining this to the Congress, and I certainly hope that as a result of his efforts here today and of the astute remarks he is making that the administration will bring in a directive to grant relief to a very worthwhile industry in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I also wish to commend the gentleman for bringing this information out. I would like to ask him a couple of questions.

First, is this zinc that is being imported into the United States from Communist Yugoslavia identified in any way so the purchaser of this zinc plate in this country can identify it as being manufactured in a Communist country?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge, let me say to the gentleman, I think not.

Mr. STINSON. So a consumer in this country could possibly buy this zinc sheet on the open market in the United States without any knowledge of its having been manufactured in a Communist country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge I am sure that is correct.

Mr. STINSON. Another question if the gentleman will permit: Is it possible that the industry manufacturing this zinc sheet in Yugoslavia is subsidized by the American taxpayers through the foreign aid program?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not have that information.

Mr. STINSON. The fact that the United States has given something over $2 billion in aid to various foreign constituencies and economies, it is just possible that some of it went to establish the zinc sheet industry in Yugoslavia, and that our own aid is being used against American workers in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman and can only say I think that is entirely possible.

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for the presentation of these facts here today. The imports of zinc are having a very seriously damaging effect, as the gentleman has pointed out, upon our American economy and upon American employment; and I sincerely hope that these remarks will serve to bring to those charged with the responsibility in this respect the need for direct and immediate remedial action.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. As a very knowledgeable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am very sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is aware of the impact of these importations, and I am very hopeful that through his support and that of my other colleagues in the House we will be able to bring this forcefully enough to the attention of the President that he can take action.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 24, 1963, marked an historic milestone in the long and proud history of the State of North Carolina. Three hundred years ago yesterday King Charles II of England issued a charter at his royal court in Westminster, conveying to eight of his close friends and supporters a vast tract of land in North America. The grant extended southward from present-day Virginia to Florida, which was then a Spanish possession, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Seas, or Pacific Ocean.

Over his royal seal King Charles officially designated the territory conveyed in the charter as "Carolina." March 24, 1963, therefore, marked the 300th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of North Carolina.

The people of North Carolina take pride in the history and the accomplishments of our great State. They are fully aware of the fact that our State existed long before there was a United States of America. They are proud of the tremendous progress the State has made in industry and in the arts and sciences during the past 300 years.

To make appropriate plans to commemorate the tercentenary of North Carolina, the general assembly of the State established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission in 1959. Distinguished North Carolinians from every part of the State are serving on the commission. Under the direction of the commission pageants, plays, and historical observances are being held this year over North Carolina to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State.

Mr. Speaker, out of the vast tract of land designated "Carolina" on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, 14 great States of the Union, wholly or in part, were subsequently created. In view of this fact, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission felt that the observance of the 300th anniversary of North Carolina was an event of significance, not only to North Carolina, but to the other States of the Union and to foreign nations as well. To place the tercentenary, therefore, in its proper perspective, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission requested the North Carolina delegation in the Congress to sponsor legislation to create a Federal North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was pleased to introduce the House bill creating the Commission. The Commission consists of 15 members, 4 of whom are Members of the Senate and 4 of whom are Members of the House of Representatives. In addition, seven members have been appointed to the Commission by the President of the United States.

I have long felt that the magnificent story of the founding of America and the growth of its democratic institutions has largely been a story as yet untold. God has surely blessed the efforts of our forefathers to found a new order in America based on the dignity of man. We have grown to be the most powerful nation in the world, and our voice commands attention in the councils of the great.

As we have made material progress I am afraid we have failed to give enough attention to the wonderful and inspiring history of our Nation. In our zeal to build a new order of material wealth we have overlooked, to a great extent, some of the basic lessons to be learned from our illustrious past.

I sincerely believe that if we are to maintain our position of greatness and if we are to reach the fulfillment of the grand design bequeathed to us by our forefathers, we must rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and ideals of our forefathers. In short, Mr. Speaker, we must again study and learn to appreciate the history of our Nation.

The venerable poet, historian, and philosopher, Carl Sandburg, has said:

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin rot and dissolution.

The citizens of North Carolina are well aware of the truth of Mr. Sandburg's statement. Thus, in this year of the 300th anniversary of our great State, they are rededicating themselves to the eternal principles upon which their free society was founded.

For a moment let us examine the events that led up to the founding of Carolina. It is a remarkable page in history. On January 30, 1649, King Charles I of England was beheaded. There followed a period of great upheaval and political unrest in the country. England was without a king. Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, ruled the land as a virtual dictator.

With the death of Cromwell in 1658 the English people called to the throne Charles II, the son of the beheaded Charles I. On the 28th of May, 1660, his 30th birthday, Charles II entered London.

During the despotic rule of Oliver Cromwell in our mother country, King Charles II had been forced to live in France. Penniless and with few friends, he had eked out a meager existence. On the restoration of the monarchy, therefore, Charles II was understandably generous to those who had supported him with money and who had espoused his cause in England during his exile.

To eight men who had been his strongest supporters and who had done the most for his restoration to the English throne, Charles II gave the Carolina grant of land on March 24, 1663.

These eight men, known in history as the Eight Lords Proprietors of North Carolina, were distinguished Englishmen. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was Lord High Chancellor of England. George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, was Master of the King's Horse and Captain General of all his forces. William, Lord Craven, had been a great friend of Charles II's father. John, Lord Berkeley, had supported Charles I and had joined the royal family in exile. Sir George Carteret was Vice Chamberlain of the King's household. Sir William Berkeley, as Governor of Virginia, had persuaded his colony to stand by Charles II, even though he was in exile. Sir John Colleton had supported the royal cause in the Barbados. Anthony Ashley Cooper was Chancellor of the Exchequer and subsequently was created the Earl of Shaftesbury.

The Eight Lords Proprietors, of course, were not aware of the extent of the vast property they acquired in the New World through the generosity of Charles II. In 1585 an unsuccessful attempt had been made by Sir Walter Raleigh to establish an English settlement on Roanoke Island, N.C. This was 20 years before the settlement of the Virginia Jamestown Colony and more than three decades prior to the founding of the Plymouth Colony.

When the Carolina Charter of 1663 was given to the Proprietors, North Carolina had approximately 2,000 European inhabitants. Most of these had filtered into Carolina from the Virginia colony. The ill-fated Sir Walter Raleigh Colony, founded in 1585 on Roanoke Island, had disappeared from the face of the earth. The fate of the 117 members of the colony still remains a mystery.

The Charter of 1663 described Carolina as "not yet cultivated or planted and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of Almighty God." The charter, however, extended to the people then in Carolina and to the future citizens of the colony all of the rights and privileges that Englishmen had inherited in the centuries since Magna Carta.

The Lords Proprietors were required:

To ordain, make, enact, and under their seals to publish any laws whatsoever, either appertaining to the public state of the said province or the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion of, and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or of the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies; whom, for enacting of the said laws, when and as often as need shall require, we will that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; and their heirs, shall, from time to time, assemble, in such manner and form as to them shall seem best.

At another point in the charter King Charles said that the people of Carolina as his subjects:

Should enjoy, give, sell, alien, and bequeath; as likewise, all liberties, franchises, and privileges of this our Kingdom of England and of our dominions aforesaid, may freely and quietly have, possess, and enjoy as our liege people born within the same, without the let, molestation, vexation, trouble, or grievance of us, our heirs and successors; any statute, act, ordinance, or provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it will be seen, that North Carolina was founded upon the principle of representative government and that the rights of Englishmen were guaranteed to Carolinians. For 300 years the citizens of the State have cultivated their free institutions. The people of North Carolina have always been jealous of their rights and privileges as free citizens.

Even the Lords Proprietors were well aware of the independent nature of North Carolinians. A few years after Carolina was founded the Proprietors said plaintively in a message directed to Carolinians that they were "a people that neither understood your [their] own nor regarded our—the Proprietors'—interests."

Approximately 6 months after the Lords Proprietors received their charter from King Charles one of their number, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, was given the authority to exercise the powers of government in Albermarle, the only portion of Carolina settled at that time. Sir William Berkeley, in turn, appointed William Drummond, "a sober Scotch gentleman of good repute" in 1664 as Governor.

In 1665 the first formal plan of government for Carolina was adopted pursuant to the charter. It is known as the Concessions and Agreement of 1665. Under the Concessions, a popular assembly was created which had much broader powers than were actually required by the Proprietors' charter.

The Concessions and Agreement of 1665 was, in turn, succeeded by the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in 1669. This plan of government was known as the "Grand Model." It was not as successful an instrument of government as the Concessions. The colony was plagued by what has been described as "many and various commotions, disorders and irregularities."

Although there was friction and turmoil in the Carolina Colony, it made great advancement under the Proprietors. Tobacco, the "bewitching vegetable," as it was called then, was widely used as the currency of the colony.

The proprietary government of North Carolina lasted until the Carolina Charter was surrendered to the English Crown in 1729. In that year North Carolina became a royal colony and so remained until it threw off the English yoke and assumed its position as a sovereign State in the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is the inspiring story of the founding of representative government in North Carolina. From the approximately 2,000 people who inhabited Carolina in 1663 we have grown to a great State stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the highest crest of the Appalachian mountains and embracing within our borders nearly 5 million citizens engaged in industry, commerce, and the arts and sciences.

The motto of our great State is "To Be, Rather Than To Seem." We have fulfilled the meaning of this motto in every respect. The history of North Carolina has been carved by men of vision and faith in the American ideal.

As the people of our State pause this year to mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter which gave birth to their free society, they will take renewed faith in the great principles which have enabled North Carolina to reach a position of eminence among the States of the Union. In developing an understanding of the glorious past of North Carolina, and indeed of the founding of liberty in the New World, our people will be better prepared to face the trials of the present and the uncertainties of the future.

It is my hope that our sister States will join with North Carolina in this proud moment in her long history. May the 300th anniversary of Carolina be a spark which will rekindle a desire on the part of every American to learn more of the heritage of their Nation and by so doing become better citizens.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay the gentleman from North Carolina the highest tribute I know for delivering here this morning a historical paper that calls to the attention of America the great occasion that is taking place in the State of North Carolina in this tercentenary event.

Mr. Speaker, in 1584 and 1585, the first and second efforts of Sir Walter Raleigh to settle the New World were made on Roanoke Island, North Carolina. At that time the entire area was christened "Virginia" in honor of England's virgin Queen Elizabeth. The third expedition, due to trials and tribulations of the second, moved on to the deep waters of the Chesapeake and settled at Jamestown.

This occasion is particularly significant to me because it is in the district that I have the honor to represent that the first vestiges of permanent colonization took place in the Carolinas. The charter that we commemorate today was the first to provide for the beginning of religious tolerance in the area encompassed by the grant.

It is this tolerance and the Charter's concepts of freedom of thought, that have been handed down through the centuries and have helped make this country what it is today.

The fact that the first effort by the English to colonize the United States occurred in what is now North Carolina is well known. What is less known is that in Edenton, N.C., and Bath, N.C., we find the first permanent North Carolina settlements that stimulated the migration which swept across the State and to the south. Just yesterday tercentenary exercises were held at old St. Thomas Church at Bath, N.C. The communion service at this church was given by Queen Anne. Other historical homes and buildings of the community were open. It was here that the first library in Carolina was established.

On April 6 in Edenton, N.C., the Post Office Department will issue a commemorative stamp that honors the Carolina Charter. There is some question as to whether the first post office in the area encompassed by the grant was in Edenton or Bath, N.C., but the question does not take away in any respect the privilege that is Edenton's in being the focal point for the issuance of this commemorative stamp, that is of significance to all America and particularly to the North Carolinians.

It is right and proper that this 300th anniversary observance should extend far beyond the boundaries of the district I represent, for each part of the State has played a part in the development of the area covered by the grant. It is also fitting and proper that the observance of this 300th anniversary should extend to the schools, the colleges, and the universities, to cultural projects and religious programs, and in effect to all the peoples of the State, for each is concerned with the events of the first century of the colony's history and the provisions for the above that were written in the charter.

One of the great traditions of North Carolina has been the fact that progress has been made through the cooperation of all its peoples. This is why it is quite fitting that no specific city or area be designated as the focal point for the celebration of this 300th anniversary.

Because it is a statewide project of interest to all the State's peoples, it is best that the programs which are being conducted are done at a local level and centered upon local personalities, sites, or events of significance during the early history of the colony, and the entire area is full of great historic events that had bearing on the eventual founding of the independence and the freedom of the peoples of America who exist today.

I am proud that the real history of the development of North Carolina began in the district I have the honor to represent, and the first English-speaking child was born on Roanoke Island, which is now part of Dare County, N.C., and that a drama has been held at Fort Raleigh for 20 years or more portraying that first effort to settle the New World. However,

it pleases me that this is a tercentenary celebration that reaches all parts of the State—the Albemarle, the Pamlico, the Cape Fear, the Piedmont, and the Blue Ridge. For it was people who came through from the eastern part of the country and from the eastern seaboard that made the march across our country that caused our country to grow. They banded themselves together and went into the forest and conquered the wild and laid the foundation so that men could live today in freedom and in comfort and enjoy their respective ways of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I congratulate my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for introducing the resolution that commemorates this great occasion and for arranging these proceedings today so that we might speak about this tercentenary celebration.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for his splendid remarks, and I would join him in emphasizing that on April 6 at Edenton, N.C., the Carolina tercentenary commemorative stamp which the gentleman has mentioned will go on sale for the first time. I understand there is a great public interest in this outstanding event.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for bringing to the attention of this body this historical event. The word "tercentenary" is a large word. The tercentenary celebration in North Carolina calls for large plans throughout our State to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the founding of North Carolina. Visitors to North Carolina this year will find a wide variety of attractions to make their stay a memorable one. Throughout the State local groups and communities are scheduling programs of varying type and degree, which usually will be centered on local personalities, sites, and events of significance during the early history of our State and our colony. As an example, on June 27 through the 29, the people of Watauga County and the town of Boone, which is situated in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, will join in these commemorative events. An outstanding program and appropriate events are being planned including the opening presentation of the 1963 edition of "Horn in the West," which is a superlative outdoor drama. This part of the State is of particular significance because 200 years ago that famous frontiersman and explorer, Daniel Boone, first crossed the Blue Ridge to open up the western part of our country. In this program at Boone, which is named for this great explorer, there will be events to commemorate his great achievements. A wagon train will be sent across the original route that he took to cross the Blue Ridge and to open up our great West.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] concerning the historical significance of these events in North Carolina and the importance that they have even today in the history of our country. You know history shows us that many civilizations have risen and have fallen and history also shows us that these civilizations have built many monuments to materialism, usually under a dictatorship-type of government.

It also shows us that these monuments have rotted and decayed. They leave their silent remains as proof to us that these civilizations failed. Why did they fail? It is because human freedom was not the basis for their existence.

I am certainly glad to see that our educational institutions are taking part in this great celebration that we are planning and are having in North Carolina and that the young people and all of the people today can be made aware of the past history not only of our State but also of our country as a whole. Through these and other events, let us rededicate ourselves to the continuation of liberty and freedom in America.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague for his participation in this discussion and assure him that the people of North Carolina are aware of the activities planned in his congressional district in the Watauga County area, particularly.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina for being the author of this resolution which provides for the celebration of this significant historical event in our State.

North Carolina is rich in history and tradition; it has a great heritage. It has a greater heritage, I might say quite vainly, if you want to call it that, quite vainly, than any State I know of. I think it is significant for us to keep in mind that this charter that was issued 300 years ago yesterday embraced the grant area that it did. As has already been mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and by the distinguished gentleman from the First Congressional District [Mr. BONNER], and our friend from the Blue Ridge area of North Carolina, it started at what would be now the northern boundary of Virginia and extended southward to what is now the northern boundary of Florida. That is a great expanse and area, and then from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, embracing today 14 or perhaps 15 of our finest States in our union of States.

It is significant to me that just in 1949 after many years of search, North Carolinians were able to locate the original charter. They found it in the hands of a bookseller or merchant in England, in London, to be more precise. Funds were forthwith raised to purchase this historic document to bring it back to North Carolina where it is now housed in our archives of history at our capitol at Raleigh. Here it is seen visually and studied by literally hundreds of thousands of people every year, not only people from North Carolina but people from all the States that are embraced in this total grant covering some 14 States of our Union.

It is significant to me that in this so-called statewide celebration, historic as it is, it was deemed advisable to keep it at the lower level, the level of the community where the people themselves reside, the grassroots, where they can get inspiration from what took place 300 years ago when the forebears of the present generation had the drive and the initiative to move westward to what is now our Pacific coast.

To me it is a very great event. We share with all the people in this great area our pride that the gentleman must have [Mr. WHITENER], a member of this Commission, and the others in North Carolina, who have meant so much in bringing this to the attention not only of the North Carolinians but to people everywhere.

I commend the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. BONNER], and the other members of the North Carolina delegation, and others who will offer for the RECORD their statement and thinking along this line.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from the Seventh District for his contribution. I take note of his reference to what may be derived today from the lessons of the past. I known that the gentleman comes from one of the leading tobacco districts of America. I am sure in his section of the State the people will take great interest in the fact that the first known crop control program in the history of the world, I suppose, was proposed for Carolina territory.

In 1666, Gov. William Drummond, of North Carolina, met at St. Mary's the first capital of Maryland, with representatives of Virginia and Maryland to investigate the possibility of controlling tobacco prices. The plan called for a temporary suspension of tobacco planting which would result in a tobacco shortage. The shortage, they hoped, would in turn increase the price paid for the tobacco crop. The Carolina Legislative Assembly was willing to impose the controls, but the plan failed of adoption because Lord Baltimore, the proprietor of Maryland, refused to go along with the agreement.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying honor to North Carolina on the 300th anniversary of the North Carolina Charter, issued in 1663.

This document, on display in the North Carolina Hall of History at Raleigh, was issued on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, of England, to eight loyal supporters whose assistance helped the King regain the English throne.

The original area granted to these eight lord proprietors would dwarf North Carolina's present size. The area was so immense it extended southward from Virginia to Florida and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, or

"South Seas," as the Pacific was known in those early days.

By 1763—100 years after issuance of the charter—the colony's population had grown to approximately 200,000 persons and the settlement had extended westward to the Blue Ridge Mountains.

It should be pointed out that North Carolina did not officially become North Carolina until December 7, 1710, when the area then referred to only as Carolina was divided into North and South Carolina.

I wish to take this occasion to pay particular tribute to the North Carolina Tercentenary Commission for the outstanding contribution it has made in calling to the attention of North Carolinians the importance of this 300th anniversary in our history and heritage.

One hundred years ago, we were in the midst of the War between the States and little time was available to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Carolina Charter. Two hundred years ago, the French and Indian War was drawing to a close and few stopped to look back over the previous 100 years.

This makes it even more fitting that we should pause this year to commemorate North Carolina's 300th year as a unit of government.

As a closing thought, I would state that the last 300 years have been years of progress for North Carolina so that its future today is bright and promising. We are proud of our history and are proud to be one of the 50 States which, collectively, make America what it is today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 24, will mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter of 1663. The grant was issued by King Charles II of England to eight prominent military and political leaders of the time whose help had been indispensable to him. It embraced an immense territory: all the land between the 36th parallel of latitude on the north and the 31st parallel on the south, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. This tremendous tract included not only the present-day States of North and South Carolina, but also all or part of a number of States of our country.

Although the charter of 1663 was not the first, nor the last, patent affecting the modern Carolinas to be issued by English sovereigns, it was the most significant because it put the new colony on a permanent footing and added yet another brick to the structure of our American heritage. For this charter qualified the vast powers of the lords proprietors, as its beneficiaries were called, to "enact any laws whatsoever pertaining to the public state of the said Providence, or to the private utility of particular persons," by making such laws subject to the "advice, consent, and approbation of the freemen of the said Providence, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies" who were required to be assembled from time to time.

The 87th Congress by its Public Law 437 provided for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans for the observance of this most significant occasion. The Federal Government has also put its stamp of approval on the event, literally, by arranging for the issuance next month of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the tercentenary of the Carolina Charter of 1663.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the House when I extend felicitations to the present-day beneficiaries of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and express confidence that the principles of freedom and justice which it conveyed to our land will continue to flourish and be strengthened in the decades and generations that lie ahead.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to join with our distinguished Speaker, the members of the delegation in this House from North Carolina, and with the people of the great State of North Carolina in calling the attention of the entire Nation to the tercentenary celebration of the Charter to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina by King Charles II on March 24, 1663.

Certainly, the granting of the Carolina Charter ranks among events of primary historical importance to this Nation. From these vast tracts of territory, a large segment of this Nation has been formed. From the people it has produced have come a succession of leaders who have helped to fashion the detailed architecture of our democracy and its social and economic institutions. Surely these leaders and the people who sent them forth have added to the strength, prosperity, and wisdom of the Nation.

Again, let me express the assurance that all Americans celebrate with you and that their interest will be proved when they join with Carolinians this summer in attending the festivals and ceremonies that are being planned to mark this historic occasion.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, by appointment from you on January 31, 1963, I have the honor to serve as a member of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission, established by joint Senate and House resolutions, enacted into Public Law 437 of the 87th Congress. The House division of the tercentenary celebration commission, under the able chairmanship of my North Carolina colleague, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, works in cooperation with the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, created by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The purpose of the State and Federal Commissions is to assist in developing plans for the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II to the eight Lords Proprietors. The territorial scope of the charter was tremendous, running southward from Virginia to Florida and west to the Pacific Ocean. I believe even my colleagues from the Lone Star State will admit that this is nearly as big as the State of Texas.

But even more significant than its territorial dimensions were the guarantees contained in the charter to the settlers within the boundaries to form a government of freemen with the rights enjoyed by Englishmen under English laws. Thus the shadow of the Magna Charta was extended, through the Carolina Charter, to the shores of the New World.

The impact of this guarantee of political freedom was reflected in the first General Assembly of North Carolina in 1665 and in the several constitutions which were to follow. And so we feel that in Carolina was the genesis of those democratic ideals which have become the cornerstone of our great country and which, please God, will continue to motivate our national life.

The formal opening of the tercentenary celebration occurred in January of this year at the Governor's mansion in Raleigh. The occasion was highlighted by an immense birthday cake, shaped like the U.S. map, bearing 300 candles, which Governor Sanford handily extinguished in four mighty blows.

There are many more events to follow in our observance of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, for when anything of such import becomes 300 years old, it calls for a statewide celebration. These events will call into play all our State resources in the cultural arts, and they are many. Long before the National Capital became concerned about the preservation and enhancement of our national cultural heritage, the State of North Carolina was quietly going about its business of encouraging the arts—through many channels: the State Literary and Historical Society, which every year holds a "culture week" in our State capital of Raleigh; the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra, widely renowned; the Carolina Playmakers at Chapel Hill and the Little Theater movement throughout the State; the State Art Gallery, the finest, say some, south of Washington, and many other university and private art galleries; our grassroots opera company; and our impressive galaxy of writers in all areas of the written word.

If we appear too fulsome in praise of our State today, Mr. Speaker, we are but carrying out the injunction of the late Dr. R. D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, a historian of note and the first Archivist of the United States, who said:

> A people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording.

In connection with our tercentenary celebration, we are very much gratified that the Post Office Department will issue a 5-cent commemorative stamp, depicting the first page of the Carolina Charter against a background of red velvet. The stamp was unveiled by Postmaster General J. Edward Day at ceremonies held here in the Capitol on February 28. First-day sale of the stamp will take place on April 6 in Edenton, N.C., one of the early settlements of the State which even today retains much of its colonial atmosphere.

We extend to our colleagues in the Congress a cordial invitation to visit North Carolina, either for the first day of issue of this stamp or for some of the subsequent celebrations which will be held in this tercentenary year from Murphy to Manteo.

Come down and drive over our fine highways which unwind like silver ribbons from the mountains to the sea. Visit Mount Mitchell, the highest peak east of the Rockies; visit Roanoke Island, birthplace of Virginia Dare, the first white child born in America; see Kill Devil Hill, where the first flight of a power-driven airplane was made by the Wright Brothers; and by all means visit our capital city of Raleigh, with its brandnew State House and its beautiful old Capitol Building of classic Greek design. And while there do not fail to visit the Hall of History, a component of the State Department of Archives and History, where you may see the selfsame charter we are talking about today, for North Carolina owns the charter, one of the most rare and interesting documents of the world.

Although I have referred to our State cultural activities and interests, let me assure you that we Tar Heels are really as plain as old shoes. The Old North State was not settled by the aristocracy but by plain people. So along with our culture, come down and enjoy our corn pone and chittlin's, our coon hunts and fish fries, breathe our fresh mountain air, sniff our sea coast medley of smells; play our splendid sandhills golf courses; go deep-sea fishing off our coast; see our rolling, industrialized Piedmont where my own district is located and where you will find many colleges and universities, including the University of North Carolina, the first State university to open its doors to students, and Duke University, as well as famous-name textile, furniture, and tobacco factories, famed battlegrounds, and the finest people in the world.

In short, do just about whatever you enjoy doing. You name it, for we believe we have it.

And so, in the vernacular of some sections of our State, let me extend this invitation, which in North Carolina is unsurpassed in neighborliness and enthusiasm: "Y'all come."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and in commemoration of that great historical event, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, established by the North Carolina General Assembly, has planned appropriate observances throughout 1963.

The original charter itself is preserved in North Carolina's Hall of History in Raleigh, where it is carefully encased in such a way as to protect it while still making it available for page-by-page inspection. It is one of only six of the original charters so preserved.

A number of significant programs and ceremonies are planned for the entire year. Some have already been held and others are scheduled. The U.S. Post Office Department has approved the issuance of a special commemorative stamp for this occasion and was recently unveiled in the Capitol by Postmaster General Day. The stamp will be placed on sale for the first time at Edenton, N.C., on April 6.

Texans and Alaskans who like to boast of the size of their respective States might note that the original Carolina Charter established a land grant to eight men extending from coast to coast in a strip bordered roughly to the north by what is now the present-day border of Virginia, and to the south by what is now Florida.

To those interested in colonial history, 1963 is the ideal year to visit North Carolina, as local groups will be sponsoring various programs throughout the entire year in observance of the tercentennial of the charter, and colonial history will be highlighted throughout the entire State.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission upon the valuable and lasting service it has rendered, and will doubtless continue to render throughout its existence, to the great State of North Carolina by bringing into better focus and emphasizing the early history of our State. I would also commend the hundreds of others who are assisting in a variety of ways to publicize and dramatize our colonial history and to make a memorable success of the celebration of Carolina's 300th year.

North Carolina is justly proud of the part it has taken in the founding and building of the greatest nation on earth. No country in the world has ever started so humbly and achieved so much in so short a period as America. It did not happen by chance.

As we celebrate Carolina's tercentennial in song, pageant, documentary, narrative and otherwise, I sincerely hope that all North Carolinians will be constantly mindful, or at least often reminded, of the character and spirit of the men and women of 300 years ago who undertook the building of a State in a strange, desolate and wild region. The events which marked the development and progress of colonial Carolina are of immense historical interest, of course, but we of modern North Carolina should find something more than mere interest in the spirit and attiude of the people in whose lives and activities our State had its beginning. We should find inspiration and a challenge.

Three hundred years ago, Carolina was not merely an underdeveloped area, as we understand and so often use that term today, but was an undeveloped raw wilderness. Early Carolinians had no indulgent and benevolent government upon which to lean and depend for their needs from the cradle to the grave; there were no public welfare programs, no government lending agencies, and no foreign aid programs. But they had something of far greater worth, the qualities of character and spirit that underlie all individual and State stability and progress. They actively sought a way of life which they knew beforehand would bring them face to face with dangers, obstacles, barriers, and challenges unnumbered and unknown.

What kind of people were they? What possessed them? They were proud, independent, and self-reliant; their undertakings and accomplishments under hardship conditions required great personal courage, initiative, stamina, and determination. They were willing to work, strive, venture, and sacrifice much in the hope and belief that the future would bring large returns. But they did not know that it would—they ventured much. Most of the natural obstacles they encountered have now been removed and we in modern North Carolina have no occasion to test our mettle against the forces and challenges which the early Carolinians met. Even so, while we celebrate the 300th anniversary of Carolina's first charter, it is in the best of order to ask ourselves a couple of questions: How do we of today compare with them in the qualities of self-reliance, fighting spirit, personal courage, initiative, general strength of character, and urge for individual and collective freedom? Do we as willingly and courageously meet the challenges and responsibilities of modern life as they met those of a far more difficult period?

In this tercentenary year, let us celebrate and glory in the achievements of those early Carolinians who broke the ground and laid the foundation for our great State. But let us be constantly reminded that the glory is theirs, not ours, and that all of our narratives and pageants will not add one whit to the significance and worth of their struggles and accomplishments. As we celebrate, then, let us also pause and take stock of ourselves with the view of honestly determining whether we individually and collectively possess those qualities of character and spirit that would prompt, urge, and enable us, if such were possible, to stand in their stead and duplicate their feats. A negative finding will be cause for concern because real progress in an individual or in a State involves intangibles which are neither seen nor measured by material standards.

In substance, all recorded history is an account of how individuals and nations have met and dealt with the challenges and responsibilities of their times. Other peoples, as well before as since 1663, have taken ignominious flight before challenge and responsibility, having neither the will nor the courage to assume the posture of men and take on the responsibilities essential to the creation and development of a stable system of free government. Such peoples abound in the world today.

I believe the qualities of character and spirit essential to the establishment of a stable system of free government are the same today as they were 300 years ago or 3,000 years ago and as they will be 300 years hence. And I believe that the maintenance of such a system is more difficult than its establishment.

It is suggested from time to time that the so-called underdeveloped countries of the world can eventually be stabilized economically and politically by giving them economic, military and technical aid. I do not agree. Such aids may temporarily serve an apparently good purpose but they will never imbue the people of these countries with the character and spirit which moves and drives individuals and peoples to fight for the privilege of assuming responsibility. Freedom grows out of the assumption of responsibility; it has no other source. To personally or collectively face up to

the challenges of responsibility is the price of freedom.

Little more than 100 years after the charter of 1663, Carolinians joined in a war and fought and died for the privilege of assuming the responsibilities of independence and self-government. I wish that the people of all the restless and underdeveloped countries of the world today could be taught and made to understand and take unto themselves the lessons that may be learned from the example of early Carolina. Let us remember them, too. Our system is established; so let us look to its maintenance.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marked the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II of England. We North Carolinians proudly trace our American heritage to this historic document.

When the charter was granted, North Carolina as we know it today is estimated to have contained but 2,000 people. They had emigrated to a wild, unexplored, undeveloped wilderness seeking religious and political freedom and an opportunity to improve their economic status. From this humble beginning, North Carolina has grown to the point where our State now contains over 4½ million people.

We are all rightfully proud of the advances our State has made in agriculture, industry, education and the arts during three centuries of progress. The emphasis in North Carolina today is on industrial expansion and the improvement of our educational facilities, in short, on the future. This is well and good because no civilization can progress by resting on its oars and reliving the past. But as the French poet Lamartine said, "History teaches everything, even the future."

So I think it is important that in the year 1963, which marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the charter from which comes North Carolina as we know it today, the attention of the people of our State and the Nation should be focused on some of the lessons to be learned from the past. Our forefathers brought representative government to this land and they earned their freedom by a great outpouring of blood, sweat, and tears. Many of us take this heritage too lightly. We can all glibly recite the things we feel we have a right to expect from our country but many fail to realize that there is a corresponding obligation. The North Carolina General Assembly in 1959 established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and the commission is planning a series of festivals and ceremonies designed to refresh the memories of our people about some of the significant events in our State's great history.

A cordial invitation is extended to our fellow citizens from the other States of the Union, and to friends from abroad, to visit North Carolina during this tercentenary year. They will find that North Carolina indeed has a glorious past and a bright and promising future.

The Congress of the United States recognized the importance of this anniversary by creating a North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission composed of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, and seven members appointed by the President of the United States. I am very proud to serve as a member on that Commission by appointment of the Speaker of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject on which I just spoke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILES

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of this House to developments involving the Federal Republic of West Germany and the United Arab Republic, with respect to the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction, that I regard as a grave threat to peace and stability in the Near East.

These events indicate a need by our Government for closer scrutiny of West Germany's role in NATO.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the active collaboration of German scientists and German industries in the efforts of Colonel Nasser, dictator of the United Arab Republic, to perfect rockets with radiological and bacteriological warheads for use in the destruction of Israel and other countries in Nasser's aggressive designs on his neighbors.

In justifying the nefarious work of German scientists and technicians, authorities at Bonn are trying to hide behind a cloak of spurious legalism all too reminiscent of the "laws" of the Nazi era under which Germans perpetrated horrendous deeds and later said they "were only doing their duty."

German morality may now be reasonably questioned at the very time we hear demands from Bonn for stronger influence in NATO and nuclear weaponry. Instead of contributing a fair share to the peaceful development of developing countries in cooperation with the United States—and I must stress the prosperity of German economy—some Germans are irresponsibly seeking to grow even more prosperous as merchants of death catering to the treacherous Colonel Nasser.

Bonn has as much governmental responsibility to keep radiological and German rockets out of Egyptian hands as the United States has to prevent its citizens and industries from doing similar work for Castro Cuba, which, incidentally, is a good friend of Nasserite Egypt.

I wish to direct attention to the following authoritative news reports pertaining to the situation I have described.

FOUR HUNDRED GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILE

(By Antony Terry)

BONN, March 23.—In Egypt's closely guarded missile center Project 333, near Cairo, nearly 400 German scientists and technicians, most of them from the wartime German V–2 missile center at Penemunde, are working on the first Egyptian-made rocket missile with warheads containing radioactive materials designed for President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Details of this work have been known to Bonn authorities for some time and have caused some concern here.

Israeli anxiety over the military effects of Egyptian rocket development on the power balance in the Mideast at a time when talks on federation of Egypt, Syria and Iraq are getting underway has led to the recent "underground war" by Israel agents in West Germany.

Their aim has been to buy off or scare off German experts engaged on this rocket work.

Though their efforts have been widespread and, according to some German sources, as efficiently organized as Eichmann kidnapping commandos, they have met with only moderate success.

VANISHED MYSTERIOUSLY

One of the West Germans who vanished mysteriously last September is Heinz Krug, a former insurance clerk who ran a firm with headquarters in Munich, whose job was to purchase materials and technical equipment in Europe for Egypt's missile research and construction.

After the war and before joining the Egyptians, Krug was a member of the German research physics under West Germany's best known missile expert, Prof. Eugen Saenger, who was among the first to advise Nasser on his rocket program. Saenger is reported to have received a $5.6 million fee for himself and his German team. Saenger was persuaded to return to West Germany and is now teaching in West Berlin.

West German authorities believed for a while that after Krug vanished and left his family in Munich that he had defected to Israel. When he disappeared, he was said to be in the company of "an Egyptian visitor" and information since received from Cairo showed that documents this man was carrying were forgeries.

But West German intelligence has since received hints that Krug, who was more a businessman than a scientist, may after all have been wanted by the Egyptians—for having tried to doublecross and sell information on his purchasing group to the Israelis.

TAKEN BY TWO OTHERS

Krug's place has since been taken by two other German scientists who normally work in Egypt. One is Paul Gercke, the electronics missiles guidance expert whose 25-year-old daughter, Heidi, is alleged by the Swiss authorities to have been pressured by two Israeli agents who were arrested by the Swiss police earlier this month after they had tried to get her father to join the Israelis. Bonn security authorities have been watching rival activities of Israeli and Egyptian agents in their competition for West German missile experts with growing anxiety. The Bonn constitution gives every West German citizen nominal right to work where and for whom he chooses and the Bonn Government claims it has no power to direct labor or stop the German scientists and technicians from selling their specialist knowledge to the highest bidder.

UNREPENTANT NAZIS

Nevertheless, it is known that the hard core of the German scientific colony in Egypt are unrepentant Nazis, many of whom fled there after the war with avowed aim of helping the Arab world with scientific know-how

to continue the fight against the Jews. In addition to Israeli protests, the Egyptian Government has also been flooding the West German security authorities recently with details of the alleged activities of Israeli commanders in West Germany who are trying to intimidate the German rocket experts.

Egyptians, for instance, provided Bonn with full details of passports accidentally left behind by three men who fled after alleged shooting up of another rocket and electronics expert, Hans Kleinwechter, who was on visit to Loerrach near the Swiss-German border a month ago. Egyptians showed that passports were forged and in names of persons living in Egypt at the time of the incident in prison there.

REAL TARGET

Egyptians also showed that official signatures on passports were forgeries. Throughout the story runs the name of Professor Saenger, West Germany's most prominent rocket expert, who was employed by the French Government after the war and for whom many of the German rocket missile team have worked, including both missing Krug and near-assassination victim, Hans Kleinwechter, as well as Gercke who was involved in the Swiss arrests incident this month. A prominent figure in the Egyptian atomic missile team in Cairo is known by West Germans to be Prof. Wolfang Pilz, another Saenger man who during the last war was on Wernher von Braun's staff in Peenemünde research station designing the V–1 flying bombs and now heads the German missile research team in Cairo.

Pilz was the real target of one of the mysterious powerful bombs which exploded on being opened in Cairo and killed five persons. The parcel bomb and letter, which also exploded destroying an eye of Pilz's secretary, was posted in Hamburg and police there are trying to trace who posted it. One major success for the Israeli efforts to sabotage Project 333 has been Austrian Prof. Otto Joklik who was a member of President Nasser's missile research group in Cairo. Joklik one of two men arrested by Swiss police, alleges that while in Cairo he discovered Egyptian plans to use radioactive materials in warheads of new rocket missiles and was so shocked by the discovery that he refused to continue work and offered his help to Israelis. Since leaving Cairo, he has appealed to other Austrian and German scientists working there to follow him.

[Usually reliable sources in Cairo say Swiss, Italians, and Spaniards as well as Germans are employed on jet aircraft and rocket research in the United Arab Republic, according to the Associated Press.

[They said Germans engaged in rocket research are believed to number no more than 10 and that none is engaged in rocket production.

[A spokesman for the West German Embassy in Cairo said he felt an estimate that 400 Germans are working on secret U.A.R. projects is exaggerated. Other sources put the figure in excess of 250.

[Some West German experts live in closely guarded apartment buildings in Cairo. Others have homes in the suburbs.]

A-THREAT TO ISRAEL BEGAN IN 1954 WHEN GERMANS ARRIVED IN EGYPT

TEL AVIV, March 23.—The affair of the German atomic scientists in Egypt, which Israelis see as a growing threat to their survival as a nation, all started 9 years ago, when the Arab-Israeli border warfare was nearing its peak.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, then new to office, was seeking new allies against Israel. He concluded an arms deal with the Soviet Union, and his representatives also began enlisting likely Germans.

The first group of West German technicians arrived in Egypt in 1954. They helped to establish an iron and steel plant—now producing 300,000 tons annually. A growing stream of German scientists has followed them during the past 2 years.

According to Israeli information, they now number almost 500, and have succeeded in laying the foundations of Egypt's heavy industry and war plant. These items include the construction of an atomic reactor plant for the production of heavy water, a jet aircraft factory, rocket and missile installations and bacteriological and poison gas warheads.

Prof. Otto Bahn is said to be engaged on the construction of a nuclear reactor with a planned capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. When completed, this will be considerably bigger than Israel's Negev reactor and will be the largest in the Middle East. Its plutonium production will only theoretically enable Egypt to produce atomic bombs.

The rocket installations, which he considered the most menacing aspect of the German contribution, are believed to be situated in Helouan.

Concern over the Egyptian rocket development program has increased considerably since the launching of four Egyptian rockets last August—the Al Zafir (Victor) of 180 miles range and the Al Kahir (Conqueror) of 360 miles. Commenting on these launchings, President Nasser then said they were capable of reaching "just south of Beirut"—thus including Israel's entire territory.

In an interview on the Israeli radio this week, Eugen Saenger, who once headed the German rocket team in Egypt, expressed his willingness to work for other countries including Israel. He also said that President Nasser would not be able to launch military rockets within the near future due to a number of technical reasons.

Two particular problems are hindering the rocket program, Israelis believe. The first is the question of accurately guiding the rockets. The other problem is what warheads the rockets should carry.

According to an Austrian who worked in Egypt and has since been arrested in Switzerland as an Israeli spy, the Egyptians are experimenting with genocidal weapons, including so-called death rays, biological and bacteriological warfare and poison gas.

It is feared that German scientists also are trying to help the Egyptians develop a cobalt warhead. A cobalt bomb would scatter radioactive particles over large areas: this also falls into the prohibited weapons category.

Some light on possible ties between the Bonn Government and Egypt's rocket development program are disclosed in a letter written by Sanger's Stuttgart lawyer, Adolph Karch, to a correspondent of a German press agency.

It pointed out that "the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, to also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launching pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic."

The original of this letter, dated August 14, 1962, has been shown to this reporter.

The Knesset (Israeli Parliament) this week proclaimed that "the German people cannot absolve itself of responsibility for the continuation of this vile work." The resolution also said: "It is the duty of the German Government to put an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens and to take all steps required to prevent this cooperation with the Egyptian Government."

Alvin Rosenfeld, correspondent for New York Herald Tribune, reported from Jerusalem:

"This week's session of the Israeli Knesset was in fact sitting in judgment on Premier Ben-Gurion's policy of conciliation with postwar Germany, according to the influential and respected Israeli newspaper Haaretz.

"This and other bitter editorial comment in the wake of the Knesset resolution appeared to reflect a deep public resentment of Germany's position and a revival of the old wounds and memories of the Nazi period. It seemed clear that Ben-Gurion's policy had suffered at least a psychological defeat which may postpone full Israel-German reconciliation.

"The Knesset session had been forced upon a reluctant government by the opposition. The overwhelmingly approved Knesset resolution was more strongly worded than the government's official statement delivered in Parliament.

"The liberal nonparty Haaretz, known for its staid responsible views, noted with surprise that Ben-Gurion was not at the Knesset session—he is officially on vacation—and said the Premier had good reasons for not appearing. Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy had once been acceptable to the Israeli public, Haaretz said, 'but he went too far in his belief that in Western Germany we could find an anchor in all storms.' "

GERMANS BUILDING ROCKETS FOR NASSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have given careful attention to the reports of the last several days concerning the German role in the development of rockets, reportedly with radiological and bacteriological warheads, by the United Arab Republic.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic openly proclaims that he is developing a powerful arsenal of military rockets for the destruction of Israel. There can be no doubt in the minds of the many German scientists and technicians, bearing valid German passports, who are in Egypt perfecting these rockets, that the weapons are intended for the completion of Adolph Hitler's goal, the mass murder of the Jewish people. Nor can the German industries exporting parts and equipment for rockets and weapons systems have any reasonable doubts of the use intended by Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that West Germany has defaulted on a grave moral responsibility by permitting Germans and German interests to help Nasser effectuate his aim to destroy those escapees from German barbarism who now reside in Israel. This is definitely not a technical or legalistic issue of what the Bonn Government can or cannot do to influence its scientists or industrialists.

What this is, Mr. Speaker, is a test of the German conscience and the pious professions of sorrow over the murder of 6 million human beings merely because of their religion. I refer, of course, to the Jewish people whose survivors are seeking to rehabilitate themselves in the democratic new State of Israel.

I might note that Israel is sending its scientists and technicians abroad to help the new countries of Africa and Asia. But they, unlike the Germans in Egypt, are bringing medical skills to heal the sick and agricultural skills to feed the hungry and construction skills to shelter

the homeless. I cannot understand how any civilized German scientist can go to Egypt, in view of the events from 1933 to 1945, to build vicious bacteria warheads or warheads using radioactive waste materials or any kind of rocket at all.

Bonn could quickly enough find applicable laws and authority to prevent German scientists from going into East Germany and building the same kind of dreadful weapons. Yet the zealous and efficient German technicians and scientists, unrepentant Nazis among them, are now working with the Soviet-trained and Soviet-equipped Egyptian military force.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by the blindness of the West German authorities to the humanitarian aspect involved and blindness to the desire of civilized people for peace and stability in the Near East, and even German blindness—or defiance—to President Kennedy's policy against proliferation to small nations of mass destructive weapon systems.

The time may have come, Mr. Speaker, for us to more carefully observe the alleged maturity of West Germany as a leader of NATO, a nation which wants to be entrusted with more say on use of thermonuclear weapons that may seal the fate of all humanity.

I have made known my deep concern to the Department of State on these matters and will continue to observe developments. I am certain many other Members share my hope that the West German Government will assert the stature of a truly new Germany by terminating this dangerous foolishness in Egypt.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, among the Nation's leading supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, who has this to say on the subject:

> It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements of lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

The American Council of Learned Societies has also shown great interest in this subject, and published in its newsletter of November 1962, a most interesting article by Gustavo O. Arlt, president, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. President Arlt quoted from the Seaborg report, the important policy statement issued on November 15, 1960, by the President's Science Advisory Committee, which I should like to call to your attention at this time:

> Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.
>
> We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth.

This statement was signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, immediate past director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and others.

I am introducing a bill today to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments. This measure would also expand the present activities of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

I include as part of my remarks the article by Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States which was published in the November 1962, newsletter of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Also, as part of my remarks I include a speech by W. McNeil Lowry before the Association of Graduate Schools which was published in a recent issue of the Art Journal of the College Art Association.

Mr. Lowry is director of the Ford Foundation program in the humanities and the arts. His speech was delivered at the meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools which took place in New Orleans, October 24, 1961. It is a very important and highly significant speech.

The former Federal Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has said:

> The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

In conclusion I include the text of my bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, and to expand the activities and programs of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

The above-mentioned material follows:

A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION? [1]

(By Gustave O. Arlt)

On July 17, 1962, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, arose in the House of Representatives and began a lengthy speech with the following words:

"Mr. Speaker, there is a pressing need today for Federal legislation that will build up nationwide support for the arts and humanities, on a basis comparable to the support that is provided in other areas, such as science and technology. Progress in the arts and humanities is essential to true national strength."

These are strange words, indeed, to be heard in the Halls of Congress. Fifteen years ago they would have been branded as subversive. Only 3 years ago they would have been called incompatible with, even adverse to, the national interest. That they could be spoken in 1962 in the introduction of a bill in support of the humanities and the arts indicates a remarkable change in the attitude of Congress toward American higher education.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when universities and colleges financed their own teaching and research, when professors expected no subsidies in support of their creative work, and when graduate students were grateful for a small stipend for teaching or for grading papers. No one had heard of a research grant, let alone a contract. A Guggenheim fellowship represented the pinnacle of the hopes and aspirations of the dedicated scholar. And this condition prevailed more or less in all departments and disciplines in the university. The chemist and the philosopher, the physicist and the art historian—all were supported equally well and equally badly. As a result, academic society was homogeneous and virtually classless, for where no one is rich no one is poor.

This academic homogeneity extended down into and pervaded the graduate student body. The student in languages had no reason to cast envious eyes at his colleague in biology because one had as good and as poor a chance at a small fellowship as the other, and when they received their degrees they had equal prospects of a poorly paid instructorship. As a result there were no status problems and academic excellence rather than field of study constituted the badge of distinction.

---

[1] This article is also scheduled to appear in the December 1962 issue of the Journal of Higher Education.

This classless utopia came to an abrupt end about 1940 when the Federal Government discovered that the natural scientist had something to offer that the Nation badly needed. Almost overnight the universities became purveyors of scientific expertise and the Government became their best, perhaps only customer. Before the end of the war, hundreds of scientists in scores of universities, along with thousands of their students were subsidized to perform research in physics, chemistry, and the biological sciences.

But this was only the beginning. The Nation had become science-conscious and its leaders were not about to let the universities relapse into their comfortable prewar torpor. The establishment of the National Science Foundation was inevitable and it was only surprising that its budget for the first year was a mere $3.5 million. By 1961, of course, this meager budget had risen to $261.7 million, and in fiscal 1963, the National Science Foundation aims to spend $360,800,000. But even these impressive figures are dwarfed by the sums disbursed through the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These various agencies between them support some 12,000 to 15,000 predoctoral and postdoctoral students annually by nonduty fellowships and traineeships. In addition, an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 graduate students in the sciences and engineering hold research assistantships paid from Federal funds.

It hardly seems necessary to document what is now called the imbalance between the natural sciences and the humanities, but a few comments and conclusions from recent studies are pertinent. Both Bernard Berelson in "Graduate Education in the United States" and James A. Davis in "Stipends and Spouses" have made use of the same NORC survey of graduate student finances. This survey is somewhat misleading for our purposes since it does not differentiate between Federal support and subvention from other sources. It tends, therefore, to obscure the full extent of the imbalance. Nevertheless, Berelson concludes that "the sciences, including engineering, are at a clear advantage over other fields" (p. 149). Davis, whose entire book is devoted to graduate student financing, is naturally much more specific. He says, "In every comparison, natural science students are more likely to have high aid than social science and humanities students" (p. 62). "Over-all, natural science students have a marked advantage over their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities. Seventy-nine percent have some sort of stipend, as contrasted with about 60 percent in social science and humanities, and in every subcategory their stipend holding is higher. The extreme is in research assistantships. One out of five natural science students is an RA compared with one out of nine students in social science and one out of a hundred in humanities" (p. 60).

On the faculty level the contrast is, if anything, even more marked. In 1961, the National Science Foundation alone awarded 611 fellowships to persons of faculty rank (postdoctoral, senior postdoctoral, and science faculty). The figures for NIH, AEC, and NASA are generally comparable. In the humanities fields, on the other hand, postdoctoral and other faculty awards are virtually nonexistent, with the exception, of course, of Fulbright and a few other specialized awards that are available to all fields."

No one intended, of course, to relegate the humanities and the arts to an existence in obscurity and poverty and, in a sense, they were not so relegated. They were actually no poorer and no more obscure than they had been in the prescience era. They had become poor and obscure only by contrast with their affluent and distinguished neighbors. But relative poverty and obscurity are as painful as though they were absolute. And even in Academia, much as it hurts to admit it, affluence and public recognition bring with them enhanced academic status. (Of the 60 graduate deans in the land-grant universities, 47 are in the natural sciences, 8 in the social sciences, and 5 in humanities.) At any rate, there is no question that the financial imbalance has brought about a status imbalance in our universities, both on the faculty and graduate student levels, that constitutes a very real threat to higher education.

As one of the results, the number of students entering graduate study in the humanities fields is declining and there are some indications that their quality is deteriorating. In the past 5 years the production of Ph. D.'s in the humanities, arts, and social sciences has not kept pace with the overall increase in all fields nor with the needs of the colleges. In some areas, as for example history, the supply is already critically short of the demand.

Ever since the early 1950's the educational associations, the universities and colleges and the U.S. Office of Education have tried to secure legislation that would help to restore some sort of balance in the lopsided academic world. In 1958 they almost succeeded. In that year the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act which was designed to stimulate advanced study and research and particularly to expedite and improve the training of college teachers. Under its various titles it provides for graduate fellowships, student loans, summer language institutes, subsidies for courses in critical languages, and for experimental programs in new educational media, including television. For the humanities and the arts, title IV, the graduate fellowship program, seemed to offer the greatest hope, since it provided 1,500 3-year fellowships without any apparent restriction by field of study. And, indeed, in the first year approximately 32 percent of these fellowships were awarded in the arts and humanities fields and 26 percent in the social sciences. But as soon as the lists of awards were published the Congress wanted to know what possible relation to national defense could be claimed for folklore, art history, and ancient languages. When the awards for the second year were to be made, the House Committee on Labor and Education drew up a sharp directive forbidding fellowship awards in fields that had no direct connection with national defense, and specifically naming ancient languages, literatures, and history; arts, folklore, music, philosophy, and religion. No protests availed and the tabu against the arts and humanities still stands. No awards in the prohibited fields were made last year nor will any be made this year.

But perhaps this is a very good thing. For since this drastic congressional directive, a swelling chorus of voices has been raised on behalf of substantial aid to the arts and humanities as well as of those social sciences that are not recognized by the National Science Foundation. Some of the voices came from expected sources: the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools, the presidents of many liberal arts colleges. But some came from unexpected sources and were therefore all the more welcome. On November 15, 1960, the President's Science Advisory Committee issued an important policy statement which has since become known as the Seaborg report. Its introduction includes the following significant paragraphs:

"Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth."

And this statement is signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, President of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanograph, and others.

On December 15, 1961, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, said in a speech before the Council of Graduate Schools that he believed the time was ripe for legislation in support of the arts and humanities and that he would wish personally to introduce such a bill in the 88th Congress. He has further evinced his continuing interest, suggesting preparatory steps to be taken. At the same meeting, Dr. Robert M. Lumiansky, provost of Tulane University, proposed the establishment of a national humanities foundation, specifically defining the term "humanities" to include the fine arts and certain of the social sciences.[2]

In the past 6 months, interest in Federal aid to the humanities has been building up rapidly and there are indications that a favorable climate is developing in the Congress. Various formats have been suggested, three of which seem to be gathering more support than others. The first is the establishment of a national humanities foundation, patterned after the highly successful National Science Foundation. The latter is a unique cross between a private foundation and a Federal agency which has the dual function of setting science policy and of supporting basic research and education. It is governed by a 24-member National Science Board, appointed by the President for 6-year terms, plus a director. The national humanities foundation would be similarly organized and governed and it would support, besides the humanities and the arts, those social sciences which are not included under the National Science Foundation.

The second program proposes the expansion of the National Science Foundation into something like a national arts, letters, and science foundation, with at least two governing boards and perhaps a coordinating body. This type of organization is favored by some Members of Congress who are disturbed over the growing number of agencies disbursing Federal funds for education. Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, for example, has pointed out that the current

[2] ACLS Newsletter, vol. XIII, No. 1 (January 1962).

Federal outlay for 689 education programs is $2 billion, administered by 40 separate agencies. "This," she complains, "makes it impossible for any Member of Congress to know what is going on."

A third proposal is the establishment of a bureau or an institute within the Office of Education, charged with the specific support of the arts and humanities. This would place the ultimate control of the activity in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This proposal naturally has the support of the Commissioner of Education, and probably of the administration, but it might not find much favor in Congress and it would not satisfy the Council of Graduate Schools.

On April 17, 1962, the executive committee of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States voted unanimously to support the first of the three proposals, that is, the establishment of a national humanities foundation. As a second choice, it would reluctantly support a national arts, letters, and science foundation, but it would accept a bureau of an institute in the Office of Education only as a last desperate resort if all else failed. A fourth proposal to meet the situation by amending and expanding the National Defense Education Act received no support whatever.

Early this year, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island drafted a bill for support to the arts and humanities which he introduced in Congress on July 17, 1962. He calls it the Cultural Development Act of 1962 and it is carried on the House docket as H.R. 12560, a bill to establish a national institute of the arts and humanities.

This institute is to be located in the United States Office of Education and is to consist of a Federal advisory council on arts and humanities and a director and staff. It is authorized and directed to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities; to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or other nonprofit agencies; to provide through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals or through arrangements by contract or grant with institutions of higher education for the conduct of institutes or seminars for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel needed to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities.

The Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities shall consist of 24 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for terms of 6 years each. They shall be persons eminent in the education in or practice of the arts and letters; they shall be selected solely on the basis of distinction; and they shall be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by the act. And finally, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to employ a Director of the Institute and a staff of not more than 20 professional and technical persons to carry out the functions of the Institute.

It is apparent that Mr. FOGARTY, in outlining the format of his Institute, has drawn freely from the sucessful model of the National Science Foundation. Like the latter, his plan also provides for a 24-member Federal Advisory Committee plus a Director and staff. The chief difference here is that the Science Board is appointed by the President, while the Arts and Humanities Board is to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, the functions of the two organizations are similarly defined as far as the differences between their fields permit. This, of course, is all to the good; it is always sensible to follow a sucessful pattern.

Since the bill was introduced so late in the year it obviously could not expect action by the 87th Congress; nevertheless its introduction has served a very good purpose. It gives the learned societies and the educational associations an opportunity to clarify their thinking on the type of organization they wish to support and it gives them time to build up nationwide interest. Mr. FOGARTY has indicated that the does not insist upon the format now provided by his bill but is quite ready to alter it to meet the needs and the wishes of those concerned. He says, very reasonably, that he wants to provide the kind of support that the humanities and the arts need in a form acceptable to them and to the Congress.

So far, this account has been nothing more than a dry, objective report of the present efforts to provide Federal financial support for the humanities. This reporter, however, whose academic life was dedicated to language and literature, cannot refrain from adding an editorializing conclusion. He need hardly begin by saying that the realm of the spirit in the life of an individual, of the Nation, and of the world is of equal importance with the realm of science. Nor need it be said that the Nation and the world today need spiritual, ethical, and esthetic leadership at least as sorely as they need scientific leadership. Granted that we need scientific leadership to survive, we need spiritual leadership to make survival worthwhile. There was a time when these sentences were axioms. Perhaps they still are today.

A great deal has been written in the last two decades about the ailing humanities but there is little agreement on the nature of the ailment. The only certainty is that the humanities have been relegated to a place of secondary importance, not only in the world at large but unhappily also in the academic world. Our teachers and scholars have gradually accepted this inferior position and, as the strong grew stronger, the weak grew weaker. And today we suffer not so much from financial impoverishment as from status impoverishment. No one can deny the crying need for financial support of our scholarly and creative activities but no one can be so pragmatic as to believe that money alone is the panacea for all our ills.

What we need is reassurance of the validity of what we study and teach and practice. What we need is public recognition of the importance of the humanities and the arts to our system of higher education, to national welfare, and to the life of the individual. This means restoration of the principle of universality and indivisibility of learning. It means equal availability of opportunity accorded to all disciplines—not necessarily equal dollar support. It means, therefore, the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, parallel in structure, administration, and status to the National Science Foundation. Or it means the establishment of a National Arts, Letters, and Science Foundation, dedicated to the support of the entire edifice of higher education on an equal and impartial basis. Anything short of the establishment of one or the other of these agencies would not constitute restoration of balance and equality of discipline. An Institute or a Bureau or a Division in the Office of Education—no matter how much money it might disburse—would only serve to accentuate the status distinction between the natural sciences and the humanities and deepen the schism in higher education. The healing of the schism is the gravest problem that we face today.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

(By W. McNeil Lowry)

(The following discussion on the university and the creative arts was prepared for an audience of graduate deans under conditions noted in the first two paragraphs of the text. It is admittedly one sided: I had suggested to the Association of Graduate Schools that a professor of drama, music, or the visual arts be given a hearing on the same program. The AGS urged me to take the role of prosecutor, with the promise that its committee on policies would keep the subject on its agenda and afford opportunities for rebuttal. I am confident that readers of the Art Journal will take up the debate and thus help to clarify many of the issues involved in university training in the arts—W.M.L.)

I hope I have the sympathy of every member here who has read the report of your committee on policies in graduate education. When the committee in that report reaches the problems of higher education in the creative arts, it says:

"The facts of what has occurred are not fully available, however; nor, we believe, is there widespread understanding of the national conditions in the arts which have led to the present trends.

"The committee recommends no action by AGS on the subject. Instead, it has invited Dr. W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, who has long been concerned with the state of the creative arts in the United States, to discuss with us 'The University and the Creative Arts.'"

So I am on the spot. You are too, of course, for at the very least your committee has given me a clean slate upon which to write, and though I recommended it they were unable to associate with me upon this program a member of an arts faculty who might really know something about the problem from the inside. Furthermore, if I remember my academic politics, few fine arts, music, or theater professors ever become graduate deans, so there may be none in the audience who will feel like talking back.

My own dilemma remains the more acute, nevertheless, because there are too many ways to begin in analyzing the place of the creative arts in higher education and the impact upon the arts of what the universities do about them. Let us stipulate at the outset that the limit to what I can do today is to raise provocative questions, in the conviction that your committee on policies will keep the subject on its agenda for 2 or 3 years at least. To cover any ground at all, I can not even leave everything I say in the form of questions, and at times I shall have to appear dogmatic without, I hope, being so.

We could spend a great deal of time on the historical developments which have led deans of graduate schools to concern themselves with the relevance of education in the creative arts to the objectives of a university, but for the most profitable discussion the historical background must be treated in summary fashion. In the early days of the Republic private tutors were the source of education in music and the visual arts, creative writing was a thin adjunct of formal education, and only elocution had a remote connection with the theater arts. In 1804 a society of artists and their friends formed the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Its original purpose was the professional instruction of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, but it was thought necessary to collect works of art from the past in order to guide potential artists, and regular training in the history of art was launched. (It is at least worth noting that most of our oldest American museums in the same way grew out of independent art schools.)

It was not until the days of Charles Eliot Norton that history and interpretation of the fine arts became a really proper subject for concentration in those private institutions of higher learning that had their roots in the classics. Until then painting and sculpture (and music too) had been treated as sketchy backgrounds to history. Even in

the second and third decades of this century, the students of Paul Sachs at the Fogg were chiefly young men who were destined to take over the museum directorships of the country, for which, as one of them said to me recently, their qualifications were "70 percent social and 30 percent professional." By 1934 a special study of the subject showed that the history of art was well entrenched as a major discipline in both private and public universities, and every college had art appreciation and at least one course in art history. Today's graduate student in the fine arts only rarely trains for curatorial work in a museum. He finds in college or university teaching more sustained opportunities for his own scholarship, higher pay, and more fringe benefits than our financially hard-pressed museums can offer him.

The 1934 study to which I referred also showed that not only the history and appreciation but the practice of art had invaded the universities. Led by the public institutions, the universities had started a process which was less conscious than gravitational but which since 1934 has had a profound impact upon the future of the independent art school and upon art and the artists as well. By 1950 rising costs of operation in the independent professional schools were sharpened by an increasing loss of student tuitions. It was now possible to major in painting or sculpture in State supported universities with lower tuitions, and more important, one could gain a regionally accredited college degree while doing so. Many parents who had only mild enthusiasm for their son's or daughter's desire to become an artist insisted that he or she at least gain the passport to a marketable vocation like teaching. Independent art schools in the past decade have faced a bitter struggle for survival. Many have not survived, many have joined the opposite camp and merged with nearby colleges or universities in their programs, a few have taken leadership in gaining regional accreditation without sacrificing too many professional studio requirements, and only a very few have maintained intact a tradition that was always Spartan financially anyway.

As the universities increased their offerings in studio practice, the professional teacher was joined by the professional artist, first as an artist in residence and then as a regular member of the faculty. The principal economic base of the contemporary American painter and sculptor today, even among the top rank, is university and college teaching. In many ways these men were interlopers upon Olympus so far as historians of art were concerned, and in the early 1950's fine arts deans of the Midwestern State universities had to lead a revolt in the College Art Association to give the practice of art and its practitioners greater recognition within the fraternity. When the president of a small liberal arts college became the president of Harvard, he asked whether Harvard students too should not have some of the liberalizing benefit of aesthetic practice, and there followed a report on visual instruction at Harvard University which still can engender heat between disciples of the künstgeschichte and those who believe that students should be allowed to play with colors on canvas, if only as a sort of extracurricula activity.

I can myself attest to the liveliness of the controversies occasioned by the university's assumption of professional art instruction as a legitimate part of its curriculum. For 4 years in our program in the Ford Foundation we discussed with art historians, museum directors, artists, independent art school heads, and representatives of teachers colleges the need and timeliness of a national study of higher education in the visual arts. Our ultimate aim was to see such a study made under the most objective conditions, with the interests of the artist, the museum director, and the independent art school head as firmly maintained as the interests of the historian of art. Success, as always, came in personal terms, meaning in this case the breadth and judgment of the study's director, and 6 days ago we announced a grant of $180,000 to the College Art Association for an independent study to be led by Andrew Ritchie, director of the Yale University Art Galleries and formerly curator of painting at the Museum of Modern Art and director of the Albright Gallery in Buffalo. Two years from now you and I should know a great deal more about what is going on in your institutions in at least the visual aspects of the creative arts.

Among the many things we already know is that the normal course requirements for a liberal education and even the minimal concentration on technical practice, when put together in a university required more than 4 years and hence a new kind of degree, the master of fine arts. In a few institutions the doctorate itself has been modified to include a program that consists not primarily of history and theory but practice in art.

And the process I have sketched for the visual arts has been paralleled in music, the drama, and creative writing. Independent drama schools, never very strong in the United States, as well as the much stronger music conservatories have generally decayed as the universities, nominally at least, have taken over some of their functions. As your committee on policies has said in its summary:

"Since the 19th century, a steady migration to the campuses has occurred of types of instruction that formerly took place largely in independent schools and institutes. Training in the creative arts has joined this procession. Academic institutions now increasingly perform functions that formerly fell chiefly to independent drama schools, art institutes, music conservatories, and other forums of personal instruction not associated with educational institutions of more general purpose. [And] modern universities seem increasingly to be expected to offer instruction in the creative arts beyond the bachelor's degree."

So much for what has happened. Its implications range far more widely and intricately than we shall have time to discuss today, but the most important of these are, I think, clear, as is their relevance to your own responsibilities. Before coming to analyze the implications, however, I must digress for a moment to sharpen the frame of reference. There are some ways in which the arts are involved with university education which create no problems either for the objectives of a university or the state of the arts in the American society. But the professors of drama, music, and the visual arts for various reasons are on the defensive in many ways, and it is necessary for any critic to say what he is not talking about as well as what he is.

Let me state, therefore, that in analyzing the condition your committee has noted I am not concerned with university education in esthetics or in the history and theory of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, the dance, or any other of the creative arts. Perhaps it is necessary to say this because we can recall that in the generations shortly preceding ours even the literatures written in contemporary tongues were not considered proper subjects for scholarship, particularly of the advanced sort prescribed for graduate students. Twenty years ago I myself was a witness to a tiny change in this fashion when I became the first student in a very large graduate department ever to have the privilege (if that is the word) of writing a dissertation on a living author.

At any rate, I am assuming in this discussion that neither the undergraduate nor the graduate deans in the universities you represent have any special problems from the inclusion in the curriculum of musicology, theater history, the philosophy of art, the history of painting, and other such courses. This is, I take it, what we all mean when we include the fine arts, music, and drama in the humanities, whether we are talking about liberal education for the undergraduate or whether we are trying to get more of society's money into the support of doctoral and postdoctoral scholarship. As some of you know, in the Ford Foundation's support of humanistic scholarship through either the postdoctoral fellowships offered by the American Council of Learned Societies or our subsidies to new material published by university presses, we have tried to stress the importance to the humanities of musicology, art history, theater history, and aesthetics generally.

There is another large area I should like to except from the discussion, and this is harder to do because in one way it can be thought of as the crux of the whole matter. Throughout history institutions of formal education, primary, secondary, or higher, have generally afforded some opportunities for students with a taste for the arts to express this taste in peripheral or informal ways. It was only in our own century that one of these ways became the course in so-called appreciation of art, a curricular practice hard to defend unless such courses are taken in addition to a full and formal schedule. It has always seemed to me that the appreciation of literature, for example, can best come through a fairly rigorous course in literature, and similarly for the other arts. The more traditional ways—chamber music societies, the opportunity to participate in a dramatic performance without regard to courses in acting, literary clubs—all help to enrich the experience of young people living together in an educational community. I think this rather large and general view was what actually motivated President Pusey when he asked whether formal art history and the existence of the Fogg Museum really gave the Harvard undergraduate all the benefits of the visual arts as a means to the liberal education of the individual.

But these two digressions into which I have wandered forcibly bring us back to the subject of the university and the creative arts. The objective of undergraduate education in the humanities, I assume, is the liberal education of the individual; the objective of graduate education in these disciplines is the training of scholars competent to grasp a whole corpus of systematic knowledge and subject it to philosophical analysis. What is the relevance, to either of these objectives, of training in the techniques of painting, acting, directing, dancing, instrumentation, musical composition, creative writing, or any other branch of artistic creation? Can such training, given the objectives of a university, be offered under what are known as "professional" standards? If it cannot, what importance should the university attach to it? If it can, what are the problems to the university of adapting professional training in the arts to its other, more primary objectives?

If we look back at the historical timetable by which the university expanded its role in the creative arts, we find an almost exact coincidence with the growth in the American society of the vague idea that "the a-r-t-s are somehow good for people." Some of us have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private or public, individual or corporate, would find a greater share for the professional arts. That greater share for the arts is actually becoming visible, though by no means as yet proportionate to the importance of the arts in any society. But largely it is becoming available to the amateur artist, rather than the professional. So-called cultural centers are on the drawing

boards in many U.S. communities; somehow in our country businessmen or municipal and State officials appear to think that art begins with real estate. But by far the greatest number of these centers have no professional performing groups as components; many of them are to be built by State funds and will use State university budgets as the financing vehicle. It seems that we are to have the audience before we are to have the creators and performers.

Whence does this audience come? It is my belief that it has come largely from the increase in the proportion of our population that has been university trained. The whole phenomenon of that segment of our theater known as off-Broadway is supported, for better or worse, by an audience that has been educated in colleges and universities. Abstract expressionism is kept alive, critically and otherwise, by allied interests. The most consistent proportion of ticket buyers (though not of patrons) of the Metropolitan Opera is found among the physicians, very few of whom, I imagine, ever had courses either in singing, in musical composition, or even in the history of opera. Some of the richest and most varied concert programs outside our largest cities are supported in State university communities. And there are numerous other examples to be cited.

They all would seem to support the idea that the arts are somehow good for people, and given the nature of our democratic and laissez-faire economic society this evolution within it is undoubtedly a necessary step in the development of cultural resources. But it antedates (by how long a period we can only guess) any realization that it is the highly talented and professionally trained artist on whom all depends; it lacks as yet, in short, discrimination as to what the arts are really about. And if I have given the university the bulk of the credit for providing a new audience for the arts in the United States, I feel I must also give it a strong share of the blame for the lack of discrimination visible in that audience.

How did all this come about? I think, to put it bluntly, the university has been having it both ways. It says on the one hand that its function is the liberal education of the individual, and exposure to the creative arts is merely one avenue toward that end. It acts on the other hand as if it were training young people for vocations, and not merely the vocations of scholar or teacher of the arts but the vocation of the professional artist per se. Let me illustrate what I mean generally from two contrasting art fields, one in performance and the other in creation.

The best equipped theaters in the United States are not those in which professional actors appear but those maintained by the universities. The drama is quite legitimately an important vehicle for liberal education, and this is what university administrators say when forced to defend the existence of both the theater and the theater department. It is not the university's function to train professional actors and directors—historians of the drama, of the theater, and of stagecraft, yes, but not performing artists per se. So far, so good. But in the catalog are course sequences not only in theater history or dramatic literature but in acting, directing, technical direction, costuming, even in theater management. And the university, through its accreditation to grant degrees if not through its tuition, competes with the few remaining independent drama schools for the student who thinks he wants to make the theater a career. Such a student will be expected, of course, to take many other subjects in fields he would not have time in which to concern himself if he were apprenticing as an actor in a resident company or would not be required to take in a professional drama school. From these subjects he is expected to receive the balance of the liberal education for which the university intends him. But if his university career is the only training as an actor the young person either expects or knows how to obtain, then for him this is his professional training. It goes on, generally, in a well-equipped theater, but also generally with amateur directors and amateur acting ensembles, and if criticized at all, criticized again by amateurs. He is told by the professors that academic theater stands for the classical, cultural, or avant garde theater, in contrast to Broadway, which is commerce, though with its large budgets and a few great stars Broadway may now and then produce a work of art. He is told that university productions are often "better than Broadway." But in any event, the young actor normally is led to believe that there is nothing in the American theater between academic theater and Broadway; this is the choice given to him; and he leaves the university to beat a path to New York or Los Angeles, where he joins hundreds of other young actors who have been similarly indoctrinated. The fact that he still has not had a professional apprenticeship, and that this is all he is ready for, is ignored. To the theater professor who stays behind, there is always the consolation that if the young actor does not make his way into the professional theater, he has had a liberal education and that is the university's objective anyway. Since, as you must realize, the opportunities for serious actors in spoken dramas are steadily being curtailed on Broadway, the supply of frustrated young academic theater products becomes greater and greater.

I ask your indulgence to quote at length from the analysis of a talented academic theater director, Prof. James H. Clancy of Stanford University. He is talking about a recent opportunity he had to test in Europe Giraudoux' hyperbole that theater is "the only form of a nation's spiritual and artistic education." I quote:

"But unfortunately this is not the sense in which the word 'education' is applied to much of the 'theater in the school' with which I am most familiar [in the United States]. Here the word has been used variously, but most frequently to make palatable the fact that art was neither the possibility nor the aim. This frightened and furtive use of the word 'education' resulted not only from technical incompetence [and helped perpetuate it] but also from faintness of heart and spiritual debility. One of its results has been to produce a strange dichotomy in many of the institutions of higher learning that profess the dramatic arts. On one side tend to be the 'researchers.' Their results may be useful in the theater when and if the artist finds a meaning for them, but they are material to the artist in the same category as any other material. In this sense the theater will possibly find more use for an intensive study of Pepys' diaries than of a calendar of the production at Drury Lane in the last half of the 18th century—although the latter is apt to be considered, mistakenly, more directly the provenance of the department of dramatic art.

"On the other side of this uneasy dichotomy are the 'practical' theater men who, sure of the myopia of their colleagues on the 'research' side, are not troubled by their own astigmatism. Sensing the artistic unlikelihood of the Drury Lane Calendar they remove themselves scornfully from such 'ivory tower' considerations, forgetting, if they ever knew, that the ivory tower and its dreams are an important and necessary extension of reality, and not a substitute for it. Caught in their centripetal activities of box office, billing, and good, clean entertainment, they soon come to regard the construction of a flat as more important than its function [poor Gordon Craig, he didn't know how to stand 'em up in Moscow] and that the values of a play can be best judged by the number of people who can be cajoled or chivied into attending its performances. Working in an institution such as the theater which is fortunately still primitive mechanically, the educational theater is fast developing a large group of extremely competent men who are 'practical'—about the major matters of unimportance.

"One thing, it seems to me, the college or university is eminently fitted to do for the education of the artist: serve as the source of what I can only think to call chronological integration. The university has traditionally served as a repository of the past, a place where the experiences of past generations are sifted, analyzed, and interpreted. Social pressures outside the academy, plus the political pressures of world events, tend to prevent the contemporary artist from becoming a racial or geographical segregationist, but the university can be a major aid in preventing him from developing into a chronological segregationist, producing a gauche and baseless form of 'art moderne' that serves only to express his dissociation from the streams of humanity. This does not mean, God knows, that the academic theater should persist in archeological reconstructions of presumed theatrical methods of the past. The academy rightfully preserves the past only when it constantly interprets in light of the present: it maintains the past by demonstrating its imminence. It helps create the future by demonstrating its continuance."

Let me turn now from the performing to the creative arts. In my introduction I sketched the process by which economic and popularizing forces turned hundreds of would-be painters and sculptors from the independent art schools to the universities. The burgeoning of university curriculums in the practice of painting and sculpture since 1950 has coincided with the supremacy of a particular artistic style—call it action painting, the New York School of Abstract Expressionism, or whatever your favorite term may be. For good or bad, this style in painting particularly lends itself to intellectual and technical imitation even by those young artists who have not had 2 or 3 years of rigid grounding in drawing and design. The result is that we now have a new academic style that has spread throughout college and university studios almost without check. A couple of years ago I was examining student paintings submitted from a variety of institutions as a part of the requirements for admission to an independent art school that will not take candidates before their junior year in college. "You know," the instructor said to me, "each time I leave the room and come back, I couldn't for the life of me prove that all these paintings weren't the work of the same person."

Another result of great importance to all of us whose first interest is in the professional arts, is the effect upon the painter or sculptor who has been brought into the university to teach his craft. This is a subject I hear about all the time in the running conversations we keep up with artists. A few enjoy teaching as a second vocation and believe their own creativity does not suffer from it. Some enjoy teaching while believing their own work does suffer. The great majority endure teaching as a means of livelihood, suffer the fact that there may be only two or three students a year in whom they glimpse any potentialities of talent, agonize over that portion of their own creative quotient which ends in the canvases of amateurs, and yearn for the unlikely year when some agency like the Ford Foundation may permit them simply to paint. Unanimously, even including those who believe their own creativity does not suffer from teaching, the artists to whom I have talked are bitter about the fact that their students are handed to them in groups and they have no voice in screening or selecting them.

One of the first sculptors of his generation chose to go without a regular livelihood when he came to the United States 14 years ago rather than teach students he himself could not select. He was merely more courageous or more optimistic than his colleagues, who are probably equally dedicated to the old atelier system in which social democracy was not allowed to excuse the total absence of talent.

I think you will by now have foreseen my first conclusion: The university has largely taken over the functions of professional training in the arts but in the main has sacrificed professional standards in doing so. The absence of discrimination has proceeded partly from the strong popularizing currents already at work in the society outside the campuses, and partly from the university's original objective, the liberal education of numerous individuals drawn from an affluent democracy.

You may be somewhat more surprised at my second conclusion: The trend is irreversible. The future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists, and second, upon the provision of postgraduate opportunities for professional apprenticeship removed from an academic environment.

My final conclusion is a mixture of pessimism and optimism: The requisite shift in the university environment for the arts will be achieved only under great difficulties, if at all. Opportunities exist for new forms of cooperation between the university and professional institutions in the arts, provided the university will regard the arts as important and give financial support to the cooperative mechanisms that must be established.

I shall proceed to elaborate on the last two conclusions and to single out the implications for the university graduate school.

As Director of the Ford Foundation in Humanities and the Arts, it has been my privilege since 1957 to study not only the trends in the arts but the ways in which the arts are now or can be financially supported. It is as a result of this latter study that I am convinced we can not reverse the migration to the campuses of all forms of training that formerly took place under independent auspices. There are still many individual patrons of the arts, despite the income tax, but the motives of many of these are largely social and they like to support buildings or performances. Many of them also like to support education, but they think of education in terms of schools and colleges. Organized donors, such as corporations, put education first in their philanthropies, though they still, as you know, do not give the maximum allowed by law. The proportion they give the arts again chiefly reflects the social interests of individual patrons in the arts. The foundations grant much more money through universities and colleges than through the professional arts. When Government bodies come into the act, which in this country is rare, they too act either for public institutions in the arts or for the interests of the schoolchildren.

Academic deans coping with deficit financing in their annual budgets may not make the best audience to which to say it, but the fact is that so far as artistic training is concerned the universities have the money. The retiring president of Indiana University has often said that the State institution in our generation has taken over the regional role in the arts once played by the German princeling and later by the German stadt. He was not thinking merely of training the would-be artists, either. He was thinking of providing Indiana communities with musical and dramatic performances and with art exhibits, both professional and student. But if we think only of training in the creative arts, the future is clear. An enterprising academic theater director in Texas runs a repertory theater in a $1 million building in Dallas with M.A. candidates at Baylor University in Waco. The same illustration emphasizes another reason why individual and organized donors prefer to support the amateur artist in universities. It is safer to give money to people like yourselves and the institutions you represent, and though the donor may get less of the beautiful he gets at least as much of the good and the true.

In short, I think you and I were probably in agreement before I started that except for a few institutes and conservatories that may (and only may) survive our generation, except for a peculiar art like ballet in which the practitioners are already too old if they wait until college age, the university of the future will get the first crack at most potential artists. My question today, and it goes first to your undergraduate deans, is whether the university can change the environment on one part of its campus while holding its traditional atmosphere on another. It does not help to say you have done so on the agricultural campus or in the physical education school. The requisite atmosphere for professional training in the arts is somewhat more subtle than that in the dairy barns or in the locker rooms.

What is that atmosphere? It is easier to describe it than to analyze it. I have met it frequently in the 50-odd cities I have visited, often three or four times, in my personal fieldwork in the arts. I have encountered it most often in two otherwise quite unrelated institutions—the independent school of art and the resident theater company. Even at first blush, the independent art school looks different from the university art department, and not because the models in the latter place generally wear halters and shorts. And the resident theater's atmosphere, contrasted to that of the academic, is not merely a product of its physical inadequacies. (It may interest you to know that the capsule report of the European drama training expert, Michel St. Denis, after his first trip outside New York, was of the amateur work going on in wonderful university theater plants and the truly professional work going on in a few cramped cubbyholes.)

No, the Spartan effect one detects in professional environments is not merely physical, though that situation is general. It has much to do with the drive or fanaticism or whatever of the person who has made his choice, and will eschew anything else—money, the elite identification of a university degree, even health—to develop the talent he hopes he has. It comes also from the pride of doing for oneself, of making ends meet, of giving society what it will pay for even if what it pays is inadequate to sustain a normal life, of working in the midst of a fraternity that will show the same fanaticisms and abnegations. It comes from the endless time, time, time spent on doing one thing, only one thing, and then starting all over again. It comes, finally, from the acceptance of such distortion as a way of life, a way of life, you will note, that is in some ways completely antithetical to the ideal objective of a liberal and humane education. Some of the most professional, the most talented, and the most mature artists I have met lack either the time or the capacity to sort out a decent personal life from the endless hours of their artistic concentration. Only a rare heredity or early environment and not, I am afraid, a very good education, has given some of these artists a humanity that separates them from the talented bums in their midst.

I shall waive the question whether you even want this sort of atmosphere on your campuses, and go instead to whether you can have it if you want it. The best answer is, I do not know. But despite that, there are some implications more obvious than others. The most obvious is that if the university is going to allow the student's distorted concentration on hardnosed doing and redoing it, it cannot also require of him all the courses in humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences that are even minimally thought to constitute a liberal education. The university can, of course, stretch out the years to be applied, as it has done in the MFA. But there is a limit to that adjustment. I have already noted that the ballet dancer, starting at 9 years to train her body as her artistic instrument, knows she must forego the university completely, at least if the potentiality of a professional career still seems good by the time she is 18. There is a real question whether under professional conditions an actor, even if he spent 5 years in college, could leave more than 2 hours a weekday in those 5 years for anything but rehearsal or performance. It is not an accident that the university now probably does a better job in training the musician than in training other artists. Historically there have been so many branches of the musical art required of a training musician that the universities have allowed more concentration in that program. And secondly, the most technical accomplishments of a musician are more easily tested than those of an actor, a writer, a director, or even (these days) a painter. But again it can be argued, as the musicologist, Paul Henry Lang has done, that "pseudo-scholarship is the fateful consequence of the indiscriminate mixing of university with conservatory." (Lang was commenting at the time on the University of Michigan's announcement of a doctoral program in piano.)

Another obvious implication of my general argument is that neither the professors of the creative arts nor the students can be selected for a professional curriculum and atmosphere according to the patterns now employed in universities. No one has found the litmus paper that can make a positive or a negative test for artistic talent, or even for artistic drive, which would help us almost as much in this context. But drives can be isolated for identification if certain choices are forced. Roughly 80 percent of the university students now concentrating in one of the creative arts have chosen to major in art education; they are insuring their ability to have a second vocation if the first fails. For four-fifths of the students, then, I would be so dogmatic as to say no special atmosphere, no distorted concentration need be attempted. By all means excuse them from none of the normal requirements of a liberal education. Let them hunger for the true. Their hunger for the arts is not fanatical enough. They are not, as Brooks Atkinson once said about talented theater directors, hopefully crazy. I would recommend that the universities screen creative arts students twice: once by their own choices, as I have indicated, and again by the choice of the individual teacher after the student has had a term or a year of the distorted concentration for which I am groping to find other words.

Selection of the directors for a truly professional training in the arts will be difficult. But in one stroke, the university will have a wider field of talented artists from which to choose if the reform I have just recommended is taken and the teacher is allowed to have his atelier of potential talents by his own selection. I think this principle from the training of painters and sculptors should be extended to performing artists and to composers and to writers, as indeed for the last named it has already been in many universities. Another obvious corollary is that the man who is trained to teach theater history is not necessarily qualified to direct a play, any more than the historian of arts is qualified to teach painting or sculpture.

The concentration of courses and the selection of students and faculty, though difficult, are probably more feasible than the creation of that intangible atmosphere

of professionalism to which I referred a few moments ago. I do not want to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that the universities simply borrow outright the curriculums and atmosphere of independent institutes and conservatories; I am certainly not suggesting that these independent institutions have done a perfect job in the professional education of the artist. They have not, and today they cannot, because already they have found themselves unable to compete with the universities in the salaries and tenure and fringe benefits of faculty. When I cited the atmosphere of the independent art school and the resident theater company, I was citing an intangible spirit and not model institutions for training. How to translate this spirit into a very different location is problematical. Yet undoubtedly the spirit is a product of motive and procedure, to a large extent, and the changes to which I have already alluded may help produce it. To face the necessary distortion of the primary objective of a university, to reflect that distortion in a highly concentrated curriculum, to open that curriculum only to the students with the most fanatical drives, to give to the artist-professor responsibility for testing both the drives and the talents—these motives and procedures may go part way toward producing a professional atmosphere. That is as strong as I can put it confidently.

There is one other possibility, again by analogy. Wherever Spartan restrictions are logical and natural, they should be applied to the whole enterprise of professional training in the arts. Nothing so much as the raw need to survive pares a resident theater or other institution in the arts to the essentials of professionalism or makes it a better place for hard-nosed apprenticeship. It is fortunate that universities by and large have well-equipped theaters and concert halls, and fairly adequate painting and music studios. It is still possible, perhaps, to emphasize repeatedly that what goes on inside is of prime importance and real estate of only secondary. One of the most influential of all theater departments has flourished for years in shockingly inadequate quarters.

I said earlier that the future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists and, second, upon the provision of opportunities for professional apprenticeship through nonacademic persons or institutions.

Most of these opportunities, I believe, will be found only when the student is ready to leave his undergraduate career. Not all of them, however. At the University of Utah, for example, mature professional actors are mixed with each student dramatic production. Indiana, Minnesota, Catholic University, and others give graduate and sometimes undergraduate students experience in the trials of the touring theatrical company. Minnesota hopes that Tyrone Guthrie will use some of its student actors in small parts at the new repertory theater going up in Minneapois. And so forth.

In the past 3 years a few universities have been groping toward other developments in the arts, You are all conscious of the festival seasons and seminars involving professional artists on the campus; it would be difficult to assay the lasting impact of these on undergraduates training in the arts. A more important innovation is the idea of maintaining on the campus a professional resident theater company as a cultural resource on a footing with the library. Only the Extension Division of the University of California at Los Angeles has to date pulled it off satisfactorily, and there the secret was actually the long mailing lists of southern Californians addicted to any kind of adult education. Princeton University's experience was instructive, for good and for bad. With the McCarter Theater a white elephant on its hands, Princeton decided it would have two short seasons in the performing arts including the theater. But the university did not want to put much money into the enterprise, so its original plan was to give the professional director and actors 4½ days to rehearse each play. I had occasion to point out that Princeton would not start off a new science laboratory in that fashion and expect the result to reflect the institution's own standards. But as the agenda before us today suggests, the universities are still groping for new patterns in the arts, and I am sure we are all sympathetic to the attempt Princeton is making. Harvard did not have a white elephant, and through the generosity of an alumnus built its own new and challenging theater. To date, however, so far I have learned, this theater is destined as another extracurricular home for the undergraduate.

If they will move in still more unorthodox fashion, the universities can build many more cooperative mechanisms for students who are graduating or have become postgraduates. Our own program in the Ford Foundation affords illustrations; I shall cite two in contrasting fields. Young composers, most of them holding advanced degrees, are selected to write music directly for performance by high school orchestras and choral groups. You are no doubt aware that young composers generally must write for their filing cases rather than for performance, and you may not be too old to recall that the repertoire of even the best high school musical organization is deficient in contemporary music. The other example is the so-called theater communications group, which among other aims, will attempt to point out to both the most talented undergraduate actors and their professors where the young actors may get a year-round professional apprenticeship instead of going off to beat the streets of New York and Los Angeles.

The field for new modes of cooperation between the universities and artistic groups in the same or more distant communities in 1961 appears very wide. I say this rather confidently because my mail and my fieldwork bring me new ideas for such cooperation almost daily. I am even more confident that these artistic groups expect either the universities or the foundations to support such mechanisms, and they are realistic enough to know that a national foundation does not expect to give widespread support to local activities. Theatrical and musical organizations want your students as paid audiences; they will take the best of them as paid apprentices if you will put up the money, and if you want to give them graduate credit for such apprenticeships, that is all right too. Museums want to join with you in the training and retention of curators and directors (as is already being done in half a dozen places), but again they want you to find the money for this.

As administrators in important and complex institutions, you, of course, are most conscious of the fact that raising the funds for existing activities is already a difficult undertaking. But I presume we are talking of the future, too. And I believe that in addition to the trends your Committee on Policies has noted, there is an inevitable trend toward a greater sharing of both your facilities and your funds by community institutions in the arts, particularly and most extensively when your funds come from the taxpayers of your States.

The choice you make in this decade may be crucial for the arts, because already the universities have drifted along with the society in the perpetuation of the amateur and of the imitator. It would be very discouraging to think that your efforts and your financial resources, like most of those being utilized in other quarters, could be expended toward a greater and greater popularization of standards. Whether you can make a home on your campus for what I have called distortion as a way of life, I do not know. If you cannot, I hope you will confine all your activities in the arts to historical and theoretical treatment.

When President Wall came to talk to me about this session, he said you would all be prepared for the fact that in addressing myself to the subject of "The University and the Creative Arts" I would have to speak largely without distinction between the undergraduate and graduate schools, and this is certainly what I have done. But I think whatever specific advice I have to give about graduate curriculums has already emerged from the contest. Just to recapitulate it, however—

Graduate schools, it seems to me, have two responsibilities for the creative arts. One is very old and one is very new. The very old one is to recognize the history, theory, and esthetics of the arts as legitimate subjects for scholarship and research on a par with any of the other humanistic disciplines. The very new responsibility is to support new forms of cooperation between the university and truly professional institutions in the arts, however small or financially pressed such institutions may be. The training resulting from such cooperation will largely go on outside the campus; it will be unorthodox; it will have to be extemporized; but it will not be any less integral a part of the university than many of the scientific and other institutes which you all have tucked away here and there. Whether you will give graduate degrees for such training, and which degrees, I am not prepared at the moment to argue.

Unless and until such new forms can be developed, however, I would not want, if I were a graduate dean, to give either credits or degrees to technical (as distinguished from historical) proficiency in the arts beyond the first year. Under present conditions, the best service you can perform for the potential artist is to throw him out. If he is more interested in the shadow than the substance, in pretense than in intensity, he will readily find his enclave somewhere else anyway. And if he just should happen to be an artist, he will begin his long and painful education. No play was ever more dramatic, no musical composition more evocative, no novel truer to the imagination merely because its author was given a Ph. D. for creating it. And that is probably the safest thing I have said this afternoon.

H.R. 5140

A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cultural Development Act of 1963".

TITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS

Findings and purposes of Act

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds that the vitality, quality, and further development of the arts and humanities in the United States are matters of profound national interest, and that the preservation and extension of the Nation's cultural resources requires that the Federal Government provide appropriate encouragement and support to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and associations engaged in education in, sponsorship of, or otherwise advancing, artistic and cultural interest and activity. The Congress also finds that the many Federal programs and

activities which involve, or which affect or are related to the arts and humanities should be assessed and evaluated in terms of their impact on American culture, and, insofar as it is practical, be coordinated and related to broad cultural needs and objectives.

(b) While the Congress strongly affirms that individual initiative and personal choice are the inviolable characteristics of American art and culture, it recognizes that government has a responsibility to help assure that conditions in our society encourage creativity. Increasing urbanization and population growth, greatly increased leisure time afforded by industrial and agricultural technology, early retirement, and extended lifespan and related factors have created an enormous need and opportunity for the pursuit and enjoyment of cultural interests. The failure of our society to meet this need and to exploit this opportunity would be a tragic blow to the general welfare of the American people.

(c) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a means by which the Federal Government can render effective assistance, in ways entirely appropriate for government, to efforts to encourage cultural development.

Assurance against Federal interference

SEC. 102. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association.

Definitions

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia;

(4) the term "nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations" means those organizations described in section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(5) the term "art" or "arts" means both the performing and the nonperforming arts, including but not limited to music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, and the dance; the term "humanities" includes modern and ancient language and literature, history, and philosophy; the term "culture" or "cultural" is used more broadly to characterize the whole range of interests and activities that promote the enlightenment and refinement of the public in intellectual and esthetic matters.

Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of Advisory Council

SEC. 104. (a) Any member of the Federal Advisory Council appointed under this Act, who is not a regular full-time employee of the United States, is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 201. There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Institute of Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Institute"). The Institute shall consist of a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Council") and a Director and staff.

Functions of the Institute

SEC. 202. (a) The Institute is authorized and directed—

(1) to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities and in the advancement of culture;

(2) to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities, including the evaluation of such activities, through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations;

(3) to promote and advance education in the arts and humanities by the production or commissioning, collection, and dissemination of films, records, tapes, reproductions, or printed matter suitable for use in courses or lectures in the arts conducted by schools, colleges, and universities, or other nonprofit institutions engaged in providing education in the arts and humanities;

(4) to maintain a central clearinghouse of information covering the various aspects of the arts and humanities in the United States, including activities of other Federal departments or agencies, and to make such information available to the public;

(5) to provide, through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals (within the limits of such sums as the Congress may specifically appropriate for this purpose), or through arrangements (by contract or grant) with groups specified in paragraph (2) for the conduct of institutes or seminars, for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel who, in the judgment of the Council, are in short supply and are most needed by educational and other cultural institutions and agencies to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities; and

(6) to render consultative and advisory services to other Federal departments and agencies, State and other public agencies, public and other nonprofit educational agencies and institutions, and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations concerned with education in or advancement of the arts and humanities.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the Institute shall place primary emphasis upon the educational aspects of the arts and humanities but it shall interpret "education" broadly so as to include all levels, conducted formally or informally by both public and private groups specified in paragraph (2) for the benefit of people of all ages.

(c) The Commissioner shall render an annual report to the Secretary for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Institute and making such recommendations as he may deem advisable. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Council.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 301. (a) The Council shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Secretary, and of the Institute Director ex officio, and shall, as provided by this Act, advise the Commissioner in the exercise of the authority granted to the Institute by this Act, and advise the Secretary on national needs relating to the arts and humanities in the United States. The persons appointed as members (1) shall be eminent in the education in or the practice, performance, administration, criticism, or promotion of the arts, letters, or cultural interests of the United States; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council (except that of the Director) shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of members first appointed after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the Secretary, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years.

(c) The Secretary shall call the first meeting of the Council, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The Institute Director shall be secretary to the Council.

(d) The Council shall meet at least once annually and at such other times as requested by the Commissioner. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum, and each member shall be given reasonable notice in writing of the call of a meeting.

(e) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by the Council at the first meeting for a term of two years, and at every succeeding annual meeting occurring at the end of each such two-year term, except that a vacancy in either office may be filled by vote of the Council.

(f) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Council pursuant to its authorization, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authority of Commissioner

SEC. 302. In order to carry out the functions of the Institute, the Commissioner shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act (other than title IV), including but not limited to the authority—

(1) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the Institute's operation and organization and personnel;

(2) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for the administration of this Act;

(3) to make grants or enter into contracts or other financial arrangements as authorized by title II, except that such grants, contracts, or other financial arrangements shall be limited to those recommended by the Council, or by a committee of members established by the Council for this purpose;

(4) to make advance, progress, and other payments in connection with contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(6) to receive and use funds donated by others, provided that such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to further one or more of the general purposes of the Institute;

(7) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by law for persons serving without compensation;

(8) to employ such personnel as he may deem necessary to carry out the functions of the Institute under this Act, not to exceed twenty of which may be technical and professional persons including the Director of the Institute compensated at rates not to exceed $19,000 per annum without regard to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; and

(9) to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

TITLE IV—FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 401. Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) to promote and support activities, projects, and education in the arts and humanities in order to encourage and assist cultural development in the United States in conjunction with the programs provided in titles II and III of the Cultural Development Act of 1963."

SEC. 402. (a) Section 4(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "education, or public affairs" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "education, the arts and humanities, or public affairs";

(2) by striking out "scientific leaders" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "leaders in these fields"; and

(3) by striking out "other scientific or educational organizations" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "other organizations in the fields of science, the arts and humanities, and education".

(b) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) A Division of the Arts and Humanities."

(c) The first sentence of section 9(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(except that in the case of the Division of the Arts and Humanities six of the members shall be eminent in the arts and humanities and five in other fields)".

(d) Section 9(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

(e) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after "engineering, and other sciences" the following: ", and for study or work in the arts and humanities,".

(f) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "such basic scientific research activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "such basic scientific research and other activities".

(g) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

(h) Section 11(i) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

GREECE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here in this distinguished hall in the first week of spring in the year 1963. Each year at this time we celebrate the end of the long cold of winter, and the promise of the fine warmth of summer soon to come. It is a day of joy. But it is something else. It is the day on which we celebrate the freedom of a tiny nation. On a map of the world it is scarcely a dot, it is so minute. But on the great map of time and civilization it looms like a veritable Colossus, like a towering mountain of learning and culture. The sands of time may have many footprints, but the prints of this nation walk across all the Western World, and indeed all the Eastern World. It is the day we celebrate the freedom of the great nation of Greece.

The very name conjures up haunting memories.

There is the memory of art. We remember the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, and among them the great statue of Zeus by Phideas, and the splendid temple of Artemis at Ephesus and the Colossus of Rhodes by Chares. We remember the splendor of the Doric, the Ionian, and Corinthian temples. From across 2,000 years the sculpture of ancient Greece reached its magic hand to form Michelangelo Buonarotti, and still haunts the beauty of Rodin today.

There is the memory of poetry. All of us have learned the wonders of epic poetry from Homer. All of us have encamped outside the walls of Troy with the avenging Greek Army; and all of us have wandered the world with Odysseus, with the distant memory of Penelope haunting the pages of these great books. We remember the odes of Pindar and the lyric poetry of Sappho.

We remember also the drama. There were the great and moving dramas of Aeschylus, with long forgotten death of Iphigenia still waiting to be avenged upon the head of Agamemnon. Sophocles is the one we most remember, with the enormity of the tragedies of Oedipus and Antigone still towering over the world today. And Euripides with Elektra. They are the great foundation stones of the drama, and so well were they written that when Rome turned to the drama, she achieved greatness only when she translated the Greeks, and even in the 20th century, the greatest of American dramatists, Eugene O'Neill, turned back to the Greeks to frame his own dramas, with Euripides and Sophocles walking anew in the pages of "Mourning Becomes Electra."

We remember the wars of Greece. We remember their strength when they stood against the tyranny of the Persians. We remember Thermopolae, and we remember Marathon.

"The mountains look on Marathon
And Marathon looks on the sea
And musing there an hour alone
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.
For, standing on the Persian's grave,
I could not deem myself a slave."

So spoke the poet Byron in "Don Juan," and so indeed speaks all the world when we read anew those tales of heroism, when a small nation stood against the power of an enormous empire.

We remember philosophy. We read again the works of Socrates, of Plato, of Aristotle. We walk through the grove of Academe with the men who came to be taunted, prodded by Socrates. We sit with Plato at the feet of Socrates, and we stand in awe before the ponderous mind of Aristotle. Their footsteps echo like distant thunder all through the history of Western philosophy, and for the great minds of each age, there is that moment when in desperation they turn again to the greatness of the Greeks.

We remember their politics. We stand in awe before the minds which first set up a system of government so similar to our own. We know that if these souls returned from the shades of the past, they could sit beside us in this very house, and could deliberate with us; indeed, would add new notes of wisdom to our deliberations.

These we remember, and these are only part of the greatness of Greece. I sat beside the Greek Orthodox Bishop Iakovos only a week ago when he was honored at a dinner in my district. After a long evening of moving speeches he rose solemnly, knowing that this would be an audience difficult to hold after all the other talks.

Ladies and gentlemen—

He said—

this is a great nation, with freedoms unheard of, especially freedom of speech. But for every privilege there is a price. Tonight the price of freedom of speech is patience.

I assure you, the audience was his, and listened to the wise words of a man who has been chosen president of the World Council of Churches.

Today we celebrate the freedom of this nation. For nearly 400 years Greece was a captive State in the Ottoman Empire but the seeds of freedom would not die and in the war for freedom from 1821 to 1829 Greece proved she had a right to stand among the nations of the modern world. In 1830 her freedom was guaranteed by the nations of the West.

There is a lesson in this for all of us. The freedom of Greece stood strong at the end of the Second World War when the power of communism sought to crush out the flame of freedom, but they fought with bullets and ballots and Greece is a free nation today.

The wisdom of Athens has prevailed over the power of Sparta. The love of liberty that burned brightly at Marathon still burns even brighter from the heights of the Acropolis today. When men look at the awesome brute power of Moscow standing upon the bodies of so many enslaved nations today, let them remember to ask, "Where is Sparta today?" And if Khrushchev is proud of

his name among the nations today, let him remember that we all remember Sophocles and Aristophanes, and Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle, and Phidias, but who remembers the tyrants of Sparta?

Today we can all look with Byron at Marathon. Today we can celebrate the freedom of Greece, and if the course of history runs true, tomorrow we may celebrate the freedom of all the other oppressed nations of the world. In the strange course of history, in the not too distant future children may ask in puzzlement, "Who were Mao Tse-tung, and Stalin and Khrushchev?"

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF *INDEPENDENCE* OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 45th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia. Like millions of other oppressed victims of Soviet colonialism, the people of Byelorussia today live in conditions near slavery behind the Iron Curtain. However, in coordination with representatives and spokesmen for other captive peoples, Americans of Byelorussian origin are maintaining the struggle for freedom of the land of their forefathers.

Therefore, this 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence takes on additional significance since it serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain, and that the determination of all anti-Soviet peoples continues to be the fundamental weakness of the Soviet Union.

In comemmorating Byelorussian Independence, I join the other Members in encouraging them in their perseverance and hope for national independence through the principle of self-determination, and remind the brave Byelorussian people that they do have the sympathetic alinement of other captive nations who, in the cause of justice, must eventually triumph in their drive for political and economic liberty and freedom from the Soviet colonial yoke.

NATIONAL VISITOR AND STUDENT CENTER

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a "19-whereas" resolution that would lead to the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia.

Most of the whereases deal with the reason why we should have an adequate information center here in Washington, D.C., so that the millions of people who come here every year—and it is estimated that over 15 million people visit here each year—may have a better opportunity to benefit from seeing the memorials, the Capitol Building area, the Library of Congress, the Archives, the Art Gallery, and all the other things that can be seen here. This resolution calls for the creation of a committee of 20: 12 Members of Congress, 6 House Members and 6 Senators, to be appointed on a bipartisan basis; the Superintendent of National Capital Parks; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; 2 distinguished citizens to be appointed by the President of the United States; and 2 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

This bill calls for the study of the feasibility and advisability of having such a center here in Washington, patterned after the one you can see in Williamsburg, where people may go, park their cars, go into an information center, be refreshed, and see a film demonstrating the historic role of this community.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, my resolution proposes the appointment of a Commission which will carefully study and subsequently report to the Congress its conclusions respecting ways and means of effectively and relatively inexpensively educating the public, both at home and abroad, respecting American history, traditions, democratic processes and devotion to peace.

To be sure, the executive departments carry on some activities toward this objective. The Members of both Houses of the Congress give preferred attention to the subject in talking to their constituents and when speaking before many groups throughout the land. But it is clear that we have neglected to take advantage of the unequaled opportunity for influencing public opinion along these lines here in the Nation's Capital.

Almost 15 million people are now visiting Washington every year. This number included delegates to some 400 conventions, several hundred thousand students and an increasing number of visitors from other countries of the world.

Despite the fact that our National Capital contains a fabulous array of historical material and patriotic shrines as well as living demonstrations of democracy at work, there is no methodical and organized method for educating the millions of visitors concerning their existence and the lessons which can be learned in them.

In my opinion an appropriate designed and operated visitor center should be provided. The Park Service has recognized this need and made a small and very inadequate start by conducting a visitor center in the Old Haines Point Sea House. The residents, particularly the business people, see this need too and have included the outlines for such a center in their plans for revitalizing the central business district. It has also been suggested that the polo field in Potomac Park which provides ample space for parking of cars and sightseeing buses be converted into a visitor center.

My resolution does not contain any specifications respecting the solution to the shortcomings to which I have referred. Its preamble recites in detail existing needs and inadequacies and outlines in broad generalities the wisdom of establishing a vast educational program to create a true image of America in the minds of our millions of visitors.

NEWSLETTER FOR MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, several of our exceptional and capable freshman Members have already written with great clarity and forcefulness on the problem of minority staffing.

One of those, who has been most active in studying this problem and urging this remedial action, is Congressman ROBERT MCCLORY, of the 12th Congressional District from Illinois. His newsletter, dated March 7, in a few and well chosen words, clearly presents the need for more adequate minority staffing, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, thoughtful students on this subject, and members of the press:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN ROBERT MCCLORY REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

A great deal is being said and written these days about minority staffing. It is important for residents of the 12th Congressional District to become better acquainted with this issue and to understand how greater minority staffing can assist their Congressman.

In the first place, congressional committees are composed of majority and minority members. In the case of the Committee on Government Operations on which this writer serves, there are 19 Democratic Congressmen who make up the majority and 12 Republicans representing the minority. This 3-to-2 ratio is roughly that of the total House ratio of 258 Democrats to 177 Republicans.

Committee staffs which consist of lawyers, researchers, writers and other specialists of various types provide committees with the assistance they require in performing their tasks. This assistance consists of factual and legal research, bill drafting, preparing of analyses, summaries and reports, and many other detailed and necessary tasks. If minority members of a committee are to be served equally with the majority, it is essential that minority staff personnel should be provided in the same ratio as the total membership of the committee. For this reason, the Republican Conference (composed of all the Republican Members) urged that 40 percent of committee staffs should be named by the Republican (minority) members of the committee. The Democratic majority in the House opposed this move, and the Republi-

cans in their efforts to serve as an articulate opposition party have been obliged to rely on Democratic assurances that increased minority staff personnel will be furnished as required. While not an entirely satisfactory arrangement, this is a vastly improved situation.

Again, with respect to the writer's Committee on Government Operations (the so-called watchdog committee of the Congress), the majority has engaged 51 while the minority members have been allotted only 3 staff personnel. One can readily see that the staff ratio of 51 to 3 is completely out of line with the committee ratio of 19 to 12. Unless additional staff members are assigned to the Republican minority, there will be roughly three staff members for each Democratic Congressman on this committee, while four Republican Congressmen will have to share one of the minority staff members. In fairness, it must be pointed out that the staffs of some committees, such as the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, are essentially nonpartisan and strictly professional.

But the members of the Government Operations, Appropriations, Education and Labor, and other committees have vital responsibilities to draw attention to the weaknesses of the majority's position. How, for instance, can the minority of the Committee on Government Operations point out specific objections to the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the TVA, the executive department's improper management of the news, the Agriculture Department's abuses (responsible for the Billie Sol Estes scandal), foreign aid waste, etc., unless the minority has the staff with which to do its job? Without adequate staffs, the minority's investigations will result in whitewashes and inactivity in areas where close scrutiny and criticism should be provided.

Respect for and encouragement of the minority party are essential elements of our two-party system. Democrats as well as Republicans should support a vocal, constructive, and responsible minority. Adequate staffing for minority members is essential in performing this role.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, partially in response to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and secondly, as a matter of clarification of the on-again-off-again attitude of the President and his deficit spending programs, I would like to point out that Mr. Kennedy is running up a deficit at more than twice the rate of the Eisenhower administration. Not that I, in any form, approve of deficit spending under any administration, either Eisenhower or Kennedy or anyone else, but I find it rather amusing that the gentlemen would refer to the increased national debt under Mr. Eisenhower, when Mr. Kennedy will have, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, upped the national debt more in 3 years than Eisenhower did in 6 years.

Also, Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. In only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8 years.

At this point, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which points out some very interesting and informative comparisons of the two administrations referred to:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 23, 1963]

A DEGREE OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In his most recent plea for a tax cut without a cut in spending, President Kennedy asserted that such a program would offer a thrust to the economy "and also a degree of fiscal responsibility."

We note that Mr. Kennedy is withdrawing, by degrees, from his earlier contention that the tax program is fiscally responsible without qualifications. And well he might. Not even the most agile economic propagandist could devise a definition of fiscal responsibility which would cover everything put forward in its name by the New Frontier.

Last summer, for example, fiscal responsibility meant delaying a tax cut because a recession did not appear to be imminent. Today Mr. Kennedy's position is that "we don't believe there will be a recession this year" but that, nevertheless, "merely because our prospects look good in 1963, I would think it is all the more pressing for us to take action at this time."

In short, what was fiscally irresponsible last year has, for reasons which may have more to do with politics than economics, become fiscally responsible "to a degree."

In his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy voiced firm opinions about fiscal responsibility. Here is what he said on November 4, 1960:

"I want to make it clear that * * * if I am elected President of the United States, we commit ourselves to a sound * * * fiscal and responsible monetary policy.

"From fiscal 1954 to fiscal 1960, the last 6 years, we increased the national debt by $21 billion. In the last 6 years, $21 billion.

"Never before in the history of the United States did any administration in peacetime have a deficit larger than this [the Eisenhower] administration in 1958, $12 billion. They would have had an increase in the debt of more than $10 billion except a Democratic Congress in the last 6 years cut the budget requests of the President of the United States by $10 billion.

"So if we are going to talk about fiscal responsibility; if we are going to talk about meeting our obligations; if we are going to talk about balanced budget; I want to look at the record.

"[The Eisenhower] administration [came to power] on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees, I think it's about time the people knew."

Very well, then, let's look at the record after 2 years of the Kennedy administration, which was likewise elected on a clear promise of fiscal responsibility.

In 3 years, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, Mr. Kennedy will have run up a cumulative deficit of $26 billion. In 3 years, $26 billion. This is more than double the Eisenhower rate. The Kennedy deficit for 1964, now pinned precariously at $11.9 billion, is almost certain to end up higher than the Eisenhower bellringer of 1958–59.

Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. And in only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8.

Mr. Kennedy cannot, with consistency, call his program fiscally responsible, even to a degree. It's time for Congress to do what Mr. Kennedy commended it for doing under Mr. Eisenhower: Cut the budget requests of the President and make certain that our fiscal policy is responsible—not by the wavering Kennedy definition, but by the definition of sensible economists and businessmen everywhere. It's time the people knew—and, fortunately, many of them already do.

GROSS MISMANAGEMENT IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT SELF-SABOTAGES U.S. MILITARY COMBAT READINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1963, the Comptroller General issued a report on its study of the supply of repair parts needed for combat and combat-support vehicles of the U.S. Army. This General Accounting Office—GAO—review covered the years of 1958–62.

The management inefficiencies, neglect, and irresponsibility of the U.S. Army Logistics, Ordnance, and Materiel Commands seriously endanger our defensive and offensive military commands.

The operational deficiencies for the supply of vital repair parts for tanks, artillery, and other combat-support vehicles can be attributed to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

A partial checklist of Army installations showed the following out-of-combat-readiness vehicles due to lack of spare parts:

First. In Korea, many of our M–48 medium tanks, and other combat vehicles were out of commission due to lack of parts, some of which had been on order for more than a year.

Second. On December 2, 1960, our M–48 medium tanks were in need of 3,900 booster coil items that were in short supply, many of which were urgently needed in Korea.

Third. U.S. Army tanks and combat vehicles were out of combat readiness in the United States, Europe, Korea, Okinawa, and the Panama Canal Zone due to 994 unfilled orders for parts on December 2, 1960. Some of these parts orders had been on order for as long as 313 days.

Fourth. The lack of cylinders was putting many self-propelled artillery howitzers in Europe out of commission.

Fifth. In six Army installations in the United States, 600 tanks, artillery pieces, and combat-support vehicles were out of commission during 1960 and 1961 due to a short supply of repair parts.

Sixth. At Fort Bragg, N.C., 87 combat or combat-supply vehicles were not combat ready on March 8, 1960. Repair items had been on order for from 3 to 9 months.

In its thorough review of the Army Tank-Automotive Center, the GAO found

that, on June 30, 1961, that organization had 688 active items out of stock, 260 of which were identified as essential for combat purposes.

The Comptroller General cited three specific management deficiencies that were primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts:

First, delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made; second, delays in determining whether to procure; and third, delays in determining needs for parts.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General cautioned that his "review of unfilled orders disclosed a very serious condition. As of September 10, 1961, the ATAC had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts from Army installations throughout the world."

The Comptroller General's report cited an alarming number of instances which attested to the failure of this system to function properly:

> Lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. In addition, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of over $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by procurement of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices.

The GAO revealed that the Red River Arsenal, during fiscal year 1961, procured 184 repair parts for about $362,000. On the basis of unit prices paid for identical parts by ATAC on previous occasions, these parts should have cost only $249,000. The arsenal, therefore, paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than ATAC would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for the gross mismanagement that permeates our U.S. Army supply operations for vital parts needed to keep our tanks, artillery, and combat-supply vehicles in instant readiness. The revelations of the General Accounting Office constitute, in effect, a self-sabotage of our military capabilities.

Our Federal system of administrative management is in sore need of a major and complete reform. It lacks production objectives, production techniques, production accountability and responsibility.

Our management process encourages mismanagement and discourages efficiency and good management.

RUSSIA'S CZARIST DESPOTISM CRUSHED HUNGARY'S 1848 WAR OF INDEPENDENCE—RUSSIA'S SOVIET-COMMUNISM TOTALITARIANISM THREATENS ENTIRE FREE WORLD

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I had the honor of addressing the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, Ohio, on the occasion of the 115th Anniversary of Hungary's 1848 War of Independence.

It was my privilege at that time to pay tribute to Hungary's great leader and patriot, Louis Kossuth.

The following is a quote from a speech delivered by Kossuth in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 3, 1852:

> Yours is a mighty republic, destined to enforce the law of nations, upon which rests the delivery of the world from an all-overwhelming despotism.

By "overwhelming despotism," Kossuth was specifically referring to the then ruling Russian Czarist Government. The Soviet-Communist depotism that we have today is both an extension and an expansion of the czarist tyranny. Kossuth was truly prophetic. The United States is confronted with an all-overwhelming threat led and directed against us by the Russian Soviet-Communist Party and government.

My address before the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland follows:

Mr. President, Andrew Dono, reverend and, respected members of the clergy; the distinguished mayor, Ralph S. Locher, honored guests; my esteemed fellow Americans of Hungarian ancestry, I appear before you today with a deep sense of attachment by personal and ancestral ties.

We share a common Hungarian inheritance of moralities, of political ideals, of culture, of language.

We share an appreciation of the gay and, at times, sad emotional harmonies of Magyar music.

We have a common acceptance of those highest moralities of the Christian-Judaic religions and our Western civilization.

There is implanted in our Hungarian background an abiding faith and love for one's fellow man.

That greatest Hungarian, Louis Kossuth, has inculcated in every Hungarian some of those political ideals upon which this great country was founded.

That is why I am especially grateful to you for your kind invitation to meet with you, my Hungarian kinsmen.

I extend to this distinguished Hungarian community my respects and offer you my good wishes.

My compatriots, we, each of us, share a deep sadness on this commemoration of Hungary's war of independence of 1848.

That was was a struggle between tyranny and freedom.

It was not a new struggle.

That clash has occurred in every generation since the beginning of recorded history.

One-hundred and fifteen years ago, the Hungarian war had for its objectives: Political home rule for Hungary; an equal political status in a dual monarchy; emancipation of Hungarian serfs and peasants; economic, social, and political reforms to raise the status of the peoples of both Hungary and Austria.

The war of 1848 was a revolution against the tyrannies resulting from the political absolutism of an aristocratic monarchy.

It is appropriate to recall the events of that period.

They are quite applicable to our own unrecognized struggle to maintain our freedom.

In the year of 1848, Europe was in a state of political fermentation.

The forces of liberty, of constitutional limitations upon government, of constitutional guarantees recognizing the sovereignty of the people, were reaching a crescendo.

These popular demands were the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions.

America has her Revolutionary War of 1775; Hungary has her Revolutionary War of 1848.

In our own war of independence, George Washington came to the fore and carried the cause of freedom to final fulfillment.

We, here today, are the beneficiaries of Washingtons personal abilities and devotion.

We are the legatees of man's greatest inheritance, freedom.

The testators are those heroic American soldiers and people who sacrificed 8 years of war to hand down to us our most precious inheritance.

Historians record the 1848 Hungarian war of independence as a failure.

They unanimously state that Kossuth's objectives and Hungary's cause were lost in that war.

That is not my interpretation of the events of that time.

It is not my evaluation of the life work of Louis Kossuth.

No one can possibly understand the casual relationship between the noble efforts of Louis Kossuth, the war of 1848, and subsequent events unless one fully understands and appreciates the "Father of the Hungarian Revolution," Louis Kossuth.

We are not gathered here today to commemorate a lost revolution or to pay our respects to the memory of the leader of a lost revolution.

The Hungarian ideals of independence in the war of 1848; the Kossuth principles of the brotherhood of man were not merely vainglorious, frustrated dreams.

The war of 1884 did result in the attainment of Kossuth's objectives in a very short time after 1848.

Kossuth's grand designs, his platforms, his objectives were fulfilled and came to pass due almost wholly to his political leadership; to his devotion to the cause of freedom; and to his sympathetic understanding for his fellow men.

These are some of the Kossuth reforms that came to fruition: Measures for the emancipation of serfs were enacted; freedom of the press was granted in both Austria and Hungary; flogging and corporal punishment were abolished.

The constitutional settlement in 1867, between Austria and Hungary, was effected. This settlement was based upon the Kossuth Hungarian Constitution of 1848.

Under the terms of the 1867 settlement, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary was created.

Power for concerted action within international and military spheres was centralized.

Austria and Hungary were each allotted equal, separate and autonomous powers in domestic affairs.

His crusade for orphanages, for hospitals, for mass education, for fiscal reforms, for economic growth, for industrialization, succeeded in bringing about an early realization of these sociological and economic goals.

Kossuth's character and political ideals were influenced and patterned, to a large degree, upon the life of George Washington.

As a youth, he attended that outstanding law academy at Sarospatok.

Part of his catechism at Sarospatok were these questions and answers:

"Who was the first man?"

The answer to that question was "George Washington."

"What form of government is the best?"

The answer to that question was "The Republican form of Government."

Although Louis Kossuth was the greatest Hungarian, he was also a great American—in his beliefs, in his heart.

Louis Kossuth was a profound philosopher, an eminent historian.

He was a humanitarian above all. His most profound conviction was the brotherhood of man.

He was equally humble, loyal and devoted to his associates, to the peasants, to his superiors in rank.

He was a masterful linguist. He had a remarkable command of a beautiful Shakespearean English.

In addition to his native Magyar language, he was fluent in Latin and German.

Louis Kossuth was an eloquent orator, a fervent inspirational crusader. Yet, he was never a demagog.

He was a strict moralist, a truly devout practitioner of Christian-Judaic moralities.

Kossuth was Hungary's first modern journalist. It was his editorship and his contributions that successfully established the Pesti Hirlap.

It is said that Kossuth was proud. That is true. But it was not an arrogant self-pride.

It was a pride in the principles he believed in.

He had a mind that was conscious of its own rectitude. He zealously protected the sanctity of his grand concepts, of his moralities, of his principles.

Louis Kossuth belongs not alone to the history of Hungary. His concepts are eternal. His work will live in the recording of world history.

My friends:

Father Kossuth still lives. He holds a special place of honor in our hearts.

He remains a symbol of those rare qualities that are so lacking today, that are so sorely needed by this Nation and the free world.

His brilliant concepts provide an answer, the only answer, to these forces that threaten our existence.

Effective countermeasures against the Soviet-Communist politico-military war against all freedom, against all free peoples cannot be founded upon compromise of fundamental principles.

Survival cannot be predicated upon policies of vacillation, conciliation, compromise, retreat, and surrender.

It is a sorrowful commentary to recall that the aspirations of the Hungarian people for freedom have been brutally crushed, bathed in Hungarian blood on three occasions by Russian despotism and totalitarianism.

On August 11, 1848, General Gorgey surrendered his Hungarian Army not to the Austrians, but to the Russian Field Marshal Paskiewitisch.

Hungary's desperate struggle for freedom was defeated not by its oppressor, Austria, but by the overwhelming military forces of Russia.

In the year 1919, Bela Kun overthrew Hungary's democratic government. He coldbloodedly murdered thousands of Hungary's leaders.

He imposed a Communist regime upon her people. He extinguished all Hungarian freedoms.

Bela Kun was a Moscow-trained murdering revolutionist. Bela Kun was the forerunner of Castro.

That revolution was conceived, planned and its execution directed out of Moscow. History repeated itself in Cuba.

It is most tragic that the State Department of the United States is so incapable of reading and understanding, and interpreting historical events.

It is only 6½ years ago, that these same Soviet-Communist murderers machine-gunned the children of Budapest, in October and November of 1956.

Again, the Russian Soviet-Communist despotism crushed Hungary's struggle for freedom by brutal bloody massacre.

The security of neither the Russian nor the Soviet nation was threatened on any one of these occasions. There was never a scintilla of legitimate justification for these shocking brutalities.

We must not allow time to soften or dim the atrocities of Budapest.

The sacrifices of the children, the women, the men of Hungary will have been in vain if we do not recognize the diabolical purposes behind these events.

These massacres of Hungarian people are a prolongation of a more than 400-year-old fixed obsession for aggressionist expansion—First under Russian czarist despotism and now under Soviet-Communist world totalitarianism.

The Nikita Khrushchev who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who repeatedly threatens the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian Freedom Crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

Today, 1963, marks another anniversary that is of critical significance to we Americans.

It was in 1933, that this Nation gave diplomatic recognition to the Soviet.

The year 1933, marks the beginning of self-defeating policies toward the Soviet and world communism.

This year is the 30th year of our shameful, ruinous policies that are based upon self-deception.

We like to believe the myth that the inherent strength of freedom, the weakness of a tyrannical government assure the United States of victory in this deadly global power war.

Many people have laid down their lives to learn the contrary.

It is not ordained by anyone that freedom cannot be lost.

It is still true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We have lost all vigilance.

The most honest homage we can pay to those who died in Budapest is to recognize, and to admit that freemen can, and do, die in vain.

We have become corrupted by prejudices, by false images. Chastity of mind, the stark truth, is a prerequisite virtue for a free people.

A large segment of our intelligentsia, and of those teachers and news media who form and shape public opinion offer the theory that communism is only an ideology, another political philosophy, an alternative series of sociological and economic principles.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a completely false concept of the crises that confront us.

The sociological and economic theories of Karl Marx have been proven to be fallacious almost in toto.

We are not dealing with Marxist dialectics or ideology.

The Soviet-Communist world conspiracy is a system of world political-military power. It is the product not of Marx, but of that mad evil genius, Lenin.

This Moscow-directed worldwide campaign is a permanent international revolution played with the skillful advance planning of a chess game.

All military, economic, social, cultural, ideological resources are focused and concentrated upon world power politics.

Neither freedom, nor prosperity, nor materialism, nor patriotism, nor military strength offers security for this Nation.

We must learn that the survival of this Nation is dependent upon a combination and coordination of truth, power, policy, and will.

For an accurate assessment of the requirements for survival, this Nation and every other nation demands:

First. An accurate appraisal of its own strength and capacity.

Second. Assess correctly the power of the forces against it.

Third. Assess correctly the potential combination of actions the enemy may take.

Fourth. Plan correctly, and be ready to activate, political and other actions under foreseeable future circumstances.

We must, as a people, as a Nation, first establish our national aspirations and human values.

We are currently befuddled in vague, abstract gossip about freedom, survival and peace.

These concepts should be clarified and assigned their proper priorities.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded, not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

My friends, the United States and the free world have completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons systems of the Soviet-Communist war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction.

It is a relentless, unlimited war of indefinite duration.

It is a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

It is a dual war.

One war is carried on by the more than 100 Communist parties, organized and operating in every nation on this globe. These parties recognize and serve under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second war is the one being waged by the Soviet and its satellite bloc of nations. This second war concentrates the total military, political, economic, diplomatic, and all other human resources upon the disintegration of the free world. Khrushchev is the commander in chief for both of these wars.

While the Soviet-Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of political, military, economic, diplomatic, and psychomoral war, the United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

There has not been one 5-year period in the past 30 years during which the Soviet Union has not become relatively stronger and the United States has not become relatively weaker.

We are losing the war for survival at an ever-accelerating pace.

Permit me to review some of the failures of our foreign policies that have contributed to our present critical posture:

First. For a period, we relied upon military superiority. Yet, our heaviest losses—the loss of middle Europe and China—were sustained between 1945 and 1950 when the United States had a clear military superiority.

Second. For a time, we relied upon military alliances. NATO and SEATO were not an effective answer. They are today rapidly disintegrating.

Third. The policy of massive retaliation is now only a memory.

Fourth. The United Nations is now recognized as no hindrance to Soviet-Communist subversions.

Fifth. Summit meetings and endless negotiations are an exercise in futility.

Sixth. Foreign aid, atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations, nuclear test bans have proven to be self-defeating.

As a people, we continue to be guilty of oversimplifications. We like to believe that there are easy, simple answers to our most complex international problems.

Let us remind you of some of these oversimplifications that have been peddled to our people.

First. The only missile we need is to distribute Sears, Roebuck catalogs around the world.

Second. The only trouble with the State Department is the failure of our diplomats to speak the language of the nation to which they are accredited to.

Third. Electrify all rural villages.

Fourth. Land reform.

Fifth. Get rid of all dictators—Cuba is an example.

These are samples of our simpleness and gullibility.

Ladies and gentlemen: It is my conviction that the steady decline of the U.S. power and prestige is backing us into the desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our present unrealistic foreign policies invite and encourage the horrors of either a nuclear war or a cleverly hidden continuation of retreat and eventual surrender.

But, my fellow Americans, there is a third alternative if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

The Nation and its people must first of all face up to the grim truth:

First. That the Soviet-Communist international conspiracy is dedicated to the destruction of all free nations and all free peoples.

Second. That the Soviet-led Communist conspiracy is waging a total war against the free world.

Third. That the United States is the No. 1 target of the Soviet-Communist campaign.

Fourth. That the Soviet-Communist forces are winning that world politicomilitary struggle and the United States and the free world are losing it.

Fifth. That we cannot win this struggle unless we recognize its existence, and arouse in our people a will to defend themselves, and to win this conflict.

Sixth. We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, and subversions until we identify our enemies, correctly appraise and locate the deployment of their forces.

Ladies and gentlemen; if we accept the need to give national and official recognition to the Soviet-Communist self-proclaimed and self-admitted campaign to destroy all free nations, there are two additional fundamental requirements that this Nation must accept and fulfill if we wish to survive.

The first requirement is that the United States restore a clear, preponderant military superiority over the Soviet-Communist forces.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet now has a relative parity of military firepower. This policy invites national and international suicide.

Our military superiority and firepower should be in a ratio of at least 1½ to 1 over the Soviet at all times.

We have the wealth, the economy to attain and to maintain this supremacy.

It is essential for our survival.

We must have sufficient military power to prevent a Khrushchev miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet Empire. Our first aim must be to avoid the inception of war and still attain our national and international objectives.

The second requirement is in the field of foreign policy.

We sorely need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a serious lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies, our economy, our military capabilities are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives and aspirations.

The three successive fiascos of Cuba are a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I refer, first, to our policies that aided Castro's overthrow of Batista when our officials were fully aware of the fact that he was a Soviet-Communist agent.

Second, I refer to the Bay of Pigs debacle—the most ill-conceived, misplanned, and mismanaged military fiasco in all history.

Third, I refer to the recent and present policies that encouraged and permitted the Soviet to convert Cuba into a military base that critically threatens our margin for survival.

Our present policy of halfhearted containment is ineffective and wholly inadequate to meet the Soviet-Communist challenge.

This Nation cannot continue in its present state of schizophrenia psychosis, its split personality and vacillations toward communism.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of Hungary and the captive nations.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people upon the altar of freedom will not have been in vain, if we can remember that freedom is not free. It demands vigilance, courage, dedication, and sacrifice.

The moral principles upon which our freedom is founded are irreconciliable with totalitarianism. Freedom is not compromisable.

Communism is an absolute evil. It is not debatable.

The survival of this Nation, of the free world is not negotiable.

RHODE ISLAND CHARTER TERCENTENARY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 300th anniversary of the Rhode Island Charter of 1663; I ask permission to revise and extend remarks in order that it may be printed in full in the RECORD.

Rhode Island was colonized by religious dissenters from Massachusetts, led by Roger Williams. For them he obtained a parliamentary charter in 1643 by which the colony was governed until the restoration of Charles II in 1660. As soon as the restoration had been officially proclaimed, John Clarke was sent to England as the deputy of the colonists in order to solicit a new charter. This was necessary since the charter of 1643 had been granted by parliamentary rather than by royal authority.

Clarke's petition to Charles II contained the following words which found their way into the charter, and are now inscribed on the south front of the Rhode Island Statehouse:

> Wherefore your petitioners have it much on their hearts (if they may be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civill State may stand, yea, and best be maintained, and that among English spirits, with a full liberty in religious concernments.

The charter of 1663 was the first creation by British patent of a body politic. Previously, of course, corporations had been constituted within the realm for the government of colonial plantations; but now specific powers were granted for administering all the affairs of a colony within the colonial territory. And in its provision for representation of the freemen of the colony the charter was a major improvement on that granted to Massachusetts.

The colony was given its new name in the clause establishing it as a body politic:

> We create and make them a bodye politique or corporate, with the powers and privileges hereinafter mentioned. And accordingly * * * wee * * * doe ordeyne, constitute and declare, that they, the sayd (named persons and all subsequently admitted freemen) shall be * * * forever hereafter, a bodie corporate and politique, in fact and name, by the name of The Governor and Company of the English Collonie of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantation, in New-England, in America.

Then follow provisions relating to the Governor, Deputy Governor, and 10 assistants, for an annual general assembly with power to admit freemen, elect officers, and make laws:

> So as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but (as near as may be) agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England, considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there.

Provisions of the charter grant the power to establish courts, and to hold annual elections. The first officers are named. The power to bear arms is granted:

> And to use and exercise the law martiall in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require.

There is to be no interference with fishery rights. There shall be freedom of migration from England. The inhabitants and their children are to have the rights of persons born in England. There shall be appeals to the Crown in controversies with other New England colonies, and there shall be freedom of movement among the colonies. This clause is of interest since it is the germ of the idea of what much later became the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States:

Itt shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of sayd Collony of Providence Plantation, without let or molestation, to passe and repasse with freedom, into and through the rest of the English Colionies, upon their lawful and civill occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce and trade, with such of the inhabitants of our other English Collonies as shall bee willing to admit them thereunto, they behaveing themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the sayd Collonies provided, or that shall bee provided, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

And most important of all:

The government is to be held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants.

By the charter of 1663 complete religious liberty was granted. This is the famous provision:

Noe person within the sayd colonye, at any tyme hereafter, shall bee any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinione in matters of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civil peace of our sayd colony; but that all and everye person and persons may, from tyme to tyme, and at all tymes hereafter, freelye and fullye have and enjoye his and theire owne judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments * * * any lawe, statute, or clause, therein contayned, or to bee contayned, usage, of custome of this realme, to the contrary hereof, in any wise, notwithstanding.

Founded by those to whom freedom of conscience was more precious than life itself, Rhode Island, throughout its history, has preserved its proud heritage. At this time of celebration of the tercentenary of a famous charter, Rhode Islanders will honor the distinguished past of their State in its days as a colony by preserving in the present and in the future its tradition of freedom.

LUCAS, SAMUEL. CHARTERS OF THE OLD ENGLISH COLONIES IN AMERICA. LONDON, J. PARKER, 1850. JK49.L8.

RHODE ISLAND, GRANTED BY KING CHARLES II, IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF HIS REIGN.

Charles the Second, by the grace of God, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Whereas we have been informed by the humble petition of our trusty and well beloved subjects John Clarke, on the behalf of Benjamin Arnold, William Brenton, William Codington, Nicholas Easton, William Boulston, John Porter, John Smith, Samuel Gorton, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dext·, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, Samuel Wildbore, William Field, James Barker, Richard Tew, Thomas Harris, and William Dyre, and the rest of the purchasers, and free inhabitants of our island called Rhode Island, and the rest of the colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England in America, That they, pursuing with peace and loyal minds, their sober, serious, and religious intentions, of godly edifying themselves, and one another, in the holy Christian faith and worship as they were persuaded, together with the gaining over and conversion of the poor ignorant Indian natives, in those parts of America, to the sincere profession and obedience of the same faith and worship, did not only by the consent and good encouragement of our royal progenitors, transport themselves out of this kingdom of England into America; but also since their arrival there, after their first settlement amongst other our subjects in those parts, for the avoiding of discord, and those many evils which were likely to ensue upon those our subjects, not being able to bear in those remote parts their different apprehensions in religious concernments; and in pursuance of the aforesaid ends, did once again leave their desirable stations and habitations, and with excessive labour and travel, hazard, and charge, did transplant themselves into the midst of the Indian natives, who, as we are informed, are the most potent princes and people of all that country; whereby the good providence of God (from whom the plantations have taken their name) upon their labour and industry, they have not only been preserved to admiration, but have increased and prospered, and are seized and possessed, by purchase and consent of the said natives, to their full content, of such lands, islands, rivers, harbours, and roads, as are very convenient both for plantations, and also for building of ships, supply of pipe-staves, and other merchandize, and which lies very commodious in many respects for commerce, and to accommodate our southern plantations, and may much advance the trade of this our realm, and greatly enlarge the territories thereof; they having by near neighbourhood to, and friendly society with, the great body of the Narraganset Indians, given them encouragement, of their own accord, to subject themselves, their people and lands, unto us; whereby (as is hoped) there may, in time, by the blessing of God upon their endeavours, be laid a sure foundation of happiness to all America.

And whereas, in their humble address, they have freely declared, That it is much on their hearts (if they be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concernments, and that true piety, rightly grounded upon gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty: now know ye, That we being willing to encourage the hopeful undertaking of our said loyal and loving subjects, and to secure them in the free exercise and enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights appertaining to them as our loving subjects; and to preserve unto them that liberty in the true Christian faith and worship of God, which they have sought with so much travel, and with peaceable minds and loyal subjection to our loyal progenitors, and ourselves, to enjoy: and because some of the people and inhabitants of the same colony cannot, in their private opinion, conform to the public exercise of religion, according to the liturgy, form, and ceremonies of the church of England, or take or subscribe the oaths and articles made and established in that behalf; and for that the same, by reason of the remote distances of those places, will, as we hope, be no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this nation, have therefore thought fit, and do hereby publish, grant, ordain, and declare, that our royal will and pleasure is—

That no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be any-wise molested, punished, disquited, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments, throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others, any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained, usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary hereof, in any wise notwithstanding. And that they may be in the better capacity to defend themselves in their just rights and liberties against all the enemies of the Christian faith, and others, in all respects, we have further thought fit, and at the humble petition of the persons aforesaid, are graciously pleased to declare, That they shall have and enjoy the benefit of our late act of indemnity, and free pardon, as the rest of our subjects in other our dominions and territories have; and to create and make them a body politic or corporate, with the powers or privileges hereinafter mentioned: and accordingly, our will and pleasure is, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have ordained, constituted, and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do ordain, constitute, and declare.

That they the said William Brenton, William Coddington, Nicholas Easton, Benedict Arnold, William Boulston, John Porter, Samuel Gorton, John Smith, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, William Dyre, Samuel Wildbore, Richard Tew, William Field, Thomas Harris, James Barker, Rainsborrow, Williams, and John Nickson, and all such others as are now, or hereafter shall be admitted, free of the company and society of our colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, shall be, from time to time, and for ever hereafter, a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America; and that by the same name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession, and shall and may be persons able and capable in the law to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, to answer and to be answered unto, to defend and to be defended, in all and singular suits, causes, quarrels, matters, actions, and things, of what kind or nature soever; and also to have, take, possess, acquire, and purchase lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any goods or chattels, and the same to lease, grant, demise, alien, bargain, sell and dispose of, at their own will and pleasure, as other our liege people of this our realm of England, or any corporation or body politic within the same, may lawfully do; and further.

That they the said Governor and Company, and their successors, shall and may, for ever hereafter, have a common seal, to serve and use for all matters, causes, things, and affairs whatsoever, of them and their successors, and the same seal to alter, change, break, an make new from time to time, at their will and pleasure, as they shall think fit. And further, we will and ordain, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do declare and appoint, That for the better ordering and managing of the affairs and business of the said company and their successors, there shall be one governor, one deputy governor, and ten assistants, to be from time to time constituted, elected, and chosen, out of the freemen of the said company, for the time being, in such manner and from as is hereafter in these presents expressed; which said officers shall apply themselves to take care for the best disposing and ordering of the general business and affairs of and concerning the lands and hereditaments herein aftermentioned to be

granted, and the plantation thereof, and the government of the people there. And for the better execution of our royal pleasure herein, we do for us, our heirs, and successors, assign, name, constitute, and appoint, the aforesaid Benedict Arnold to be the first and present governor of the said company, and the said William Brenton to be the deputy governor, and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Cogeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, to be the ten present assistants of the said company, to continue in the said several offices respectively, until the first Wednesday which shall be in the month of May now next coming.

And further, we will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain and grant, That the governor of the said company, for the time being, or in his absence, by occasion of sickness, or otherwise, by his leave or permission, the deputy governor, for the time being, shall and may, from time to time, upon all occasions, give order for the assembling of the said company, and calling them together, to consult and advise of the business and affairs of the said company; and that for ever hereafter, twice in every year, that is to say, on every first Wednesday in the month of May, and on every last Wednesday in October, or oftener, in case it shall be requisite, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company, not exceeding six persons, for Newport, four persons for each of the respective towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick, and two persons for each other place, town or city, who shall be from time to time thereunto elected or deputed by the major part of the freemen of the respective places, towns or places for which they shall be so elected or deputed, shall have a general meeting or assembly, then and there to consult, advise and determine, in and about the affairs and business of the said company and plantations. And further, we do of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America, and their successors.

That the governor, or in his absence, or by his permission, the deputy governor of the said company, for the time being, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company as shall be so aforesaid elected or deputed, or so many of them as shall be present at such meeting or assembly, as aforesaid, shall be called the general assembly; and that they, or the greatest part of them then present, whereof the governor, or deputy governor, and six of the assistants at least, to be seven, shall have, and have hereby given and granted unto them, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to appoint, alter, and change such days, times and places of meeting, and general assembly, as they shall think fit, and to chuse, nominate and appoint such and so many persons as they shall think fit, and shall be willing to accept the same, to be free of the said company and body politic and them into the same to admit, and to elect, and constitute such offices and officers, and to grant such needful commissions as they shall think fit and requisite, for ordering, managing, and dispatching of the affairs of the said governor and company, and their successors; and, from time to time, to make, ordain, constitute or repeal, such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, as to them shall seem meet, for the good and welfare of the said company, and for the government and ordering of the lands and hereditaments herein after mentioned to be granted, and of the people that do, or at any time hereafter shall inhabit, or be within the same; so as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but, as near as may agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there; and also to appoint, order and direct, erect and settle such places and courts of jurisdiction, for hearing and determining of all actions, cases, matters and things, happening within the said colony and plantation, and which shall be in dispute, and depending there, as they shall think fit; and also to distinguish and set forth the several names and titles, duties, powers, and limits, of each court, office and officer, superior and inferior; and also, to contrive and appoint such forms of oaths and attestations, not repugnant, but as near as may be agreeable as aforesaid to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as are convenient and requisite, with respect to the due administration of justice, and due execution and discharge of all offices and places of trust, by the persons that shall be therein concerned; and also to regulate and order the way and manner of all elections to offices and places of trust, and to prescribe, limit and distinguish the number and bounds of all places, towns and cities, with the limits and bounds herein after mentioned, and not herein particularly named, who have or shall have the power of electing and sending of freemen to the said general assembly; and also to order, direct and authorise, the imposing of lawful and reasonable fines; mulcts, imprisonments, and executing other punishments, pecuniary and corporal, upon offenders and delinquents, according to the course of other corporations, within this our kingdom of England; and again, to alter, revoke, annul or pardon, under their common seal, or otherwise, such fines, mulcts, imprisonments, sentences, judgments and condemnations, as shall be thought fit; and to direct, rule, order and dispose of all other matters and things, and particularly that which relates to the making of purchases of the native Indians, as to them shall seem meet.

Whereby our said people and inhabitants in the said plantations, may be so religiously, peaceably and civilly governed, as that by their good life, and orderly conversation, they may win and invite the native Indians of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind; willing, commanding and requiring, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and appointing, that all such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, instructions, impositions and directions, as shall be so made by the governor, deputy, assistants and freemen, or such number of them as aforesaid, and published in writing under their common seal, shall be carefully and duly observed, kept, performed and put in execution, according to the true intent and meaning of the same. And these our letters patents, or the duplicate or exemplification thereof, shall be to all and every such officers, superior or inferior, from time to time, for the putting of the same orders, laws, statutes, ordinances, instructions and directions, in due execution against us, our heirs and successors, a sufficient warrant and discharge. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby for us, our heirs and successors, establish and ordain, That yearly, once in the year for ever hereafter, namely, the aforesaid Wednesday in May, and at the town of Newport, or elsewhere if urgent occasion do require, the governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, and other officers of the said company, or such of them as the general assembly shall think fit, shall be in the said general court or assembly, to be held from that day or time, newly chosen for the year ensuing, by greater part of the said company for the time being, as shall be then and there present. And if it shall happen that the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants, by these presents appointed, or any such as shall hereafter be newly chosen into their rooms, or any of them, or any other the officers of the said company, shall die, or be removed from his or their several offices or places, before the said general day of election (whom we do hereby declare for any misdemeanor or default, to be removeable by the governor, assistants and company, or such greater part of them, in any of the said public courts to be assembled, as aforesaid), that then, and in every such case, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, deputy-governor, assistants and company aforesaid, or such greater part of them so to be assembled, as is aforesaid, in any of their assemblies, to proceed to a new election of one or more of their company, in the room or place, rooms or places, of such officer or officers so dying or removed, according to their directions.

And immediately upon and after such election or elections made of such governor, deputy-governor, assistant or assistants, or any other officer of the said company, in manner and form aforesaid, the authority, office and power, before given to the former governor, deputy-governor, and other officer and officers so removed, in whose stead and place new shall be chosen, shall, as to him and them, and every of them respectively, cease and determine: provided always, and our will and pleasure is, That as well such as are by these presents appointed to be the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, as those which shall succeed them, and all other officers to be appointed and chosen as aforesaid, shall, before the undertaking the execution of the said offices and places respectively, give their solemn engagement by oath or otherwise, for the due and faithful performance of their duties in their several offices and places, before such person or persons as are by these presents hereafter appointed to take and receive the same; (that is to say) the said Benedict Arnold, who is herein before nominated and appointed the present governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before William Brenton, of any two of the said assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Brenton, who is hereby before nominated and appointed the present deputy governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before the said Benedict Arnold, or any two of the assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Coggeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, who are herein before nominated and appointed the present assistants of the company, shall give the said engagement to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the said Benedict Arnold and William Brenton, or one of them, to whom respectively we do hereby give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same.

And further, our will and pleasure is, that all and every other future governor, or deputy governor, to be elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, shall give the said engagement before two or more of the said assistants of the said company for the time being, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same; and the said assistants, and every of them, and all and every other officer or officers, to be hereafter elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, from time to time, shall give the like engagements to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the governor, or deputy governor, for the time being; unto which said governor, or deputy governor, we do by these presents give full power and authority to require, administer, or receive the same accordingly. And we do likewise, for

us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that for the more peaceable and orderly government of the said plantations, it shall and may be lawful for the governor, deputy governor, assistants, and all other officers and ministers, of the said company, in the administration of justice, and exercise of government, in the said plantations, to use, exercise, and put in execution, such methods, rules, orders, and directions, not being contrary and repugnant to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as has been heretofore given, used, and accustomed in such cases respectively, to be put in practice, until, at the next or some other general assembly, especial provision shall be made and ordained in the cases aforesaid. And we do further, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, or in his absence the deputy governor, and major part of the said assistants for the time being, at any time, when the said general assembly is not sitting, to nominate, appoint and constitute such and so many commanders, governors, and military officers, as to them shall seem requisite, for the leading, conducting, and training up the inhabitants of the said plantations in martial affairs, and for the defence and safeguard of the said plantations; and that it shall and may be lawful to and for all and every such commander, governor, and military officer, that shall be so as aforesaid, or by the governor, or in his absence the deputy-governor and six of the assistants, and major part of the freemen of the said company, present at any general assemblies, nominated, appointed and constituted, according to the tenor of his and their respective commissions and directions, to assemble, exercise in arms, marshal, array, and put in warlike posture, the inhabitants of the said colony, for their especial defence and safety; and to lead and conduct the said inhabitants, and to encounter, repulse, and resist by force of arms, as well by sea as by land, and also to kill, slay, and destroy, by all fitting ways, enterprizes, and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons, as shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprize the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of the said inhabitants or plantations; and to use and exercise the law martial, in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require; and to take and surprize, by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person and persons, with their ship or ships, armour, ammunition, or other goods of such persons as shall in hostile manner invade or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said company and inhabitants; and upon just causes to invade and destroy the natives, Indians, or other enemies of the said colony.

Nevertheless, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare, to the rest of our colonies in New-England, that it shall not be lawful for this our said colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantations in America, in New-England, to invade the natives inhabiting within the bounds and limits of their said colonies, without the knowledge and consent of the said other colonies. And it is hereby declared that it shall not be lawful to or for the rest of the colonies to invade or molest the native Indians, or any other inhabitants in having within the bounds or limits hereafter mentioned, (they having subjected themselves unto us, and being by us taken into our special protection,) without the knowledge and consent of the governor and company of our colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation. Also our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare unto all Christian Kings, Princes and States, that if any person, which shall hereafter be of the said company or plantation, or any other by appointment of the said governor and company, for the time being, shall at any time or times hereafter rob or spoil, by sea or land, or do any hurt, or unlawful hostility, to any of the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, or any of the subjects of any Prince or State, being then in league with us, our heirs and successors; upon complaint of such injury done to any such Prince or State, or their subjects, we, our heirs and successors, will make open proclamation, within any parts of our realm of England, fit for that purpose, that the person or persons committing any such robbery or spoil, shall, within the time limited by such proclamation, make full restitution or satisfaction of all such injuries done or committed, so as the said Prince, or others so complaining, may be fully satisfied and contented; and if the said person or persons, who shall commit any such robbery or spoil, shall not make satisfaction accordingly within such time so to be limited, that then we, our heirs and successors, will put such person or persons out of our allegiance and protection; and that then it shall and may be lawful and free for all Princes or others, to prosecute with hostility such offenders, and every of them, their and every of their procurers, aiders, abbetors and counsellors, in that behalf.

Provided also, and our express will and pleasure is, and we do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and appoint, that these presents shall not in any manner hinder any of our loving subjects whatsoever, from using and exercising the trade of fishing upon the coast of New-England in America, but that they, and every or any of them, shall have full and free power and liberty to continue and use the trade of fishing upon the said coast, in any of the seas thereunto adjoining, or any arms of the sea, or salt-water, rivers and creeks, where they have been accustomed to fish, and to build and set upon the waste land belonging to the said colony and plantations, such wharfs, stages, and work-houses as shall be necessary for the salting, drying and keeping of their fish, to be taken or gotten upon that coast. And further, for the encouragement of the inhabitants of our said colony of Providence plantation, to set upon the business of taking whales, it shall be lawful for them, or any of them, having struck a whale, dubertus, or other great fish, it or them to pursue unto that coast, and into any bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, and it or them, upon the said coast, or in the said bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, to kill and order for the best advantage without molestation, they making no wilful waste, or spoil; any thing in these presents contained, or any other matter or thing to the contrary notwithstanding. And further also, we are graciously pleased, and do hereby declare, that if any of the inhabitants of our said colony do set upon the planting of vineyards, (the soil and climate both seeming naturally to concur to the production of wines,) or be industrious in the discovery of fishing-banks, in or about the said colony, we will, from time to time, give and allow all due and fitting encouragement therein, as to others in cases of like nature.

And further of our more ample grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant, unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation in the Narragansett bay in New-England, in America, and to every inhabitant there, and to every person and persons trading thither, and to every such person or persons as are or shall be free of the said colony, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to take, ship, transport, and carry away, out of any of our realms and dominions, for and towards the plantation and defence of the said colony, such and so many of our loving subjects and strangers, as shall or will willingly accompany them in and to their said colony and plantation, except such person or persons as are or shall be therein restrained by us, our heirs and successors, or any law or statute of this realm; and also to ship and transport all and all manner of goods, chattels, merchandize, and other things whatsoever, that are or shall be useful or necessary for the said plantations, and defence thereof, by any law or statute of this our realm; yielding and paying unto us, our heirs and successors, such the duties, customs, and subsidies, as are or ought to be paid or payable for the same. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain, declare and grant, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, that all and every the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, which are already planted and settled within our said colony of Providence plantations, or which shall hereafter go to inhabit within the said colony, and all and every of their children which have been born there, or which shall happen hereafter to be born there, or on the sea going thither or returning from thence, shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects, within any the dominions of us, our heirs or successors, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, as if they and every of them were born within the realm of England.

And further know ye, that we, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, all that part of our dominions, in New-England in America, containing the Nahantick and Nanhlygansett alias Narragansett bay and countries and parts adjacent, bounded on the west, or westerly, to the middle or channel of a river there, commonly called and known by the name of Pawcatuck alias Pawcawtuck river, and so along the said river, as the greater or middle stream thereof reacheth or lies up into the north country, northward unto the head thereof, and from thence by a strait line drawn due north, until it meet with the south line of the Massachusets colony, and on the north or northerly by the aforesaid south or southerly line in the Massachusets colony or plantation, and extending towards the east or eastwardly three English miles, to the east and north-east of the most eastern and north-eastern parts of the aforesaid Narragansett bay, as the said bay lieth or extendeth itself from the ocean on the south or southwardly, unto the mouth of the river which runneth towards the town of Providence, and from thence along the eastwardly side or bank of the said river (higher called by the name of Seacunck river) up to the falls called Patucket falls, being the most westwardly line of Plymouth colony; and so from the said falls, in a strait line due north, until it meet with the aforesaid line of the Massachusetts colony, and bounded on the south by the ocean, and in particular the lands belonging to the town of Providence, Patuxit, Warwicke, Misquammacock alias Pawcatuck, and the rest upon the main land, in the tract aforesaid, together with Rhode-Island, Blocke-Island, and all the rest of the islands and banks in the Narragansett bay, and bordering upon the coast of the tract aforesaid, (Fisher's-Island only excepted) together with all firm lands, soils, grounds, havens, ports, rivers, waters, fishings, mines royal, and all other mines, minerals, precious stones, quarries, woods, wood-grounds, rocks, slates, and all and singular other commodities, jurisdictions, royalties, privileges, franchises, preeminences and hereditaments whatsoever,

within the said tract, bounds, lands and islands aforesaid, to them or any of them belonging, or in any-wise appertaining.) To have and to hold the same, unto the said governor and company, and their successors for ever, upon trust, for the use and benefit of themselves, and their asociates, freemen of the said colony, their heirs and assigns.

To be holden of us, our heirs and successors as of the manor of East-Greenwich, in our county of Kent, in free and common soccage, and not in capite, nor by Knight's service. Yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, only the fifth part of all the ore of gold and silver, which from time to time, and at all times hereafter, shall be there gotten, had or obtained, in lieu and satisfaction of all services, duties, fines, forfeitures made or to be made, claims and demands whatsoever, to be to us, our heirs or successors, therefore or thereout rendered, made or paid; any grant or clause, in a late grant to the governor and company of Connecticut colony in America, to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding; the aforesaid Pawcatuck river having been yielded after much debate, for the fixed and certain bounds between these our said colonies, by the agents thereof, who have also agreed, that the said Pawcatuck river shall be also called alias Narrogancett or Narrogansett river, and to prevent future disputes that otherwise might arise thereby, for ever hereafter, shall be construed, deemed and taken to be the Narrogancett river, in our late grant to Connecticut colony, mentioned as the easterly bounds of that colony. And further, our will and pleasure is, that in all matters of public controversies, which may fall out between our colony of Providence plantation, to make their appeal therein to us, our heirs and successors, for redress in such cases, within this our realm of England; and that it shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of the said colony of Providence plantation, without lett or molestation, to pass and repass with freedom into and through the rest of the English colonies, upon their lawful and civil occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce, and trade with such of the inhabitants of our other English colonies as shall be willing to admit them thereunto, they behaving themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the said colonies provided, or that shall be provided, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And lastly, we do for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that these our letters patents shall be firm, good effectual and available, in all things in the law, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, according to our true intent and meaning herein before declared; and shall be construed, reputed and adjudged, in all cases, most favourably on the behalf, and for the best benefit and behoof of the said governor and company, and their successors, although express mention &c. In witness, &c, witness, &c.

Per Ipsum Regem.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there have been some 47 new nations created out of the once vast colonial empires of England and France, and the smaller oversea possessions of Holland and the United States, 47 new nations whose people are learning to live and develop alongside their own institutions, under their own leaders, under their own independent governments.

Today I want us to remember a nation that was not so fortunate, a nation whose short-lived independence was one of the first submerged into the monolithic wave of what has become the world's leading colonialist power, Soviet Russia. March 25 is the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Republic, a Republic that lived for 3 short years between 1918 and 1921, after 300 years under the subjection of czarist Russia. The people of Byelorussia are known as White Russians—a name synonymous with heroic resistance against oppression. Their leaders declared their people's independence during the height of Russo-German fighting toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist empire was falling into pieces and when at last it appeared the Russian autocracy was to be destroyed. During Byelorussia's brief independence there was a constant struggle to survive; it was absorbed back into Russia as soon as the new Red autocracy could consolidate power and destroy any self-sought freedoms on the part of former czarist subjects. Today 10 million Byelorussians may find their only vestige of freedom to be membership in the United Nations, but this is a fictional independence, supported and totally controlled by the Kremlin.

On this anniversary we must not, in the onrush of events, forget the peoples past and present, who have fought and are fighting for freedoms that we consider part of our daily lives. We must, in remembering their struggles, renew our determination to see their eventual liberation.

BIRTHDAY OF THE FREE STATE OF MARYLAND

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the birthday of the Free State of Maryland. Although a relatively old State, Maryland was described in a recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, as a State "whose economy has been showing the boundless energy of a teenager."

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago today, a group of colonists under the leadership of Leonard Calvert, brother of Lord Baltimore, landed on St. Clement's Island, and the colony of Maryland was founded. The first Lord Baltimore had arranged for a charter for the colony which Charles I insisted should be called Terra Mariae or Maryland in honor of his Queen Henrietta Maria. Lord Baltimore died before the charter was issued, and King Charles granted it to his son Cecil on June 20, 1632.

It took some time to assemble the colonists and supplies for the trip to the New World and it was not until November 22, 1633, that the expedition sailed for America. The two vessels chartered by the colonists—the *Dove*, weighing 50 tons, and the *Ark*, 350 tons—carried Leonard Calvert and about 200 others of various trades, professions, and religious beliefs. On March 25, they landed on St. Clement's Island in the Potomac River and held a religious service. A few days later, they sailed up the St. Marys River and founded the town of St. Marys, which became the capital of the colony. The colony was founded in the spirit of tolerance and religious freedom.

There are many other outstanding events in Maryland's history. In 1783 Annapolis, Md., became the temporary capital of this Nation and in 1791 Maryland ceded to the United States land for the District of Columbia and location of the Nation's Capital. Our National anthem was written at Fort McHenry in September 1814. The first railroad in America and the first telegraph line in America were established in Maryland. Of all these events, however, the initial element in the founding of the colony of Maryland—tolerance—is the most important and much needed in today's world.

On the 300th anniversary of the founding of Maryland, a great American, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoke over the radio in honor of the anniversary and highlighted the significance of the founding of Maryland. He said:

> Lord Baltimore and his colonists sought in their charter liberty not alone for the members of the expedition, but for all later comers as well. It is a good thing to demand liberty for ourselves and for those who agree with us, but it is a better thing and rarer thing to give liberty to others who do not agree with us. We would do less than our duty to Lord Baltimore if on such an anniversary we paid no tribute to this, his greatest contribution to America, a free America.

TRIBUTE TO A SOLDIER-PRIEST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, frequently the heroic deeds of men are not revealed in full until many years after they have occurred. Such is the case of a distinguished and heroic service rendered by the Very Reverend Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, pastor emeritus of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of Newark, N.J. Father Klodnycky formerly served a pastorate in my home city of Bayonne, N.J.

The New Jersey region of the Anti-Defamation League has honored Dr. Klodnycky for his humanitarian efforts

to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20.

What follows is an excerpt from an article, "Soldier of Peace," which appeared in the ADL bulletin published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The article was written by Dr. Joseph H. Lichten, director of ADL's department of intercultural affairs:

SOLDIER OF PEACE

More than 40 years ago, a time when eastern Europe was plagued by anti-Semitic pogroms, a rabbi in the small Ukrainian town of Chmelnyk wrote an unusual letter and gave it to an army officer. The letter, addressed to the rabbis of all Jewish communities, identified its bearer, Maj. Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky, as a man who had "distinguished himself for his great spirit, love of truth, and love for the Jewish people." It also appealed to the rabbis to recognize and aid the major in all things he sought to do.

This month in New Jersey, a different type of Jewish community honored the Chmelnyk rabbi's appeal. Through the Anti-Defamation League's New Jersey regional advisory board, tribute was paid to the former major who is now Reverend Klodnycky, a 70-year-old Orthodox priest who was ordained 30 years ago in the United States and, for the past 23 years, has been pastor of the Holy Ascension Church in Newark.

The League citation to Reverend Klodnycky begins: "In recognition of his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20 * * *." The story of the major turned priest is one of the brightest memories of a dark and troubled era.

In August 1919, Major Klodnycky's unit of the Ukrainian Galician Army was sent to Chmelnyk in the center of an industrial area. There were two problems in Chmelnyk—plunderers and pillagers had a special interest in the rich territory and unrest had spread throughout the whole region. In addition, the relationship between the Jewish population of 15,000 and the peasantry was an uneasy one. When Major Klodnycky's unit entered the town, antagonism between Christian and Jew had reached the point of crisis—a crisis set off, oddly enough, by love.

The only daughter of a Jewish merchant living in a small village outside of Chmelnyk had eloped with a Christian peasant and converted to Christianity. The Jewish parents, unhappy about the marriage and conversion, severed relations with their daughter. Or, at least, the girl's father did. Her mother secretly met the girl and her husband and invited them to the parents' home—when the father was away. One night the young couple left the house with gifts—two cows, featherbeds, money, and jewelry. When the girl's father returned and found out what had happened, he vowed to destroy his son-in-law's house. The father set fire to the straw-thatched house; the wind carried sparks to other houses, and soon the entire village was burned to the ground. The disaster took place on the eve of Major Klodnycky's arrival.

The Jews feared a pogrom. They knew the inhabitants of the burned village and neighboring villages were waiting for an excuse for vengeance. "The Jews burned down the village of Chmelnyk" would be the cry. Despite their fears, the Jews appeared in town for their market day. On that day, too, an unusually large number of farmers and peasants appeared on the streets of the town, carrying rifles, revolvers, and, as was later discovered, machineguns concealed in their wagons. At the inn, near the center of town, was a small army unit and patrol.

Major Klodnycky ordered his soldiers to ride, fully armed, through the streets. After the villagers had a chance to see the strength of the troops, they were assembled in the main square in front of the city hall. The major addressed them.

"Dear brothers," he said, "certainly every one of you built his own house. When you began laying the foundation, you crossed yourself three times, recited the 'Our Father,' sprinkled your work with holy water, and in a whisper to heaven asked our Lord to help you build.

"My men and I have been summoned by the Ukraine Government to help you build your homes, and your state. We are building a nation, my brothers. How can you think of sprinkling the foundation of our nation with blood? There must be law and order in our nation. To take the law into your own hands to settle real or imagined grievances is sinful."

The peasants put away their weapons and began to return home. In a half hour, the streets of Chmelnyk were empty. Major Klodnycky had stopped a pogrom before it was started.

PRESIDENT'S PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about our President's physical fitness program. The Nation has been swept by an enthusiastic hiking movement.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to be the purveyor of additional good news on physical fitness from the Fourth District in Florida. It concerns the sponsors and members of the Homestead, Fla., Bicycle Club. This small group of interested people, who are enthusiastic about the joys and therapeutic effects of the sport of bicycling, had an idea and stanchly went to work to put it into operation.

And so these dozen people of Homestead, Fla., without a budget and at very low cost, propelled the bicycle and the urgent need for a bicycle safety campaign into national prominence.

In order to accomplish their goals—demonstration of the healthful effects of bicycling, and the promulgation of safety measures—this little band of amateurs approached Dr. Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, he is a very astute man in other areas than his own specialty. He is a frequent vacationer in Homestead and has made public his appreciation of Homestead as, in his words, "a homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation." Dr. White is one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness. He prescribes proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding as preventives of heart attacks.

Next, the Homestead bicycle enthusiasts begged, borrowed, and earned sufficient money to erect bicycle signs through the city of Homestead, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

High point of the bicycle safety campaign was the dedication ceremony at which Homestead Mayor Richard Conley, Dr. and Mrs. White arrived, all pedaling bikes. Addressing a group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past middle years, Dr. White commented:

Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation. It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people who have worked to get these safe-for-cycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment.

So successful were the efforts of this little band of Florida amateurs that they have engaged national attention through nationwide press stories, radio and TV coverage, including mention on network TV shows, and stories in Time and Life magazines.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint my colleagues with the full report and editorial comment on this event in the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., on February 26, 1963:

UNITED STATES NOTES HOMESTEAD BIKING—PEDALCADE HIGHLIGHTS BIKE ROUTE OPENING

Homestead, bicycles and hearts made national news Sunday with the visit of Dr. Paul Dudley White to South Dade to take part in the dedication of Homestead's bike routes—a first in the Nation.

It was Dr. and Mrs. Paul Dudley White Day, proclaimed by Mayor Richard Conley to coincide with the dedication and with National Heart Sunday, in which the noted cardiac specialist is especially interested.

Kicking off the day's events was the cutting of blue and white ribbons stretched across North West Fourth Street at Krome Avenue—one of the bicycle routes mapped out by traffic experts and marked with new blue and white signs.

Some 500 people turned out to see the ceremony and hear Dr. White. Almost half of them joined in a bicycle tour of the town, led by the famous doctor after the ribbon cutting.

Homestead is the first city in the Nation to be officially proclaimed "The City of Bicycles"—a fact that drew Time and Life magazine photographer-reporters, newsreel cameramen from all three Miami television stations, representatives from a number of newspapers in the area, and cycle-minded visitors from as far away as Missouri.

After more than an hour of pedaling around Homestead and the immediate area, cyclists wound up at the city's ball park and picnic grounds for a chicken barbecue, where caterers served more than 200.

Another group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past-middle years, turned out Sunday evening at the Homestead Armory to hear the famous cardiac physician tell how to prevent heart attacks through proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding.

The famed heart specialist arrived at dedication ceremonies pedaling beside his wife and Homestead Mayor Conley, and stopped to pose for pictures before mounting the speaker's platform.

"Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation," Dr. White said. "It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people

who have worked to get these safe-for-bicycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment."

The doctor, one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness, first visited Homestead last year, when the city of bicycles movement was only beginning.

Since then, he has talked of the town and its project to groups all over the country, and has given Homestead untold publicity by his remarks.

"Doctor," said Mayor Conley, "you and your wife are officially citizens of Homestead and we salute you." With a grin, he added, "And no taxes."

The Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead, at whose invitation Dr. White officiated at the bike route dedication, presented Mrs. White with a charm bracelet from which dangled three miniature bicycles. Dr. White's "charm," presented by Milton Fischer, was one of the 300 safety route signs, to which a bronze plaque had been attached in tribute to his interest in the bicycle city idea.

Also lauded during the ceremonies was Irvin Barnett, who has been one of the bicycle club's most ardent supporters, both with work and in financing the signs which were dedicated Sunday.

Barnett accepted a framed certificate of appreciation, which he immediately presented to Conley, who was serving as president of the Chamber of Commerce when the bike movement got chamber endorsement and backing.

Congratulations from Gov. Farris Bryant were conveyed by J. Robert Terry of the Florida Development Commission, and a lengthy telegram of approbation from Senator GEORGE SMATHERS was read.

During the bike parade which followed, some 250 cyclists streamed along behind Dr. White, who was preceded by a truck bearing newsreel cameramen, photographers, and reporters.

At first, cyclists filled the streets from curb to curb, but the agile doctor, an advocate of safe cycling, hopped aboard the news truck to direct riders to go two abreast or single file. * * *

LOCAL BIKE CLUB GOES TO TOWN ON NATIONAL SCALE

The boosters of Homestead's Bicycle Club deserves the praise and imitation of all organizations in South Dade.

They have taken the bicycle and a campaign of bicycle safety and lifted it to a high position as a "vehicle of national publicity."

Nationwide press services have carried the story of Homestead to the newspapers and radio stations.

Time and Life magazines covered the event.

Three TV stations photoed the affair.

And it was mentioned on network TV shows yesterday morning.

Such a job, as these dozen people of a bicycle club, at a very small cost and with no budgeted money, have done is a better job than the heavily financed Dade-Miami Publicity Bureau would have done, or could have done.

In order to accomplish their purposes, this little band of amateurs, enlisted the help of Dr. Paul Dudley White, a heart specialist, who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast, and vacations in Homestead frequently, finding it a "homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation."

This group also begged and borrowed and earned enough money to put up bicycle signs throughout the city, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

These two factors were put together by the bicycle club and with only this to go on, parlayed into a really worthwhile nationwide advertising of Homestead and South Dade.

Other efforts of a similar nature should be invited and promoted by other areas in South Dade, an area which is neglected by the leaders of our county, who know little about our area, and who concentrate their effort to other areas, with South Dade paying part of the bill.

So it is up to the initiative and effort of local groups such as the Dr. Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead.

Hats off to these promotion pioneers of South Dade, who are pushing a new club slogan: "I'd rather bike than hike," which is a twist of the hiking craze which recently started in Washington governmental circles, and which amounted to little because the politicos couldn't take it. They too should take up cycling.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to compliment Dr. White for his selection of Homestead, Fla., as a frequent vacation spot and his public service in encouraging and participating in this bicycling and bicycle safety movement, which not only aids the middle-aged and senior citizens by giving them healthy recreation and constructive exercise, but contributes to the well-being and happiness of our youth and all our citizens.

I should like also to commend Mayor Conley and the Homestead City officials, the sponsors and members of the Homestead Bicycle Club, the News Leader, and the citizens of Homestead, for their public-spirited efforts which have brought merited recognition to the Homestead area.

We in Florida have demonstrated that it can be done. We have led the way. Other communities should be inspired to follow our example. I challenge other cities and States to adopt similar programs. Let us get all of America aboard bicycles for health and happiness.

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. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, on Thursday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS.

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

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

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

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. MULTER.

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

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. PATTEN.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

584. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during February 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

585. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relating to the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses" for the fiscal year 1963, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

586. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the January 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

588. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

589. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes,' approved March 1, 1899, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the U.S. Information Agency's 19th semiannual report, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to

amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

592. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

593. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona (Convair), a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

595. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Saline Water Act for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

596. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 116. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 117. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 118. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend paragraph 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to duties imposed on the importation of clocks, clock movements and other measuring devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5098. A bill to repeal section 2(d) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5099. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5100. A bill authorizing the modification of the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5101. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5102. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Cancer Society; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 5103. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5104. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5107. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities of certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to prevent discrimination because of sex in payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5112. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5113. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5114. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5116. A bill to prohibit the extension of Grand Teton National Park without the expressed approval of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 5117. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5119. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5120. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5121. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5123. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5124. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5126. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5128. A bill to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5129. 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. PATMAN:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards based on the extent of migration out of certain areas for the purpose of designating such areas as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5133. A bill to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton, to authorize the Secretary to permit cotton-growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5134. A bill to provide transportation for certain parents and unremarried widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces who are buried in national cemeteries outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5135. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5137. 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. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the National railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 5139. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5140. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to authorize the several States to permit the offering of a prayer in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the feasibility and advisability of and to formulate preliminary plans and recommendations for a site and for the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restricting the judicial power of the United States in State legislative apportionment cases to those States which do not provide their citizens with the opportunity to initiate and vote upon plans of State legislative apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document, the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and auxiliaries regarding proposed amendments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 297. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred for minority purposes in the Education and Labor Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 298. Resolution to amend clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 299. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred to as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to naming the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border after the Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine protesting against the proposed transfer of internal revenue personnel and services from the State of Maine; 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 urging immediate action by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the national defense system in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the rejection of the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protecting the U.S. lumbering industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation to the Secretary of Agriculture for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate

the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging consideration of legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to asking consideration of the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor Federal legislation providing for regulation and control of appropriations, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their State and her sister States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging legislation to prohibit the killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means; 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 follow:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Leung Kar Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Dana Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Paul Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Adamo Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Spyridoula Mavrogianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Harry Cornish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5154: A bill for the relief of Wilfredo Larar de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. Fred Wynn, chairman, Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling upon Congress in the public interest to initiate proper legislation to make labor unions subject to the same laws as industry, amenable to the national security and public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

73. Also, petition of John Biancucci and others, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Bernard E. Hanus, assistant committee clerk, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Detroit, Mich., relative to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transaction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Democratic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I proudly join my colleagues in paying tribute to the inspiring courage and determination of Byelorussians all over the world. I am certain that the independence they once enjoyed, will be regained and that freedom will flourish.

Byelorussia was once an independent country and made important contributions to the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In 1795, this freedom was crushed when Byelorussia was made a part of the Russian Empire by force.

Since then, Byelorussians have fought to regain their independence, without success. Major attempts were made in 1812 and 1863; and in 1917, after creating a congress with the goal of establishing an independent Byelorussia, the democratic body was attacked and scattered by the armed power of Soviet Russia.

Unconquered, despite this tragic defeat, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed independence by passing the Third Constitutional Act on March 25, 1918. But Soviet Russia attacked and defeated the young democratic state, consisting of 10 million persons.

Demonstrating their indomitable courage and love for freedom, the people of Byelorussia rebelled and fought in the Slutsk District in 1920, but were defeated by the Soviet armies, and again during